Subject: @Crimson
Posted by trooprm02 on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 17:35:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey, just a debate we had a couple years ago I remembered. Basically, I said Renegade was meant to be played in smaller servers (16-24) and used several gameplay examples to prove my point and you used the fact Westwood's own servers were 40 slots...Well, below is a picture taken from recent (physical) renegade merchandise I bought online and clearly shows 1-16 players

Toggle Spoiler

ALSO, taken from the same box, a Renegade PRO TIP from Renegade Legend, halokid aka hardkil:

Toggle Spoiler

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Spoony on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 18:13:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

on the second point, that's actually true in the single player campaign. MCTs can be pistoled pretty quickly.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Starbuzzz on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 18:20:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Spoony's right. Certain wooden barriers can also be pistoled away in the single player missions to get to powerups and health packs. Most enemy vehicles and buildings had somewhat lower hit points in the campaign than what they are in multiplayer so the pistol is quiet powerful.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by R315r4z0r on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 18:45:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Renegade is meant to be played. Period.

The amount of people in a server is not specified at any set amount. You can have games of 2, you can have games of 16, you can have games of 120. It doesn't matter. All of them have their merits.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by CarrierII on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 19:26:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 15 October 2010 19:45All [game sizes] have their merits.

End of thread.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Herr Surth on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 20:00:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 15 October 2010 21:26R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 15 October 2010 19:45All [sizes] have their merits.

End of thread.

Hehehehehehe PENISJOKE

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by liquidv2 on Fri, 15 Oct 2010 23:58:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

who is D-PAN DESTROYER
the stats on the box are by him
he must be Westwood

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Tunaman on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 04:00:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ljbh if you have never used a pistol to wear down an mct you haven't played renegade

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Dover on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 06:02:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trooprm02 wrote on Fri, 15 October 2010 10:35recent (physical) renegade merchandise
Toggle Spoiler

For $49.99? I think not

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by InternetThug on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 15:10:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

D-Pad destroyer was one of the writers for GamePro magazine, I got switched over to that magazine when my subscription to Official Dreamcast Magazine ended because Dreamcast went under .. everyone in Gamepro has a funny name lol.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by danpaul88 on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 15:19:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually the 7 vehicles per team limit does suggest that Westwood aimed at games not having many more than that number of players per side, which would fit in well with 16 player games (8 per side)...

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Crimson on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 15:22:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Then why were the official Westwood servers set to 40 players? The vehicle limit was more of a technical limitation. If I remember correctly, a vehicle sends 4 times as much data as an infantry unit because it sends data for each wheel to each player. Also, most maps are not designed for much more than 8 vehicles per team where they can fit many more infantry units.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 16:29:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 10:22Then why were the official Westwood servers set to 40 players? The vehicle limit was more of a technical limitation. If I remember correctly, a vehicle sends 4 times as much data as an infantry unit because it sends data for each wheel to each player. Also, most maps are not designed for much more than 8 vehicles per team where they can fit many more infantry units.
Pretty much this. I mean, 16 player games and 40 player games are both awesome- but you have to admit, Westwood could hardly push out more than 7 vehicles per team for the technology at the time, so that doesn't really define too much.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by trooprm02 on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 17:26:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

danpaul88 wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 10:19Actually the 7 vehicles per team limit does suggest that Westwood aimed at games not having many more than that number of players per side, which would fit in well with 16 player games (8 per side)...

Good point.

@Spoony, I played SP once several years ago so I guess I just forgot. Nonetheless, that sounded really funny in my head.

@Cabal, I never said 40 player servers aren't fun (thats where I got my real start in renegade), but what im saying it by the design of the gameplay mechanics alone (map size, vehicle limits, ingame tactics, etc) its pretty clear MP was optimized for no more than 8 players per team.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by R315r4z0r on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 18:00:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No, it's optimized to work under the largest possible amount of players possible in a game.

Otherwise we would be seeing games with 250 players, 30 vehicles on each side, and lag up the wing-wang.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by trooprm02 on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 19:53:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 13:00No, it's optimized to work under the largest possible amount of players possible in a game.

That doesn't even make sense The only thing the 40+ camp has going for itself are the servers hosted by Westwood during the beta, so its like 5-1

Theres a reason we don't see 127 player servers even though their possible, (maybe not now because of the player count, but they never existed) because it would just be pure spam. Meanwhile, if anyone has played a lobby/larger clan war (2v2, 3v3 even but ideally 6v6) they will know exactly what im talking about...

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 20:01:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trooprm02 wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 12:26@Cabal, I never said 40 player servers aren't fun (thats where I got my real start in renegade), but what im saying it by the design of the gameplay

mechanics alone (map size, vehicle limits, ingame tactics, etc) its pretty clear MP was optimized for no more than 8 players per team.
yeah, I know you didn't say they aren't fun, but it's not like it becomes horribly unbalanced or anything.

Honestly, I'd say Renegade is designed for just about ANY amount of players- I don't think there was any specific size of players in mind, so that's why it works fine with say, 4v4, 8v8, 16v16, or even 20v20.

I will admit that the maps are more accommodating to lower player sizes, but if they were any bigger, it'd be really annoying getting around.

And I think the fact that there's only 7 vehicles per teams works pretty well. If they were more vehicles, maps would become too crowded- instead, it's just filled up with more infantry, which are alot smaller than vehicles (and lag less).

TL;DR: It works well for any size matches, and was never intended for any specific size (just a threshold of anything between 4v4 to 20v20). Anything more than 20v20 is going into over the top territory.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by R315r4z0r on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 20:09:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trooprm02 wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 15:53R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 13:00No, it's optimized to work under the largest possible amount of players possible in a game.

That doesn't even make sense The only thing the 40+ camp has going for itself are the servers hosted by Westwood during the beta, so its like 5-1

Theres a reason we don't see 127 player servers even though their possible, (maybe not now because of the player count, but they never existed) because it would just be pure spam. Meanwhile, if anyone has played a lobby/larger clan war (2v2, 3v3 even but ideally 6v6) they will know exactly what im talking about...

It does make sense because the word "optimize" means to adjust something in such a way that it can achieve it's highest level of efficiency.

They wouldn't have made the game do something that it can't handle doing is basically what I'm saying.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Crimson on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 21:16:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

They weren't just hosted by Westwood during the beta. They hosted servers for several months, maybe even a year after the release of the game. And all their servers were 40 players. If they didn't think their game was "designed for" 40 players, they would have run smaller servers.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 22:07:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Sat, 16 October 2010 16:16They weren't just hosted by Westwood during the beta. They hosted servers for several months, maybe even a year after the release of the game. And all their servers were 40 players. If they didn't think their game was "designed for" 40 players, they would have run smaller servers.
To be fair, Westwood's uh... management, was rather shitty at that point. They barely knew what was going on in their own game most of the time (Obviously bad bugs like blue hell, pointsbug, etc).

Still, though, yeah, it never had a target size for its games, really.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Crimson on Sat, 16 Oct 2010 22:31:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's not really true. They were very much involved in the game and several of the devs and other Westwood staff continued to play after the retail release.

Any company developing games/programs for profit have to selectively fix bugs. Management must evaluate the time to fix the bug versus the financial impact. A 'showstopper bug' like the beacon-and-leave exploit were given the green light to fix because that bug would have killed the game years ago and they would have made a lot less money. I also helped Westwood develop and test a (a band-aid) fix for an exploit that was allowing people to crash servers fairly easily, which would have also been really bad for the longevity of the game. The points bug wasn't discovered by even the players at large until Westwood was already gone. To say management was "shitty" isn't necessarily true... it was more of budget problems than anything. The devs cared about the game and I'd sometimes trade emails with a couple of them late at night. (I'm in the same time zone as Las Vegas, at least half of the year)

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by [NE]Fobby[GEN] on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 02:39:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm pretty confident Renegade was designed both for large and small games. If it were exclusively for bigger servers, we'd probably have some larger maps as well. Battlefield games, for example, have gigantic maps, and are also designed for larger servers.

Renegade maps on the other hand still take small games into account, as it does not take more than two minutes to get across the field on any map. But whether it's 20v20 or simply 2v2, you don't need more than a couple chokepoints on the map, or a giant or tiny map. That's an element the stock maps perfected that I think some of the custom maps on W3D haven't gotten down perfectly, with some exceptions.

But Crimson is right, I do remember the official Westwood servers back in the demo days, and the playercounts were easily 20-40 throughout the whole day. I personally like more medium-sized games (14-24 players) but that's just a preference.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by R315r4z0r on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 04:39:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Exactly. But there are a few points one could make to relate the reasons way maps are laid out the way they are.

Hardware limitations meant they had to limit the size of maps and what they put on them. Additionally, this also includes what could be put on them which would answer the question of why there are vehicle limits.

Now, because there are vehicle limits, only 7 people per side could own a vehicle by default. That left everyone else in the server to infantry classes and thus were forced to walk. That would explain why the maps are small - because the majority of people playing had to walk.

Looking at it that way, and including the fact that Westwood servers were for 40 players (20 per team which is well above the vehicle limits), it's fair to conclude that the maps were balanced for vehicle combat but were sized for infantry travel.

Meaning, 40 players is a nice middle ground for a Renegade match.
Less people in a server (12-16 players) result in heavy vehicle combat and slower battle pace (no immediate threats to your team).
More people (60-127 players) result in heavy infantry combat with an intense battle pace (every structure needs at least 1 or 2 people repairing at all times).
40 players would result in intense vehicle combat, chaotic infantry skirmishes, and a steady battle pace where there is always action happening around you.

So, while Renegade can be played at any player level, I believe that a 20vs20 is pretty much the core Renegade experience.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Goztow on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 06:18:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:Less people in a server (12-16 players) result in heavy vehicle combat and slower battle pace (no immediate threats to your team).
I don't think you ever played small Renegade games? :-S The less players, the more threat to your base because the harder it gets to keep all entrances cleared.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by R315r4z0r on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 13:34:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

What I mean is that if there are less people, but still more than 7, all the game's focus (or at least 80% of it) is devoted to vehicle combat.

If there is too many infantry units on your team, then the enemy will overrun you with their vehicles and vis versa.

There is usually, in these games large amounts of idle playing field behind the action that is currently taking place on the map.

Basically, 12-16 players is a much more laid back environment as opposed to there being 60 players or more.

What I mean by "no immenent threat" is that there is usually a lul period in which your base is not under attack. Sure there are the chance of small infantry rushes, but that's not a constant problem. On a 120 player server, the action is so tight, that you can't affort to leave your base unattended for even a moment because there is always something that needs your attention.

And also, I'm going to disagree with your statement. It is not hard to defend your base with less people. Especially if the teams are even. I used to play on a server that played 4 vs all (usually 16) and the 4 won the vast majority of the time. It wasn't about communication, because a number of times I played on the 4 and there was no teamspeak or anything. It's about knowing your team, how they play, and knowing your own strengths. If you know that, it's easy to merge tactics with your teammates, defend and win, even with the odds stacked 3:1 against you.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Goztow on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 13:49:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I stick with my statement.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Homey on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 19:18:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I was always under the impression that this game was designed for 32 players. Half the team tanking, half being infantry and support. I just figured that from one of the default server sizes in some FDS readme from years ago. Honestly 32-40 has the best balance in the game IMO. I've always maintained that the vehicle limit should be half of the team's max player. Ie 40 player server = 10 tanks per side. It kind of helps fight the campfest troop talks about in 40+.

In all honestly, no one here truly knows. But 16-40 seems like what they logically thought was appropriate.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by trooprm02 on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 20:51:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 18 October 2010 08:34

Basically, 12-16 players is a much more laid back environment as opposed to there being 60 players or more

^from this, I'd personally say you haven't played enough smaller games to understand (I'd wish Spoony would jump in here and use lobbywars as an example but). With 40 players, THAT is laid back gameplay....it allows people to pointwhore because there are 19 other players on your team that you can rely on to defend the base.

With smaller games, you have to ACTIVELY keep track of where you oppenents are, what your own team mates are doing etc. Its for this exact reason you don't near see as much point whoring in smaller games (if you've ever wondered why not), as players are forced to be more productive.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Tunaman on Mon, 18 Oct 2010 21:01:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

edit: I think I'll lay off the trash talk for today

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Tue, 19 Oct 2010 04:19:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Homey wrote on Mon, 18 October 2010 14:18I was always under the impression that this game was designed for 32 players. Half the team tanking, half being infantry and support. I just figured that from one of the default server sizes in some FDS readme from years ago. Honestly 32-40 has the best balance in the game IMO. I've always maintained that the vehicle limit should be half of the team's max player. Ie 40 player server = 10 tanks per side. It kind of helps fight the campfest

troop talks about in 40+.

In all honestly, no one here truly knows. But 16-40 seems like what they logically thought was appropriate.

This. They didn't have an EXACT amount in mind, but since it works just as well for 16 as it does 40... yeah. I don't see why this is even worth discussing... what's there to be gained? It's not like Crimson is forcing all servers to be 40 players only...

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Crimson on Tue, 19 Oct 2010 05:16:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's true, nor have I ever said the game wasn't designed for anything BUT 40 players. It's great 1v1, 2v2, 25v25... doesn't matter.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Altzan on Tue, 19 Oct 2010 05:29:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It works for all amounts, although nearly every 2-8 player game I've been in made me want to snap my laptop in half.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by R315r4z0r on Tue, 19 Oct 2010 06:00:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trooprm02 wrote on Mon, 18 October 2010 16:51R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 18 October 2010 08:34

Basically, 12-16 players is a much more laid back environment as opposed to there being 60 players or more

^from this, I'd personally say you haven't played enough smaller games to understand (I'd wish Spoony would jump in here and use lobbywars as an example but). With 40 players, THAT is laid back gameplay....it allows people to pointwhore because there are 19 other players on your team that you can rely on to defend the base.

With smaller games, you have to ACTIVELY keep track of where you oppenents are, what your own team mates are doing etc. Its for this exact reason you don't near see as much point whoring in smaller games (if you've ever wondered why not), as players are forced to be more productive.

Hmm, I see you're point. I don't know why I said that.. you can even see at the bottom of my post I started talking about those 4 vs All games. Yes, the 4 won the majority of the time, but playing on

that team made you run around in circles just to make sure the enemy didn't get any headway.

I think what I meant to say was larger games provide more action while smaller games (or teams, rather) provide more strategy and require you to think on your feet more.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by trooprm02 on Tue, 19 Oct 2010 19:14:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 19 October 2010 01:00

I think what I meant to say was larger games provide more action while smaller games (or teams, rather) provide more strategy and require you to think on your feet more.

Exactly my point, and the higher the level of strategy involved = better gameplay

Anyway, I didn't start this topic to say a is better than b (like ive already said, ive played most of my renlife in 40 player servers), but just to prove a point because a recent discover jogged my memory

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Wed, 20 Oct 2010 08:05:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Altzan wrote on Tue, 19 October 2010 07:29It works for all amounts, although nearly every 2-8 player game I've been in made me want to snap my laptop in half.
That might be, but I'm pretty sure that's also due to the teammates you where playing with. It makes a huge difference if you have 4 cooperating teamplayers or 4 random guys put into one team.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Speedy059 on Fri, 22 Oct 2010 08:27:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This game was designed for 1 on 1 action. You guys have ruined it.

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by Jerad2142 on Sun, 31 Oct 2010 06:01:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Speedy059 wrote on Fri, 22 October 2010 02:27This game was designed for 1 on 1 action. You

guys have ruined it.
No! It was designed for 64 vs 63. You guys are ruining it by not filling the servers! XP

But on a serious note:

I wonder why they slowly upped the player count on the box as they released more copies of the game. My copy is still the stock version and I have to patch to 1.037 and all of that... So why slowly up the player count.

File Attachments
1) PlayerCount.bmp, downloaded 221 times

Subject: Re: @Crimson
Posted by trooprm02 on Sun, 07 Nov 2010 03:44:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Also Crimson, please check your PM's, I replied to yours.