

I'm not a bot

































Hi, just a quick question on whether or not its been thought of adding a Cavalry section to fort battles? My thinking is that anyone who couldn't get into the battle because of numbers allowed could be added to a Cavalry section that could be brought into the battle anytime after say 10 rounds. Same could be done for both sides so that those alliances that work together the best can be rewarded for their efforts.Thoughts anyone? Please go on more depth, this sounds very interesting, thanks. Please read the sticky threads before posting here. Ideas should use the idea form, be well thought out and balanced as well as contributing substantially to the game in comparison the coding effort required. Your idea fails to meet these standards, so please be sure to read the sticky threads and adjust your idea accordingly. The idea is simple and the object is to reward those alliances that are active in the game. Currently many of the smaller fort battles are over subscribed and players, after travelling all day to the fort staging a battle have to be turned away through lack of spaces. This can be especially hard on lower level players who some generals only rank last and in desperation to make up the numbers.My thought is to allow both attacker and defender to rank and hold back a percentage of the total number of people allowed to partake in a fort battle. Shall we say 10%, therefore if a battle allows 100 players to be ranked for the fort itself, they will actually have 110 at their full disposal.Then, after say 10 rounds of the battle, each general can choose whether or not to bring in a cavalry to assist their side during the battle, thus making it far more strategic. There should also be a limit of when the cavalry is allowed to be used so again I'd say after 10 rounds and before the last 10 rounds of battle.This way not only do more players get to be involved but it allows those lower ranked ones who are normally shunned during the ranking process, an opportunity to become involved in battles in order to gain the rewards that others get and makes them feel just as important.The cavalry would have to have slightly different bonuses that the other fighters in the battle and truth be told i haven't thought it out that far yet. Although I'd suggest aim is lowered whilst dodge is lifted along with an appearance bonus?Hope this bigger explanation is well received and feel free to suggest adjustments etc.I have no idea if this will get any backing or become incorporated into the game but i think it will help retain the interest of new and lower level players.will do Last edited by a moderator: Apr 6, 2011 Yeah thats what I thought, problem is what if the defenders don't have any extra for a cavalry wave ? they will lose.Maybe abetter idea would be for though's that stayed at the fort that couldnt take part, get to take part in a field battle with all the other left overs.Wouldnt count for much other than you would fight against your enemy, get some XP/CASH and maybe there would be 1 or 2 battle boxes up for grabs.They could run with this by having objectives for the field battles, like defend the wagon, cross/destory the bridge.Anyways im with you they need to make it worth players runing around like crazy and once they get there they dont even get to take part. And cavalry would have some special sci-fi powers to climb walls...No. There's no need for the cavalry to enter the fort so climbing walls is not requiredThe idea is to allow each side to have a reserve if they so choose to bring in when required, thus mirroring real life when the cavalry ride to the rescue.The main point though is that it allows lower ranked players to get involved more as they are often shut out of fort ranking. This retains their interest and keeps the game going forward. ... mirroring real life when the cavalry ride to the rescue Huh? No. RL infantry vs infantry strategy was "form line", "shoot", "charge", why? to avoid friendly fire. guns were not precise as are today, trust me.infantry vs cavalry wasn't like that. in case cavalry attack is expected or cavalry wasn't hidden to reach the infantry quickly (forest, fog, etc) infantry would execute the order "form square". if in line when cavalry arrives, the infantry would be slaughtered as cavalry would pass through a line like through a cheese. if in square, cavalry can't pass through that easy and a few foot soldiers can certainly close around and "remove" one horserider "from the board". then another, then another. etc etc. you can write a book about this. fort fighting minigame is practically forcing infantry to "form square" all the time. if you're trying to make it "RL compatible", that cavalry you'd bring in, if we'll take RL as an example, wouldn't help much against the infantry that filled a square and not a line. More on the matter: Last edited by a moderator: Apr 6, 2011 I do not think you quite got the idea Joxer. The idea was to make it possible to let more off the players signed up for the battle take part in the battle. It could just as well has been called reinforcements as cavalry i think. Last edited by a moderator: Apr 6, 2011 I do not think you quite got the idea Joxer. The idea was to make it possible to let more off the players signed up for the battle take part in the battle. It could just as well has been called reinforcements as cavalry i think. Your right it's always comes down to someone saying it's not realistic, who cares ?The idea is to include players that miss out, call them cavarly / reinforments.I get it though the whole reinforcements bit doesn't wash unless there is a limit or way to make it fair both sides. It will never be just let them fight a battle field battle that means nothing to whome ever wins it. Just XP/cash. Would be like you missed the main battle because you where too late though wait you walked into a trap, your under attack.....look out !!!! BOOM , BOOM ,BANG !!! ARUGH ...I've been shot !!!!And you fight it out exchanging bullets in this battle with the defenders who also didnt get to take part in the fort battle. If Joxer disagrees then it must be worthy of some thought at least, I vote yes Seriously though, I like where this is going - with this folk on developed worlds with overfilled batties can still get their sice of the action and will be particulaly good for those low levels that usually get dropped from battles due to insufficient space. It could just as well has been called reinforcements as cavalry i think Reinforcements (without horses) is another thing. Please post it as a separate idea without the "cavalry" word in the thread title.Thanks.P.S. I'll again say no on it, but for totally different reasons (unless the possible abuse is dealt with inside the core idea). This is one response that came from a W10 town forum: I think the amount of calvary allowed would have to be directly proportionate to the starting #'s of each battle. For instance, 84 defenders allowed in med fort, but say only 80 show up.compared to 100 attackers allowed and 100 show up. The difference is 20 fighters. I have no idea what kind of % would make sense, but in my mind, the defending team should be able to bring in a higher # of cavalry into that battle due to the fact that they were the 'underdog' from the beginning.It would add another facet to the otherwise sometime dull fort fights. Like when both sides are sitting with little or no LOS, one side is waiting for other to "make a move" the leader of one side, could out of the blue, call in the calvary from the opposite side of the map (ie take them from behind)..... Could be fun.And for those that don't like the idea, they could make it so that when you're digging the hatchet, you could choose if you wanted a calvary type battle or not.....!!!!???? Reinforcements (without horses) is another thing. Please post it as a separate idea without the "cavalry" word in the thread title.Thanks.P.S. I'll again say no on it, but for totally different reasons (unless the possible abuse is dealt with inside the core idea). This is wack, yesterday I start a topic afew of you, you being one said idea already been said, though no one linked me it. Now you want him to start new topic on same idea just because you can't get around the word cavalry !!! your a funny bunch UP in here !!!! :laugh:laugh:laugh: Huh? No. RL infantry vs infantry strategy was "form line", "shoot", "charge", why? to avoid friendly fire. guns were not precise as are today, trust me. infantry vs cavalry wasn't like that. in case cavalry attack is expected or cavalry wasn't hidden to reach the infantry quickly (forest, fog, etc) infantry would execute the order "form square". if in line when cavalry arrives, the infantry would be slaughtered as cavalry would pass through a line like through a cheese. if in square, cavalry can't pass through that easy and a few foot soldiers can certainly close around and "remove" one horserider "from the board". then another, then another. etc etc. you can write a book about this. fort fighting minigame is practically forcing infantry to "form square" all the time. if you're trying to make it "RL compatible", that cavalry you'd bring in, if we'll take RL as an example, wouldn't help much against the infantry that filled a square and not a line. More on the matter: The forming square tactic versus Calvary was a workable tactic until the Civil War when military units no longer carried pole arms to break the charge. Squares wern formed with the pole arms pointing out, horses would not charge into them, the charge was broken. This tactic was used in the Napoleonic Wars on occasions, but most units were not carrying pole arms so terrain had to be used to funnel the Calvary into fields of massed fire for it to be effective. By the Civil War it was outdated, line warfare was used, numerous lines were broken by Calvary charges. Common tactic was Calvary versus Calvary until one sides Calvary broke, reform and then charge the infantry. from Joxers link.. Use outside of Europe There is only one confirmed use of an infantry square against cavalry in the American Civil War, formed by the Thirty-Second Indiana Volunteer Infantry at the Battle of Rowlett's Station, December 17, 1861 and used against Terry's Texas Rangers. And this game is set in the US West post Civil War... Last edited by a moderator: Apr 6, 2011 This is wack, yesterday I start a topic afew of you, you being one said idea already been said, though no one linked me it. Now you want him to start new topic on same idea just because you can't get around the word cavalry !!! your a funny bunch UP in here !!!! :laugh:laugh:laugh: I dunno what you started yesterday, and I don't remember any cavalry.As for this idea I've explained. No artillery to break the square, default formation are squares in forts = any cavalry is doomed.About bringing infantry reinforcements also promised to explain why not when such idea is brought up in a separate thread. In here it'd be an utter offtopic as it doesn't break the illogical possibility that cavalry wins vs infantry square. but makes a space for different types of abuse. Every single idea I make a post about I take seriously and I don't think anything is funny about this one. I may post something funny in this subforum, but... That doesn't mean I haven't thought about the idea at all. And always the idea creator is aware if I'll say yes or no when it comes to vote. Although it looks arrogant, I believe it's fair to tell the thread starter yes or no and why.As this section is too important since it can make the game better, but also worse, I'm definitely not just spamming, trolling, lurking, stalking or flaming someone here. Last edited by a moderator: Apr 6, 2011 So many posts from you after I told you to put it into format and you have yet to do so..I will be closing this thread soon if it is not done. OMG people taking over forts would be the easiest thing possible on this game! GG's have already made it impossible to defend a fort if the stacking bonus is used correctly know you want to make it completely impossible to defend a fort by letting the attackers have a ton of reinforcements if that happens to attackers, defenders should be the same >> \_ \_