
Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:09:05 GMT

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

Figured as a member of BHS, I'd start the topic rolling. We want to do some unit balance changes. Almost certainly, we'll end up changing the "snipers" so that they're not grossly overpowered.

This way, aircraft will be usable, without being blown away five seconds after leaving their base.

My suggestions are that missile armed units (Rocket Soldier, Gunner, Recon Bike, MRLS, Mammoth Tank, Orca, Stealth Tank) track units better. This will replace the "need" of "snipers" to destroy aircraft or other light armored vehicles.

Additionally, this would also entail the use of Helicopter Pads where aircraft rearm, and only have one weapon - Orca would be armed with its TOW-2B missiles, six salvos. Apache would have 25-75 rounds of chain-gun ammunition, both would rearm back at the Helicopter Pad instead of endlessly loitering over the battlefield.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Spice](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:11:38 GMT

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

sounds good. No more n00bjettors The rockets for the infantry dont need to seek.

aslo thats excellent about the aircrafts. On big maps they wont get pwned now. Wont alot of fan maps become usless.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [U927](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:12:29 GMT

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

Sounds plausible. I was getting tired of continuously getting blown out of the sky by a n00bjet rifle.

The snipers and choppers seem to be the only units that need to be revamped. The rest seem fine in my opinion.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [xptek_disabled](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:12:32 GMT

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

Havoc/Sakura really needs to get his/her gun reduced, esp. against MRLS/Art. I'd also like to see tracking missles.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:16:22 GMT

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

Please note that ACK intended to start a discussion on what we will change if there's support for the ideas. This isn't something that will definitely happen, we are hoping you guys will brainstorm ideas for how to keep balance.

Also know that any changes we make will have to be tested. Balance is a delicate procedure and it's perfectly reasonable to expect several variations to get a balance that makes for exciting gameplay.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [drunkill](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:21:32 GMT

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

yay, well kinda, thats good then, it will become better. but how will you inforce these changes? or will the server choose?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:22:35 GMT

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

The aircraft should have more ammo than you prepose. Both aircraft should have enough ammunition to take out a tank. Not a Mammoth of course, but being able to take out, or almost take out, a medium tank (Nod) and a light tank (GDI) if every round hit. This would prevent the bordon factor of firing a few rounds, returning to refill, fire a few more, base becomes decimated as a group can only take out one tank at a time.

It would make them powerful, hence the need to refill, but not completely useless against armor.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:29:23 GMT

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

If you've installed RenGuard 1.02, you were asked if you'd like BHS to automatically apply core updates as they become available. Saying Yes to this question will allow us to apply patches to your game files wherever a client-side fix is necessary to make the change.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 01:46:07 GMT

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

warrantoThe aircraft should have more ammo than you prepose. Both aircraft should have enough ammunition to take out a tank. Not a Mammoth of course, but being able to take out, or almost take out, a medium tank (Nod) and a light tank (GDI) if every round hit. This would prevent the boredom factor of firing a few rounds, returning to refill, fire a few more, base becomes decimated as a group can only take out one tank at a time.

It would make them powerful, hence the need to refill, but not completely useless against armor.

Aircraft are support units in C&C. Renegade is based off C&C. Aircraft are meant to do quick strikes, not destroy things easily like that.

If so, that makes everyone want to get aircraft... Then it negates the use of ground vehicles. The missiles on an Orca would damage a Medium Tank 25%, and a Light Tank 50%.

Not so much with the Apache, as it would be more effective against infantry and buildings.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Renx](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 02:40:18 GMT

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

I like the idea for the snipers, that would be a major improvement for the game.

But, as for the helicopters, they may not of been like that in TD, but I don't think such a big change should be made to the way they are in Renegade. I'm not saying keep the unlimited ammo, because if snipers can't damage them, everyone might suddenly seem like TankClash when they're flying one

I just don't think 6 missles, and 25-75 is enough for renegade.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 02:53:25 GMT

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

hmm this could be cool. Definitly the air craft reloading on a helipad and not having unlimited ammo is cool, but what about tanks? Tanks should have to refill to but have a larger stock of ammo than orca and apache. If tanks have an limeted amount of ammo, it would lead to much much more stratigic gameplay, which would be really cool.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 02:58:39 GMT

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

AircraftkillerwarrantoThe aircraft should have more ammo than you prepose. Both aircraft should have enough ammunition to take out a tank. Not a Mammoth of course, but being able to take out,

or almost take out, a medium tank (Nod) and a light tank (GDI) if every round hit. This would prevent the boredom factor of firing a few rounds, returning to refill, fire a few more, base becomes decimated as a group can only take out one tank at a time.

It would make them powerful, hence the need to refill, but not completely useless against armor.

Aircraft are support units in C&C. Renegade is based off C&C. Aircraft are meant to do quick strikes, not destroy things easily like that.

If so, that makes everyone want to get aircraft... Then it negates the use of ground vehicles. The missiles on an Orca would damage a Medium Tank 25%, and a Light Tank 50%.

Not so much with the Apache, as it would be more effective against infantry and buildings.

True enough. Though admittedly I did aim high on purpose, simply to establish a maximum. It's simply an attempt to balance realism with the fun factor.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 04:21:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not about realism, it's about C&C.

The aircraft can be made to handle better in order to make up for the loss of ammunition.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 05:28:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Interesting idea... but it'll only work in big games... Small games especially 1v1 will become useless on cityfly/wallsfly without the orca's machinegun... I can't help but oppose this.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 05:36:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renegade is fine the way it is.

Spoony, I take offense to your signature.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 05:48:35 GMT

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

Fixed. Forgive my WOLness.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 07:03:24 GMT

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

Heh, by "realism" I was referring to the C&C universe.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [cokemaster](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 10:10:27 GMT

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

spoonyratInteresting idea... but it'll only work in big games... Small games especially 1v1 will become useless on cityfly/wallsfly without the orca's machinegun... I can't help but oppose this.

This explains it...

Quote:Aircraft are support units in C&C. Renegade is based off C&C. Aircraft are meant to do quick strikes, not destroy things easily like that.

Personally I say do it, snipers are too powerful at the moment. I suggest toning them down so that they only effectively hurt men but not get mass points off tanks. Their firerate is quiet high as well....

In order to 'balance' it - rockets should track more effectively (as you said on the first post).

But If snipers aren't able to be toned down, then the artirelly and the MRLS should be less open to sniper fire.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 10:42:09 GMT

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

I think giving stuff like rocket soldiers and the MRLS better anti-air ability is a great idea, but messing around with the air unit's weapon systems and sniper's anti-air damage will change Renegade for the worse.

One thing I would definitely support is if snipers didn't get points from attacking stuff they don't damage i.e. tanks. I can't help but cringe to see 70% of a team in a public buy ramjets just to shoot enemy tanks.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Uberfahr](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 12:07:04 GMT

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

Quote:Almost certainly, we'll end up changing the "snipers" so that they're not grossly overpowered.

What about the points you receive for the useless sniping of stanks for example? They should be reduced in my opinion.

To the sniper-heli interaction: I like the idea of having a counter unit against helis and these counter units are definately Havocs/Sakuras. The same as an APC counters a Sniper. Counter units are a classical element of RTS games, so why weaken it?

And of course, if you have 5 helis in your teams, and the enemy has 5 Snipers, then thats your own fault. You could change easily to tanks and rush their base. Snipers are not overpowered. They leave the base defenseless.

But I agree: if the map is really large, then you wont reach your target with helicopters. I never played on this kind of maps though. However, on City_Flying you can easily group with an APC and eliminate the enemy snipers. As you have to balance mainly for the main maps, please take that into account.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 13:43:07 GMT

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

Everyone wishes to be a sniper, few actually are. Look at all the n00bies who run around doing nothing but bodyshots with there havoc, and get it just to get hte points for shooting tanks, then there are people like me that buy an 500 sniper, aim for head, does not shoot tanks or buildings at all, because i have the skill to get top 5 just by killing people.

I think that headshot should still be 1 shot 1 kill, but i body shots should be less powerful.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [jonwil](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 13:59:21 GMT

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

I think we should cut back on snipers and instead make rockets (for example, the Rocket Launcher and the MRLS and others, also the recon bike if its put back in) the main anti-aircraft weapons.

Snipers should be for taking out people and should do lots of damage (and get lots of points for attacking) people. They should do almost no damage (and get almost no points for attacking) vehicles and buildings.

Every unit should have a speciality.

For example, snipers are great for taking out infantry.
Engineers are great for repairing shit and stopping beacons.
Rocket Launchers are great for taking out armoured stuff (including aircraft)
Machine guns are good at taking out lightly armoured stuff
Tanks are great at taking out medium armoured stuff
etc

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 18:42:46 GMT

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

I 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 cautious (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.

Subject: Re: Unit Balance

Posted by [Majiin Vegeta](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 22:16:04 GMT

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

AircraftkillerFigured as a member of BHS, I'd start the topic rolling. We want to do some unit balance changes. Almost certainly, we'll end up changing the "snipers" so that they're not grossly overpowered.

This way, aircraft will be usable, without being blown away five seconds after leaving their base.

My suggestions are that missile armed units (Rocket Soldier, Gunner, Recon Bike, MRLS, Mammoth Tank, Orca, Stealth Tank) track units better. This will replace the "need" of "snipers" to destroy aircraft or other light armored vehicles.

Additionally, this would also entail the use of Helicopter Pads where aircraft rearm, and only have

one weapon - Orca would be armed with its TOW-2B missiles, six salvos. Apache would have 25-75 rounds of chain-gun ammunition, both would rearm back at the Helicopter Pad instead of endlessly loitering over the battlefield.

i like the first part but the second part about rearming back at the pad i dont like.. tanks dont need to rearm so why should the orca / apache

just give them decent reload times

Subject: Re: Unit Balance
Posted by [Slash0x](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 22:32:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AircraftkillerAlmost certainly, we'll end up changing the "snipers" so that they're not grossly overpowered.
But can you make it where they get the same amount of points...because everyone has their forte and like mine, it's sniping. I shouldn't get docked 120 points because snipers are too useless to use and I'm at the bottom of the ladder list in points.

Subject: Re: Unit Balance
Posted by [Majiin Vegeta](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 22:37:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Slash0xAircraftkillerAlmost certainly, we'll end up changing the "snipers" so that they're not grossly overpowered.
But can you make it where they get the same amount of points...because everyone has their forte and like mine, it's sniping. I shouldn't get docked 120 points because snipers are too useless to use and I'm at the bottom of the ladder list in points.

when i snipe im never at the bottem of the list.. try killing adv infantry and not.. basic..

also i think would be good is to stop snipers shooting armored tanks for 15 points a shot.. they should get less or just 0 snipers get there points from killing infantry

Subject: Re: Unit Balance
Posted by [Slash0x](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2004 22:43:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Majiin Vegeta
when i snipe im never at the bottem of the list.. try killing adv infantry and not.. basic..

I know that, you barely get anything in Renegade already against 0 infantry, the only true benefit is to better a k/d ratio.

Majiin Vegeta

also i think would be good is to stop snipers shooting armored tanks for 15 points a shot.. they should get less or just 0 snipers get there points from killing infantry

If I am willing to shoot at a tank, should be my own choice, all I am doing is wasting bullets to kill infantry...I came to this several times, so I know (and I don't get refills every five seconds because I got barely hit for 60 health...). :rolleyes:

Subject: Re: Unit Balance

Posted by [cokemaster](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 00:18:57 GMT

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

Slash0x

If I am willing to shoot at a tank, should be my own choice, all I am doing is wasting bullets to kill infantry...I came to this several times, so I know (and I don't get refills every five seconds because I got barely hit for 60 health...). :rolleyes:

:rolleyes: Then why should you get points for it then? All you are doing is wasting ammo on it.

The default mammoth missiles I think they might need an increase in range.

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.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 05:15:19 GMT

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

Is this patch going to be an optional one? Will people who have it be able to play on non-patched servers? Frankly, I dislike most of these changes, having already played through them on ACK's maps and RenAlert... if WW wanted the game to play like that, they'd have done it themselves. While I can appreciate your fervor in wanting it to be exactly like C&C was, Ren is fun solely because it took liberties to improve gameplay in areas where a direct comparison would have been not as cool. Take artillery, for example, or grenadiers. The artillery would have been impossible to use well in Ren if it had to fire in an arc. The way it is now, it still has a minimum firing range, yet works much better in the game's engine.

If you're going to balance something, make it so GDI and Nod Rifle Soldiers do the same damage, or make it so both the Orca and Apache have the same machine guns, or make Tib Rifle Sydney a little better considering the Chemwarrior is a much more useful character.

Making the aircraft have actual clips wouldn't be a bad plan, either; say 4-6 rockets for an Orca, then a reload similar to the MRLS. Since the Orca doesn't have the same ROF as an MRLS does this would be a decent balance change that wouldn't horribly impact the game. Also, try making the machine guns on the aircraft not be 100% accurate, as both have a spray radius of 0 right now. I suppose this was done to try to negate the impact of "float" on your shots but these guns are too beefy vs. infantry. Lowering the ROF by about 20% might not be a bad call, or making the warhead not Steel because they have a disproportionate impact on infantry.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 06:22:10 GMT

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

Quote: if WW wanted the game to play like that, they'd have done it themselves.

That's nowhere near true. WS would have patched the game for unit balance if EA had allocated the resources for it.

Quote:The artillery would have been impossible to use well in Ren if it had to fire in an arc. The

way it is now, it still has a minimum firing range, yet works much better in the game's engine.

You mean it doesn't require skill. Gotcha.

I don't get why people play a C&C game and want to turn it into something that isn't C&C gameplay.

If you want Unreal, go play it... Most people were expecting C&C up close, not some bastardized version of it. [/list]

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [DarkFish](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 07:53:18 GMT

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

So we are looking at something like the remake you did of City_Flying?

The idea sounds good for an option, I would try both before choosing one though. A project such as this might have uptake problems. If you look at a non fanmap-dedicated server, when they do have the occasional fan map, they tend to empty.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 08:05:54 GMT

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

These would be included with RG.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 09:56:49 GMT

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

When you install/installed RenGuard 1.02, you were asked if you wanted us to automatically install bug fixes from BlackHand Studios. Whether these types of changes are included is completely based on your feedback.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Dan](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 09:58:17 GMT

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

if you're going to allocate ammo for the apaches/orcas then I think that their power should be increased slightly as when you go off to reload the tank driver you were attacking can just get out and repair while you are reloading

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Dan](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 09:59:14 GMT

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

And crimson, are we still able to play on nonpatched servers with the patches, and vice versa?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 10:00:26 GMT

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

The bug fixes we have scheduled right now will work on ANY server you join. As far as balance changes, we're going to need to do a LOT of brainstorming and playing with the engine to figure out the best way to deliver those changes to you. If we can do it server-side, that would be optimal.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Dan](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 10:02:27 GMT

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

When you start releasing updates for the engine & stuff. is it possible to make it so that the changes only work in patched servers, and a different configuration can be used in non patched servers? that way we can play in any server

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 10:12:57 GMT

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

I agree with all your suggestions except the Orca/Apache ammo. It's a great idea to have them rearm at the Helipad, but I think they need more ammo. In Tiberian Dawn you could build large groups of them, but you only control yourself in Renegade (and other players won't necessarily co-operate with you all the time), so I think it would be better if you had at least enough Orca missiles to destroy a basic tank on your own.

Aircraft in Renegade were either far too weak or far too strong, depending on whether the enemy had snipers. If the Hand/Barracks was down, they ruled over everything, because they could stay in the air indefinitely and their chainguns could rip through both tanks and infantry. Now if you make them specialized, with the Orca finding it hard to take out infantry and the Apache doing little damage to tanks (unless in groups), then you've already narrowed their effectiveness to one type of unit. When you factor in having to return to base to reload every so often, I think you can safely give them a moderate supply of ammo without it affecting the unit balance. They wouldn't be all-powerful anymore, even without anti-air snipers, because they wouldn't be able to damage all units to the same degree.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 14:32:10 GMT

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

AircraftkillerQuote: if WW wanted the game to play like that, they'd have done it themselves.

That's nowhere near true. WS would have patched the game for unit balance if EA had allocated the resources for it.

What kind of "resources" would it take? Anyone could bang out something like that in the Ren tools in like 30 minutes. Do some in-house testing, which I'm sure is what you'll be doing with your patch, and send it out. If it was so resource intensive that a big company like EA didn't want to do it then why are you able to do it?

Aircraftkiller

Quote:The artillery would have been impossible to use well in Ren if it had to fire in an arc. The way it is now, it still has a minimum firing range, yet works much better in the game's engine.

You mean it doesn't require skill. Gotcha.

I don't get why people play a C&C game and want to turn it into something that isn't C&C gameplay.

If you want Unreal, go play it... Most people were expecting C&C up close, not some bastardized version of it.

I fail to see how being able to only shoot at stationary targets and skill are equated. I'd think it'd be the other way around; it takes no skill to hit a stationary target. As I said before, I can appreciate the fact that you want to make this game exactly like C&C, but there's a reason it wasn't made like that. There's also a reason games like Unreal are infinitely more popular than Ren, since you brought that up: they're simple. Simplicity in form and perfection in execution are much better goals to shoot for. Complexity, while it may keep some of the hardcore people playing, will alienate most of the rest of your userbase.

I might as well ask this here: if this forum has been opened to discuss balance changes, among other things, and you're not going to actually read what people say with at least an attempt at objectivism, then why are we even bothering to post our opinions?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 15:28:49 GMT

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

CrimsonThe bug fixes we have scheduled right now will work on ANY server you join.

To me, this seems tantamount to an endorsement of cheating. Some people may not agree that all of the "bugs" actually need to be changed. (And as self-proclaimed "leaders of the community," you should be sympathetic to those of us who wish to play the game un-modded.)

You may not think of these bug fixes as a cheat. But consider this: if one person starts with a pistol always loaded, and another must reload his pistol before firing, doesn't that give one player an unfair advantage? (Granted, this is not as extreme as, say, a bighead mod, but it is still unfair.) Another example: if only one or two people in a game can see icons to go along with radio messages, doesn't that create an unfair situation?

I believe that if you want to fix bugs and make balance changes, you should release everything as a mod to the game, so people can still play a totally un-modified game on certain servers. Don't just try to change the game itself. Doing that only punishes those of us who want to play the game the way Westwood made it.

-mahkra

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [tooncy](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 16:22:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In response to the pistol thing, that's exactly why I always reload after killing somebody.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 16:38:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anyone with an ounce of sense reloads their pistol once they've bought their character.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 17:40:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:What kind of "resources" would it take? Anyone could bang out something like that in the Ren tools in like 30 minutes. Do some in-house testing, which I'm sure is what you'll be doing with your patch, and send it out. If it was so resource intensive that a big company like EA didn't want to do it then why are you able to do it?

That isn't the point. They have to assign a team of beta testers to make sure it works right and that nothing is overbalanced. Then, after that testing phase, it has to go to EA's quality assurance department. If it passes that, it has to get compiled into a patch for release, and possibly release another patch to fix issues that arose from the one before it.

That's why they didn't release a patch to fix gameplay, because they'd need to release more as the game changed.

Quote:As I said before, I can appreciate the fact that you want to make this game exactly like

C&C, but there's a reason it wasn't made like that.

Yeah, you're right. There is a reason. Electronic Arts suits decided it needed to be changed at E3 2000.

"Hey, that Buggy is cool and all, but you can make it better. So do it."

And so forth. This is how we ended up with Renegade as it is today. If they had left development to WS, and had they developed Renegade faster than five years, we'd have a true C&C experience.

Quote:Complexity, while it may keep some of the hardcore people playing, will alienate most of the rest of your userbase.

People use Artillery all of the time in RA. I don't see any complaints about it being changed. People who use it normally say they love how it works now, because it has massive range with better damage, but less accuracy.

Those who don't like it... Do not use it. They simply use another unit on the Allied vehicle arsenal.

Quote:I might as well ask this here: if this forum has been opened to discuss balance changes, among other things, and you're not going to actually read what people say with at least an attempt at objectivism, then why are we even bothering to post our opinions?

Because I don't make the balance changes. I'm here to argue my position, and I will do so because I want this game to be what it was intended to be, not this bullshit we're playing right now.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PiMuRho](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 18:33:44 GMT

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

Just as a side note - Renegade multiplayer was only added in the last 6 months of development, and was absolutely not a priority. For the majority of the game's development, it was purely a single-player game.

The beta test was used to address some balance issues, but obviously some still remain - that can't be denied. I don't agree with all the changes ACK wants to make but that's why this has been opened to the public.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 20:18:05 GMT

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

Exactly. All I want is this game to be what it was envisioned to be, C&C in first person. Not Unreal

& Conquer, or Command & Doom or whatever else people here think it needs to be balanced off.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Homey](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 20:28:24 GMT

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

Just one little thing about artillery, If your aimed at something exactly thats not moving, sometimes it goes right on, others of to the right, or down. It's a little un accurate. Supposed to be like that?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 21:06:50 GMT

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

Seriously homey, I really didn't expect a dumb question like that from you.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 21:33:00 GMT

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

Homey: most of the guns in the game aren't perfectly accurate, the glaring exceptions being Orca/Apache machine guns.

ACK: I think you're taking what I am saying a little out of context. I was pointing those things out as examples of items that were changed to increase playability. You may argue that no one has a beef with your artillery currently, but the people who play RA are a small subset of all Ren players, and most of them play it because they like what you've done to make it adhere to the original game. I don't play it because I dislike these changes, so we'll just get that on the table now.

I hardly think what Ren is now is "bullshit" as you so succintly put it. It may not be literal 100% true to C&C gameplay, but for me I prefer it that way because it's faster-paced. Ren is one of the slowest-paced FPSes out there, and the only reason I DO still play it when better games are out there is because of the C&C mode and the way the whole theme is carried out. Some of your proposed changes will make the game quite a bit slower, and I hope you realize this before you do it.

While we're on the subject, if you're going to change weapon damages or ranges at all, can you post exact figures in here? I'd like to see a comparison of what the values are now to what you'd like to see done, if you don't mind. If you don't want to do it here, you can hit me up on AIM (priestofb) and we can talk there, too.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 22:26:48 GMT

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

Quote:I hardly think what Ren is now is "bullshit" as you so succinctly put it. It may not be literal 100% true to C&C gameplay, but for me I prefer it that way because it's faster-paced. Ren is one of the slowest-paced FPSes out there, and the only reason I DO still play it when better games are out there is because of the C&C mode and the way the whole theme is carried out. Some of your proposed changes will make the game quite a bit slower, and I hope you realize this before you do it.

Of course it is, because it's based on real time strategy. It's not a fucking deathmatch, why even bring that up? Renegade is less of a FPS and more of a RTS\FPS hybrid, when it should be a RTS gameplay converted to FPS.

Once again, if you want a fast paced game, C&C isn't your style. At least not a C&C FPS. If you want Unreal style games, the best solution is to go play Unreal.

C&C is about strategy, not about how fast you can win - unless you're playing tournament games. There's little strategy when a lot of the Renegade units are dumbed down so there's only a few good ones that kill everything, real fun that is...

People play RA because they enjoy it. Because it's Red Alert in first person. People who aren't playing it usually don't know what RA is, simply because they haven't been able to see it before. There's a lot of communication lapses between this community and 50% of the players on WOL.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Homey](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 22:39:31 GMT

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

spoonyrat Seriously homey, I really didn't expect a dumb question like that from you. it bugs me when you cant body shoot or hs with an arty because its ofcourse

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 22:59:29 GMT

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

We are FIXING bugs that Westwood intended to fix. You know what else is cheating? That the host of a server gets to see these things already!

The host has their pistol already loaded.

The host gets to hear when the harvester is damaged.

The host doesn't see snipers flicker when they strafe while scoped.

etc...

If Westwood did not intend to release these features, then why are they available to the host? Furthermore, in our research, we are finding mere typos or syntax errors that were making these things not work. This obviously shows that Westwood intended to have these features available.

However, it appears you are in the minority, as less than 1% of all RenGuard users have opted not to accept these bug fixes. Thanks to all of you for your support.

mahkraCrimsonThe bug fixes we have scheduled right now will work on ANY server you join.

To me, this seems tantamount to an endorsement of cheating. Some people may not agree that all of the "bugs" actually need to be changed. (And as self-proclaimed "leaders of the community," you should be sympathetic to those of us who wish to play the game un-modded.)

You may not think of these bug fixes a cheat. But consider this: if one person starts with a pistol always loaded, and another must reload his pistol before firing, doesn't that give one player an unfair advantage? (Granted, this is not as extreme as, say, a bighead mod, but it is still unfair.) Another example: if only one or two people in a game can see icons to go along with radio messages, doesn't that create an unfair situation?

I believe that if you want to fix bugs and make balance changes, you should release everything as a mod to the game, so people can still play a totally un-modified game on certain servers. Don't just try to change the game itself. Doing that only punishes those of us who want to play the game the way Westwood made it.

-mahkra

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 23:10:18 GMT

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

<RenGuard> There are 242 users and 38 servers on the RenGuard Network.

<RenGuard> 0 users have core updates turned off.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 00:09:22 GMT

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

I'm probably not the only person who thinks the host SHOULD have advantages.... as implied by the term "host advantage". But if all that's limited to is ungodly artillery splash, I'm content. Or would be if my connection didn't suck so bad that I couldn't host anyway.

/me returns to the topic

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 00:12:17 GMT

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

Homeyspoonyrat Seriously homey, I really didn't expect a dumb question like that from you. it bugs me when you cant body shoot or hs with an arty because its ofcourse

Artillery shells being HORRENDOUSLY powerful against infantry, it's only fair they aren't so accurate as, say, med shells.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Creed3020](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 00:12:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A lot of things mentioned in this thread make me ask myself this:

Why fix something that is not broken.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 00:14:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Better question might be: Why not polish something that's dusty.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 00:34:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The game's been out more than two years now. What's the point of trying to juggle the unit balance? All that would accomplish would be alienating whatever percentage of the Renegade community likes the game as it is. Renegade doesn't need to lose any more players.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 00:52:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ironically, most of those players were lost due to horrible balance problems in the game that we want to fix.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 01:12:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller! 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.

I had originally typed out a long reply to this, but I'll summarise it in 1 paragraph.

This is the only beef I have with bringing game dynamics from an RTS game to a 3D FPS and it's the same argument I had with renalert. How is it possible in Renegade to recreate the 'C&C' style when you have a limit of 8 vehicles, 20 units per team (to sum it up for fair performance rates), long range snipers, a 3D environment (where it's possible to miss your target), limited ammo for soldiers, the fact that any ground unit can hit an airborne unit, character independence, the fact that you can only control yourself and not the whole team, along with a myriad of other reasons? If you want to recreate the C&C style of something, surely you need to recreate every consequence that came with it to avoid flaw?

The limitations and differences between the 2 engines are what will always make them different and not as balanced as we'd all love them to be.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 01:18:31 GMT

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

You don't need more than eight vehicles or buildable structures or whatever else.

You need the core gameplay, and that is what Renegade lacks. RA seems to do just fine with it the way it is right now.

It doesn't matter if you just control yourself. Each unit in C&C was individual and interacted with each other in a balanced way. They do not in Renegade. Your argument falls apart there.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [jd422032101](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 01:21:22 GMT

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

excatly

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 01:47:17 GMT

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

I think that's where my argument takes flight. That's exactly what I'm trying to say. Some elements from C&C are simply not possible in Renegade, just like you said, and without every consequential element that comes from one, such as the "hit and run" tactics of aircraft, the game won't be balanced like you'd want it to be. That could always be seen as a theory, but each to his own.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Try_lee](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 01:53:25 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller<RenGuard> There are 242 users and 38 servers on the RenGuard Network.

<RenGuard> 0 users have core updates turned off.

I have the updates turned off.

Why? Because I want to know what I would be downloading before I do and it isn't made clear if I'll be asked to confirm downloads before they take place.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 01:55:00 GMT

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

Some aren't, that's why I said CORE GAMEPLAY.

I'll make it simpler:

Rocket Soldier versus Medium Tank.

Medium Tank loses.

Why? Rocket Soldier, while cheaper, has anti-armor rockets and will eventually destroy the Medium Tank 80% of the time unless the tank runs it over. The tank's cannon isn't meant for AP warfare.

Rocket Soldier versus Orca.

Orca loses, because the Orca isn't meant to survive against SAM threats.

Rocket Soldier versus Humm-vee.

Rocket Soldier loses, because the Humm-vee is an AP weapon and kills the Rocket Soldier before it can do much damage.

Rocket Soldier versus Commando (Or Havoc as he's now called.)

Rocket Soldier loses because the Commando has a powerful .50 caliber sniper rifle which kills him in one shot.

Get the point? I'm not saying anything but having the core gameplay.

It'd be a lot more fun, and C&C, to have everything the way it should be. Just without buildable bases and other minor issues that can be balanced out (Such as leaving in snipers but not allowing them to damage vehicles, adding in brush or better designed levels for snipers and infantry to hide instead of being forced into the open to die over and over...) over a short period of time.

C&C is already balanced. Renegade isn't.

If you don't like how Orcas handle, or Apaches in a C&C balanced situation... Here's a concept, use a tank! They're meant to dominate, not aircraft. This is true even in a real military conflict. Aircraft cannot hold objectives in reality, only foot soldiers and tanks have the ability to hold an objective because they aren't required to refuel by returning to a set point.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [jd422032101](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 02:02:34 GMT

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

kaboomer23excatly

once agin i think ack is right

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 02:11:06 GMT

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

AircraftkillerIronically, most of those players were lost due to horrible balance problems in the game that we want to fix.

That's a moot point.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 03:59:10 GMT

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

CrimsonWe are FIXING bugs that Westwood intended to fix. You know what else is cheating? That the host of a server gets to see these things already!

The host has their pistol already loaded.

The host gets to hear when the harvester is damaged.

The host doesn't see snipers flicker when they strafe while scoped.

etc...

If Westwood did not intend to release these features, then why are they available to the host? Furthermore, in our research, we are finding mere typos or syntax errors that were making these things not work. This obviously shows that Westwood intended to have these features available.

However, it appears you are in the minority, as less than 1% of all RenGuard users have opted not to accept these bug fixes. Thanks to all of you for your support.

Crimson,

First, I'd just like to clarify that I did not intend that to be a personal attack, so please don't take offense.

Second, I didn't know the host got to see those things already - I've never hosted a game on my own computer; I've always just played on my dedicated server.

(My point is still valid, though. Maybe the host already gets an unfair advantage, but then again, some people already use bighead. Does that mean that we should just give 50% of the players bighead to make things more even?)

Third, you said that most people with RenGuard have auto-update turned on. But do you have any statistics about what % of people who play Ren actually have RenGuard? (Maybe 99% of RenGuard users want auto-update. But that might actually only be 50% of all people who play Renegade.)

Personally, I think it would be great to fix bugs like making the pistol come loaded & making the radio work the way it was intended. And if someone could release an OFFICIAL patch that would fix the bugs, I'd be supportive. (but NO balance changes - the game doesn't need any)

The problem, though, is that BHS is not Westwood, nor is it EA. Any patch released by BHS would be unofficial, and there's no way to get an unofficial patch to everyone who plays Renegade. (It *might* be possible to get the patch to everyone in "the community," but there happen to be LOTS of players who never visit n00bstories and know nothing of "the community." And we shouldn't forget about them.)

If you could make the changes in a mod, though, then people with the patch could play together, and people with the unpatched version could still play in a fair environment. (An alternative might be to force the patched version to connect through BHS instead of WOL, which would also prevent patched & unpatched players from being in the same games.)

I'm not opposed to fixing obvious bugs. What I AM opposed to, though, is changing the game when there's no way to get the change to EVERYONE.

-mahkra

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 04:05:34 GMT

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

AircraftkillerC&C is already balanced. Renegade isn't.

Actually, Renegade IS balanced. But it's not balanced in the same way as C&C. It's balanced in a way that makes it fun to use each individual unit, rather than in a way that makes it fun to control all the units at once.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 04:22:34 GMT

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

Like I've said, changes like this might well improve gameplay in large servers... They'll totally wreck 1v1-2v2-3v3

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 04:37:40 GMT

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

Quote:It's balanced in a way that makes it fun to use each individual unit

Yeah, like how the n00b cannon Havocs and Sakuras kill each basic soldier in one body shot...

Or how they destroy aircraft in five shots...

Or how they get 20 points for shooting a tank just once with its armor still left...

Or how Grenadiers and Flamethrowers are almost totally useless...

Or how MRLS\Artillery are paper-thin and barely have any defense against anything they're meant to be attacking...

Or how... You get the point. It would be fun to control units that are balanced ala C&C. Rifle soldiers that aren't cannon fodder. Grenadiers that have a useful, damaging weapon. Flamethrowers that slaughter soldiers, but have a short range.

Etc... Instead of "Everything is somewhat useful until the Havoc and Sakura n00b cannons come out, then nothing is."

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 05:45:21 GMT

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

One possible solution could be to try and get in contact with the Dev team for their input.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 06:43:26 GMT

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

I already did, why do you think I've been on this crusade for over eight months?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 06:47:24 GMT

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

You pretty much outlined our struggles. The benefit to getting everyone in RenGuard is so that the game can once again be supported instead of left as abandoned by EA. Some people say we want to "take over Renegade"... but our intentions are noble. Not motivated by financial gain (in fact I and others have SPENT money to make this happen)... we just want this game to be supported and try and finish what Westwood couldn't.

The solution to this is to run RenGuard on your servers. More and more people every day are downloading it. It takes time, and the servers that don't run RenGuard are just hindering our growth and for those who are "waiting for Renguard to be more popular" ... they aren't helping the situation. I stand firm that if you want to play on my servers, you'd better prove to me that you're not cheating. I don't want my moderators and admins to have to sit there and test you all the time. We want to PLAY.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 06:53:26 GMT

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

Shit, Grenadiers already HAVE a useful, damaging weapon. They fuck up vehicles and buildings hardcore, and they are FREE. They can kill a building by themselves, for god's sake.

OMFG UNBALANCEDD!!!!!!11 CAL FUKEN WASTWOD I B WANTIN MY MONEYS BAK!

And last time I checked, in EVERY C&C GAME the artillery units are lightly armored. They're not meant to be used in a firefight. This can be negated in Ren to a large extent through skillful driving and engineer support.

Are you going to take out the engineers' ability to repair vehicles and players too? That wasn't in C&C. :rolleyes:

Wait, you probably will, since all your ideas so far turn it from Renegade into ACKgade which is strikingly similar to RenAlert. If these issues are so problematic, and you fixed them all in RenAlert, then why not just play it?

I still don't get what your beef with the 1000-cred snipers is. Change their point scale so they don't get as much for shooting armor, as it's a bug, and leave the rest intact. It takes an aircraft 4-5 machine gun shots to kill a Havoc or Sakura, in the same time that the sniper can get ONE shot off. If you're getting that torn up by snipers I honestly feel it's a case of user error. I've also never had a huge problem killing them with regular soldiers, and even if you do die, they get 2 points. WOW GAMEBRAKINN FUKEN HAXX.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 06:56:05 GMT

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

I like the concept of Renguard itself. I think you've all done a really great job with that. What I don't like is the fact that now that you've given us a way to play cheat-free again, you're in essence asking us to not play the game we wanted to be playing but a new game that is similar yet different in many basic ways, and in my opinion not as fun.

I hope you're going to ask everyone who uses Renguard to come look at this thread and offer their opinions, because otherwise it's going to be quite biased.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 08:04:53 GMT

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

DeathgodShit, Grenadiers already HAVE a useful, damaging weapon. They fuck up vehicles and buildings hardcore, and they are FREE. They can kill a building by themselves, for god's sake.

And any soldier kills them without a problem. Because they're meant to be anti-infantry and anti-structure, but they aren't. They're simply fucked up weapons that have little use. Rarely can a Grenadier ever destroy a building by themselves, or any other free unit. Most of them shouldn't be free to begin with.

Quote:And last time I checked, in EVERY C&C GAME the artillery units are lightly armored. They're not meant to be used in a firefight. This can be negated in Ren to a large extent through skillful driving and engineer support.

Yeah, and in every C&C game, they didn't get destroyed in five seconds by a sniper all the way across a level.

Quote:Are you going to take out the engineers' ability to repair vehicles and players too? That wasn't in C&C. :rolleyes:

We should, but since TD didn't have a repair ability for vehicles beyond Repair Facilities, I can't really say "change that."

Quote:Wait, you probably will, since all your ideas so far turn it from Renegade into ACKgade which is strikingly similar to RenAlert. If these issues are so problematic, and you fixed them all in RenAlert, then why not just play it?

No, it's strikingly similar to C&C. Perhaps you enjoy Homogade, that's your prerogative. It isn't mine or the opinion of many others. I want to play C&C1 in first person, I don't want a bastardized version of it. How many times do I have to tell you that?

Quote:I still don't get what your beef with the 1000-cred snipers is. Change their point scale so they don't get as much for shooting armor, as it's a bug, and leave the rest intact. It takes an aircraft 4-5 machine gun shots to kill a Havoc or Sakura, in the same time that the sniper can get ONE shot off. If you're getting that torn up by snipers I honestly feel it's a case of user error. I've also never had a huge problem killing them with regular soldiers, and even if you do die, they get 2 points. WOW GAMEBRAKINN FUKEN HAXX.

Man, you must not be playing the same game I am, because it only takes five shots from a n00b cannon to kill an Orca. No accuracy penalty. No round times. No nothing except "point, click, Orca is dead."

How fucking balanced is that? ANYTHING CAN BE COUNTERED IF YOU CAN GET NEAR IT.. BIG FUCKING WHOOP! I swear you'd be defending a unit if it were in Renegade for two years, and it destroyed everything in one button press that took ten seconds to charge... Yeah, you can stop that from happening, but it isn't very fucking realistic to imagine it happening.

n00b cannons aren't that overbalanced, but they're pretty damn close with the way they fuck up the game. Why attack with tanks, they just shoot them to get points and negate the damage you do to buildings... Why attack with soldiers? They just kill you in a few seconds from across the level.

Yeah, you don't have a problem... I'm sure you won't after being killed over 10 times trying to kill a Havoc with a rifle soldier.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 12:22:54 GMT

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

Deathgodnow that you've given us a way to play cheat-free again, you're in essence asking us to not play the game we wanted to be playing but a new game that is similar yet different in many basic ways, and in my opinion not as fun.

Bear in mind the reason I created this forum was so everyone can talk and discuss not only bugfixes but possible enhancements. This is just the discussion stage, and while of course Aircraftkiller is very passionate about the way he thinks things should be, nothing has been decided, and this isn't a "this is how things are going to be" discussion.

Personally I think that if Blackhand Studios does any substantial modifications to Renegade besides basic bugfixes, that we should create an alternate game, and call it something like

RenegadeX or something. So that people can still play the original game with its wacky environment that they like, and those who want to play the "new and improved" Renegade can click a different icon and play on RenegadeX servers.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [jonwil](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 12:33:37 GMT

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

If/when we do implement new preset changes, they wont be global.

They will only be on new Blackhand Studios maps (which might be modified versnios of existing maps, westwood, ACK or otherwise or might be totally new)

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Homey](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 14:15:00 GMT

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

About the host

It doesn't matter if they flicker or not its still hard to hit, if it wasn't the host would never miss, yet they do. the pistol, you should have it loaded anyways

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 15:36:49 GMT

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

See, ACK never mentioned that these will be on specific maps. He was making it sound like anyone who owned Renguard and opted for patches was going to wake up one day with a different game. I think the map plan is by far a better idea, though. That will mean old maps and the new, 'fixed' maps could be in rotation at the same time, which would be pretty cool. Thanks for the clarification, Blazer and jonwil.

ACK, man, honestly I think you take everything I say as a personal attack. I'm not intending that. If I was I'd come in here and just say "ACK IS AN ASSRAMMING HOMOFAG MASCOT" or something. I'm not here to try to insult you, I appreciate your work ethic in getting these bugs and shit taken care of. I just feel that a lot of you are overdramatizing the fucking Ramjet. It's one gun. I don't see anyone complaining about the fact that Sydney does 5 more damage at the MCT than Raveshaw does, or that GDI soldiers do 40% more damage than Nod ones do, which is really broken early game. If the gun itself is the problem, then fix the bugs which give it extra points against heavy armor and be done with it. I think they should be able to kill free soldiers in one shot; if Rav and Sydney can, why shouldn't they? Are Rav and Sydney broke too? What about Mobius/Mendoza? They eat everything just like Rav/Sydney do.

And I'm sorry, not only have I never been horribly destroyed by a Havoc/Sakura when all I get is a free solidier, but I rarely get taken down by Ramjet fire when I'm in an Orca because I put 5 slugs into that person's face right after I see the first shot and they die before they get enough shots off

to kill me. If you fly into an area where you KNOW there are a lot of snipers with an aircraft, that's not a broken game, that's poor strategy. Would you be complaining if it was 5 Raveshaws who dropped you in one shot?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Homey](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 16:06:49 GMT

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

BlazerDeathgodnow that you've given us a way to play cheat-free again, you're in essence asking us to not play the game we wanted to be playing but a new game that is similar yet different in many basic ways, and in my opinion not as fun.

Bear in mind the reason I created this forum was so everyone can talk and discuss not only bugfixes but possible enhancements. This is just the discussion stage, and while of course Aircraftkiller is very passionate about the way he thinks things should be, nothing has been decided, and this isn't a "this is how things are going to be" discussion.

Personally I think that if Blackhand Studios does any substantial modifications to Renegade besides basic bugfixes, that we should create an alternate game, and call it something like RenegadeX or something. So that people can still play the original game with its wacky environment that they like, and those who want to play the "new and improved" Renegade can click a different icon and play on RenegadeX servers.

I agree, all these balance changes should be a modification or something. I doubt half of the people who play now want it changes.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [zunnie](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 16:08:29 GMT

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

jonwillf/when we do implement new preset changes, they wont be global.

They will only be on new Blackhand Studios maps (which might be modified versions of existing maps, westwood, ACK or otherwise or might be totally new)

Is it possible to have these changes done Server Side only?

Like what they did with Dragonade (DragonServ) on Canyon for example they have Turrets and stuff like that.

Its not required for the connecting people to download a new version of the map. They can join it with the original Canyon map and the server tells their client that on some spot of the map there is a turret or something.

The patches that BHS applies to maps and/or game-bugs/enhancements , your saying they are only applied for those who had answered with Yes during the installation of RenGuard.

Will the people who said No still be able to play on the same server as the people who answered it with Yes?

[zunnie]

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 16:13:32 GMT

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

I think GDI soliders are supposed to do more damage than Nod soldiers...the ongoing theme of Renegade/C&C is that GDI has strong armor/weapons (Mammoth/med tank, PIC, etc), and Nod has advanced tech (stealth tanks, stealth black hand). So a GDI soldier versus Nod soldier, yeah the GDI soldier will win, but at the same time an SBH slips quietly by on his way to C4 your MCT

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 16:15:23 GMT

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

Zunnie there are some bugfixes such as emoticons fix that require actually patching game(2).exe...these are the sort of updates that will be sent out to RG users who opt for them. Anything that can be implemented server side or in a map, we will release that way as we prefer to give people the most options.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 16:34:46 GMT

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

BlazerI think GDI soliders are supposed to do more damage than Nod soldiers...the ongoing theme of Renegade/C&C is that GDI has strong armor/weapons (Mammoth/med tank, PIC, etc), and Nod has advanced tech (stealth tanks, stealth black hand). So a GDI soldier versus Nod soldier, yeah the GDI soldier will win, but at the same time an SBH slips quietly by on his way to C4 your MCT

Could be. It just irks me early game to know that if I am on Nod and I go to shoot the harvy that the opposing team gets 40% more money for doing it than I do.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Homey](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:13:10 GMT

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

Nod shooters have way bigger heads then gdi

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [DarkFish](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:35:33 GMT

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

I don't see the need to go so far. Sure, just upgrade the mammoth a little to make it useful, decrease sniper damage to Helicopters and Artilleries/MRLSs. Fix a few bugs, and major balance issues, then leave it at that.

Of course, you can make a more extreme "True C&C" map pack if you want, but I for one would like to see just smaller changes on their own, as I feel these would improve the gameplay more for me.

Remember that Ack is not trying to force these down your throats. I'm sure there are others who want to play a "True C&C" Renegade mod, and this would be an option available to them.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Creed3020](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:56:23 GMT

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

Deathgod

Wait, you probably will, since all your ideas so far turn it from Renegade into ACKgade which is strikingly similar to RenAlert. If these issues are so problematic, and you fixed them all in RenAlert, then why not just play it?

He figured it out what's going on and what RenAlert is based on.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 22:09:19 GMT

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

AircraftkillerGet the point? I'm not saying anything but having the core gameplay.

I take the point. Although I think what you're trying to say is in one way or another what I was too. "Change what can be changed, keep the focus on gameplay, keep it fun while making it as accurate as possible to C&C."

~g

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [EnGiMaN56](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 02:28:19 GMT

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

Ok, its a 1v1, walls_flying im gdi, enemy buys a light tank, i come over in my orca and shoot him down 50% or w/e it was, i go back to reload, he repairs way quicker with technition and gets

closer to my base, i go him him down from full health again to half health, and he hops out repairs again while im refilling, nice cycle there light tank wins . I know you guys say that renegade is meant for 7v7+ but reloading of orca/apache is just lame, Tanks dont have to.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 03:40:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So don't use an Orca, OBVIOUSLY...

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [EnGiMaN56](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 07:58:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

orca > anything 1v1.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [EnGiMaN56](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 07:59:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ACKgade rofl , you're to newb to realise how good the orca is? if you could aim too it owns ramjet.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Slash0x](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 15:20:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kill the healer if he jumps out of the Light tank, not that hard, then steal his light and destroy your orca, bam! Fun fun...doh!!!

>.<

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 16:57:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Like I keep saying.... downgrading orca/apache or changing its armour system will wreck small games... But since ACK doesn't like small games, obviously that's irrelevant :rolleyes: . Let's ignore the fact that a massive part of the gaming community PREFERS small games, because they're not ACK and as such, don't matter

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 18:20:09 GMT

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

Yeah, that's why the majority of players are found on the larger 16-128 player servers.

Quote:ACKgade rofl , you're to newb to realise how good the orca is? if you could aim too it owns ramjet.

I'm a newbie? I hate to break it to you but I've been playing this game since 3 December of 2001, and beta tested the game AND the flying units before people like you had a chance to play with them.

They don't easily own any "sniper" units. If you can keep a bead on a "sniper," sure, but that's pretty damn hard when they're in scope mode and flicker around making it imposible to get a good shot on them. Try and land on them and they move out of the way, by which time their other n00b cannon friend has already shot you down, and you're dead.

It's even worse if you just leave your base, they camp on the bridge or at their own base, and flying out gets you destroyed in a few seconds.

Pretty fucking lame to have units that are almost worthless. Why even bother to purchase an aircraft if their only use is to give massive points to the enemy team and not even be able to do much?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 19:19:15 GMT

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

EnGiMaN56ACKgade rofl , you're to newb to realise how good the orca is? if you could aim too it owns ramjet.

FYI, he tends to own in an aircraft. Except when I'm being cheap and pecking him off with my Ramjet from the safety of my base (). In that case he swears at me over teamspeak

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 19:46:36 GMT

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

If people camp on the bridge, you fly up from under it, using it as cover to pounce on them. If they flicker, shoot in the middle of the flicker and they die because they walk through that spot.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 21:44:15 GMT

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

If they're camping on the bridge, leaving your base means you get shot down ANYWAY...

And going under it by the side entrance means that you've probably already taken three hits, and you're going to be even easier to destroy than you normally are.

The flicker doesn't matter, most times it's so horrid that you can't tell where the center of it is.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 22:12:50 GMT

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

There's always a way out of your base that is free of sniper fire, unless your defense are down in which case this is a moot point anyhow. You can fly around the back of the skyscraper by the Hand or WF, then fly under the bridge and out go kill your snipers. As I have said before, though, if you choose to fly an aircraft into an area where you KNOW there are 3 or 4 snipers waiting, your stupidity is to blame and not the game.

I don't know what to tell you about the flicker, I never have that problem. I might miss half the shots because of the dancing, but that just means it'll take 10 shots instead of 5 to kill them, which I can still spam out in less than a second.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 22:26:22 GMT

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

Whatever. Snipers are not anti-aircraft infantry and we're going to make sure of that in the next patch. There will be a myriad of anti-aircraft units to use to replace the n00b cannons.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 01:58:45 GMT

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

If you're whingeing about a mob of snipers camping on the bridge, just get 7 meds and rape their base...

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:29:36 GMT

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

I have a new idea to brainstorm on.

It would be nice if the Renegade engine had better vehicle physics. You can crack into the coding and completely revamp them, but doing so would require a LOT of work and skill, and I'm not sure if we have anyone in the community who is skilled enough to edit this. It would be pretty cool that when the Hummers collide, they'll behave correctly like fly up a few feet or tilt, instead of just immediately stopping. That's another thing to discuss.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:33:52 GMT

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

spoonyratIf you're whingeing about a mob of snipers camping on the bridge, just get 7 meds and rape their base...

No shit, man. No shit. That's kinda the point I have been getting at the whole time this argument has been going: don't use aircraft when there's 10 snipers waiting for you.

ACK, I honestly think that when you say "we" you mean "you."

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:35:05 GMT

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

spoonyratIf you're whingeing about a mob of snipers camping on the bridge, just get 7 meds and rape their base...

But that's easier said than done.

Why put so much effort in getting 6 allies to rush with you, because of a few snipers on the bridge wherein that required no teamwork, just PT, 6,7, and hit the road with shiny new rifle watermarked "Aircraft killer" on the side.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:35:43 GMT

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

DeathgodNo shit, man. No shit. That's kinda the point I have been getting at the whole time this argument has been going: don't use aircraft when there's 10 snipers waiting for you.

ACK, I honestly think that when you say "we" you mean "you."

Dude, Aircraftkiller just said that the next patch will fix the snipers, and you can't do shit about that. Don't make up retarded reasons to why the n00bjets should be left unfair.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:49:23 GMT

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

Correct me if I'm wrong... but wouldn't the idea of bastardizing Renegade include having engineers that can heal tanks and people also? I mean, that wasn't in CNC. Moreso, flying vehicles had to reload their rocket banks. Giving them unlimited ammo is bastardizing.

There are so many aspects of CNC that CAN be implemented with the proper care and consideration. You can't just pick and choose what you want to change that will just support you as an individual. Oh? Remember how you couldn't hit aircraft with anything short of a rocketeer in CNC while it was airbourne? While it isn't practical to rationale between airbourne and grounded when it comes to damaging aircraft with everything else, you should be considering what you're given now: Aircraft = light armour.

Since you can't stop people from shooting at a light armour airbourne vehicle, and you're going to have a sniper rifle with an armour piercing bullet, you can't seriously think that the damage of a high powered AP bullet wouldn't inflict some serious damage to any LIGHT ARMoured VEHICLE.

There are a couple of things you can do, change the Ramjet to not fire an armour piercing bullet, or you can shut your gob and stop whining, really. Keep in mind though, if you're going to forego AP bullets, the snipers cannot practically damage any vehicle at all, which, given the nature of the game, would make it considerably less fun.

You've got a fine line between bastardization and fun, just remember that the nature of the game isn't to bastarize as much as possible, it's to have fun.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:55:30 GMT

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

icedog90DeathgodNo shit, man. No shit. That's kinda the point I have been getting at the whole time this argument has been going: don't use aircraft when there's 10 snipers waiting for you.

ACK, I honestly think that when you say "we" you mean "you."

Dude, Aircraftkiller just said that the next patch will fix the snipers, and you can't do shit about that. Don't make up retarded reasons to why the n00bjets should be left unfair.

I beg to differ, friend. I can choose not to run said patch on my servers, which I have chosen to do some time ago.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:59:52 GMT

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

^^ Which gives me an idea. IF these fixed versions are coming out with different names like "C&C_BHS_City_Flying" or whatever, you can just run the standard "C&C_City_Flying" for small games, which eliminates any arguments of "that wouldn't work in a small game". (Also eliminating my point earlier on)

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 03:01:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeathgodI beg to differ, friend. I can choose not to run said patch on my servers, which I have chosen to do some time ago.

You can do that, it is your server and I don't have a problem with it and neither does anyone else.
;P

What I meant was that you yourself can't stop Blackhand Studios from changing this problem since almost everyone else agrees with the idea.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 03:09:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, but the people that have replied to this thread aren't everyone.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 03:10:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't see everyone coming in here and voicing their support. When they do, I'll agree with you.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Homey](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 03:10:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Most people that know about it do, which is hardly anyone.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 06:03:30 GMT

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

DeathgodI don't see everyone coming in here and voicing their support. When they do, I'll agree with you.

There's another topic about this that has a lot of people saying "Yes."

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Rex](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 08:28:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Quote:Wait, you probably will, since all your ideas so far turn it from Renegade into ACKgade which is strikingly similar to RenAlert. If these issues are so problematic, and you fixed them all in RenAlert, then why not just play it?

No, it's strikingly similar to C&C. Perhaps you enjoy Homogade, that's your prerogative. It isn't mine or the opinion of many others. I want to play C&C1 in first person, I don't want a bastardized version of it. How many times do I have to tell you that?

Just wondering: if you want to play C&C1 in first person.. Why don't you play RenAlert then? Or is that very different?

I dont think snipers should be changed, nor flying units.
The only things I would change is: Making Tib Sydney, Gunner and all other less used characters a bit better.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deactivated](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 09:30:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RexJust wondering: if you want to play C&C1 in first person.. Why don't you play RenAlert then? Or is that very different?

RenAlert isn't based on C&C1.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Rex](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 13:33:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I know and I didnt say that.
I said: "Why don't you play RenAlert then? Or is that very different?"

Little explanation for people who don't really get it: "I get the feeling that ACK (& BHS?) want to do

more then just fix bugs." My opinion is: Fixing bugs is ok, but if you change add new vehicles/buildings or change the way they shoot its not a gamefix anymore, its just a mod.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 15:30:51 GMT

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

icedog90DeathgodI don't see everyone coming in here and voicing their support. When they do, I'll agree with you.

There's another topic about this that has a lot of people saying "Yes."

By a lot, you mean a handful. Maybe you haven't checked but out of all the people who still play this game, hardly anyone comes to these forums.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 18:38:57 GMT

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

JavaxcxSince you can't stop people from shooting at a light armour airbourne vehicle, and you're going to have a sniper rifle with an armour piercing bullet, you can't seriously think that the damage of a high powered AP bullet wouldn't inflict some serious damage to any LIGHT ARMoured VEHICLE.

There are a couple of things you can do, change the Ramjet to not fire an armour piercing bullet, or you can shut your gob and stop whining, really. Keep in mind though, if you're going to forego AP bullets, the snipers cannot practically damage any vehicle at all, which, given the nature of the game, would make it considerably less fun.

You've got a fine line between bastardization and fun, just remember that the nature of the game isn't to bastarize as much as possible, it's to have fun.

This seems familiar somehow. Anyway, you might have noticed that the rest of the game isn't particularly realistic with regards to damage caused by the different weapons. Tanks survive the impact of multiple anti-armour shells before they're finally destroyed, and infantry can walk around after taking a bullet to the heart from a high powered sniper rifle without any ill effects. Now I suspect that this was also with the idea of making the game more fun to play, like you suggested. However, if you can apply that idea to tanks and infantry, why can't it be applied to aircraft? I would find the game to be much more enjoyable if I could fly my Apache out of my base without having to worry about being downed in a few seconds, by some snipers firing at me from way out of my range.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 00:55:57 GMT

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

Still, I think it was pretty much decided a while back that we'd change the snipers to not blow up aircraft in seven seconds. Let us find something else to discuss and finish the argueing. These forums are for the sharing and suggestions of ideas and deciding on one as a community, instead of flaming and argueing it out on the spot. Any other ideas?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 01:13:53 GMT

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

Well, to be fair, if you look at CNC, soldiers could take quite a bit of machine gun fire and still be able to walk cross country and idle for eternity when they might have the equivalent of 1 hit point remaining.

Basically, the point I'm trying to get across is that you cannot pick and choose which aspects of the game you want to change if you're trying to recreate the CNC experience properly. Meaning, you can't say "well, snipers hurt my aircraft a lot, so I'm going to change their values for this so I can play my game in a way that is similar to what I played in CNC1," and leave out important things about CNC such as the fact that engineers in CNC could not repair vehicles or infantry.

Of course, that all has to do with balancing the game, but like Deathgod stated: If you're going to drive your Apache into a GDI base full of snipers, and complain about being pwned quickly, it's not the sniper's fault for doing uber damage, it's poor strategy. I'd think you'd notice that if you played a game where 2 or 3 Apaches attacked a GDI base, the snipers would have their work cut out for them, especially seeing how Apaches could easily take cover behind structures and attack or repair, or could EASILY destory a sniper unit in 4 or 5 shots.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 02:02:56 GMT

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

Yeah, so if Renegade shipped two years ago with a character that ended the game in 5 seconds after being purchased, it's your fault for allowing them to purchase it... Not that it's unbalanced or anything. :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 02:14:09 GMT

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

uhh.... Am i missing something?

Ramjet Rifles have rocket propelled bullets and are most likley armor peircing. If things like that

existed in real life, it is very realistic that they could down an apache (most likely by killing the pilot).

Don't like getting shot down? Don't fly. Orcas and Apaches are fun, but they don't win games.

I don't see the point of balancing the game unless Nod or GDI won the majority of games...which simply isn't the case.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 02:32:37 GMT

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

Don't pull out the realism card. Nothing in C&C is realistic and you should not make a C&C game with realistic damage.

GDI wins the majority of games.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 02:35:29 GMT

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

AircraftkillerYeah, so if Renegade shipped two years ago with a character that ended the game in 5 seconds after being purchased, it's your fault for allowing them to purchase it... Not that it's unbalanced or anything. :rolleyes:

There is a difference between unbalanced units and strategy. You already know this. If you're stupid enough to charge into a base full of snipers in a lightly armoured vehicle, it is your own fault.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 02:56:59 GMT

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

SEALDon't like getting shot down? Don't fly. Orcas and Apaches are fun, but they don't win games.

Last I played, which was last night, me and a couple of other Orcas easily owned a Nod base in a couple minutes, and no one could hurt us fast enough. Keep in mind that this was after the Hand of Nod was destroyed.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Battousai](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 03:03:23 GMT

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

Is there a way to make critical areas on vehicles? If you hit a vehicle in different areas, it does a different amount of damage? I feel like that's the best solution to the orca-sniper balance problem. If the sniper can hit the orca in the cockpit then the pilot should die and the orca should crash, elsewhere the sniper does no damage.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 05:09:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEAL Orcas and Apaches are fun, but they don't win games.

lol? it's perfectly possible to win a game single-handedly in a large server with an orca/apache. Not in a small clan game though, you'll get shot down, but it's do-able in a public server

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 07:42:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxThere is a difference between unbalanced units and strategy. You already know this. If you're stupid enough to charge into a base full of snipers in a lightly armoured vehicle, it is your own fault.

He only chooses to acknowledge the difference when it suits his argument.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 08:00:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Likewise, you're guilty of the same thing.

Not one person has given a logical argument as to why "snipers" should destroy aircraft. Most everyone against the lame damage they do has provided reasons that can be backed up with more than just "I want to be able to fly," unlike what I get from people who think "sniping" aircraft is alright... "omg if i lose my n00b cannon AA ability ill quit renegade!"

What it seems like is that everyone is so used to how the n00b cannon "snipers" work that they, as a majority, don't want it changed for fear that they might not be as good anymore. Or something similar to that. God forbid that you'd have to hide and use tactics as a sniper instead of play "sniper" and flicker dance on a bridge in the open... Or get massive points versus vehicles, and destroy seven different vehicles with relative ease, while killing almost any soldier with only one or two shots.

This is why I keep saying "if Renegade shipped with a unit that won the game five seconds after being purchased, you'd probably be defending it as a strategy." Why wouldn't you? In essence, they're not much different. n00b cannons win the game for their team, all it takes is three n00b cannons to shoot enemy vehicles all game... At 10 points a shot for the Medium and Light Tank, Artillery, and MRLS... And 15-25 for the Mammoth Tank and the Stealth Tank, who needs to use tanks to attack the enemy base? You get more points shooting tanks and soldiers all game than you do actually trying to attack the enemy base.

This goes against the point of C&C mode which is to destroy the enemy base, not shoot at tanks and soldiers simply because you can get plenty of points to negate the enemy attacks on your base.

Oh, yeah, and the fact that they're nearly unstoppable to begin with. Add it up. Seven vehicles easily destroyed from 300 meters, which is maximum viewing distance. All soldiers easily destroyed from that same distance. 32 rounds, four in the clip. Five takes out an Orca or Apache. Four are in the gun. It takes less than 10 seconds to destroy an Orca with a n00b cannon if each shot hits, which they usually do.

If they have two n00b cannons, you live an average of 2-5 seconds.

Three, 2-4 seconds.

Four, you're probably falling to the ground (Wow, even more punishment for aircraft pilots! Guaranteed death each time you get shot down with no chance of escaping.) by the time you pop out of your base.

Maybe you think it's strategy to allow snipers to destroy aircraft and seven other vehicles, while garnering huge amounts of points. I don't. It goes against C&C and it goes against any fucking concept of a balanced game.

The Commando in C&C barely hurt a Buggy for fuck's sake. Why? I'm sure you'll say "but you can only get eight vehicles." Obviously, but that doesn't mean the unit balance or interactions are different in first person. Simply because you can't get more than eight vehicles doesn't mean that you have to make those vehicles more easy to destroy via a really half-assed means of balance, nor does it mean the unit balance\interactions would be any different in the game to begin with.

Eight vehicles in C&C are still powerful. Eight in C&C can still assault an enemy base if all the base is limited to are a few defenses.

If you limit everything else except soldiers, the balance is pretty much identical to C&C. Renegade is not.

If you read Pi's statement, Renegade's MP mode wasn't even made until really late in development. It got half-assed. Why should we have to put up with a half-assed game because you aren't willing to accept that some things Just Aren't Right?

BHS has already said that aircraft will have more survivability, and it's not as if we're forcing the changes into standard Renegade itself, they're only going to be in additional levels.

Besides, you can't know that it won't work if you haven't even tried it before.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 10:11:33 GMT

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

Aircraftkillerit's not as if we're forcing the changes into standard Renegade itself, they're only going to be in additional levels.

Oh.....

In that case, forget anything I said to oppose this

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 12:46:42 GMT

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

icedog90SEALDon't like getting shot down? Don't fly. Orcas and Apaches are fun, but they don't win games.

Last I played, which was last night, me and a couple of other Orcas easily owned a Nod base in a couple minutes, and no one could hurt us fast enough. Keep in mind that this was after the Hand of Nod was destroyed.

And what destroyed the Hon in the first place, giving you the upper hand? Orcas?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 14:27:58 GMT

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

AircraftkillerLikewise, you're guilty of the same thing.

Not one person has given a logical argument as to why "snipers" should destroy aircraft. Most everyone against the lame damage they do has provided reasons that can be backed up with more than just "I want to be able to fly," unlike what I get from people who think "sniping" aircraft is alright... "omg if i lose my n00b cannon AA ability ill quit renegade!"

Given the nature of the game, and given the nature of the ammunition, snipers should be able to damage airborune vehicles heavily. Renegade uses the first person engine, which means that you can point your weapon anywhere and fire, and it will cause damage to whatever target it effectively hits. This being said, any unit can potentially hit an aircraft. Now, if the game says: "Havoc units and Sakura units will share an armour piercing bullet", this means: it will penetrate

light armour. Since aircraft have light armour, and snipers fire an armour piercing bullet, and the nature of the game allows for the snipers to hit aircraft, then you should have to coordinate your strategy to take into account the fact that you are susceptible to major damage from snipers.

The only recourse I can see for this might be if Deadeye and Blackhand snipers also fire armour piercing bullets, in which case I would see it reasonable to reduce the damage of the Ramjet rifle's munition to that slightly greater than the Standard Sniper rifle instead of what appears to be double the damage.

Quote:What it seems like is that everyone is so used to how the n00b cannon "snipers" work that they, as a majority, don't want it changed for fear that they might not be as good anymore.

Not speaking for the majority, but I know that a good portion of the snipers in Renegade don't choose a sniper over another unit for the reason that they can take out lightly armoured vehicles easily. The good ones take Deadeye, or the Blackhand sniper instead for reasons totally unrelated.

Quote:Or something similar to that. God forbid that you'd have to hide and use tactics as a sniper instead of play "sniper" and flicker dance on a bridge in the open...

Well, I can use the same argument about aircraft: "God forbid that you'd have to think about your plan of attack while driving an Orca, or coordinate a way around known snipers on the map"

Quote:This is why I keep saying "if Renegade shipped with a unit that won the game five seconds after being purchased, you'd probably be defending it as a strategy."

I'd have to disagree with you, if that supposed super unit did exist, the game wouldn't be fun and people wouldn't play it. It's not the same way with aircraft at all for the reason that aircraft en masse will win a game faster and with more points than a group of snipers could. Hell, ONE aircraft could eradicate a base while the sniper could do nothing short of a few scratches. And don't argue that the sniper would simply shoot down the aircraft. In maps like Walls_Flying, for example, you figure it out.

Quote:Why wouldn't you? In essence, they're not much different. n00b cannons win the game for their team, all it takes is three n00b cannons to shoot enemy vehicles all game...

When is the last time you've seen a team full of snipers just sit there and shoot tanks for points instead of defending their base. If you can't turn the tides if that happens, then you really shouldn't be complaining about point values and damages.

However, I do agree that the points given for snipers against heavily armoured vehicles is likely a flaw in the system, and I fully agree that the point values and cash income off this should be changed.

Quote:Oh, yeah, and the fact that they're nearly unstoppable to begin with. Add it up. Seven vehicles easily destroyed from 300 meters, which is maximum viewing distance. All soldiers easily destroyed from that same distance. 32 rounds, four in the clip. Five takes out an Orca or Apache. Four are in the gun. It takes less than 10 seconds to destroy an Orca with a n00b cannon if each

shot hits, which they usually do.

If they have two n00b cannons, you live an average of 2-5 seconds.

Three, 2-4 seconds.

I'm going to repeat myself: If you're going to fly an Orca into a base full of Boss Class snipers, you're to blame, not the sniper.

You're also forgetting that Orcas and Apache's aren't without their advantages either: they can fly faster, maneuver around objects and land to repair, can EASILY avoid being anally raped by snipers if they use the terrain to their advantage. You shouldn't be trying to nerf some damage on account of a few people who can't figure out that when they're being shot at, they might want to get out of the way and take cover. And that is easy! Because you can see the tracer from the Ramjet and see EXACTLY where it's coming from.

Quote:Four, you're probably falling to the ground (Wow, even more punishment for aircraft pilots! Guaranteed death each time you get shot down with no chance of escaping.) by the time you pop out of your base.

That is the risk that all pilots take when they fly out of their base. It doesn't need to be 4 Ramjet rifles, it can easily be 4 railguns, or a barrage of Gunners.

Quote:Maybe you think it's strategy to allow snipers to destroy aircraft and seven other vehicles, while garnering huge amounts of points. I don't. It goes against C&C and it goes against any fucking concept of a balanced game.

Yes, and no. Snipers should be allowed to maintain their damages, but shouldn't be allowed to rack up points and cash by shooting heavily armoured vehicles. Yes, it does go against C&C by having snipers able to shoot down airbourne units, but so does having airbourne units shot down by any other infantry unit, short of rocketeers.

Quote:The Commando in C&C barely hurt a Buggy for fuck's sake. Why? I'm sure you'll say "but you can only get eight vehicles."

Nope, I'd say that is merely an issue about Renegade that does not mirror C&C. Just like engineers repairing infantry and vehicles, or the Obelisk shooting down Orcas.

Quote:If you read Pi's statement, Renegade's MP mode wasn't even made until really late in development. It got half-assed. Why should we have to put up with a half-assed game because you aren't willing to accept that some things Just Aren't Right?

"Just aren't right" is awfully subjective. I think that snipers are fine on their own as it stands and I've justified myself.

Quote:BHS has already said that aircraft will have more survivability, and it's not as if we're forcing the changes into standard Renegade itself, they're only going to be in additional levels.

Weren't those additional levels supposed to be "fixed" versions of the originals? I hope in that case, that BHS would release "untouched" versions of those fixed levels, because I'm sure the levels themselves will turn out great, not the munition changes.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 18:33:10 GMT

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

AircraftkillerNot one person has given a logical argument as to why "snipers" should destroy aircraft.

A RAMJET is a type of jet engine that has a MINIMUM operating speed of around 400mph, and no theoretical maximum speed. In practice, it is used at low supersonic speeds, up to about mach 5.

The fact that a ramjet is not usable at less than 400mph made the idea of a "ramjet rifle" ludicrous to me, because it's meaningless for a ramjet to be integrated into the rifle part. What it might mean, though, is that the bullets somehow have a micro-ramjet engine embedded inside them that accelerates them even more after they're fired. This idea may seem absurd, but C&C is a fantasy world with invisible tanks, so let's just assume we can do it. (Also, this explains the tracer -- a stream of exhaust from the ramjet engine.)

For purposes of comparison, the M40A1 sniper rifle has a muzzle velocity of 2550 feet per second, which is almost 1750 miles per hour. Some more modern sniper rifles are around 10% faster. I haven't thoroughly researched every rifle in the world, so there may be some that reach even higher velocities, but I'll just use an estimate of 2000 mph for a "real" sniper rifle.

So let's say the bullet is fired at 2000 mph. After it leaves the muzzle, the normal rifle's bullet will slow down from the air drag and fall to the ground from gravity, which is what gives the rifle an "effective range." For modern rifles I believe this number is around a couple thousand meters.

We should assume a ramjet rifle would have a comparable muzzle velocity. After the bullets are fired, though, the differences become extreme. While the normal bullet slows down, the ramjet round SPEEDS UP, possibly reaching speeds of around 3500 - 4000 mph before impact. This would extend the range of the rifle by an incredible amount and greatly increase the damage caused by a single shot.

Now, I ask you, would a bullet traveling at mach 5 be able to tear apart a lightly armored helicopter? Before you say no, remember what ACK said:

AircraftkillerBesides, you can't know that it won't work if you haven't even tried it before.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PiMuRho](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 19:03:13 GMT

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

Or, of course, "Ramjet" might just be a name given to the rifle...

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 19:25:33 GMT

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

PiMuRhoOr, of course, "Ramjet" might just be a name given to the rifle...

Yes, but why would they give it a f*ing intense name unless it's f*ing intense?

The point is, the ramjet rifle is NOT supposed to be a real sniper rifle. Deadeye already has one of those. It's supposed to be a ridiculously intense sniper rifle that can waste people even by shooting them in the foot.

Personally, I think a gun like that would be able to hurt vehicles, too.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 19:34:23 GMT

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

SEALicedog90SEALDon't like getting shot down? Don't fly. Orcas and Apaches are fun, but they don't win games.

Last I played, which was last night, me and a couple of other Orcas easily owned a Nod base in a couple minutes, and no one could hurt us fast enough. Keep in mind that this was after the Hand of Nod was destroyed.

And what destroyed the Hon in the first place, giving you the upper hand? Orcas?

Yes.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 20:38:05 GMT

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

Not to butt in or anything, but I really think you should strengthen your support base before you go off making significant changes that will probably not help broaden your support. Lately n00bstories servers have all been requiring rengaurd, and in the last week I have never once seen a single play in the n00bstories servers. Instead of immediately rebalancing the game, or at least while you rework some balancing problems, you should make some new implementations, like the Taunts featured by BC servers, and the emoticons, which I know you have already worked on, to attract more players. Then, once you have the support of the majority of the players, even the ones who don't normally download maps and mods when they're available, then you start trying to get your balancing ideas supported. I know that just about everyone who actively posts in this forum

supports renguard, but look at the thousands of players who don't. If the masses supported renguard, the renguard servers would not be running empty. In the words of Proximo, "Win the crowd and you will win your freedom."

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 20:42:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And about your little discussion, considering how little armor a helicopter or helicopter-type vehicle has, I don't think its unreasonable to have the a heavy-bore sniper rifle be highly effective against the vehicle, thought that may make aircraft less desirable for some. Now thats not to say that I don't think helicopters should have more armor, or sniper rifles should be less effective against them, but I think realism is an important factor in a game designed to be relatively realistic, like renegade.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 01:36:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HTMLGOD does make a pretty good point in both posts.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 05:43:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BUT ITS NOT REELISM ITS CNCISM FUKEN NUBS JUZUS CRISTTTTTTT!1111

That's what ACK will come say, I already pointed this facet of sniper rifles out a while ago.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 07:24:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For the Nth time, this forum is just for discussion of possible enhancements. None are currently being worked on, this is just the "everyone talk about it" stage so we can get a feel for what people want. In other words, RenGuard is not suffering from any lack of attention, RenGuard is our primary goal right now.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 07:28:45 GMT

It's a fucking game, not real life. The ramjet rifle was added in to be a one-hit-kill sniper rifle with a cheaper, but weaker, alternative. It should not be able to make aircraft completely worthless for the sake of game balance. Sure, maybe a ramjet bullet in real life would speed up instead of slow down, and maybe helicopters have paper-thin armor already, and maybe a bullet that speeds up may do considerable damage to an aircraft in real life, but in a video game, such a weapon creates an imbalance. It makes everyone want to get these ramjet rifles to kill aircraft in a handful of shots from halfway across the map. Why even have helicopters in the game if they're going to be destroyed two fucking seconds after it leaves the base because some retards with no better strategy decide to use a weapon that was intended to be a one-shot-kill anti-infantry weapon against a helicopter?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 12:47:37 GMT

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

I really do not understand why the ramjet is such a problem.

Everyone complaining about the ramjet says that it's just n00bs and such sitting out in the open shooting at tanks and helicopters.

If this is really the case, then why don't you just buy ONE deadeye and snipe them all? If they suck so much that all they can snipe is vehicles, it should be easy for you. And you'll get TONS of points if there are always lots of sakuras around for you to kill.

Quote:Why even have helicopters in the game if they're going to be destroyed two fucking seconds after it leaves the base

Helicopters NEED SUPPORT. But that's not unusual; nothing in this game is supposed to be uber-effective alone. Given the right counter, ANY UNIT you try to use by itself can be stopped ALMOST INSTANTLY. Why should helicopters be any different?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 16:57:14 GMT

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

Even if you have support units, how are they supposed to kill snipers shooting aircraft halfway across the map from inside their own base? If you go after them you're going to have more than just snipers shooting at you. If you manage to get near them, you'd better hope you kill them instantly because they're never too far from a refill. In fact, even during an assault on their base snipers can still kill aircraft, because their instant hit weapon means that they only need to be out of cover for a second to do good damage to you.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 17:04:44 GMT

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

My personal opinion on snipers versus vehicles...hmm well I would say that in "real life" if you are a sniper, your job is to hide and pick off infantry, you would NEVER fire your rifle at a vehicle, much less a freaking TANK. You might fire at a helicopter if you knew where to aim to hit a hydraulic or fuel line in one shot.

That being said, Renegade is not "real life"...its a game. But at the same time, when Im sitting in what I feel is a huge steel plated vehicle (mobart or mrls), I dont think its right that some guy with the equivalent of a deer rifle (deadeye), can destroy my vehicle in a few shots!

The ramjet rifle, which seems to me to be a "railgun" (even though raveshaws weapon is called the railgun, it has laser ammo so its not really), I could understand being able to penetrate armor and such (like in the movie "Eraser"), so I could see it being able to damage lightly armored vehicles.

In short, I think the deadeye/blackhand sniper should do very little or no damage to armored vehicles, and the Ramjet should do a little damage to lightly armored vehicles (aircraft, mrls, mobart), but very little damage to heavily armored vehicles like tanks.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 17:24:46 GMT

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

m1a1_abrams Even if you have support units, how are they supposed to kill snipers shooting aircraft halfway across the map from inside their own base? If you go after them you're going to have more than just snipers shooting at you. If you manage to get near them, you'd better hope you kill them instantly because they're never too far from a refill. In fact, even during an assault on their base snipers can still kill aircraft, because their instant hit weapon means that they only need to be out of cover for a second to do good damage to you.

He said support units; in this case other snipers to remove the enemies' snipers. AS WE HAVE SAID BEFORE: IF YOU ARE DUMB ENOUGH TO FLY INTO A NEST OF SNIPERS YOU ARE DUMB ENOUGH TO DESERVE WHAT HAPPENS.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 19:11:23 GMT

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

Renegade is balanced, more or less. On a map-by-map basis, Nod has the advantage sometimes, and GDI has an advantage sometimes. Overall, though, it's not one side winning all the time, so the game is balanced. I assume that what you people are saying is unbalanced is the battle between a helicopter and a high-class sniper. One on one, the advantage goes to the helicopter. Higher than that, and your helicopter deserves to die. Snipers are necessary to winning

a game, in that they take out support units, like Raveshaw and Mobius--just try to win a game without a Hand of Nod or Infantry Barracks. Snipers are also fucking owned by Orcas and Apaches, so they need to be able to defend themselves, as there's little to no cover in Renegade.

If Renegade is changed so that snipers no longer do damage to lightly-armoured vehicles, the Apaches and Orcas are the units that are going to be suddenly creating an "imbalance."

It's not C&C, it's Renegade, and it's too late to do anything about it.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 19:57:10 GMT

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

DeathgodHe said support units; in this case other snipers to remove the enemies' snipers. AS WE HAVE SAID BEFORE: IF YOU ARE DUMB ENOUGH TO FLY INTO A NEST OF SNIPERS YOU ARE DUMB ENOUGH TO DESERVE WHAT HAPPENS.

Yes, and as I have said before, although in a less patronizing way and not in all caps, snipers do too much damage to aircraft.

You make it sound as if you can avoid snipers, but there are at least 2-3 of them per team practically every game... often more. Snipers are a very popular character class, so unless it's a small game, you're always going to be flying into a nest of snipers. I suppose that means we are all dumb for trying to make use of one of the vehicles included in the game?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 20:22:14 GMT

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

If there are three snipers on a team, and you enter their base with one airbourne unit, with no support, like what you're SUGGESTING, then you do deserve what happens.

I would bet that if you attack with more than 2 or 3 airbourne units, those snipers would either be killed, or wouldn't be able to stop at least one of those airbourne units from taking cover behind a structure and repairing.

Or if you have support! Those snipers might take a few pot shots, but I can guarantee you if the sniper had any sense, they'd want to take out that hotwire or technician that is trying to sneak in over your airbourne unit.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Rex](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 20:24:16 GMT

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

BlazerMy personal opinion on snipers versus vehicles...

In short, I think the deadeye/blackhand sniper should do very little or no damage to armored vehicles, and the Ramjet should do a little damage to lightly armored vehicles (aircraft, mrls, mobart), but very little damage to heavily armed vehicles like tanks.

^^ I think exactly the same.

And I would like to add my own extra idea: Havocs shouldnt get 8 points for shooting an harvester. It should be more like 4 points or even less.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Mon, 03 May 2004 23:24:14 GMT

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

I agree with Blazer much more.

Also, you don't get raped by Ramjets just by flying in their nest, they come to the cliff on Walls_Flying and harrass the base and demolish any air unit that is bought. This doesn't really happen too often, but it does happen sometimes, which gets really annoying. Walls_Flying is actually an easy level to use air units. There aren't really any places for snipers to hide except under the cliff in the middle, which rarely happens also. City_Flying is the worse problem. I will never buy an air unit on that level unless I know that the Hand of Nod is gone, or that there are supportive snipers or vehicles out there to protect me.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Tue, 04 May 2004 01:10:32 GMT

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

JavacxIf there are three snipers on a team, and you enter their base with one airbourne unit, with no support, like what you're SUGGESTING, then you do deserve what happens.

I would bet that if you attack with more than 2 or 3 airbourne units, those snipers would either be killed, or wouldn't be able to stop at least one of those airbourne units from taking cover behind a structure and repairing.

Or if you have support! Those snipers might take a few pot shots, but I can guarantee you if the sniper had any sense, they'd want to take out that hotwire or technician that is trying to sneak in over your airbourne unit.

I wasn't suggesting that you fly an aircraft into the enemy base to kill the snipers. I was pointing out that it's difficult to kill them with anything if the snipers are shooting from inside their own base. On Walls Flying, they shoot from the walls, or from on top of their buildings. Sure, you can send your own snipers to take them out, but they're going to be at a huge disadvantage since they have to actually go out of the safety of their base to do it. If they take a hit to the body, they can move straight back into cover and get a refill from the nearest building.

Come on, who cares if a fictional rifle could theoretically destroy a helicopter. That's not the issue, because Renegade is a game, and most of it isn't the slightest bit like real life. Are you seriously going to tell me that snipers should be able to sit on the Refinery roof and slaughter aircraft half the map away, in five shots, with very little fear of retaliation?

Imagine something for a second. Imagine Orcas that don't have machine guns, but have powerful missiles like a Stealth Tank, and can be used effectively in groups to take out an enemy building. Wouldn't that be cool? I think it would be more fun than constantly hiding from snipers. Also, if they had to reload their ammunition like was suggested, there wouldn't be the problem of aircraft dominating everything once the Hand/Barracks has been destroyed.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 04 May 2004 07:04:51 GMT

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

m1a1_abrams Snipers are a very popular character class, so unless it's a small game, you're always going to be flying into a nest of snipers. I suppose that means we are all dumb for trying to make use of one of the vehicles included in the game?

If you fly into areas where you KNOW multiple snipers are at, then yes you most certainly are stupid. Would you fly into an area that had 4 LCGs? What about 4 Mobiuses? 4 Rav/PICs? It's the same issue, just that snipers have more range. If the enemy is whoring snipers, then YOU should get a sniper and go remove them, then come back if you're so dead-set on flying an Orca over there. I don't see anyone complaining about how snipers fuck up Humvees or Buggies with a vengeance, and I think that's the same ballpark personally.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Tue, 04 May 2004 16:25:51 GMT

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

There are multiple snipers practically every game. That means that if you're in an aircraft, you're always going to be getting shot by them. Unless you're saying that it's stupid to fly at all, I don't understand what your point is.

You hit the nail on the head when you said that "it's the same issue, just that snipers have more range". Raveshaws and PICs do more damage than Havocs and Sakuras, but I don't have a problem with that... because they can't hit you from halfway across the map, inside their own base. If you're in range, they have a better chance of killing you than a Havoc... but if you're in range, you also have a chance to kill them with your aircraft without being down to red health before you get close to them. I consider that to be fair. Oh, and just so you know, if there happened to be a group of PICs, of course I wouldn't try to approach them with a single Apache. However, "approaching them" would mean flying physically close to them, which is different to Havocs where it would mean flying a helicopter in the open anywhere on the map.

Also, I would complain about the damage snipers do to Humvees and Buggies, because they're

pretty much useless as soon as the snipers appear. Even more so than aircraft, because they're limited to driving horizontally so they can't use the terrain to hide in the same way. They're supposed to be fast attack anti-infantry units, not a poor man's APC for the first 5 minutes of the game and then never used again.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Pavla](#) on Tue, 04 May 2004 19:00:46 GMT

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

ok... and now my opinion:

I've got an open mind for changes and game modifications to optimize gameplay so let's try out and see whether it works or not!

I like the idea of special maps/mods with balancing modifications in it, and new anti-aircraft characters. What I do like especially are the little updates like the emoticons, the harvester message and the pistol loaded (not that I need it) in renegade. So when modifications are developed, I'll try them definitely out and decide then if I like them or not.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Tue, 04 May 2004 22:25:37 GMT

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

I'm against the damage they do, but I can't help but think about what happened in city_flying_exp that aircreftkiller done. Ramjets could barely damage aircraft, rockets could home in on them, but that didn't seem to stop their domination on the field.

Here's a fact though: Ramjet rifles do exactly DOUBLE the damage of standard sniper rifles to light armour. Standard rifles do 30 per shot, ramjets do 60. Looking at this from a different viewpoint, doesn't it seem fair that a character double the price does about double the damage with the same warhead against the same armour type? The ramjet rifle is like a high velocity sniper rifle. It's not a sniper rifle like some would have you believe.

I propose this: Ramjet rifles to 1½ times the damage to light armour (this includes aircraft), instead of double like it is now. If it was this way, it'd take exactly 7 shots to bring down an aircraft. You do the math, it's correct. Good for the price AND fair enough for the drivers and pilots. By this standard, aircraft would last longer, but not a lot longer.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Wed, 05 May 2004 03:45:47 GMT

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

How many players are in these games you normally play in, m1a1_abrams? I usually play in

16-20 player games, which is about what I feel is the max that the default maps support without it turning into a campfest like everyone seems to describe in here. I can see how if you were playing in a 30+ player game that it would be possible for the enemy to have 5 or 6 snipers on their team, but most of them are being 5th wheels I'd imagine. You don't have that luxury in smaller games, you actually need to help the team instead of going off to pointwhore. I have a feeling this difference could impact this sniper issue.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Wed, 05 May 2004 05:01:00 GMT

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

Anywhere between 20 and 40 players, depending on which server I'm playing on and how full it is. It's true that the larger the server is, the more unbalanced Havocs/Sakuras are against light armoured vehicles. The thing is though, you could theoretically have a lot more Raveshaws/PICs while the vehicle limit remains the same, but that doesn't make anywhere near as much of a difference to tank warfare as the extra snipers do to flying. Even in larger groups, Raveshaws and PICs still need to be relatively close to tanks to damage them. If the tanks move away, they have to follow them to stay in range, possibly having to move out of cover. They can't just stand in a tunnel entrance and be able to hit anything within viewing distance. It's the Ramjet itself that's unbalanced, not the larger servers, because it shouldn't be doing that much damage to light vehicles at sniper rifle range.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Wed, 05 May 2004 06:04:01 GMT

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

I think the Ramjet is just fine, really. I don't see it as a problem, because you can always get an APC and go run the snipers down without fear of retribution.

Raveshaws and PICs have the same range as tanks, so if they have to move to follow the tank it means the tank can't hit them either, making them excellent characters to camp tunnels with. And I would argue that having your whole team spam PIC or Rav is much more effective overall than spamming snipers in just about every situation I can think of.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Thu, 06 May 2004 02:55:31 GMT

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

I understand that that's your opinion, and so should everyone else. This is a community forum where we help each other out and give ideas/suggestions and agree/disagree on them.

Subject: i disagree

Posted by [snipbravo](#) on Fri, 07 May 2004 00:56:02 GMT

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

I would have to respectfully disagree about the snipers. While they are especially good at killin infantry, they should also be good at killin vehicles. If i see a heli comin toward me, im goin to shoot no matter what gun i am carrying. This game is a combat game, not a flying game. IF people would like to fly free with no sniper fire oriented at them, buy one of those. It is oriented on destroying the bases and killing people any way possible. This includes shooting down helis with the most powerful anti-heli weapon, in this case the sniper rifle. I have posted a few topics on this.

Subject: Snipers and vehicles

Posted by [snipbravo](#) on Fri, 07 May 2004 01:01:45 GMT

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

Not to anger anyone, but i think snipers should remain the same. Renegade is a all out combat game, not an aircraft oriented game. IF you and your aircraft loving self want one of these games, buy commanche or f22 lightening. Westwood made the game this way to keep from aircraft becoming the oobra almighty vehicle of renegade, and theu just happened to give this power to the sniper, and they did a good job.

Subject: Re: Snipers and vehicles

Posted by [Drkpwn3r](#) on Fri, 07 May 2004 01:10:46 GMT

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

snipbravoWestwood made the game this way to keep from aircraft becoming the oobra almighty vehicle of renegade, and theu just happened to give this power to the sniper, and they did a good job.

He does kinda have a point there... :rolleyes:

I know I don't want aircraft to be the #1 dominant unit in the game, in fact, I only really use a deadeye or black hand sniper anyways, that is, as long as people don't try to get all uber powerful against me by using a sakura/havoc against me, then I just buy the same strength unit to kill them, but only if they kill me with 1, no other time.

However, if aircraft do get turned into the #1 dominant unit in Renegade then I'm just gonna move to my Half-Life games completely

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Fri, 07 May 2004 18:12:05 GMT

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

My thoughts in a nutshell:

Nerf the n00bjets, more powerful helicopters with repair/reload pads would be cool, definantly power-up the Mammoth, give snipers less/no points for attacking vehicles, down sniper's armor, make rocket launchers more powerful and seeking.

Subject: no

Posted by [snipbravo](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 01:37:10 GMT

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

I thin that that is a HORRIBLE idea. You dont play renegade much, do you? If you cant locate a sniper shootin at you then you are a NOOB. IF the sniper hides, track him down and dont waste your time here whining about this topic. I've heard about you before. You spend your time whining about snipers which are WAY better players tahn youll EVER be. LEARN TO PLAY BEFORE WHINING FROM NOW ON.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 05:08:54 GMT

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

snipbravo: And you don't seem to know how to do anything other than complain. Mammoth powerup is good - it is not worth its price at the moment, as it can be beaten easily by a Stealth Tank, which is supposed to be a support vehicle, not to mention it only costs 3/5 as much.

Regular snipers damage aircraft too, almost as much as n00bjettters. You're saying you can find a sniper that's hiding in a tunnel or on a base and kill him before he kills you when he can see you EASILY and can start taking shots at you before you're anywhere near the range where you can hit him, and when it only takes 6 or so shots to kill you? I don't believe you. Unless you happen to be lucky and the enemy n00bjetter/sniper happens to be shooting you when he's only 100 or less meters away (which is rare), you're going down. And considering helicopters are the second-most expensive unit, that makes them nearly worthless.

Helipads would be good because they completely prevent helicopters from ever being the most powerful unit. Why? Simple. Helicopters cannot hold an area if they have limited ammunition. They may be able to momentarily clear it in the case of the Apache against infantry, or the Orca against light vehicles, but they'll have to return to base to reload, allowing you to come back into the area, possibly even further than before. As Aircraftkiller said, a single Orca would only be able to damage a Light Tank 50%. That means he has to go find a safe place to hide and repair for a little bit, and then he's back rolling. Helicopters are supposed to be support units, and limited ammunition is a much better way of enforcing that than making them piss-weak against a unit that costs half as much and can hit them without fear of retaliation.

EDIT: Oh, and by the way, KaiserPanda is not a whiner. I've seen him around more than you have, I'm sure of it. It sounds like someone's hypocritical :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 08:51:45 GMT

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

PointlessAmblerMammoth powerup is good - it is not worth its price at the moment, as it can be beaten easily by a Stealth Tank, which is supposed to be a support vehicle, not to mention it only costs 3/5 as much.

You might lose to a Stank if you suck, yes. I don't know where you get the idea that they're support vehicles, either... I guess that makes the medium tank a support unit since GDI gets the mammoth. :rolleyes: Light Tanks cost only 40% of what a Mammoth costs, but I can take out a Mammy with one. Does that mean they need to be nerfed?

PointlessAmblerRegular snipers damage aircraft too, almost as much as n00bjettors.

Try half as much. It takes a havoc/sakura 5 shots to kill an Apache/Orca, and Deadeye/BH Sniper 10 shots.

PointlessAmblerYou're saying you can find a sniper that's hiding in a tunnel or on a base and kill him before he kills you when he can see you EASILY and can start taking shots at you before you're anywhere near the range where you can hit him, and when it only takes 6 or so shots to kill you? I don't believe you.

There are only so many places to hide on each map... not to mention that characters ducking in and out of places on the map are easy to spot because of their movement.

PointlessAmblerUnless you happen to be lucky and the enemy n00bjetter/sniper happens to be shooting you when he's only 100 or less meters away (which is rare), you're going down. And considering helicopters are the second-most expensive unit, that makes them nearly worthless.

They have a role, but if you fly into an area full of snipers expect to die, just like any other unit rushing into an area full of counterunits. If I drive my Medium Tank into an area with 3 or 4 Raveshaws, I expect to die. This is what some people call common sense.

PointlessAmblerHelipads would be good because they completely prevent helicopters from ever being the most powerful unit. Why? Simple. Helicopters cannot hold an area if they have limited ammunition.

They can't even hold an area now, they're a lightly-armored support unit. Even their rockets don't do a huge amount of damage.

PointlessAmblerThey may be able to momentarily clear it in the case of the Apache against infantry, or the Orca against light vehicles, but they'll have to return to base to reload, allowing you to come back into the area, possibly even further than before. As Aircraftkiller said, a single Orca would only be able to damage a Light Tank 50%.

As it stands now an Orca can kill numerous LTs, this is a big downgrade.

PointlessAmblerThat means he has to go find a safe place to hide and repair for a little bit, and then he's back rolling.

Helis already have to do this when they take damage because they're fragile.

PointlessAmblerHelicopters are supposed to be support units, and limited ammunition is a much better way of enforcing that than making them piss-weak against a unit that costs half as much

and can hit them without fear of retaliation.

See above. If you're going to make helis require ammo, all vehicles should also. It would be horribly stupid within the confines of the Renegade engine to have one vehicle for each team with such a handicap... I can't see them being too useful if they need to be flying back to base after firing at one target.

PointlessAmblerEDIT: Oh, and by the way, KaiserPanda is not a whiner. I've seen him around more than you have, I'm sure of it. It sounds like someone's hypocritical :rolleyes:

So since someone has been around longer their opinion is automatically more correct than someone else's? Wrong. I personally think that they are both idiots, and so are you. Since I have been here since the old-school Ren forums does that make me right? No. Number of posts or length of forum tenure doesn't mean fuck.

Subject: Re: no
Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 09:27:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

snipbravol thin that that is a HORRIBLE idea. You dont play renegade much, do you? If you cant locate a sniper shootin at you then you are a NOOB. IF the sniper hides, track him down and dont waste your time here whining about this topic. I've heard about you before. You spend your time whining about snipers which are WAY better players tahn youll EVER be. LEARN TO PLAY BEFORE WHINING FROM NOW ON.

Sounds like you don't play Renegade at all. Since when do snipers hide? They just hop back and forth in the open, like a pack of retarded kangaroos.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 15:03:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeathgodYou might lose to a Stank if you suck, yes. I don't know where you get the idea that they're support vehicles, either... I guess that makes the medium tank a support unit since GDI gets the mammoth. Light Tanks cost only 40% of what a Mammoth costs, but I can take out a Mammy with one. Does that mean they need to be nerfed?

Ok, fine, I guess so. STanks only have 200/200 anyway, so if you get killed, it's your own damn fault. I can agree with that.

Deathgod
Try half as much. It takes a havoc/sakura 5 shots to kill an Apache/Orca, and Deadeye/BHSniper 10 shots.

Fine, but they're much harder to find because their shots are invisible.

Deathgod There are only so many places to hide on each map... not to mention that characters ducking in and out of places on the map are easy to spot because of their movement.

It doesn't even matter if they hide, because they can shoot you down from the maximum view distance. Infantry are pretty damn hard to see from 300 meters away, especially when they're not moving or better, hiding. Their bullets don't give you hints as to where they are.

Ramjets do let you know where the shot is coming from, but since they kill you in five shots and Ramjets have a four round clip, it's basically impossible to close the distance and kill them in time even if you know exactly where they are.

Deathgod They have a role, but if you fly into an area full of snipers expect to die, just like any other unit rushing into an area full of counterunits. If I drive my Medium Tank into an area with 3 or 4 Raveshaws, I expect to die. This is what some people call common sense.

My point is, Snipers are supposed to be counterunits to infantry, not light vehicles. Where in any game, C&C included, has a sniper rifle been effective against even the lightest vehicle armor? Commandos in C&C have a hell of a time killing a goddamn Nod Buggy, and this game is supposed to be based on C&C. I'm not saying there shouldn't be air counters, that's retarded, there needs to be a counterunit to everything. I'm just saying that picking Snipers to be counterunits to aircraft was a poor design choice. I'm also saying that units should at least stand some sort of chance against counterunits, because if they don't, the unit is worthless. As you used in your example, a Medium Tank (800) can actually defend itself against one Raveshaw (1000). Agreed, two or three can rip it to pieces. With aircraft, however, it only takes one Sniper (500, 55% the cost of attack aircraft) or n00bjetter (only slightly more expensive than the aircraft) to kill the damn thing with the same speed that it would take two Raveshaws (which cost 2000, 2.5 times the cost of the Medium Tank), especially when it's a unit that is supposed to be attacking infantry.

Deathgod They can't even hold an area now, they're a lightly-armored support unit. Even their rockets don't do a huge amount of damage.

Yeah, they can't hold an area now because they get shot down from 300 meters away by some idiot with a sniper rifle.

Deathgod As it stands now an Orca can kill numerous LTs, this is a big downgrade.

Except it never gets the chance to because he gets shot down long before he approaches a target worth attacking. I'm saying that Helipads would be a better way of limiting aircraft than making them completely die against any sort of counterattack.

Deathgod See above. If you're going to make helis require ammo, all vehicles should also. It would be horribly stupid within the confines of the Renegade engine to have one vehicle for each team with such a handicap... I can't see them being too useful if they need to be flying back to base after firing at one target.

I don't see how it's a handicap... helis are support units by nature. If you use them at the right

time (ie. when you're doing an assault on the enemy base, and soften up enemy armor a bit), they can be quite useful. Why not implement them the way that C&C did it, instead of making them die the second they leave their base?

DeathgodSo since someone has been around longer their opinion is automatically more correct than someone else's? Wrong. I personally think that they are both idiots, and so are you. Since I have been here since the old-school Ren forums does that make me right? No. Number of posts or length of forum tenure doesn't mean fuck.

Meh, it's not his opinion that I'm talking about when I say that, it's that he has pulled out all the cliches: calling him a n00b for disagreeing, saying it's a horrible idea without any support behind his argument, and the "I'm right, you're not, that means USUX" attitude, not to mention poor grammar and spelling :rolleyes: Therefore, it's a bit hypocritical for him to call someone else a n00b when he himself is unable to provide a well-thought-out counterargument and misspells words in his post.

I don't think you're a moron just because we happen to disagree: you're actually capable of coming up with a coherent counterargument, a rare ability on the endless void of stupidity known as the Internet.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 16:33:48 GMT

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

I'd like to know if anyone in this thread has actually played the one level that held this theory (in a fairly large server, i.e. 7 v 7 or ideally 10 v 10+), C&C city flying exp. If you don't have it, get it here - http://www.cneden.com/ren_ackmaps.shtml and read the changes to units. The only difference is the helicopter pads don't restore ammo, they only repair airborne units. See if you can organise a game or get a bigger server to run it. If you can have a few games on this map, with at least 7 players on each side, come back and comment. Ideally, I'd ask FUD to run it since they're server admins that've been reading this topic the most, but they don't want things changed and their server would probably sit empty anyway. If fastc0nn or renstation could run it, they'd get players.

(Edit) If you're interested and can't find anyone to play it with, add foxofts to your buddy list and we can have 1v1 aircraft vs stealth tank/mammoth tank/mrls/rocket soldier fights on it, to see how well the rockets seek and if the aircraft can stay alive (they reload in 10 second intervals, it's an alternative to going back to base but leaves you exposed).

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 16:52:25 GMT

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

PointlessAmblertIt doesn't even matter if they hide, because they can shoot you down from the maximum view distance. Infantry are pretty damn hard to see from 300 meters away, especially when they're not moving or better, hiding. Their bullets don't give you hints as to where they are.

Ramjets do let you know where the shot is coming from, but since they kill you in five shots and Ramjets have a four round clip, it's basically impossible to close the distance and kill them in time even if you know exactly where they are.

I'm going to use the example of City_Flying to prove my point; seeing how it is considered an official map and should therefore maintain a sense of balance in the game.

If you are on GDI and purchase an Orca, then you've got a terrible advantage over a good percentage of snipers. Each side on City_flying has 7 possible ventures to attack the opposite base: The onramp to the highway, the westward entrance (to the GDI base, anyway), the eastern entrance (at least on GDI's side), and the four windows which look onto the base from the structure in the front of the Guard Tower. The Guard Tower will fire on any infantry unit that steps into those windows, so they can be ruled out. The War Factory's garage doesn't point to the onramp, or the eastern entrance, and it is impossible to get around as an infantry unit. So that leaves one possible place for a sniper to actually shoot down your Orca, at least inbase. Now, if you cannot maneuver your Orca to go behind the structure in the westward side of the GDI base, and repair, or even drop down from above and ambush a sniper, then you really shouldn't be complaining, because you obviously suck at flying.

This isn't even an issue in the centre of the map: If the sniper is on the highway, then fly under it. And vice versa. If the sniper is in one of the windows, you can EASILY fly between the sniper in the window and the highway and avoid all damage.

IN FACT, you can even maneuver within your effective range and ambush the snipers on the no-man's land without taking damage. Simple thought out strategy (which was what the game was MADE for) easily balances out what everyone here seems to believe is a balance issue.

Quote:My point is, Snipers are supposed to be counterunits to infantry, not light vehicles. Where in any game, C&C included, has a sniper rifle been effective against even the lightest vehicle armor?

Where in any CNC game has a mere infantry unit been able to shoot down Orcas and Apaches that are airbourne? Don't complain about those technicalities unless you're willing to change them all. That includes engineers having those repair guns, infantry (or any ground unit for that matter, save rocketeers) shooting down airbourne units, the Obelisk able to shoot down Orcas, and so on.

Quote:Yeah, they can't hold an area now because they get shot down from 300 meters away by some idiot with a sniper rifle.

Why are you applying a circumstantial situation to every situation?

Quote:Except it never gets the chance to because he gets shot down long before he approaches a target worth attacking.

No, Orcas and Apaches can easily get to their destinations without being shot down.

You can't change the Ramjet's damage to flying units because you're tired of being shot down easily. The game is meant for strategy, and in fact, only two levels are officially designed with these damage values in mind. And BOTH of those levels have strategic elements in place to counter snipers.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 17:23:51 GMT

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

I was thinking more along the lines of actually hiding in a good place. You know, like the windows that overlook the Tiberium field? You're not easily visible there. Obviously there are ways to avoid being shot down. My main point is, why should Snipers be the unit to counter aircraft? It doesn't make sense. Damage is a secondary argument, and I'll admit there are compelling arguments for both sides on that one. My main point is that rocket-firing units should be the counter to air units, like it actually was in C&C, not snipers. Bullet damage to aircraft should be decreased somewhat to reflect the fact that in C&C, bullets couldn't even hit aircraft.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 17:32:37 GMT

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

Remember, the game isn't snipers vs. aircraft, it's GDI vs. Nod.

I personally, don't waste any of my ammo on aircraft (mostly because I don't waste my money with the 1000 credit sniper over the 500 credit one) because when I'm a sniper, I'm going after infantry. Shooting down aircraft is just a costly bonus.

Chances are, if you're playing a 10 vs. 10 game, and you're planning on camping out and hunting down choppers, you're going to have opposition from tanks, stealth units, other infantry, whatever. It all balances out.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 17:37:59 GMT

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

flyingfoxI'd like to know if anyone in this thread has actually played the one level that held this theory (in a fairly large server, i.e. 7 v 7 or ideally 10 v 10+), C&C city flying exp. If you don't have it, get it here - http://www.cncden.com/ren_ackmaps.shtml and read the changes to units. The only difference is the helicopter pads don't restore ammo, they only repair airborne units. See if you can organise a game or get a bigger server to run it. If you can have a few games on this map, with at least 7 players on each side, come back and comment. Ideally, I'd ask FUD to run it since they're server admins that've been reading this topic the most, but they don't want things changed and their server would probably sit empty anyway. If fastc0nn or renstation could run it, they'd get players.

(Edit) If you're interested and can't find anyone to play it with, add foxofts to your buddy list and we can have 1v1 aircraft vs stealth tank/mammoth tank/mrls/rocket soldier fights on it, to see how well the rockets seek and if the aircraft can stay alive (they reload in 10 second intervals, it's an alternative to going back to base but leaves you exposed).

I know our server would sit empty, because we don't run mod maps on it ever. No one that comes would have the map so it would be empty every time that map came up. We tried doing this a long time ago and no one had the maps so we canned it. We've never seen a mod map that was better than the regular maps anyhow, so this is not a decision I am saddened by. I'll check out his map sometime in the next day or two here, though.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 17:40:14 GMT

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

PointlessAmblerI was thinking more along the lines of actually hiding in a good place. You know, like the windows that overlook the Tiberium field? You're not easily visible there. Obviously there are ways to avoid being shot down. My main point is, why should Snipers be the unit to counter aircraft? It doesn't make sense. Damage is a secondary argument, and I'll admit there are compelling arguments for both sides on that one. My main point is that rocket-firing units should be the counter to air units, like it actually was in C&C, not snipers. Bullet damage to aircraft should be decreased somewhat to reflect the fact that in C&C, bullets couldn't even hit aircraft.

If someone's in the window you can rocketspam in there from above with little to no fear of counterattack, while you send one of your team to rape them.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 17:55:49 GMT

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

DeathgodIf someone's in the window you can rocketspam in there from above with little to no fear of counterattack, while you send one of your team to rape them.

All the more reason to have limited helicopter ammunition, then. They wouldn't squander it to try to hurt attackers with splash damage, and would attack something worthwhile - tanks, or a building.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 18:01:51 GMT

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

If you do that, you'll have to do it to all vehicles, otherwise choppers would have an unfair disadvantage. While limiting their rockets is accurate, limiting their machine gun isn't.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 18:04:37 GMT

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

PointlessAmbler

DeathgodThere are only so many places to hide on each map... not to mention that characters ducking in and out of places on the map are easy to spot because of their movement.

It doesn't even matter if they hide, because they can shoot you down from the maximum view distance. Infantry are pretty damn hard to see from 300 meters away, especially when they're not moving or better, hiding. Their bullets don't give you hints as to where they are.

Ramjets do let you know where the shot is coming from, but since they kill you in five shots and Ramjets have a four round clip, it's basically impossible to close the distance and kill them in time even if you know exactly where they are.

Rarely do I get sniped in an aircraft from 300 meters. In fact I can count on one hand the number of times that happened recently, and that was on Friday night in our FUDvsFUD game. I flew around from a different path and owned the sniper, and the problem was solved.

PointlessAmblerDeathgodThey have a role, but if you fly into an area full of snipers expect to die, just like any other unit rushing into an area full of counterunits. If I drive my Medium Tank into an area with 3 or 4 Raveshaws, I expect to die. This is what some people call common sense.

My point is, Snipers are supposed to be counterunits to infantry, not light vehicles. Where in any game, C&C included, has a sniper rifle been effective against even the lightest vehicle armor? Commandos in C&C have a hell of a time killing a goddamn Nod Buggy, and this game is supposed to be based on C&C. I'm not saying there shouldn't be air counters, that's retarded, there needs to be a counterunit to everything. I'm just saying that picking Snipers to be counterunits to aircraft was a poor design choice. I'm also saying that units should at least stand some sort of chance against counterunits, because if they don't, the unit is worthless. As you used in your example, a Medium Tank (800) can actually defend itself against one Raveshaw (1000). Agreed, two or three can rip it to pieces. With aircraft, however, it only takes one Sniper (500, 55% the cost of attack aircraft) or n00bjetter (only slightly more expensive than the aircraft) to kill the damn thing with the same speed that it would take two Raveshaws (which cost 2000, 2.5 times the cost of the Medium Tank), especially when it's a unit that is supposed to be attacking infantry.

I would not disagree that picking snipers was a poor design choice, given their instant hit capability and incredible range compared to the unit they're countering, but I don't think it's really as horrible as you guys all make it out to be. I mean, 3 GDI rifle soldiers can shoot an apache down in just under 5 seconds. FUKEN NERF TEM TOOOOOO GOOD!!!!!!1 As I have pointed out to ACK many times, if this game took from its source material (C&C) exactly, it would be horribly un-fun. C&C worked well as an RTS, but ported straight to FPS form certain considerations must

be made to make gameplay flow faster. RenAlert is really slow, and it's just like Red Alert. I can appreciate the work that went into their mod, and I think they did an excellent job, but I can't play it because it takes about 2 weeks to drive to an enemy base through fairly empty terrain. Having maps 5 or 6 times the size of the ones in Ren is cool and all if you have stuff to fill the map with. The reason Ren works so well is because of its smaller maps and faster pace. This is a different issue though, and I am going off on a tangent.

On this point: Raveshaw and PIC Syd both kill Orca/Apache in 4 shots. They have a 200m range as opposed to the Orca's 100m range. Are you going to nerf them too?

PointlessAmblerDeathgodAs it stands now an Orca can kill numerous LTs, this is a big downgrade.

Except it never gets the chance to because he gets shot down long before he approaches a target worth attacking. I'm saying that Helipads would be a better way of limiting aircraft than making them completely die against any sort of counterattack.

So making it so they couldn't kill vehicles on their own when they can now makes them better... I fail to see the logic here.

PointlessAmblerDeathgodSee above. If you're going to make helis require ammo, all vehicles should also. It would be horribly stupid within the confines of the Renegade engine to have one vehicle for each team with such a handicap... I can't see them being too useful if they need to be flying back to base after firing at one target.

I don't see how it's a handicap... helis are support units by nature. If you use them at the right time (ie. when you're doing an assault on the enemy base, and soften up enemy armor a bit), they can be quite useful. Why not implement them the way that C&C did it, instead of making them die the second they leave their base?

So are APCs and Humvees, and apparently Stealth Tanks according to you. Should they all have to reload at base too? CONSISTENCY PLZ

PointlessAmblerDeathgodSo since someone has been around longer their opinion is automatically more correct than someone else's? Wrong. I personally think that they are both idiots, and so are you. Since I have been here since the old-school Ren forums does that make me right? No. Number of posts or length of forum tenure doesn't mean fuck.

Meh, it's not his opinion that I'm talking about when I say that, it's that he has pulled out all the cliches: calling him a n00b for disagreeing, saying it's a horrible idea without any support behind his argument, and the "I'm right, you're not, that means USUX" attitude, not to mention poor grammar and spelling :rolleyes: Therefore, it's a bit hypocritical for him to call someone else a n00b when he himself is unable to provide a well-thought-out counterargument and misspells words in his post.

I don't think you're a moron just because we happen to disagree: you're actually capable of coming up with a coherent counterargument, a rare ability on the endless void of stupidity known

as the Internet.

I'm glad you agree on this point, but you should have phrased it better in the first place to avoid this problem.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 18:55:40 GMT

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

DeathgodRarely do I get sniped in an aircraft from 300 meters. In fact I can count on one hand the number of times that happened recently, and that was on Friday night in our FUDvsFUD game. I flew around from a different path and owned the sniper, and the problem was solved.

Huh, maybe the people you play with use snipers as intended instead of sniping Mammoth Tanks for points even though it doesn't hurt them at all. You may be able to count on that in your own servers, (you seem to have a pretty strict set of rules, including the ability to kick people because they don't play up to your standards (not that I disagree with that kind of enforcement)) but there are countless others where people abuse the snipers' capabilities and the bug in armor.ini elsewhere in Renegade.

DeathgodOn this point: Raveshaw and PIC Syd both kill Orca/Apache in 4 shots. They have a 200m range as opposed to the Orca's 100m range. Are you going to nerf them too?

Of course not, they're INTENDED to be anti-vehicle units, whereas snipers are not. Plus, note that they have only a 200m range while snipers have a 300m range.

DeathgodSo making it so they couldn't kill vehicles on their own when they can now makes them better... I fail to see the logic here.

Increasing helicopters' durability by itself would be a nightmare for any ground unit. Just look at RenAlert's .991 release. The Apache Longbow pwned absolutely everything, and you could only kill it with like two units. However, if Helipads are implemented and sniper damage against helicopters goes down, the weakness of the helicopter goes away, but it doesn't become the UBER-n00b-PWNZOR vehicle, either, because its ammunition is limited. The two actions balance out. So, helicopters become balanced in addition to making the game closer to the game it's based on.

DeathgodSo are APCs and Humvees, and apparently Stealth Tanks according to you. Should they all have to reload at base too?

No, because they didn't have to reload in C&C. Also, Stealth Tanks are support units in my opinion because you can't use them in the same way you would use a main battle tank like a Medium Tank or a Mammoth Tanks. Doing that gets you killed. Hence, I consider it a 'support' unit. Sure, they do lots of damage, but if you don't approach from behind, or travel with other Nod vehicles, or are unstealthed all the time because you fire at Rifle Soldiers, you're going to get killed, fast. I've lost count of how many times Stealth Tanks have decloaked and fired at the front of my Medium Tank, leading to their quick death.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 19:05:49 GMT

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

JavaxcxRemember, the game isn't snipers vs. aircraft, it's GDI vs. Nod.

I personally, don't waste any of my ammo on aircraft (mostly because I don't waste my money with the 1000 credit sniper over the 500 credit one) because when I'm a sniper, I'm going after infantry. Shooting down aircraft is just a costly bonus.

Chances are, if you're playing a 10 vs. 10 game, and you're planning on camping out and hunting down choppers, you're going to have opposition from tanks, stealth units, other infantry, whatever. It all balances out.

Maybe you don't waste your ammo on aircraft, but it's been my experience that most snipers do. In fact, if you are in any light armoured vehicle, a lot of snipers will switch to shooting you instead of more important targets, just because they know they can kill you easily. I've seen plenty of snipers go out of their way to kill Buggies, even if they were in the middle of a firefight with other infantry and the Buggy wasn't doing anything threatening.

JavaxcxWhere in any CNC game has a mere infantry unit been able to shoot down Orcas and Apaches that are airbourne? Don't complain about those technicalities unless you're willing to change them all. That includes engineers having those repair guns, infantry (or any ground unit for that matter, save rocketeers) shooting down airbourne units, the Obelisk able to shoot down Orcas, and so on.

That's a fair point, but remember that in C&C, Minigunners would be able to damage an aircraft on the ground, whereas the Commando's sniper rifle still wouldn't do any damage. If the Renegade maps were flat like the maps in the original C&C, then fine, you could give all units without rocket launchers a restriction on aiming upwards. The problem is, Renegade maps are three dimensional with slopes and bridges etc. You would end up with problems such as infantry not being able to shoot at other ground units up a hill, because unlike vehicles, infantry stay vertical regardless of the terrain. You can't stop their weapons from causing damage to aircraft either, because they need to be able to damage grounded aircraft.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 19:35:26 GMT

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

Yes of course, any unit could attack an airbourne unit when it was grounded. But since it isn't feasible to do the same kind of thing in Renegade, and given the nature of the game, the munitions, and the whole kip'n'kaboodle, snipers shouldn't be touched. The reasons have to be stated so many times over that it's pointless to reiterate them.

Essentially, it breaks down to changing sniper's damage against airbourne units for two reasons: To remake the CNC experience "properly", and to balance the game. Thankfully, only one of those is subjective, the latter. Looking at the first, if you're going to change something such as that, you HAVE to be willing to change the countless other aspects of the game that are not based

on CNC.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 20:10:46 GMT

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

Well, I think it would be better balanced if a rocket instead of an instant hit, invisible projectile was the counter to aircraft.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 20:13:35 GMT

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

I would too, but that isn't feasible in any form, because of the First person shooter nature of the game.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 20:21:30 GMT

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

PointlessAmblerHuh, maybe the people you play with use snipers as intended instead of sniping Mammoth Tanks for points even though it doesn't hurt them at all. You may be able to count on that in your own servers, (you seem to have a pretty strict set of rules, including the ability to kick people because they don't play up to your standards (not that I disagree with that kind of enforcement)) but there are countless others where people abuse the snipers' capabilities and the bug in armor.ini elsewhere in Renegade.

Why do you think we have such rules? I tire of people being fagmars in this game, so I don't let them on our server. The pointwhore mentality is pretty rare when we're in a game nowadays. We prefer that our teams will work together on vehicle rushes and tactics designed to win the game by destroying everything rather than by getting points.

PointlessAmbler

Of course not, they're INTENDED to be anti-vehicle units, whereas snipers are not. Plus, note that they have only a 200m range while snipers have a 300m range.

That's still twice what the air units have. They also can kill Stanks in 5 shots, plus infantry in one. TOTALY FUKEN BORKED TEY NED NERFINS MAEK TEM SHOOT CHIKNES TEHN IS FAIRS

PointlessAmbler

Increasing helicopters' durability by itself would be a nightmare for any ground unit. Just look at RenAlert's .991 release. The Apache Longbow pwned absolutely everything, and you could only kill it with like two units. However, if Helipads are implemented and sniper damage against helicopters goes down, the weakness of the helicopter goes away, but it doesn't become the

UBER-n00b-PWNZOR vehicle, either, because its ammunition is limited. The two actions balance out. So, helicopters become balanced in addition to making the game closer to the game it's based on.

I never proposed increasing their durability. I think helis are in fact perfectly fine the way they are. The snipers are what appear to be the issue here, so change them. Don't change both because one is broken; change the part that's broken then see how it works when it's fixed. I would point out that the reason I don't play RenAlert is because of things like that. I dislike the way it plays; in Renegade a lot of units can take down aircraft, it's just that everyone thinks snipers are cooler because they do it faster. I have news for them: Rav/PIC are just as good but they hurt ALL the vehicles that much. Also, in the original C&C and in Red Alert you could build antiair structures to counter air units, so the fact that those aren't in Renegade is probably a lot of the reason for allowing snipers to damage them. Flying one Orca into an area with 3 SAM sites and wondering why you died is the same issue as flying one into an area with 3 snipers and wondering why you died; the answer is because you are stupid.

PointlessAmbler

No, because they didn't have to reload in C&C. Also, Stealth Tanks are support units in my opinion because you can't use them in the same way you would use a main battle tank like a Medium Tank or a Mammoth Tanks. Doing that gets you killed. Hence, I consider it a 'support' unit. Sure, they do lots of damage, but if you don't approach from behind, or travel with other Nod vehicles, or are unstealthed all the time because you fire at Rifle Soldiers, you're going to get killed, fast. I've lost count of how many times Stealth Tanks have decloaked and fired at the front of my Medium Tank, leading to their quick death.

You can use Stanks in the same way, you just have to be a good driver. I don't think the fact that it requires skill means it's a support unit... frankly I fear a rush of Stanks more than just about anything in the game, except maybe a Mammy rush on certain maps. Pointing out that people who use certain units are stupid players is not justification for a balance change.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 09 May 2004 23:13:28 GMT

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

DeathgodThe snipers are what appear to be the issue here, so change them. Don't change both because one is broken; change the part that's broken then see how it works when it's fixed.

Okay then, I propose, to make the largest number of people happy as possible, to reduce the damage snipers do to aircraft and leave it at that. Want to shoot down aircraft? Use a PIC or Rav. instead. Not a n00bjet. That is the main problem. If ACK wants to release maps with Helipads, he can, and I'll probably play them, and some people probably won't. However, for the rest of the RenGuard users, just reduce sniper damage to aircraft. Bam! Problem solved.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 06:40:27 GMT

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

Go look at our site. Just about anything can shoot down aircraft effectively.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 09:05:11 GMT

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

Pretty funny to knock fly-boys out of the sky with standard infantry, but that's not the point. Of course you can take down aircraft with just about everything. But you can't take out aircraft far outside of their range with everything.

Question: how fast do Orcas/Apaches move in m/s, discounting the time to accelerate?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 09:49:49 GMT

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

"You can't please all of the people all of the time". Sadly it doesn't matter what the majority wants, there will be those who LOUDLY oppose any ideas whatsoever. There are people that right now want Renegade exactly like it is, and people who want some balance tweaks, and people who want it completely changed. There's no way on earth all of these people are going to agree on anything....we may as well be discussing what religion is the right one or what operating system is best.

In short, this forum was created so discuss ideas. Many people are assuming that Idea X and Idea Y are set in stone and going to happen and they are pissed off about it. We are still in the discussion stage here folks. So try not to get too upset

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 16:04:36 GMT

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

You'd have to ask someone more familiar with the mod tools than I about that, I'm not sure how Ren calculates all that. The numbers for mass and max acceleration are in the editor, though.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 16:53:49 GMT

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

DeathgodGo look at our site. Just about anything can shoot down aircraft effectively.

With the possible exception of anyone in the CW clan.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 18:20:16 GMT

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

???

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 19:10:44 GMT

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

PointlessAmblerHowever, for the rest of the RenGuard users, just reduce sniper damage to aircraft. Bam! Problem solved.

I've got RenGuard to stop cheaters, not to play the game how you think it ought to be.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 19:26:38 GMT

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

KIRBY098DeathgodGo look at our site. Just about anything can shoot down aircraft effectively.

With the possible exception of anyone in the CW clan.

Well, if you like to sit and sp33k w1gga while your base is being anally raped by the lowliest players, you'd fit right in with CW anyway.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 19:40:45 GMT

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

JavacxKIRBY098DeathgodGo look at our site. Just about anything can shoot down aircraft effectively.

With the possible exception of anyone in the CW clan.

Well, if you like to sit and sp33k w1gga while your base is being anally raped by the lowliest players, you'd fit right in with CW anyway.

Applicants must also be able to lie profusely about how they own j00, and buying tanks for the

other team is mandatory.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 10 May 2004 19:42:34 GMT

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

You forgot to mention that you have to play "buddy-buddy" with that delightful Raven character.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 03:42:00 GMT

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

mrpiratePointlessAmbler

I've got RenGuard to stop cheaters, not to play the game how you think it ought to be.

RenGuard has NOTHING to do with the balance things being talked about, except that the MOTD may provide links to download the Blackhand Studios versions of maps.

Let me put it in other words...any changes will be map-specific, you will have a choice of playing/hosting the normal game/maps, or hosting/playing enhanced versions of old maps as well as new ones.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 03:52:35 GMT

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

mrpiratePointlessAmblerHowever, for the rest of the RenGuard users, just reduce sniper damage to aircraft. Bam! Problem solved.

I've got RenGuard to stop cheaters, not to play the game how you think it ought to be.

Amen to that.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 07:02:36 GMT

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

Fine, don't listen to what I'm saying and just keep complaining. :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Jorge](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 09:58:28 GMT

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

Quote:On this point: Raveshaw and PIC Syd both kill Orca/Apache in 4 shots. They have a 200m range as opposed to the Orca's 100m range. Are you going to nerf them too?

There is one huge difference. PIC Syd and Raveshaw's only have one-shot clips, doing 80 damage per shot to Aircraft, they have to reload after everyshot and have a decent reload time, along with just 100m less range. Havoc/Sakura have 4 shot clips, that fire in rapid succession, with a faster reload, and they do 60 damage per shot to Aircraft from over 300m away. Stop compairing those units. One is designed to be anti-Tank, and the other Anti-Infantry.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 12:18:33 GMT

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

JavaxcxYou forgot to mention that you have to play "buddy-buddy" with that delightful Raven character.

A delightful chap, indeed.

Things just are not what they used to be around here.....

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 15:40:03 GMT

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

BlazerFine, don't listen to what I'm saying and just keep complaining. :rolleyes:

In all fairness to you, I didn't read your poste before I read his.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 15:44:35 GMT

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

JorgeQuote:On this point: Raveshaw and PIC Syd both kill Orca/Apache in 4 shots. They have a 200m range as opposed to the Orca's 100m range. Are you going to nerf them too?

There is one huge difference. PIC Syd and Raveshaw's only have one-shot clips, doing 80 damage per shot to Aircraft, they have to reload after everyshot and have a decent reload time, along with just 100m less range. Havoc/Sakura have 4 shot clips, that fire in rapid succession,

with a faster reload, and they do 60 damage per shot to Aircraft from over 300m away. Stop comparing those units. One is designed to be anti-Tank, and the other Anti-Infantry.

Correction: One is anti-everything, one is anti-infantry and light armor.

And that difference on reload times isn't huge vs. an aircraft because generally the infantry can hide. One Raveshaw on the mesa on Walls will be able to remove aircraft pretty effectively, two is suicidal for aircraft to leave their base.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Tue, 11 May 2004 23:52:43 GMT

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

[quote="Blazer"]mrpiratePointlessAmbler

Let me put it in other words...any changes will be map-specific, you will have a choice of playing/hosting the normal game/maps, or hosting/playing enhanced versions of old maps as well as new ones.

Hell, that's better than what I was saying. If you're doing that, then there's really no reason for anyone to complain anymore, because the changes will be map-specific. Makes sense to me.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 00:35:35 GMT

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

Plus it would make the maps a whole lot more fun to play. I vote yes.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Homey](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 00:39:49 GMT

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

DeathgodJorgeQuote:On this point: Raveshaw and PIC Syd both kill Orca/Apache in 4 shots. They have a 200m range as opposed to the Orca's 100m range. Are you going to nerf them too?

There is one huge difference. PIC Syd and Raveshaw's only have one-shot clips, doing 80 damage per shot to Aircraft, they have to reload after everyshot and have a decent reload time, along with just 100m less range. Havoc/Sakura have 4 shot clips, that fire in rapid succession, with a faster reload, and they do 60 damage per shot to Aircraft from over 300m away. Stop comparing those units. One is designed to be anti-Tank, and the other Anti-Infantry.

Correction: One is anti-everything, one is anti-infantry and light armor.

And that difference on reload times isn't huge vs. an aircraft because generally the infantry can

hide. One Raveshaw on the mesa on Walls will be able to remove aircraft pretty effectively, two is suicidal for aircraft to leave their base.

Yup, but if it were a 1v1 the rav might lose, depending on the orca. Hell a havoc or sakura is almost as likely to lose. What I prefer to do is rush up to the wall and repair then kill him.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 09:27:56 GMT

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

Can someone, anyone, tell me how did they know that the Commando in CnC was using the Ramjet that havoc uses and not just another type of sniper rifle? If you can't, then stop comparing them. You're just assuming they both use the same weapon.

And erm, you're(those that want the change) asking what? To make gunners and rocket soldiers and anything with missiles anti aircraft? We, already have an anti aircraft unit - havoc/sakura. You want to replace an anti-aircraft unit, with what? another anti-aircraft unit?

You say that you don't use snipers to shoot at tanks and stuff because they get massive points, but others do, and you're complaining about it. What? you're complaining about what YOU and the others BOTH can ACHIEVE. But just because YOU don't do it, means THEY must not do it?

Played City_flying_exp? Flyingfox has pointed out. Every game, no one buys tanks anymore. All they do is get aircraft and zoom around City_flying_exp became a air dog fight instead of a multiplayer CnC. Missles did shit against them.

Missiles have range right? What's to stop an orca/apache to just continue flying straight until the missile goes boom because its out of range? And the locking sysem, it sucks.

Aircraft easily destroy everything in their path, as long as they are in range. They chew through infantry, high armoured vehicals, buildings. They have been so many god-damned times, when my havoc was taken out by aircraft by ambushing. ACK would know. A competent flyer, would not complain about "OMG I CAN'T KILL THIS HAVOC NOOOO1!!" You complain about havocs/sak making you unable to fly, GO TAKE OUT THE HON OR BARRACKS INSTEAD OF WHINING ABOUT IT.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 12:08:31 GMT

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

Quote:We, already have an anti aircraft unit - havoc/sakura.

The whole point is that sniper are not AA, they're AI/AP.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 12:54:28 GMT

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

YAWN

Nice rant.

The point I am trying to make is this:

The extreme range of Havoc/Sakura doesn't allow the Air unit a fighting chance to even GET TO the area of the sniper without cover. Now I will grant that a skilled flyer can avoid a great deal of flak, but if there are two ramjets out there, it is next to impossible to get in range.

I know. I do this often to air units FROM MY BASE. And God help them if I am on the mesa looking down on thier base...

I am not looking for a fantastic flying p3n15 mobile here. Just dial the damage meted out down a bit. That's all.

And by asking the missiles to home on air targets we aren't exactly asking for the game to be revolutionized. Missiles have been self-tracking against air targets since 1971. Considering C&C's futuristic setting, I don't feel this is asking too much. Let them track, but shorten thier range so the aircraft have an out. Gunner has the ability to release 6 missiles quickly. That's a lot of missiles that would be flying around everywhere if the range wasn't dialed down.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Jorge](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 20:43:54 GMT

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

Quote:Correction: One is anti-everything, one is anti-infantry and light armor.

And that difference on reload times isn't huge vs. an aircraft because generally the infantry can hide. One Raveshaw on the mesa on Walls will be able to remove aircraft pretty effectively, two is suicidal for aircraft to leave their base.

One is Anti-Vehicular, the other is Anti-Infantry. Yes, you "can" try to use a PIC or Railgun to kill infantry, but with their long reload time, and the fact that it takes 2 shots to kill infantry save a headshot, it makes them easy to kill with any non-Free Infantry, whether it be a Rocket Soldier Officer, SBH, Patch, Tib Syd, a 500 Sniper, and would utterly get owned by a Havoc.

Infantry hiding? Duh, that is the advantages of infantry, and can't Havoc/Sakuras not hide from Aircraft as well?

So you are saying going up against two Raveshaw's with a Orca is worse for the Orca than going up against two Havocs? The two Havocs would shoot you down as soon as your Orca came out from behidn the protection of the base.

Havoc/Sakura have over 100M greater range, do 60 HP per shot (compared to the 80 HP the

PIC/Railgun does), and can probably get off 3 shots before the PIC/Railgun has reloaded. So lets see... $3 \times 60 = 180$ and $1 \times 80 = 80$. Comparing them is not going to get you anywhere, the Sniper is supposed to be Anti-Infantry while the PIC/Railgun is an anti-Vehicular weapon.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Wed, 12 May 2004 23:02:26 GMT

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

Jorgethe Sniper is supposed to be Anti-Infantry while the PIC/Railgun is an anti-Vehicular weapon.

If Havok were actually designed to be Anti-Helicopter, would people still be complaining that the game is "unbalanced" and whatnot? (and on that note, maybe havok actually IS designed to be anti-helicopter. who are we to say it's not intentionally the way it is?)

Basically I'm asking if the problem is that "snipers shouldn't be able to kill helicopters" or if the problem is that "snipers killing helicopters makes the game unbalanced." Because at first I thought people were trying to say the game was unbalanced (which I don't agree with), but everyone keeps mentioning that it "shouldn't work this way," which leads me to believe that people are more upset by snipers being an anti-helicopter unit than they are by the fact that helicopters can be effectively countered by infantry.

People keep saying that Havok/Sakura should not be able to kill vehicles because they're designed to be anti-infantry. But if you believe this, then shouldn't you also say that PICsydney/Raveshaw should not be able to kill infantry?

Really, the elite units are not as simple as Havok=anti-infantry, PIC=anti-vehicle, Mobius=anti-both. It's really more like Havok=anti infantry and anti light armor; PIC and Mobius = anti infantry, anti vehicles, and anti buildings. As it is, PIC and Mobius are already more useful than Havok. If Havok's damage vs light armor is negated, then he will be totally underpowered compared to the other elite units.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 07:05:34 GMT

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

Jorge

One is Anti-Vehicular, the other is Anti-Infantry. Yes, you "can" try to use a PIC or Railgun to kill infantry, but with their long reload time, and the fact that it takes 2 shots to kill infantry save a headshot, it makes them easy to kill with any non-Free Infantry, whether it be a Rocket Soldier Officer, SBH, Patch, Tib Syd, a 500 Sniper, and would utterly get owned by a Havoc.

There's no "can" about it, pal. I decimate everything with a Rav/PIC. When I get one, I kill EVERYTHING I see. That includes, but is not limited to, enemy snipers (and all other infantry).

You seem to be discounting the fact that free infantry die in one shot, just like with a Havoc/Sakura, and one headshot with a railgun or PIC kills anyone as well. That's pretty fucking important; if you're a good shot, which I am, that means you can potentially get 31 kills with that character, just under the 36 possible from a Havoc or Sakura, but you also do more damage to everything else as well. Rav/PIC is the most utilitarian character in the game for attacking with, period. If you think they're not effective, I question your intelligence.

Jorge

Infantry hiding? Duh, that is the advantages of infantry, and can't Havoc/Sakuras not hide from Aircraft as well?

So you are saying going up against two Raveshaw's with a Orca is worse for the Orca than going up against two Havocs? The two Havocs would shoot you down as soon as your Orca came out from behind the protection of the base.

And the two Raveshaws would also drop the Orca before it got into range, so your point is what? That the Havocs can shoot it down from 50% farther than the Rav can? Whee. I'd rather have a Rav/PIC any day; they're not going to be hampered if someone brings an APC to come slaughter your Havoc. Besides, I think it would be funnier and more demoralizing to shoot the vehicles down when they're in the field instead of in the base; people will just quit if you kill their stuff as they buy it, but if you let them think they have a chance they'll stick around longer so you can kill them more often. I'd argue that this psychological fact makes the Rav/PIC in fact the better choice by itself.

Jorge

Havoc/Sakura have over 100M greater range, do 60 HP per shot (compared to the 80 HP the PIC/Railgun does), and can probably get off 3 shots before the PIC/Railgun has reloaded. So lets see... $3 \times 60 = 180$ and $1 \times 80 = 80$. Comparing them is not going to get you anywhere, the Sniper is supposed to be Anti-Infantry while the PIC/Railgun is an anti-Vehicular weapon.

Except that the PIC/Railgun hurts EVERYTHING a lot, you'd be right... You're disregarding the fact that Rav/PIC do that much damage per shot to all vehicles, can kill buildings (which snipers can't do), and only lose out on body shots to infantry, where they do 40 less damage (40, and not 50, because rail/PIC have 10 points of burn damage on top of the 200 per shot they do to infantry.).

Also, as a general FYI: Havoc/Sakura have 300m range, Rav/PIC is 200m, so it's not "over 100m," it is 100m greater. As I have said before though, if you're letting the sniper have a shot on you at that great of a distance you should be re-examining your tactics, as that (and not game balance) is to blame for your death.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 08:55:20 GMT

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

Quote: Comparing them is not going to get you anywhere, the Sniper is supposed to be Anti-Infantry while the PIC/Railgun is an anti-Vehicular weapon.

Yes the sniper is supposed to be anti infantry. But, who the hell said that havoc was using a sniper rifle?

Notice that it does not say ramjet sniper rifle. It just says ramjet rifle. Don't gimme the bull that it has a scope. Go fit a shotgun or pistil with a scope. Is it a sniper rifle? :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Renx](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 10:55:19 GMT

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

You're forgetting that they're making it so the helicopters have to go reload to, one thing that wasn't on city_flying_exp

Besides, these are going to be seperate maps, all the original maps will still be there, and everything will still do the same damage.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 17:17:10 GMT

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

People who say "giving aircraft the disadvantage of needing to reload at the Helicopter Pad is bad," don't forget that aircraft already have more advantages than any other unit does.

1. They fly.
2. They can hide easily with a properly designed level for flying (NOT STANDARD WS STUFF).
3. They're fast and maneuverable.
4. They have strong weapons (Ideally only the six missiles for the Orca and the 150-300 rounds on the Apache).

I'll reiterate, once more, aircraft in both C&C and reality are support units. They don't loiter over the battlefield endlessly, they have set amounts of ammunition, and they can't hold objectives.

In both C&C and reality, tanks and infantry hold objectives. I'm sure Kirby can tell you about this in more detail than I can. Aircraft can't hold objectives in war because they don't have staying power. Tanks and soldiers can sit there and hammer away at a target, or they can hold a point for reinforcements... Or just use that point as a breakthrough position to head through enemy lines and attack from the rear. Aircraft cannot do this because they get spotted with extreme ease when on the move. If they aren't moving, they're wasting fuel, and aren't going to be of much use to anyone unless they're hiding to ambush a column of armored vehicles.

Leaving "snipers" as they are now ends up leaving aircraft in a position where they're useless in 8

out of 10 situations. Making them rearm, not be able to loiter endlessly, and have more armor with more AA weapons makes them able to survive multiple threats without being shot down in three seconds from across a level.

It all comes down to that. You can leave them alone and have nearly useless vehicles, or upgrade the game and have vehicles that can do something useful; while not dominating everything.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 17:30:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Affirmative.

Air units are a support, and softening unit for the land warfare phase. No war has ever been won by air bombardment alone. You need troops on the ground to hold the territory.

They are VERY needy vehicles, and require tons of support personnel.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 17:34:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also, if anyone who stated "realism, thus ramjets must own aircraft, slugs that big can hurt them real bad," I hope you aren't against what I just said. Unless you feel like taking a ride on the Contradiction Junction.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 19:12:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:and only lose out on body shots to infantry, where they do 40 less damage (40, and not 50, because rail/PIC have 10 points of burn damage on top of the 200 per shot they do to infantry.).

The Railgun and PIC do 210 damage with a body shot (with burn damage). The Ramjet does 200.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 19:27:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KIRBY098You need troops on the ground to hold the territory.

They are VERY needy vehicles, and require tons of support personnel.

Doesn't this kind of disprove your argument? They're needy vehicles as it is now, if they had the support to suppress the snipers they wouldn't have trouble on the field. However, I agree that they shouldn't loiter on the battlefield, they're too powerful for that and in the hands of a skilled player just flying ownage mobiles that can't be killed without a \$1000 character.

City flying exp would have been more of a success HAD standard auto rifles done the same (or even more) damage to aircraft.

As for tracking rockets, I found a neat little trick to make them track every time. Once you fire a shot that tracks, use the right click on your mouse and the next shot'll seek too. Then, left click, right click and so on. Your missiles will always track targets and will help you against the apache (since the orca won't be as good at killing infantry targets with these new levels).

Edit, tanhm could you resize those pics? They're stretching the boundaries for 1024 * 768. I'd turn it up, but it's the max it can go.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 19:33:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, these are not mutually exclusive at all.

Aircraft carriers serve one purpose. To launch aircraft, and every human on board that 6,000 man vessel knows it.

Air bases serve the same function. That airbase exists for only one reason.

Let's look at the first and second Gulf wars. The aircraft pummeled Iraq long before surface troops were able to support the missions. Aircraft getting shot down is not directly related to ground force control. Ask the helo pilots in Iraq...

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 19:47:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Standard soldiers did the same damage, I believe. The only real change in the aircraft from what I can remember offhand is that their armor type was changed to CnCVehicleMedium.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Thu, 13 May 2004 20:09:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nah, GDI soldiers could do only 80 damage per clip as opposed to 160. That was the trouble; it was too difficult to defend against apache/orca units if you lost your bax/hand. If they done the same damage, I think it would've turned out alright lest for the apache being useless against structures.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 06:06:57 GMT

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

mrpirateQuote:and only lose out on body shots to infantry, where they do 40 less damage (40, and not 50, because rail/PIC have 10 points of burn damage on top of the 200 per shot they do to infantry.).

The Railgun and PIC do 210 damage with a body shot (with burn damage). The Ramjet does 200.

Sorry, posted that way too late in the evening.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 06:07:38 GMT

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

flyingfoxNah, GDI soldiers could do only 80 damage per clip as opposed to 160. That was the trouble; it was too difficult to defend against apache/orca units if you lost your bax/hand. If they done the same damage, I think it would've turned out alright lest for the apache being useless against structures.

Right now GDI soldiers do 210 per clip to light armor, Nod soldiers do 150.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 07:03:24 GMT

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

The irony that someone cough cough at the start said that this was only related to CnC, and not real life.

Hey, in real life, 1 rocket can take out an aircraft.

In real life, if your petrol tank got hit you go boom.

You're comparing how we use aircraft in Renegade and how aircraft are used in real life.
:rolleyes: Maybe we should go ask Havoc how the hell do we become a real life rambo.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 07:06:48 GMT

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

If you had bothered to read, I was countering their points of realism and showing them that their cries for realism can be countered with exactly what they're asking for.

Do what I do and actually read the posts...

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [nastym4n](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 09:47:07 GMT

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

it seriously took 10 pages for you guys to figure this out??

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 11:56:18 GMT

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

AircraftkillerLeaving "snipers" as they are now ends up leaving aircraft in a position where they're useless in 8 out of 10 situations. Making them rearm, not be able to loiter endlessly, and have more armor with more AA weapons makes them able to survive multiple threats without being shot down in three seconds from across a level.

It all comes down to that. You can leave them alone and have nearly useless vehicles, or upgrade the game and have vehicles that can do something useful; while not dominating everything.

I can understand that you're contrasting realism and C&C for this, but what exactly is your goal?

And I quote:

Quote:It's not about realism, it's about C&C.

Assuming that you are genuinely trying to make Renegade based directly off C&C, then refueling aircraft doesn't make much sense since that was never an aspect OF C&C. If you were going to have the aircraft reload anything, it should be limited to rocket banks (correct me if I'm wrong, but Orcas and Apaches both needed to reload their missiles only in C&C). THAT would be realistic to the C&C universe, not refueling... fuel.

And it would be balanced: If an Orca is shot for missiles, then it is practically useless when it comes to "loitering" with the exception of normal infantry, so it would be a strategic element to either stay and attempt to fortify (although out of character for the purpose of aircraft) or to leave and reload incase your team needs support.

As for the snipers, when it comes to standard WS maps that were map for flying units, I would argue that snipers and flying vehicles are quite evenly matched. If you read prior posts, you'd

understand why, so I'm not going to type it out again.

If the goal of these modifications is to recreate the C&C experience properly for Westwood maps, then snipers should be left alone, because they are a balanced unit for both Walls_Flying and City_Flying (see above).

HOWEVER: If the goal of these modifications is for mod maps, then by all means, do whatever you want. Just don't make those maps part of a standard rotation in a future WS patch (if ever).

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 13:54:43 GMT

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

When did I say I wanted aircraft to refuel? I've never said they needed to do that. I only said they need to have limited ammunition and *reload* at Helicopter Pads.

The Orca had missiles. The Apache had a chain gun. Neither had dual weapons because they were specialized for a purpose.

Snipers aren't balanced, and saying "they're balanced" isn't a reason why they are or are not.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Fri, 14 May 2004 14:33:25 GMT

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

AircraftkillerWhen did I say I wanted aircraft to refuel? I've never said they needed to do that. I only said they need to have limited ammunition and *reload* at Helicopter Pads.

That's my fault, I read "reloaded" as "refueled".

Quote:The Orca had missiles. The Apache had a chain gun. Neither had dual weapons because they were specialized for a purpose.

Then for the sake of the C&C goal, you would have to eliminate the chain gun on the Orca and make it reload its payload. You would also have to eliminate the payload for the Apache, but since that didn't have to reload, it would be given unlimited ammo.

Doesn't sound like fun, does it? But hey, that's how the game was played in C&C.

Quote:Snipers aren't balanced, and saying "they're balanced" isn't a reason why they are or are not.

Well, then it's quite obvious that you haven't read a single post prior to your returning, because this issue has been argued over and over again. For that reason, I'm not going to waste my own time restating issues that have been mentioned time and time again.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 00:20:44 GMT

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

What're you talking about? I specifically said I wanted the machine gun on the Orca removed and the missiles on the Apache removed. Both primary weapons, the missiles for the Orca and the Apache heavy machine gun, would have to be rearmed after firing a certain amount of ammunition.

It sounds like a lot of fun to me.

Don't bother restating your opinions on the sniper damage, it's irrelevant.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 00:45:20 GMT

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

AircraftkillerIt sounds like a lot of fun to me.

I'm glad thats a subjective issue, because that sounds awfully retarded to me.

Quote:

Don't bother restating your opinions on the sniper damage, it's irrelevant.

No, your opinions on sniper damage are irrelevant.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 00:59:12 GMT

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

NO URS R STFU NOOB U R NOT JUST A BIG JACKAS

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 01:30:31 GMT

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

I DESLIKE you both.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 01:57:40 GMT

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

I will wager anyone a large sum of money that this thread will never become flame-free from this point.

If only people would stop picking fights with Aircraftkiller we could really get some actual opinions discussed on this thread other than something like this:

Person 1 - "I say snipers are perfect and I am l33t"

Person 2 - "No, snipers should have damage toned down"

Person 1 - "STFU you muther-f^*\$ing n00b"

Person 2 - "What's your problem, b&tch?"

Person 1 - "You being a dumwad n00b!"

Person 3 - "ROFL at the b@bi3s!"

Person 2 - "Shut up both of you! NOW NOW NOW!!!"

Person 1 - How am I supposed to shut up with you being such a N00000000b!?!?!?!"

...and on and on and on.

P.S. Flame me if you want, I probably won't be coming back to this thread for a while.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:00:27 GMT

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

There is no "flame war". It's just a heated debate. He says snipers should be toned down, I say otherwise.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:12:26 GMT

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

AircraftkillerNO URS R STFU NOOB U R NOT JUST A BIG JACKAS

Although I could imagine he was being sarcastic, this is a little beyond the bounds of a heated debate. And it seemed pretty obvious that it was going to get worse.

Oh wait, I said I probably wouldn't be coming back to this thread for a while....

Damn!

Oh well...

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:20:35 GMT

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

He IS being sarcastic, he's not an idiot, and wouldn't resort to that for anything short of a laugh.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:24:20 GMT

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

Well, I sensed a flame war stirring, as happens so often on these forums.

My personal opinion is snipers should be fr less effective against aircraft, on the basis that aircraft suck with snipers shooting them down all over the place.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:27:22 GMT

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

And it is my opinion that snipers should be left alone for the reason that the two official maps released for flying units (excluding Glacier) have ample cover for both snipers and aircraft to avoid imbalance.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:30:16 GMT

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

Like planes having to hide behind the big rock in Walls, then pop out for a quick couple rounds before having to duck behind cover? Or how snipers will camp up on top of the hill once barracks/HoN is gone and blow up any chopper that dares to be purchased? I think the idea of homing rockets and other alternative anti-chopper devices are much better and also sound more fun.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:38:00 GMT

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

I'm confused, are you trying to argue that snipers should be toned down because aircraft (which are lightly armoured, which I'll say again) are being destoried because the top of the rockface is swarming with snipers when the HoN/Barracks are destoried?

If you KNOW the top of Walls_Flying has snipers on it, why would you purchase an aircraft anyway? So the aircraft can fly to the top and kill off the snipers? What if Raveshaws or PICs are

up there, and destroy the aircraft, or better yet, what if they're on the ground just outside the base? The aircraft can't leave the base without being bombarded by death.

That's poor strategy, not poor balancing.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 02:55:17 GMT

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

JavacxIf you KNOW the top of Walls_Flying has snipers on it, why would you purchase an aircraft anyway? So the aircraft can fly to the top and kill off the snipers? What if Raveshaws or PICs are up there, and destroy the aircraft, or better yet, what if they're on the ground just outside the base? The aircraft can't leave the base without being bombarded by death.

That's poor strategy, not poor balancing.

I've pointed this out about 30 separate times, and everyone just glosses over it because they realize it sort of defeats their argument.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 04:12:44 GMT

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

Have you noticed that all those that want the damage done to helis by 'snipers' be toned down are mostly flyers? Obviously they have been owned too and now here's the golden grail. They can tone down havoc's damage w00t! they won't be owned anymore w00t.

I betcha if everyone used mobile arts and mrls, they'd be complaining about the damage 'snipers' did to them too and want them toned down. And if raveshaws were'n called the 'anti-tank unit', i betcha they'd complain about them too. Yes everything that can own you does unfair damage to you. :rolleyes: ^_^

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 04:19:24 GMT

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

Some argue that it should only be poor strategy if the enemy has other anti air weapons besides sniper rifles and ramjet rifles.

I'm sure no-one would disagree that they're asking to be shot down if PICs, Raveshaws, laser gunners, rocket soldiers, multiple standard soldiers etc are afoot. But snipers.. seems shitty when there are proper anti air weapons available, such as rocket launchers that don't even do their intended job at a distance.

What DOES half-defeat the argument is if the aircraft are changed, the orca won't be a unit to

remove the hill of snipers since it'll have only missiles.

(Also, thanks for the correction, I'd mistaken 90 health left on an aircraft as 160 damage, forgetting the health was set at 150)

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 05:07:44 GMT

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

Javaxcxl'm confused, are you trying to argue that snipers should be toned down because aircraft (which are lightly armoured, which I'll say again) are being destoried because the top of the rockface is swarming with snipers when the HoN/Barracks are destoried?

If you KNOW the top of Walls_Flying has snipers on it, why would you purchase an aircraft anyway? So the aircraft can fly to the top and kill off the snipers? What if Raveshaws or PICs are up there, and destory the aircraft, or better yet, what if they're on the ground just outside the base? The aircraft can't leave the base without being bombarded by death.

Thats poor strategy, not poor balancing.

If you were saying "it's poor strategy to purchase an aircraft and fly into an area where you know there are lots of anti-aircraft units", then I would agree with you. However, that doesn't mean that I think that the presence of anti-aircraft units somewhere, should make the use of aircraft ineffective anywhere. If there are anti-aircraft units in the middle of the map (i.e. the mesa on Walls Flying), why shouldn't you be able to use aircraft in a different area of the map? You might want to use aircraft to defend your base during a ground assault, but using Walls Flying as an example again, a couple of snipers can kill you in seconds even if you are half the map away. That is poor balancing.

Anti-aircraft units shouldn't be able to cover such a large area because it negates the tactics involved, particularly when they have an instant hit weapon that kills in 5 shots, with 4 shots in a clip. You should have to move your counter units into position to deal with the threat, not just sit back and shoot them from halfway across the map.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 05:10:42 GMT

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

Quote:Have you noticed that all those that want the damage done to helis by 'snipers' be toned down are mostly flyers? Obviously they have beened own too and now here's the golden grail. They can tone down havoc's damage w00t! they won't be owned anymore w00t.
Errm, no. I'm all for the toning down of ranjet vs. aircraft and I never use the buggers, mainly because I just don't like them.

It can be safely said that anyone who is a regular sniper or pilot has a subjective view, well as an

objective and impartial viewpoint on this issue I'd just like to add my agreement with the nerfing of ramjets.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 06:34:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I use both n00b cannons and aircraft so I know exactly what it's like to be in both positions.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 08:36:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AircraftkillerI use both n00b cannons and aircraft so I know exactly what it's like to be in both positions.

Somehow, I think the only position you're familiar with is bending over and grabbing your ankles, judging by the whining in this thread.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 15:48:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tahnhm07: How can you know something as broad as this? There's no other unit that, if transferred into an anti-air weapon could be nearly as effective as a sniper rifle, where you can shoot anything you can see, and do major damage to it. Sniper rifles should stop being the bane of light vehicles and start actually being anti-infntry weapons, which is what they do anyway.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 17:00:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ramjet Rifles aren't technically sniper rifles.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 15 May 2004 21:25:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeathgodAircraftkillerI use both n00b cannons and aircraft so I know exactly what it's like to be in both positions.

Somehow, I think the only position you're familiar with is bending over and grabbing your ankles, judging by the whining in this thread.

Sure, if by "whining in this thread" you mean "Deathgod whining about proposed balance changes."

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 01:00:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Same range as the sniper rifle, has a scope (that nobody usues)... what makes this "technicaly not a sniper rifle"? The name?

Hah, I've seen ACK play. He's damn good. Less than I can say about people who only leave their little dark clan servers to bitch about alternate rules that won't even affect them... :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 04:03:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KaiserPandaSame range as the sniper rifle, has a scope (that nobody usues)... what makes this "technicaly not a sniper rifle"? The name?

The name and the fact that there is a sniper rifle in the game and the Ramjet isn't it.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [cokemaster](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 04:44:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sounds like they have a vested interest in maintaining the current amount of damage against aircraft.... and the points against all tanks/aircraft.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 04:51:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Snipers damage to aircraft should be left alone.
The points obtained for doing relatively no damage should be changed. Points should be proportional to the damage being delt.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:42:49 GMT

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

KaiserPandaSame range as the sniper rifle, has a scope (that nobody uses)... what makes this "technicaly not a sniper rifle"? The name?

Obviously, you did not see the screenshots that i posted. FFS. get real. If i attached a scope onto a rocket launcher and give it the same range. WOULD YOU SAY THAT IS A FUCKING SNIPER RIFLE? IT STILL GIVES ONE HIT KILLS ON HEADSHOT. JUST LIKE A SNIPER RIFLE. OMG A ROCKET LAUNCHER WITH A SCOPE IS A SNIPER RIFLE!!!!!! :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:45:21 GMT

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

snip-er P Pronunciation Key (snpr)

n.

A skilled military shooter detailed to spot and pick off enemy soldiers from a concealed place. One who shoots at other people from a concealed place.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:48:43 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngitahn07: How can you know something as broad as this? There's no other unit that, if transferred into an anti-air weapon could be nearly as effective as a sniper rifle, where you can shoot anything you can see, and do major damage to it. Sniper rifles should stop being the bane of light vehicles and start actually being anti-infntry weapons, which is what they do anyway.

The ramjet is not a sniper rifle. Now according to the name, it just states "ramjet rifle" see my screenshots.

jet: 2 n. A high-velocity fluid stream forced under pressure out of a small-diameter opening or nozzle. An outlet, such as a nozzle, used for emitting such a stream. Something emitted in or as if in a high-velocity fluid stream: "such myriad and such vivid jets of images". A jet-propelled vehicle, especially a jet-propelled aircraft. A jet engine. v. jet-ting, jet-ting, jets v. intr. To travel by jet aircraft: jetted from Ho

ram: n. A male sheep. rAny of several devices used to drive, batter, or crush by forceful impact, especially: A battering ram. The weight that drops in a pile driver or steam hammer. The plunger or piston of a force pump or hydraulic press. A hydraulic ram. A projection on the prow of a warship, used to batter or cut into enemy vessels. A ship having such a projection. Ram See Aries. tr.v. rammed, ram-ming, rams To strike or d

:rolleyes: :rolleyes: owned

ramjet : used to drive, batter, or crush by forceful impact, A jet-propelled vehicle, especially a jet-propelled aircraft

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:51:16 GMT

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

Well, technically, it shouldn't really be called "Sniper rifle" as much as "sniper's rifle". Aircraftkiller gave you the right definition, but any "rifle" and be used for sniping. The Lee Enfield, for example.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:51:32 GMT

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

Aircraftkillersnip-er P Pronunciation Key (snpr)

n.

A skilled military shooter detailed to spot and pick off enemy soldiers from a concealed place. One who shoots at other people from a concealed place.

A skilled military shooter

Lmao. You guys are running about saying that people who used havocs are un-skilled. N00bjets etc etc

pick off enemy soldiers from a concealed place.

Errr.. If its a concealed place, (To keep from being seen, found, observed, or discovered;) But, havocs should from the open! We can See them!! They are not concealed. ^^

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:52:38 GMT

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

The Ramjet Rifle is a sniper rifle. It's simply an upgraded version of the Sniper Rifle, the name is simply a name alone. It has no relevance to damages or how it operates.

In your above post you succeed at making no sense, do you want to elaborate and try again?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:53:26 GMT

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

But aren't you just assuming?

Edit: Snipers hide and shoot. Do havocs do that? No. which leads us to the fact that they are not 'snipers'

EdiT: Bah screw it. Since its not gonna be implemented to ALL official maps, go aead. Make it ^.^ I'd like to see what happens. City_flying_exp2???

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 06:54:24 GMT

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

Think about it. I had a hand in developing this game. Think, also, about what PiMuRho said, as he had very close ties to the development team. There's a rather good chance that we both know what we're talking about.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:00:27 GMT

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

Yes i forgot. Since you guys had a hand at what? developing this game. You guys are always right. I mean us players who play the game too are wrong. Right? Yeah. OMG /me bows down to ACK and the others who had a hand in developing this game. You guys are l33t man.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:04:59 GMT

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

Thanks for admitting you're wrong in that poor attempt at sarcasm. If you're simply going by name alone in the game, and not by what was intended by the people who developed it, you're not really arguing much more than semantics for a game that already breaks the meanings of a lot of words concerning realism.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:11:34 GMT

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

tanhm07

EdiT: Bah screw it. Since its not gonna be implemented to ALL official maps, go aead. Make it ^.^

I'd like to see what happens. City_flying_exp2??

and when it comes out, be sure to post it in the pits.

Btw: The point of beta testing is to see if the people like the change. or game. Maybe ea stop supporting rene because people at rene didn't listen to players opinions. I'll speak again once the map comes out and i've tried it. Then i'll say if the changes are for better or worst. maybe if its good we'll make it to all the maps?

Btw: clarification. I opposed to the changes because i did not want a city_flying_exp2. Not because i'm nota gainst the points havoc gained. But i still agree with the damage. Maybe if you tone it down to 1.5 times that of deadeye to vehicals. I'm still ok with that.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:17:20 GMT

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

The only reason you agree with it is because you're almost exclusively a n00b cannon user and would not like having to hide and think, for once, in the game. This is the usual problem with people who oppose it, they're so used to it that they wouldn't know what to do when they can't shoot down aircraft in five seconds from maximum viewing distance.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:20:02 GMT

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

AircraftkillerDeathgodAircraftkillerI use both n00b cannons and aircraft so I know exactly what it's like to be in both positions.

Somehow, I think the only position you're familiar with is bending over and grabbing your ankles, judging by the whining in this thread.

Sure, if by "whining in this thread" you mean "Deathgod whining about proposed balance changes."

So me pointing out that there is actually dissent about these changes makes me a whiner? That helps to explain where you're coming from, I guess. All I see here is people whining because they are too stupid to counter the snipers and instead choose to throw themselves into death repeatedly and wonder why they can't win. THE PROBLEM HERE IS STRATEGY, NOT THE SNIPERS. Why can't you see that?

While I'm on the subject, TEH MAPS IS BAD and I DESLIKE U.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:24:58 GMT

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

KaiserPanda

Hah, I've seen ACK play. He's damn good. Less than I can say about people who only leave their little dark clan servers to bitch about alternate rules that won't even affect them... :rolleyes:

He's not too bad, it depends on what aspect of Ren we're discussing.

I'm curious if your little jab was directed at Java and I, though. If you have something to say, then man up and say it. Being a bitch doesn't get you anywhere. I also find it amusing you like to come here and try to talk shit about us, because I have never seen you here before a few weeks ago, and I'm willing to bet that you suck at everything, including Renegade and life.

These rules do affect us even though we're not running the maps because of the fact that there are a lot of people in this 'community' who are completely unaware of these changes, and these people will wonder why their game experience is completely different from server to server. Perhaps if you thought about everyone involved and not just yourself you might be better off.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:33:12 GMT

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

AircraftkillerThe only reason you agree with it is because you're almost exclusively a n00b cannon user and would not like having to hide and think, for once, in the game. This is the usual problem with people who oppose it, they're so used to it that they wouldn't know what to do when they can't shoot down aircraft in five seconds from maximum viewing distance.

yeah sure ACK, Go ahead. attack my style of playing. And the only reason that people disagree with it is because they're almost exclusively a flyer and would not like having to hide and think, for once, in the game. This is the usual problem with people who agree with it, they're so used to it that they wouldn't know what to do when they get shoot down in five seconds from maximum viewing distance, except to whine and suggest a new map where their heli would own.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 07:37:58 GMT

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

DeathgodSo me pointing out that there is actually dissent about these changes makes me a whiner? That helps to explain where you're coming from, I guess. All I see here is people whining because they are too stupid to counter the snipers and instead choose to throw themselves into death repeatedly and wonder why they can't win. THE PROBLEM HERE IS STRATEGY, NOT THE SNIPERS. Why can't you see that?

While I'm on the subject, TEH MAPS IS BAD and I DESLIKE U.

You haven't just pointed out dissent, you've actively participated in the discussion by arguing against any changes to the snipers. That's no different to the people that have argued the opposite. You've stated your reasons, we've stated ours. Now either that makes us all whiners (including you), or you simply resorted to accusations of whining in an attempt to belittle other people's arguments. You were the first person to start talking about whining in this thread, remember?

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 14:03:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Deathgod: Man up and say it? Them's letters been said up thar boy, read ums gewd! and, OMG I N00B R SUX AT EVRTING I BETR GO CRY ME TO SLEEEP!

People in the community would like an alternative to playing with the squirley standard Renegade "snipers." Since these alternate rules will most likely be a server option, you will still have the easy choice of playing standard Renegade.

tanhm07: A Ramjet is a specialised sniper rifle. The name refers to the shell, which is self-propelled with highly compressed gas, expelled through a nossle in the rear. Since it can keep it's own spin and propell itself, it has a greater range than a standard sniper rifle, beter killing power, and is more effective against soft-skin vehicles. In reality, I don't think they're all that more effective than a big-assed 50cal sniper rifle.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Renx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 16:01:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In the manual, it actually says that the ramjet rifle is an "Anti-Material" weapon.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 16:53:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Perhaps the manual was using reverse psychology.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 18:22:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Scissors are anti-material.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Renx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 19:43:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Imao

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 20:42:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KaiserPandaPeople in the community would like an alternative to playing with the squirley standard Renegade "snipers." Since these alternate rules will most likely be a server option, you will still have the easy choice of playing standard Renegade.

Who exactly are these 'people' you're generalizing? I don't want alternatives that don't need to be implimented and I'm in the community.

I see people who like to use aircraft whenever given the oppourunity seeing this "fixing" of the game as a chance to say "FINILY!!! I CAN NOW PWN LOTZ CUZ NO MOR CNIPRS GONA FUK WIT ME!"

Now, again (AGAIN, mind you): The two maps, CNC_Walls_Flying, and CNC_City_Flying are the two maps that were released with the flying patch. These two levels were REDESIGNED to compliment aircraft, and as such, the issue between snipers and aircraft is now a matter of strategy. We've (the people in this thread) agreed that aircraft have light armour, and you've done a pretty good job admitting that the Ramjet would trash "soft-skinned" (which I assume is light armour) vehicles. There should be no problem, but there is, for what I see are the following arguments:

-- GR, I h8 DYIN IN MY AIRCRFT 2 SNIPRS BECUZ THEY FUKIN HERT ME ALOT
-- Snipers couldn't hit aircraft in C&C.

Well, since I've already readdressed the first one, I'll address the second one.

Thats right, snipers couldn't hit airbourne vehicles in C&C. But then again, engineers didn't have repair guns, or pistols, technicians didn't have ANYTHING short of a pathetic little pellet pistol, the Obelisk couldn't hit Orcas, Grenade launchers didn't exist -- I could go on. If you're going to base of changes off that point, then you better be ready to start taking out other issues of Renegade that weren't in C&C, no matter how unbalanced and outrageous they look.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 21:27:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The reason the aircraft were added was so that they could be used as a support unit, not be shot down in five seconds... Otherwise, why even play them? If you can't use the aircraft well, if at all, just use the standard levels of Walls, City, and Glacier.

It defeats the entire purpose of having aircraft if they're useless, why bother adding something half-assed? City and Walls were never designed to compliment aircraft, none of the levels were... Unless you mean "big empty space" as "designed for flying."

Yeah, it's a matter of strategy... The strategy of not using anything that a "sniper" destroys in five seconds, which eliminates using about nine vehicles in the entire game. :rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Battousai](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 21:32:42 GMT

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

I agree with Java

One sniper vs one helicopter is not unbalanced. Since the sniper needs 5 shots, and has to reload to destroy the helicopter, there is enough time for the pilot to escape/hide.

Two snipers vs one helicopter is not something to complain about because the pilot should know better than to fly over two snipers. Just like a med knows not to go against two lights.

I agree that the havoc shouldn't get so many points for hitting vehicles though.

I played a game last night and was a sniper on city flying and when apaches came out I sniped them so all they did was stay very low on top of the bridge so I couldn't hit them from the ground. Soon Sakuras came out to counter the gdi snipers so I had to focus on them instead of the apaches. This is unit balance. Both teams have snipers. If one team goes sniper heavy then you shouldn't complain about not being able to use an apache- you should go out there with an apc and kill snipers or rush their base or something else.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 21:36:40 GMT

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

Have you noticed that all the support vehicles have light armour?

The MRLS, the Mobile Artillery, the transport choppers. The only difference is that they have a few more hit/armour points.

If you drive an MRLS into range of a Nod base, and you get smoked by a sniper, that too is your fault. You wouldn't drive your MRLS into a field occupied with snipers, why would you do the same thing with your Orca? You said it yourself, they're support units, and as such, probably shouldn't be spear heading assaults against snipers in the first place.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 21:38:16 GMT

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

AircraftkillerIf you can't use the aircraft well, if at all, just use the standard levels of Walls, City, and Glacier.

I wanted to address this:

If you're going to modify your own maps to weaken snipers, that is your choice, but the official westwood maps do not need this.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 22:26:13 GMT

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

1000 Snipers don't need too much adjusting- Think about it this way: If you are getting harrassed by ramjets, use something they have a hard time against (i.e. an APC or Med/Light Tank) to get rid of them. When you start seeing your aircraft's health start going down in chunks, you either need to charge the sniper and kill them(yes, you can do that before they kill you) or get the fuck outta dodge. Due to the size of the ramjet, it is more of a light antivehicle weapon that can be used for sniping rather than the other way around.

500 snipers do need adjusting. The bullet they fire is a much smaller caliber and has less energy behind it, so it might not even get through ANY armor above the infantry level.

Aircraft need a bit of balancing in two areas: Weapons and control setup.

The weapons need to be made less accurate and be more like the clip-fed weapons of other vehicles. I agree that the Apache should have only a chaingun, and the orca should only have rockets (cool as it looks with the nose turret). This fits in well with the GDI-Nod balance that was key in TD and TS. Since every other vehicle in either side's arsenal is built differently than its counterpart on the other side, it makes no sense that the aircraft should be identical except for their 3d model.

IMHO, the Apache chaingun should have a clip size of 50 with a RoF approximately equal to that of the Tiberium Auto Rifle. The bullets would be about twice as powerful as a single APC shot. So more firepower, but firing slower and with a reload of about 3 seconds thrown in.

The Orca rockets should fire a clip of two then reload (IIRC the TD Orca fires two shots at a time, but I could be thinking of TS). Each rocket should be about as effective as that of a single MRLS shot.

The default controls are stupid the way they are, as well (Yes, I know that the keys fit where the thumb rests naturally, but I'd rather be able to use my index, middle, and ring fingers). Spacebar and C just don't cut the mustard with WASD movement controls. Since I believe ascent and descent controls were un-remappable, they should have been in a more intelligent location(i.e. Q

and E) that could be used with two or three fingers while giving other movement commands.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 22:27:40 GMT

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

I notice you pick and choose what suits you best. You want a reality in one post, then C&C in another, then a mix of both. I already went over why aircraft need to be changed in order to remove the "sniper" (and I use the term loosely) damage against them with both realism and C&C points. If you want to skip back and forth on that, go right ahead by reading what I've previously posted on the subject.

Quote:use something they have a hard time against (i.e. an APC or Med/Light Tank) to get rid of them.

Oh that's amazing, I never thought of THAT before! :rolleyes: WTF do you think we were complaining about this for? If you take an APC up on the bridge, by the time you get to the "sniper" flicker-dance area, they've shot you down about 50 points of armor while getting a lot of points from it... And they're not on the bridge anymore. If they are, a vehicle stopped you from getting to them, and they "sniped" you with their n00b cannons.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 23:36:55 GMT

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

I still propose the 1.5 upgrade that no-one lest a bare minimum of people seems to have read. A reminder: With this new change, it'll take 7 shots to bring down an aircraft, and do 45 damage per shot to all other light vehicles (excluding perhaps chinooks, since we might see a different armour type on them). This means hummvees will die in 7 hits, buggies 6 hits and artillery/MRLS 9 hits.

With 1.5 the damage of a standard sniper rifle to light armour, it's fair that the ramjet has more power, but not a lot more power and it keeps its purpose as an anti infantry rifle.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 23:39:45 GMT

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

In your entire argument, you have only once coined realism. And it wasn't even in relation to snipers, it was regarding aircraft's objectives in the battlefield, so don't pertain to issues you didn't support, and I quote:

Quote:Don't pull out the realism card. Nothing in C&C is realistic and you should not make a C&C game with realistic damage

I have shown arguments, both pertaining to CNC, and to realism stating why snipers should be able to damage aircraft heavily, and upon reviewing them, YOU chose to disregard them and maintain your "GR iH8 SNIER DAMIJ" tirade.

I'm looking at armour values, and damage patterns when I say that "snipers (ramjets) heavily damage light armour, aircraft are light armour, therefore snipers should be able to heavily damage aircraft."

And while you want to recreate the C&C RTS in FPS form, you chose not to address the argument on that. Engineers didn't have repair guns, the Obelisk couldn't hit Orcas, and so on. Don't dismiss my arguments because you say I pick and choose, because you are guilty of the same thing.[/quote]

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 16 May 2004 23:52:12 GMT

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

If you're going by realism, "snipers" aren't going to destroy aircraft. This is why I keep telling you that you're picking and choosing what you want to support.

From what I know, you don't use anything but a sniper, if you even played Renegade in the past eight months. It's hard to take your word for this when you don't play the game in question and don't even play other C&C games for balance issues based on them.

I already said that certain concessions have to be made. Engineers can't have their repair weapon removed because they repaired buildings in C&C, just not vehicles... But that's something everyone is so used to that it would never fly.

I already said I never wanted the Obelisk of Light to destroy aircraft, this is why I said SAM Sites should be in the Nod base.

I'm not picking and choosing anything, I've had to balance RA out too and the experience gained in that shows that people would enjoy having additional levels with different balancing, which may end up having them played almost exclusively.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:07:12 GMT

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

AircraftkillerIf you're going by realism, "snipers" aren't going to destroy aircraft. This is why I keep telling you that you're picking and choosing what you want to support.

Neither could normal infantry, or anything short of rocket soldiers.

Quote:From what I know, you don't use anything but a sniper, if you even played Renegade in the

past eight months. It's hard to take your word for this when you don't play the game in question and don't even play other C&C games for balance issues based on them.

Actually, I just got off a couple of games in Renegade, and I've been playing the original C&C for the last few weeks for a taste of nostalgia.

Quote:I already said that certain concessions have to be made. Engineers can't have their repair weapon removed because they repaired buildings in C&C, just not vehicles... But that's something everyone is so used to that it would never fly.

Now that doesn't make much sense. If you're going to pick and choose which variables of the game you want to change, you're not fixing this so called "bastardized" version of Renegade as much as manipulating it into another form.

Quote:I already said I never wanted the Obelisk of Light to destroy aircraft, this is why I said SAM Sites should be in the Nod base.

You DO realize this would just create more balance issues, right?

Quote:I'm not picking and choosing anything, I've had to balance RA out too and the experience gained in that shows that people would enjoy having additional levels with different balancing, which may end up having them played almost exclusively.

This isn't RA, and there aren't additional levels. There are the standard Westwood maps plus your completed Glacier. If you want to make custom maps with different damages, go for it, but leave the already balanced game alone.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:12:09 GMT

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

Once again, concessions have to be made. Soldiers should logically be able to shoot at aircraft and damage them, but that doesn't mean aircraft should be totally ineffective because of it. Soldiers just wouldn't be as good as a Rocket Soldier or the equivalent AA weapon.

I never once said I wanted the entire game's dynamics changed. Some are good, some are not, and "snipers" are one part of it that is not good. "Snipers = unbalanced" doesn't mean "Everything else needs to be changed."

How would SAM Sites create balance issues? Three SAM Sites in a Nod base would be able to get destroyed by ground units. If lost, the Nod team has to defend their base against aircraft, but not ground threats, because the Obelisk of Light is still operating. Nod would have spread-out defenses instead of one centralized defense structure, the Advanced Guard Tower.

Losing the AGT as GDI means you lose both air and ground defense. Losing the Obelisk as Nod means you just lose ground defense, not AA defenses.

There will be additional levels, if you had paid attention. There will be C&C_BHS(Levelname) versions of the official game levels that will have different balance changes.

The game isn't being left alone, get used to it.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:27:48 GMT

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

AircraftkillerOnce again, concessions have to be made. Soldiers should logically be able to shoot at aircraft and damage them, but that doesn't mean aircraft should be totally ineffective because of it. Soldiers just wouldn't be as good as a Rocket Soldier or the equivalent AA weapon.

You are picking and choosing which concessions you want to make. I find that engineers repairing vehicles and infantry to be considered bastardizing C&C, change that, too. I don't care that people are used to it, because people are used to sniper damage too (And what can I say? Most of them can adapt to the damage and know when not to engage the enemy in a SUPPORT unit).

Quote:I never once said I wanted the entire game's dynamics changed. Some are good, some are not, and "snipers" are one part of it that is not good. "Snipers = unbalanced" doesn't mean "Everything else needs to be changed."

No, snipers (Ramjets) are not unbalanced. They do exactly what the game was made for them to do (EXCEPT for the points they obtain for shooting heavily armoured vehicles), damage lightly armoured vehicles heavily and slay infantry.

Quote:How would SAM Sites create balance issues? Three SAM Sites in a Nod base would be able to get destroyed by ground units. If lost, the Nod team has to defend their base against aircraft, but not ground threats, because the Obelisk of Light is still operating. Nod would have spread-out defenses instead of one centralized defense structure, the Advanced Guard Tower.

I'm going to assume that a limit of maybe two SAM sites is present on each of the flying maps. Once those are destroyed, GDI can easily fly a transport chopper in full of the hardest units possible, and wipe out the entire Nod base because their Obelisk isn't doing anything about it. On the flipside, no matter what Nod does, their infantry get slaughtered by the advanced guard tower, their Apaches would too, also, they would only be able to prick vehicles such as Medium and Mammoth tanks with its machine gun (you DID want that, too, right?) only, while vehicles like Orcas can simply over Nod's only reasonable vehicular defenses and pummel them with its rockets (before it has to refill them). What's more, they can do this in the Nod base, because the Obelisk does nothing! Don't tell me there won't be balance issues, you'll play one game of City_flying and you'll plotz all over when you see that Nod gets ass raped every time.

Quote:There will be additional levels, if you had paid attention. There will be C&C_BHS(Levelname) versions of the official game levels that will have different balance changes.

Thanks for pointing out what obviously must happen if you want to impliment these changes. I'm talking about levels outside the realm of the original Westwood ones.

Quote:The game isn't being left alone

Good, but snipers better be.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:41:58 GMT

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

A few points,

If the Obelisk can't attack air units, as said, there'll be balance issues worse than the already bad balance between the AGT and Obelisk. How hard can it be to take out a SAM site? Defending a SAM is just like defending a turret. Once the sams are down, everyone will definetly buy aircraft. Why use ground vehicles when you can enter the enemy base by air? Why go on foot, when you can transport 4 people at a time with a chinook?

Nod will also have more of a burden on defending the sams as well as the Obelisk, which some may see as unfair.

Last point, (directed at Java) I don't think jonathan meant Adv guard towers will only use turret fire on ground units. Both warheads'll be used on both ground & flying units.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:54:37 GMT

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

Errm, could I just point out that S.A.M's tend to be inside the base, behind the obelisk. You can't roll up to them in a tank that easily.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:57:06 GMT

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

I think they'd be in positions that could defend the base better. If they were behind the obelisk (we're talking City Flying?) they wouldn't be able to defend well against side assaults, especially loitering aircraft behind the skyscrapers. They'll probably be put in place of the Turrets.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 00:59:03 GMT

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

flyingfoxLast point, (directed at Java) I don't think jonathan meant Adv guard towers will only use turret fire on ground units. Both warheads'll be used on both ground & flying units.

I didn't say they wouldn't.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 01:00:10 GMT

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

Quote:You are picking and choosing which concessions you want to make. I find that engineers repairing vehicles and infantry to be considered bastardizing C&C, change that, too. I don't care that people are used to it, because people are used to sniper damage too (And what can I say? Most of them can adapt to the damage and know when not to engage the enemy in a SUPPORT unit).

So in some strange way, you're actually agreeing with removing the n00b cannon damage?

Quote:No, snipers (Ramjets) are not unbalanced. They do exactly what the game was made for them to do (EXCEPT for the points they obtain for shooting heavily armoured vehicles), damage lightly armoured vehicles heavily and slay infantry.

Okay, so once again, if the game came with a unit that won the game five seconds after being purchased, that wouldn't be unbalanced... It came with the game, after all. They weren't made to destroy vehicles, it's a bug in the armor.ini. Shrapnel warheads do inordinate amounts of damage to vehicles when their power is increased to 200. It's the same league as the glitch causing damage points to go up.

If the GDI destroys the SAM Sites, they earn the right to fly unchallenged by base defenses. Not ground units. They aren't easy to destroy, either, since they pop up when firing, and hide underground when not firing.

The GDI would have the disadvantage. Once the AGT is gone, the entire defense system of the GDI is gone except for Guard Towers, which wouldn't shoot at aircraft.

Doesn't matter what you were talking about, you never made that clear until now. Snipers aren't getting left alone, get used to it.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 05:08:55 GMT

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

Why not all of us stop argueing, and let ACK and his team make the map? From what i see of this, both sides will not ever give in to each other. So why not make the map, play it, then argue. Instead of all this pointless speculation and assumption from both sides.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Jorge](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 07:29:57 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller

The GDI would have the disadvantage. Once the AGT is gone, the entire defense system of the GDI is gone except for Guard Towers, which wouldn't shoot at aircraft.

On a side Note, another disadvantage for the GDI is if their power goes off-line then their AGT goes offline, which means their entire defense system goes down. But if the Nod powerplant goes off-line, their SAM's still function thus they are still protected against Aircraft with low power while the GDI are not if they lose their Power Plant.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 08:05:49 GMT

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

Yes, please remember this. The attempts for rebalance would be an alternative to the normal maps, not overwriting the current ones. I think most of you should concede that you'd like to try it out ACK's way and see if you like it. You should think of it as an ongoing project.

It is in fact infuriating in a large server when some sniper can take you almost completely out before you even find him. But in converse to that, in the HazTeam servers, there are no snipers and EVERYONE is flying. It still made an exciting game but I'm not so sure flying should be so encouraged as to be so unopposed.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 13:19:39 GMT

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

Nukelt15l believe ascent and descent controls were un-remappable

Actually, ascent/descent ARE remappable, just not explicitly. When you reset your "jump" key, you're also resetting your "ascend" key. Likewise for "crouch" and "descend."

CrimsonI think most of you should concede that you'd like to try it out ACK's way and see if you like it.

Actually I can honestly say I have no desire to try it out ACK's way. Why would I want to try it a different way when I think it's perfectly good the way it is right now?

On that note, it amuses me to no end that you 'big shots' in the 'community' are the ones who want the game changed. If you think the game's so broken the way it is, then why have you all spent years playing it and obsessing over it? A lot of us think the game's perfect right now, and we're not wasting our lives on it 24/7.... if you guys don't like the game as much as I do, why are

you devoting your lives to it when I'm only playing it a few hours a week?

(That's just a rhetorical question, by the way. Don't bother answering, because I happen to not give a damn what you think anyway.)

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 13:42:11 GMT

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

On that note, why argue about changes if neither you or your server is going to be playing them?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 14:33:02 GMT

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

mahkra, you're an idiot. Why bother asking a question if you don't care to begin with?

Ooh, another rhetorical question, as if it weren't obvious to anyone who's been in school before...
:rolleyes:

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 15:35:18 GMT

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

JorgeAircraftkiller

The GDI would have the disadvantage. Once the AGT is gone, the entire defense system of the GDI is gone except for Guard Towers, which wouldn't shoot at aircraft.

On a side Note, another disadvantage for the GDI is if their power goes off-line then their AGT goes offline, which means their entire defense system goes down. But if the Nod powerplant goes off-line, their SAM's still function thus they are still protected against Aircraft with low power while the GDI are not if they lose their Power Plant.

So one side gets good air defense and the other doesn't? I also note you say SAM sites plural, meaning they get more than one, while GDI's AGT can only fire at one target at a time. Do the SAMs all fire at the same target or can they fire independently? Do they do the same damage as the AGT?

Crimson, I can also honestly say I really have no desire to try out the new method. You guys can do whatever you want, and I hope you have an excellent time doing it, but I happen to like this game just the way it is. I think if it was as misbalanced as some people here claim it is, I wouldn't have played it for nearly as long as we don't play broken games. That's why FUD doesn't play CS or Generals, for example. The only things we'd like to see changed are bugs like the ob charge,

AGT shooting through itself to hit ground units, stuff like that. I don't want any changes made to the maps themselves; we have no problems with B2B anymore, and we think walljumping is a feature not a bug so we defend accordingly.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 15:36:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

flyingfoxOn that note, why argue about changes if neither you or your server is going to be playing them?

I already explained that above, look up a few pages.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 15:58:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Deathgod...I happen to like this game just the way it is...I don't want any changes made to the maps themselves

This is the last time I am saying this. We aren't going to "change" the official maps. There will be BHS versions of official maps, as well as new maps with enhancements. It will be YOUR CHOICE to host or play them or not. We are just talking about possible balance issues, nothing has been done as of yet.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 17:02:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I already told you before that I read you loud and clear on that one, chief. I still feel it is pertinent to discuss changes that will affect a good portion of players who still enjoy this game, which is why I am still here.

Subject: Unit Balance
Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 17:15:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It will effect a good portion of players: the portion that wants to play on servers that use the alternate rules.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 17:46:05 GMT

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

Truly, a master of the obvious such as yourself only comes along once a generation, and is rewarded with the moniker of JACKASS for their tireless efforts to restate what has already been stated many times over. I salute you, JACKASS! Your work is never done.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Slash0x](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 19:42:19 GMT

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

BlazerDeathgod...I happen to like this game just the way it is...I don't want any changes made to the maps themselves

This is the last time I am saying this. We aren't going to "change" the official maps. There will be BHS versions of official maps, as well as new maps with enhancements. It will be YOUR CHOICE to host or play them or not. We are just talking about possible balance issues, nothing has been done as of yet.

So like in field where you spawn in the wall of hon and die killing your kill to death ratio will be fixed!??

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 20:13:39 GMT

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

That's the most bizarre solution to that problem I've ever heard. Why not just fix the spawn point?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [sfr3f](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 22:15:48 GMT

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

I only repeat because you ignore.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Mon, 17 May 2004 22:32:12 GMT

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

DeathgodflyingfoxOn that note, why argue about changes if neither you or your server is going to be playing them?

I already explained that above, look up a few pages.

Oh yeah. Well, you said it'll affect people who aren't aware of the changes when they go from server to server. When they download these levels, there'll be readmes coming with them (I assume) with all the changes & fixes. Unless they choose not to read the readmes

Off-topic: It would be good if BHS released fixed WW maps without balance changes, just changes like the obelisk charge up etc, to be used server-side so that everyone who joined a server would be playing fixed levels without needing to dl anything. Also: maybe some C&C music to accompany them?

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 01:19:34 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller, don't lock a thread because you disagree with counterarguments to your own. It's pathetic, and you know it.

AircraftkillerSo in some strange way, you're actually agreeing with removing the n00b cannon damage?

I can't understand how someone like yourself is unable see outrageous sarcasm when he reads it.

Quote:Okay, so once again, if the game came with a unit that won the game five seconds after being purchased, that wouldn't be unbalanced... It came with the game, after all.

For starts, this unit doesn't exist. And no, don't whine and say that the snipers do this, because they don't.

Quote:They weren't made to destroy vehicles, it's a bug in the armor.ini.

Obviously not, otherwise this would've been addressed before the flying vehicle patch was released.

Quote:If the GDI destroys the SAM Sites, they earn the right to fly unchallenged by base defenses. Not ground units. They aren't easy to destroy, either, since they pop up when firing, and hide underground when not firing.

The GDI would have the disadvantage. Once the AGT is gone, the entire defense system of the GDI is gone except for Guard Towers, which wouldn't shoot at aircraft.

Are you serious? LOL. I hope not. If you think this is balances the game, then I desperately hope you review on what gameplay is like online.

Quote:Doesn't matter what you were talking about, you never made that clear until now.

WTF does this mean?

Quote:Snipers aren't getting left alone, get used to it.

You can do whatever you want with this mod, but the public will ultimately choose to play whether to play it with these unnessesary changes.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 01:25:54 GMT

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

I locked the thread because it was getting redundant and useless. You're going to keep arguing in circles to evade the points, so there's no reason to leave it open for further discussion on things we already talked about on the first page.

It's not always obvious when sarcasm is used. I can't hear what you're trying to write, so your lack of voice isn't giving off any sort of sarcastic tone.

You didn't say why the SAM Site\Obelisk proposal, like C&C, is unbalanced. It works for both teams, there are advantages and disadvantages... That's what is called "balance." If both teams are almost identical in structures, units, etc... Then why bother playing, just make it into a large deathmatch.

There were no balance changes made to Renegade, so take the "obvious" comments and shut up... You have had nothing to do with the dev team or what they intended. There was no time or ability to allocate resources to balancing after the initial beta test.

It's not a "mod," it's an addition to the game, and it's still getting changed whether or not you agree with it. This is staying locked.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 02:24:50 GMT

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

Just for the record, I don't personally see much of a need to change anything except lower the sniper damage against light armor just a tad.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 03:30:25 GMT

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

CrimsonJust for the record, I don't personally see much of a need to change anything except lower the sniper damage against light armor just a tad.

I can understand this. I don't agree with it but I can see how in larger games it would be useful, while still keeping the basic play of the game the same.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 04:27:21 GMT

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

AircraftkillerI locked the thread because it was getting redundant and useless. You're going to keep arguing in circles to evade the points, so there's no reason to leave it open for further discussion on things we already talked about on the first page.

Until you realize that your hypothetical snipers vs. aircraft situations don't constitute changing their damages and making up imaginary uber units doesn't do anything, this argument isn't over. Yes, I know I've used hypothetical situations, but I've used them only to counter those same situations that you and others have presented.

I however, have given you logistical proof why they should be left the way they are:

Snipers heavily damage lightly armoured vehicles <-- Fact.
Aircraft are lightly armoured vehicles <-- Fact.
Snipers therefore heavily damage aircraft.

What's yours? "GR I h8 SNIPRZ KILIN AIRKRFT WEN I LEVE BASE RITE AWY!!!!111111"

And of course: "SNIPRZ CUDNT HIT AIRKFT IN C&C"

This TOO has been addressed: You cannot pick and choose which concessions YOU want to make (And I think your blantant locking of this thread TWICE has proven this). There are so many aspects of Renegade that aren't/weren't in C&C that is isn't practical to try and choose ones that will make your flying experience nicer. You CANNOT pick and choose which concessions to make, because you're NOT remaking C&C in FPS, you're manipulating Renegade into another "bastardized" form. Thats why I said for you to eliminate all that crap from the engineers. Or rather, why not eliminate the pistol from the GDI engineer, and give the Nod technician a crap ass pistol that couldn't kill a crippled monkey tied to a tree. Thats not fun at all. Renegade was made to have FUN with, not to have retarded concessions made to eliminate that.

Quote:It's not always obvious when sarcasm is used. I can't hear what you're trying to write, so your lack of voice isn't giving off any sort of sarcastic tone.

Oh please, don't pull the "UM I CANT HERE U SO YA!" because it doesn't work. The context is purely sarcastic.

Quote:You didn't say why the SAM Site\Obelisk proposal, like C&C, is unbalanced. It works for both teams, there are advantages and disadvantages... That's what is called "balance." If both teams are almost identical in structures, units, etc... Then why bother playing, just make it into a large deathmatch.

These 'balances' are so bipolar that you'd freaking plotz. Look at the other posts for GOOD reasons why.

Quote:There were no balance changes made to Renegade,

Golly Batman! You're right! That must be because they didn't feel the need to! Also, don't pull the "there is no time or resources" rhetoric. It's old, and a weak argument. They was plenty of time, and it doesn't take any substantial resources to click change the munitions damage.

Quote:It's not a "mod," it's an addition to the game, and it's still getting changed whether or not you agree with it.

It's not an addition to the game. You've said this yourself thats not taking the place of the official maps. It's a series of levels redesigned to your 'perverted' concessions. It's a MOD (you know, MODIFICATION).

Quote:This is staying locked.

Obviously not.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 04:48:17 GMT

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

flyingfoxDeathgodflyingfoxOn that note, why argue about changes if neither you or your server is going to be playing them?

I already explained that above, look up a few pages.

Oh yeah. Well, you said it'll affect people who aren't aware of the changes when they go from server to server. When they download these levels, there'll be readmes coming with them (I assume) with all the changes & fixes. Unless they choose not to read the readmes

Off-topic: It would be good if BHS released fixed WW maps without balance changes, just changes like the obelisk charge up etc, to be used server-side so that everyone who joined a server would be playing fixed levels without needing to dl anything. Also: maybe some C&C music to accompany them?

Think of the average player of this game... they're going to be confused when they play 2 or sometimes 3 different versions of the same map, all with different features. Always assume the end user of a product is an idiot until such time that their intelligence is proven.

I would agree that it would be nice to see a fixed WW map release, of course without any cosmetic or balance changes but with the ob charge and the radio icons added in. Music is unnecessary, though. If you want to listen to C&C music, run Winamp in the background. The performance hit from that is nothing at all, plus you can listen to whatever you want. Nothing beats listening to classical music when you go on a shotgun killing spree.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 05:46:31 GMT

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

The obelisk and emoticons can be easily fixed without distributing a map(s).

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Rex](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 08:19:53 GMT

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

Ok... Lets see... There are 2 groups.... One that thinks snipers are overpowered and the other group thinks that they are not.

I personally think that if you know how to fly a damn orca that you wont die that fast. I can easily kill a few snipers that are on the center of the map (in wallsflying) They wont even see me coming till its too late 4 them....

Anyway, I can understand that most people hate flying with the orca because they get killed so fast.

I love to snipe and I would hate it to become "weaker", but if its for the greater good then ok.... I think it should take a few more shots to take out an orca..... BUT... I don't think you should mess with the other vehicles... I want to still be able to shoot at light tanks or flames which gives me a few points while there is noone else I can shoot at...

Just my thoughts...

Rex

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Rex](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 08:23:39 GMT

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

Oh and btw... I read that you are planning to make ur own alternate maps... but I hope you guys fix the bad PT point in Field (Nod) and release it WITHOUT the balance changes... so that everyone can use that fix

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 08:34:24 GMT

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

Thanks for proving my point, a lot of "i only use a snip0r" people only oppose this because it would force them to actually think and use a sniper like one should be used, anti-personnel.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 09:05:23 GMT

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

RexOh and btw... I read that you are planning to make ur own alternate maps... but I hope you guys fix the bad PT point in Field (Nod) and release it WITHOUT the balance changes... so that everyone can use that fix

Yes the bad spawn point on Under and Field will be in the first core fixes release.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [tanhm07](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 12:40:07 GMT

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

AircraftkillerThanks for proving my point, a lot of "i only use a snip0r" people only oppose this because it would force them to actually think and use a sniper like one should be used, anti-personnel.

and a lot of people oppose this because they get owned in aircraft just cause they cannot fly.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 18:28:17 GMT

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

I'm considered to be one of the best pilots in this game and fly better than most everyone else I've met before, yet I still get shot down by some newbie with a n00b cannon in five seconds if I'm just trying to get back to base.

The issue isn't about how skilled with flight you are, because there's too many places for "snipers" to hide and destroy aircraft easily. You hide under the bridge, someone will pop out of the "tunnel" and shoot you up, forcing you to go above... Where you get shot down anyway.

The issue is that they're overpowered n00b units right now and need to get fixed to balance the game out for everyone, not just "snipers" who only use that class of unit and expect to have the game stay the same so that they don't have to learn anything new.

Sorry to tell you this, but I've been playing this far longer than you have, and use all the units on a regular basis. I'm not just an aircraft pilot, I also use "snipers" and it's just as easy for me to shoot them down with the n00b cannon as it is to take them out in an air battle.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 19:20:12 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller! I'm considered to be one of the best pilots in this game and fly better than most everyone else I've met before

um yeah, I beg to differ... I admit you're one of the better flyers but I can name quite a lot who are better

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 19:24:27 GMT

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

I've never met anyone in this game that was better at flying than I am. A few know the tricks I use but few have any sort of actual flight experiences or trained in simulators before. That is why I know how to use aircraft as well as I do.

Then again, I didn't say I was the best, I said I was considered to be one of the best... So your comment wasn't even necessary.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 19:25:32 GMT

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

He's a good enough pilot to validate his point. I don't think he was trying to say he was the best Renegade player EVAR OMF ACK WONZ!!!!111

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 19:33:11 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller! I'm considered to be one of the best pilots in this game and fly better than most everyone else I've met before, yet I still get shot down by some newbie with a n00b cannon in five seconds if I'm just trying to get back to base.

So let me get this straight. You want to be able to fly back to base and have to face no opposition? That isn't balancing the game, it's manipulating it in your favour.

Quote: The issue isn't about how skilled with flight you are, because there's too many places for "snipers" to hide and destroy aircraft easily. You hide under the bridge, someone will pop out of the "tunnel" and shoot you up, forcing you to go above... Where you get shot down anyway.

I still don't understand why you fly your aircraft into an area that you're suggesting has many snipers laying in wait. That IS an issue about how skilled you are. No intelligent pilot in Renegade would fly into a nest of snipers.

Quote: The issue is that they're overpowered n00b units right now and need to get fixed to balance

the game out for everyone, not just "snipers" who only use that class of unit and expect to have the game stay the same so that they don't have to learn anything new.

Stop generalizing the sniping community. I don't waste my ammo on aircraft, and I can say that many people who come into our server don't either.

Quote:Sorry to tell you this, but I've been playing this far longer than you have, and use all the units on a regular basis. I'm not just an aircraft pilot, I also use "snipers" and it's just as easy for me to shoot them down with the n00b cannon as it is to take them out in an air battle.

I'm not exclusively a sniper, I also purchase aircraft if I feel like it, and I can honestly say that I rarely have issues with snipers. If I do, it's often my own fault for flying in a bunch of them alone. I don't care how many mere months more you've been playing than I have, that doesn't make you right.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 19:53:08 GMT

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

I shouldn't be wasted by someone in five shots with instantly hitting projectiles that have no accuracy penalty or distance limitation. That is the entire problem here, why can't you see it?

Would it be more balanced out if the Orca and Apache weapons went 300 meters and instantly hit their target like the "snipers" do? Obviously not because they'd own everything they can damage, sort of like what the "snipers" do.

You miss the entire point, "snipers" aren't AA units, it doesn't matter if there were 50 in the game, they shouldn't be damaging aircraft. Missile, laser, bullet, and tank cannon armed units should be damaging them.

If you don't waste ammunition on aircraft, then how can you sit here and talk about how balanced it is? For fuck's sake the least you can do is argue about something that concerns you.

If you rarely have issues with "snipers" then you're a bloody liar, or you're a god at this game and have some kind of speed and armor hack to stay alive against their projectiles.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 20:07:45 GMT

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

AircraftkillerI shouldn't be wasted by someone in five shots with instantly hitting projectiles that have no accuracy penalty or distance limitation. That is the entire problem here, why can't you see it?

Why should snipers have an accuracy penalty? For realism? LOL, you yourself said:

Quote:Nothing in C&C is realistic

The logic still stands. Snipers heavily damage light armour, aircraft are made with light armour, therefore snipers heavily damage aircraft.

You haven't addressed this once. Stop avoiding it.

Quote:Would it be more balanced out if the Orca and Apache weapons went 300 meters and instantly hit their target like the "snipers" do? Obviously not because they'd own everything they can damage, sort of like what the "snipers" do.

No, because I find the Orcas and Apaches to already be balanced.

Quote:You miss the entire point, "snipers" aren't AA units, it doesn't matter if there were 50 in the game, they shouldn't be damaging aircraft. Missile, laser, bullet, and tank cannon armed units should be damaging them.

Wow, I'm surprised that you of all people would resort to the realism card when he himself has denounced it. If nothing in Renegade is supposed to operate realistically, why would you change issues on the pretense of realism?

Quote:If you don't waste ammunition on aircraft, then how can you sit here and talk about how balanced it is? For fuck's sake the least you can do is argue about something that concerns you.

This is only the beginning. If you change something like this which doesn't need changing, you'll do it again, and again, and again eventually until it does concern me.

Quote:If you rarely have issues with "snipers" then you're a bloody liar, or you're a god at this game and have some kind of speed and armor hack to stay alive against their projectiles.

I can honestly tell you I don't have issues with snipers and aircraft. If my Orca gets shot down, it's because I left myself open to it. It's certainly not the sniper's fault he owned me.

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 18 May 2004 20:25:14 GMT

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

No, they need an accuracy penalty to make them less powerful. As it stands they're one of the most powerful units in the game, if not the most. Rifle soldiers have it, and they're just a basic unit. Going up the ladder of units shouldn't mean you get perfection for buying a unit, you should get disadvantages that can hamper your ability to destroy what you're shooting for. I'm not asking for Artillery style shot degradation, just a simple 0.5 meter offset so that it doesn't ALWAYS hit directly in the center of where you're aiming.

I'm not basing this off realism, and assuming I did because I never said it is a logic fallacy. Snipers damage aircraft heavily because their armor type is susceptible to the armor.ini bug with light armor versus shrapnel warheads, which is why I said "that's a bug" if you fucking read what

anyone wrote instead of assuming everything.

You find them balanced. The majority of forum goers here don't, and they're the ones arguing against you.

I never said anything about realism in that post, once more. I said this:

"You miss the entire point, "snipers" aren't AA units, it doesn't matter if there were 50 in the game, they shouldn't be damaging aircraft. Missile, laser, bullet, and tank cannon armed units should be damaging them."

Snipers aren't AA units in C&C. It's THAT SIMPLE... The others aren't, but they don't have a fucking 300 meter range with instant hitting projectiles that destroy vehicles in five shots.
