

CivFanatics

Crazy George's Posts

© 2010 Copyright Brett Paufler

this is part of my
Broken Stories Unfinished Dreams
series

One wonders whether I have the right to repost this or not. But as CivFanatics is a free site and this is a free site, I'm not seeing how there could be any monetary damages or concerns. Also, because I am more than a little paranoid about such things, I just reread their terms of service and I saw no mention about giving up the copyright for anything posted, so I think it's safe to say, the copyright is shared at best.

For those interested in Crazy George's SlaughterQuest fandom, I give you the CivFanatics posts of his that I am aware of. These are pulls from the CivFanatics Forum (copies of the worksheets / rough drafts ultimately uploaded to that site). As such, they may not make a lot of sense as they are provided completely out of context without any of the surrounding forum comments.

Anyway, if you're looking for the definition of *vain*, reposting dead posts so they don't disappear into the dustbin of posterity, yeah, I think that might come close to nailing vanity dead on.

www.Paufler.net

Brett@Paufler.net

© 2014 Copyright Brett Paufler

5-27-10

I'm willing to go with the assumption that C5 will have unprecedented modability. To me, this means I will be able to make custom Units, Leaders, Civilizations, & Maps simply and easily, right out of the box. (Once again, this is my assumption).

Thus, if I want to take a standard unit and change it's characteristics, I will be able to give it extra movement, strength, or whatever. In short, I'll be able to reproduce the effects of any unique unit out there.

The question then becomes, what does one get from a Babylonian DLC that is not easily achievable and modable? The answer at first appears to be graphics... but then, maybe there will be more.

There is talk of traits (flavors, I think they call them). If the Babylonian Civ came with a unique flavor (strategy) that was integrated into the AI, then this new flavor (and not the cosmetic graphics, which I assume will be a dime a dozen) might be worth a buck or two.

As might other venues of gameplay (for lack of a better term) that would not be easily modable (due to AI integration problems, if nothing else). Things like: Religion, Espionage, Corporations, or Magic. At \$10 a shot (so much cheaper than 10? the last I looked), any of those things might be worth the price of admission (well, maybe not corporations), especially if this meant the AI would be tweaked to take advantage of them.

And as to Multi-Player online compatibility, don't we already have that same problem with C4 (vanilla, warlords, BtS, and so on)? Since I don't play online, maybe I'm over-simplifying the problem, but I would think it'd just be a matter of agreeing in advance what mods are going to be allowed. My guess is that there will come to be certain commonly accepted combinations that prove most popular, with the plain vanilla version being one of them.

5-28-10

An Espionage Point System is not the same thing as a Spy Unit.

In C5, gold will be able to purchase territory (something only culture could do previously). Gold will be able to buy Research Pacts (thus providing yet another means of exchanging gold for beakers). Continuing this trend (of allowing gold to do more), it's a small step to assume (and to my knowledge not contradicted) that gold will simply replace Espionage Points in total.

Thus the statement, C5 will not have Espionage is not inherently contradictory with C5 having a Spy Unit if one assumes that Espionage means Espionage Points and not everything that could possibly be

interpreted as being Espionage. (Maybe I missed the article that said C5 wouldn't have Spy or Diplomatic Units, would love to see a link if I did).

Furthermore, everything Zaimejs has requested in his OP could easily be implemented by making a small change to the Privateer Unit: namely, allowing Privateers to fly under the flags of foreign nations, something Pirates have been known to do. If such a Privateer were to raze an improvement, it would appear to all observers that the country whose flag is was flying at the time had committed the atrocity (less some chance the truth be known).

If Privateers can do this on the sea, another unit type could do this on dry land (call them Raiders).

Not strictly Spy Abilities, but Unit Abilities I would like to see include:

Units who can remain in enemy territory (on top of that Iron Mine or whatever) after war has been declared.

Units who are invisible (ala Submarines) except on land.

5-28-10

I heard of Steam for the first time a day or two ago. And at first it sounded bad, didn't like the idea of having to log on or connect to a portal everytime I wanted to play C5.

But then, being totally ignorant and ill informed, I started thinking about all the cool things that could be done with an Integrated Portal. Mind you, maybe not in the real world (or even anything that remotely resembles Steam), but I have confidence that someday (perhaps in some far off future after we hit Future Tech III) the real world will come back into alignment with my perception of it.

So, what if Steam were like the Apple Ap store?

A place where professional and amateurs alike could post the fruits of their labor and if desirous ask for a few pennies (or dollars, or tens of dollars) for their efforts? If the modders can make a few bucks, there will be more mods. This, I hope, we can all agree is a good thing.

And what if these mods were like tested and there was some reasonable assurance that they would work, wouldn't crash your system, and that they'd been independently rated by folks (just like you and me) who had actually bought and downloaded them. Once again, this doesn't sound like a bad thing to me.

And what if (just what if) Firaxis had a whole scratch pad full of possible add-on after market ideas they were thinking of developing, if only they could be assured that they'd make a profit on them. Well, if that was the case, it seems like a no-brainer to me that they'd put together a Fantasy Expansion Pack complete with an Integrated Magic System, fantasy map tiles, and half dozen fantasy Civ's complete with Leaders and Unit Graphics (for what? \$10? \$20?). Once again, a good thing.

Now, this might not be the direction they're taking. But it seems silly to link up with a Portal capable of becoming a revenue stream (i.e. Steam) and then not going after that revenue stream.

Since it's happening, I say look on the bright side and hope for the best. But then, maybe that's just the Crazy in me talking.

5-30-10

A Spy could sit on a Resource and steal it from another player.

I would also like Spies to be able to effect diplomatic modifiers. But in truth, I believe this would work out easier on the trade screen. As in:

How much for a +1 modifier, Monty?

5-30-10

Actually, I was just using it as what I assumed would be a well known point of reference. Me, I'm more of a Open Source type guy.

In other news, for a long time one of the programs I had to run for work was only compatible with an older version of Java. If Java had updated

automatically (without asking me), I'd would have had to reinstall it every day.

Thus, with Steam automatically updating C5 (or so I am told), this could become a way for an "evil" company to push free mods into the background. It being a pain for programmers to re-update the code on their mod (or freeware) every time a new version of the base program is released. (I point to FFH falling out of the mod game as a case point or how many free programs for XP won't work in W7.)

I don't have any expectation that mods for Civ 4 will work for C5. And if Firaxis wanted to, they could insure that mods programed for C5 v1.2 (vanilla) would not be compatible with C5 v2.3 (the inevitable Elvin expansion, I keep my fingers crossed).

Not saying they're going to do that, but if I had a fear associated with Steam, it would be something along these lines.

5-31-10

Parked in a city, a Spy could nullify the effect of one Wonder.
Or disrupt trade routes by cutting roads.

5-31-10

Hello, my name is Crazy George and I build too many cities.

Early Game, I REX my economy into the ground.

Middle Game, I settle every Island and Tundra Hex I can. If there is Neutral Ground between my enemies, I settle it.

Late Game, I occupy every city I capture, regardless of the need or return to my economy.

I know I shouldn't do this, but I can't seem to help myself.

Thankfully, during the course of this thread, I have come to see the errors of my ways. In addition to having to set my research slider to 0%, and running out of Civ specific names for my cities, I can now add, "Just plain sick and tired of building city improvements in every last one of my blessed cities," to the warning signs that I might be spamming more cities than my economy can handle.

I thank you all for your assistance in this matter. I trust the insight shall prove invaluable and with any luck will add a few points to my average score.

(Not entirely in jest, I do have a serious REX addiction. Maybe keeping this warning sign in mind will help. So indeed, thanks.)

6-19-10 (weak, not posted)

My interpretation, no substantiation, as a rough approximation.

Ten policies = Ten different aspects of the game (production, food, culture, science, commerce, war weariness, etc.). Forget about the names. They have nothing to do with game play.

If we went down the "Happiness Policy" (by whatever name it's called), perhaps we would find:

At level 1 one gets +1 happiness in all cities, ability to use, gold, silver, and fur resources.

At level 2 one gets +2 happiness in all cities +1 happiness per temple, and ability to increase cities to size 10 (from a previous base of 5).

At level 3 one gets +3 happiness, 15 city size, unlocks theater and Great Theater.

At level 4 one gets +4 happiness, 20 city size, +50% to all happiness buildings, and 1 unique tradable happiness resource (ala Hit Singles).

At level 5, Unhappiness does not exist in your empire, another tradable happiness resource is unlocked, as is the Great Happiness Wonder.

Clearly, the idea needs fleshing out, and isn't supposed to reflect the actuality of C5 past the basic mechanic and idea.

The reason why one would not max out the Happiness Policy from the get-go is because the cost between levels is geometric (just like the tech tree). Meaning one can perhaps buy two level 1 policies for the cost of one level 2, or four level 2 policies for the cost of one level 4. Sure, not having any unhappiness would be great at 500AD, but think of all the other bonuses one is passing up to obtain this.

And note, this isn't unbalanced, because everyone has access to these same bonuses. Want to build a Wonder late game, you're going to need that +33%, +50%, +100% wonder production bonus to be competitive... of

course, you're also going to need to have 10+ population cities, farms that get +30% food, and so on. That's where the tough choices come in.

6-19-10

I expect Policies to work exactly like Unit Experience levels, unlocking benefits that are completely stackable, and that work in conjunction with Technological Advances.

Like Unit Experience, I anticipate the need for a choice between basic bonuses (like Combat I) or higher bonuses that apply to a more specific areas (like Woodsman I).

For instance, if one were to pursue the culture Policy, at the first level one might have the choice between a 10% increase to all culture or a 25% reduction in cost for new territory.

If one is going to be expansive, it might be very important to choose the later, because the next level down that track might confer some sort of assimilation bonus for conquered territory, the ability to flip cities, and/or the ability to install Puppet Governments.

6-20-10

Not to be a contrarian, but I think they are doing everything possible to make C5 a combat game.

Per my interpretation of Schafer's E3 interview, he said (more or less) that City States are designed to mix it up. Left to themselves, two civs might find a way to live in peace. So, City States were added into the mix. By design a City State will tend to like one of its neighbors (who it will ally with) and hate the other (who it will force its ally to attack). Walla, instant war.

In Civ 4, a civ could found Buddhism, send out a few Missionaries, convert their neighbors, and force a PAX-Religious. This was presented as a negative thing in the interview. And so, in an effort to allow civs to act more "rationally" (which in a war game, means going to war), religion was removed.

Further, one of the examples of play shown was of a nuclear attack launched against a civ who was about to win a Space Race victory. The nuclear attack forestalled this victory. Such a turn of events clearly places a warmonger strategy above either a builder (Space Race) or cultural (Utopia Project) strategy.

Also, consider that Panzer General has been heralded as a driving inspiration for C5. Not Settlers of Catan, not some wishy-washy do-gooder liberal game, but a hard and fast old school war game is denoted as a major inspiration.

Thus, I expect C5 to be a fairly straightforward war game.

War will be inevitable.

The march of Civilization will be measured by one's ability to engage in war.

So, what does this mean for diplomacy?

For one, a fog of uncertainty surrounding diplomacy will make it harder to tweak the peace. Sure, it makes the interface feel more organic, but more importantly, juggling the needs of competing factions becomes all but impossible if one doesn't know the numbers.

Secondly, not only am I expecting war, I'm expecting a lot of it. Me and Monty will no doubt fight over City State A (Shanghi?), while Louis and Elizabeth fight their own little war brought to a head by the Medici in City State B (Tuscany?).

From there, my oracular powers grow a bit dimmer.

But I am hoping that by mid game, the civ on civ hostilities will morph into World Wars. I mean, those are more fun right?

And then in the late game, it'll be every civ for themselves as alliances switch quickly and any who pull ahead and look like they might win are mercilessly attacked by all who remain. After all, who launched all those nuclear weapons in the demonstration? My guess: everyone who had them.

Which is to say, I'm expecting the AI to act more like a Machiavellian Prince, more like a war gamer, more like someone or something that actually wanted to win the game at any price.

"So, it's all fine and dandy that you have a +1 bonus for open borders. +2 for the resources you've given us, +3 for all the years of peace,

and yeah, even the +6 for joining our war against Monty, we're not forgetting that. But you see, we've looked at the numbers, and well, there's just no way we're going to win this here game unless we start capturing some cities, and sad to say it, but yours are the first on our list.

Prepare for war!
Gandhi attacks!"

All that said, I hope the AI has to play by the same rules I do, but have no faith that they will.

7-27-10

I look forward to the prospect of playing each of the civilizations, custom tailoring my strategy to maximize their inherent strengths. It will be a great disappointment if the AI is not capable of doing the same.

With that said, I find it hard to believe that a mere movement bonus will be able to compensate for +20% Wonders or +25% for any building I've bothered to build in my capital. But I wouldn't be surprised (especially at the harder levels) if India's happiness bonus didn't prove to be the strongest of all.

7-28-10

Hate to sound like I was parsing my words.
If I was going to split the powers in half (better vs worse), India's happiness boost would have to go in the better column... and fairly high up the list.

Double unhappiness for too many cities, simply means one doesn't plan on city sprawling when playing India. It's a given.

But half of the standard unhappiness for city size means that for every two increase in population past the difficulty level set point, India will get 1 happy citizen and 1 unhappy citizen. Which in turn means:

1) Provided that the 1 happy citizen can work an irrigated flood plain or food resource, every Indian city will be able to grow indefinitely (until they run out of premium food hexes), and

2) Once India builds a happiness building or acquires a happiness resource, that unhappy citizen will be unlocked and be immediately available to add to the growth engine or serve as a specialist.

I haven't done the math. But with a city radius of three and a dozen good farm tiles, that means a late game Pop 50 city (or 10 odd higher than anyone else) would be available to India.

Sounds pretty powerful to me.
Much better than some piddling little movement bonus.

7-28-10

I will enjoy playing the Aztecs.
Iroquois will be an interesting challenge.
England will rule the seas.

But if I am playing for the win and I am able to choose my Civilization, India will be on my short list of civs to choose from.

A single Pop 20 city as India will be more than capable of achieving mid game is far superior than two Pop 10 cities or four Pop 5 cities.

1) The Pop 20 city only has to build a single instance of library, barracks, and so forth. Multiple cities must build multiple instances of these buildings, essentially duplicating their efforts and wasting hammers.

2) Hammers not wasted in multiple builds are available for more diverse builds, therefore it is to be expected that India's cities will be more fully developed. In other words, instead of building library and barracks yet again, India's cities will be moving on to build walls, courthouses, granaries, and so on.

3) Because India's cities will be more fully developed and because the bonuses received for buildings are additive (+ for library, + for observatory, + for research lab), India's Cities will have greater bonuses.

4) Thus, even though two Pop 10 cities, four Pop 5 cities, or a single Pop 20 city all work the same number of hexes and harvest the same raw amount of commerce and hammers, because more bonuses will be applied to those harvested by the Pop 20 city (due to the presence of more buildings), the effective yield for a Pop 20 city will be far greater.

Or to illustrate the advantage given to India from a slightly different angle: The Glory of Rome gives a 25% bonus for building any building already present in the capitol. Let Rome have an empire of ten Pop 10 cities, while India has an empire of five Pop 20 cities. And then have both of them build a Forge in all of their cities at a proposed cost of 100 hammers each to keep things easy.

Rome's cost is 100 (for the capitol) + 75×9 (for each of 9 cities) = 775
India's cost is 100×5 (for each city) = 500

This hypothetical example yields India a production advantage of 275 hammers, which equates to that many more buildings, wonders, or military units.

I admit that this is a simplistic comparison and one could argue that Rome should have ten Pop 15 cities versus five Pop 25 cities for India (and thus, a full comparisons would have to include the greater number of hexes worked by the Roman Empire), but as a starting point, I hope this lays the groundwork for why I believe India's power is not to be underestimated.

7-29-10

Thanks for the insight on how the new happiness system works. Pre-growing one's civilization past its happiness level does not appear to be a viable option. Still, India's happiness level will be effectively twice that of the competition, and being a fan of big cities, I see that as a tremendous advantage. Finally, and upon more thought, even with its happiness bonus, India's cities will be checked by Health constraints.

Moving on to other Civilizations, in a discussion of their relative value, I would be inclined to add up the expected bonuses and compare these to one another. For example,

Aztec to get X culture for each kill

While, French to get 1 culture per city per turn prior to Steam.

Since Settlers are limited by Population Growth, Population Growth is limited by food, and this will have a statistical distribution, I'm thinking the expected French culture bonus can be pre-determined within a fairly narrow range (provided one expands are rapidly as the game will let them).

My hunch is that if the Aztecs get any less than 10 culture per kill, the French advantage will be hands down superior. But in the end, the math will tell. Even the most aggressive War Monger can only expect so many kills... unless of course, the Aztecs don't fight for victory, but fight for the glory of their gods and "milk" their enemies for Sacrificial Captives leaving the cities to act as spawning grounds. Now, that could be fun, but hardly worth the effort unless one gets at least 5 or so culture per kill.

Also, as others have mentioned, one of the unstated drawbacks of most of the advantages is that they force a certain course of action to maximize their benefit. A bonus for Wonder Construction tends toward zero if one does not build any Wonders. And to maximize its effects, one would have to go for Aristocracy and the +35% wonder synergy bonus. While Rome's building construction becomes meaningless if one does not build a sprawling civilization with a well developed infrastructure. In either case, (Wonders or Buildings) the hammers saved should be predictable within some range.

Of course, with that being said, I wouldn't be surprised if someone came up with a strategy that showed how Monty's advantage could be utilized to gain Aristocracy sooner and thus outmaneuver Egypt's Wonder Bonus. Or that the hammers saved in buildings, being so much greater than the hammers saved in wonders, that Rome's advantage would be preferable even for a strategy that relied on building Wonders.

7-29-10

Hate to be the one to break the news, but the Super Secret Unit is clearly... Ponyta.

7-30-10

I'm sure what I don't know about Civ 4 would fill quite a few forum pages. Thus, it is my intent to pursue C5 more methodically. And while ya'll are playing the game and posting your findings, I plan on studying the results and doing a bit of armchair quarterbacking.

A solid defensive strategy like that should keep me from wasting my entire life playing C5 or ordering the game until, oh, about 6AM on the day of release.

But wait, let's see. Sept 21 is a Tues, so maybe I'll be able to hold out until the weekend. That would give me a solid four days to study strategy, a decent chance that a patch will have been released to fix any catastrophic bugs, and if I don't sleep, I'll probably be able to fit in a second game before Monday morning.

7-30-10

At first blush, The Great Warpath (Iroquois: only 1 move point traveling into forest tile) just doesn't seem like that great of an ability to me. In Civ 4, I'd gotten pretty adept at moving my Scouts in such a way that they didn't land on a forest, hill, or jungle until their second move. And long as I'm mentioning hills and jungles, it would appear the Iroquois still suffer the same movement penalties as everyone else when entering these tiles. So, I'm thinking outside of a (minimal?) combat advantage, what the Iroquois are getting can be thought of as a 10% early game movement bonus, which drops to 0-5% late game. Or if one prefers, the Iroquois are getting something like double movement when traversing heavily forested areas.

And like I said, when I first looked at it, this seemed like such a weeny ability (to me) that I figured there must be some sort of synergy or alternate way of thinking about it that I was missing. And what I came up with was that a 10% early game movement bonus (or double movement over 10% of the map) will translate directly into the Iroquois discovering roughly 10% more of the map than anyone else, yielding 10% more goody huts (if they still exist), discovery of 10% more natural wonders (and the bonus said discovery is rumored to confer), and perhaps most importantly, a 10% greater chance (whatever that means) of settling the more preferred secondary city sites.

In Civ 4, both me and the AI seemed to clear cut the forest around our cities, so I'm not really convinced of the long term combat advantage of this ability, especially when on the offensive. But if one assumes that 5x5 or 10x10 grids of forest will exist (or that the Iroquois will be able to plant

them), the Iroquois will get a tremendous advantage in these areas, using archers to harass their enemies from a distance, while using their movement bonus to remain safely out of reach. If the Iroquois could keep their territory forested, it could make reaching their cities with an army still intact extremely difficult.

8-11-10

At lower difficulty levels where spamming Wonders is a viable path to victory, Egypt's 20% bonus for Wonders will be hard to beat

At higher difficulty levels (or multiplayer), I'd opt for Japan. Fighting at full strength no matter how badly damaged is going to allow the Japanese army to emerge clearly victorious in what would otherwise be an evenly matched campaign.

I can see why so many folks voted for Russia's +1 production from Strategic Resources and double utility of same. And if I had to choose between that or Rome's building bonus, I'd choose the former, since I'd like to keep my production options open and foresee specialist cities being the rule of the day.

8-12-10

The counter to the Iroquois' forest walk ability is chopping down forests. Don't know how this will play out in neutral territory. But you can bet if the Iroquois are my neighbors, I'm going to clear cut everything in sight. One can only hope the AI will be smart enough to do the same.

8-12-10

I knew there was a reason I kept coming back to these forums.

OK. New strategy.

If I find I have the Iroquois as my neighbors, I don't clear cut everything on the border. Instead, I leave just enough forests to aid in my own defense (i.e. at my choke points, etc.) and clear cut everything else.

I would anticipate that at some level of implementation, this strategy would have a noticeably dampening effect on the Iroquois ability.

Incidentally, if there are other counter strategies that might be implemented to thwart or reduce the effect of any of the other Civilization's abilities, I would be anxious to hear of them.

8-13-10

As an idea for implementation, switching to a religion could open a Social Policy tree dedicated to that religion, which is mutually exclusive with other religions... and possibly other Social Policies.

5-12-14

Brett Paufler

Oddly, I do believe crazyGeorge was more interested in the run up to the release of Civ-5 than the actual game. Best of my knowledge (like I care about such things), all of his posts predate the actual release.

And yes, the reason I'm posting this is because it is way (way-way-way) easier for me to post everything than make a decision about each and every item. Long ago I made the decision that everything in my Broken Dreams Unfinished Stores collection (including this) was unmarketable or defective in some regard. And although many of them suck outright, and quite a few are questionable in the need to preserve (this one for instance), there are others that I thoroughly enjoyed and really had to wonder how they ever found their way into my trash pile in the first place. In twenty years, the same may hold true for this document... or if you've read your way down to here, well then, we know that at least one person found the information contained herein to be of interest...