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Description


"Cities on rivers don't have roads until the civ learns Bridge Building. This is odd: if the Persians would learn Bridge Building, then my Cannons would be able to attack Susa!"

I'm not sure how to improve this. I like the idea to allow big land units to attack units on non-native land terrain, but when I give them the flag AttackNonNative, I do not like how they can attack naval units from the coast too.

Do you have any suggestion?

Related issues:

Blocks Freeciv - Task #694704: civ2civ3: introduce new features for 2.6

Closed

History

#1 - 2017-06-12 09:27 PM - David Fernandez (bard)

I confirm that it is currently not possible to use a big land unit to attack a city on Swamp or Jungle, when the city is on a river and the owner did not research bridge building. While it do is possible to attack with big land units as soon as they research bridge building.

Right now, I have no idea how to fix it.

#2 - 2017-06-12 10:50 PM - Anonymous

AttackNonNative is fine for cannons, when compared to other lame concepts :D
It's not more stupid than figters attacking submarines, when it should be otherwise, submarines should attack figters.
Ships attacking cities when they cannot conquer them is stupid too, units should just ignore ships and stay off coast :D
Also how frigates are so powerful without gunpowder and metallurgy?
Figters staying whole turns in air and blocking tiles is probably worst idea ever.

#3 - 2017-06-13 01:40 AM - David Fernandez (bard)

AttackNonNative is fine for cannons, when compared to other lame concepts

But it'd change the gameplay a lot in a way that would allow land units to kill naval units, and would require tests and adjustments for balance. For example catapults could sink ironclads, and armours could destroy battleships with current values.
My plan was to give the bombardment ability to big land units (as civ3), taking advantage of the new features of v3.0, that will be hard to balance too, but I think easier than AttackNonNative.

For this issue, I'd prefer some simple workaround that allows cities to be always native to big land units. There must be some combination of flags or extra's properties that allows it, I'm trying to test it.

About the other lame concepts, I like to try to address them when possible.

It's not more stupid than figters attacking submarines, when it should be otherwise, submarines should attack figters.

Good point. I tried to give submarines greater defense (5) than the attack of fighters (4) to avoid this. But now it is possible to use custom unit flags to give submarines defense bonuses against all air attacks.

Ships attacking cities when they cannot conquer them is stupid too, units should just ignore ships and stay off coast

I like how it forces the attacker to send cargo ships with troops to conquer cities, but I see your point. My plan again is to replace the non native attack by bombardment, for sea to land attacks (as civ3).

Also how frigates are so powerful without gunpowder and metallurgy?
I agree too. But that issue is hard to fix without heavy changes to the tech tree.

Fighters staying whole turns in air and blocking tiles is probably worst idea ever.

This one might require a new ticket, because that idea was mine and it is included in current civ2civ3 version, but I'm up to revise it. However, it is not a big change compared to classic rules where bombers were already capable to do the same.

#4 - 2017-06-13 02:55 PM - David Fernandez (bard)
I found a simple way to fix it: to give roads the flag "AlwaysOnCityCenter" instead of "AutoOnCityCenter", and to reduce by one the trade generated in a city with river and no bridge building.
I'll do the patch when the source code is available again.

#5 - 2017-06-13 03:09 PM - Marko Lindqvist
David Fernandez (bard) wrote:

reduce by one the trade generated in a city with river and no bridge building.

Note that the road does not give trade on all terrains. So this change means you will get trade from Forest+River when it's not city center, but not when it's city center.

#6 - 2017-07-02 01:30 PM - Jacob Nevins
I'll do the patch when the source code is available again.

It is now.
Do you intend this to go in 2.6? It's OK to make ruleset changes until 2.6.0-beta1 (but I'd like to release that soon).

#7 - 2017-07-02 01:35 PM - Jacob Nevins
BTW another possible way to make ruleset effects apply to city centres would be to make a new road/base something especially for the purpose, with no graphics, which is unbuildable but AlwaysOnCityCenter. The only user-visible bit would be the name, which you could call "City Center" or something.
(Might need to take care to remove it via Lua when the city goes away? Also I don't know if the game engine / supplied tilesets make it easy to make an extra with no graphics -- we might want to add a dummy sprite to supplied tilesets for the purpose, if not?)

#8 - 2017-07-02 03:57 PM - David Fernandez (bard)
Marko Lindqvist wrote:

Note that the road does not give trade on all terrains. So this change means you will get trade from Forest+River when it's not city center, but not when it's city center.

Right, thank you.
I made a patch taking that into account, but it creates an exception in the rules that I'm not liking: cities on rivers get roads for free, but not the bonus to trade.
I'm thinking that it would be simpler, and easier to explain, if all cities get roads for free (bonus to trade included), and we remove the incompatibility of farmland and roads in the City Center tile. Same behavior as older freeciv versions.

Jacob Nevins wrote:

BTW another possible way to make ruleset effects apply to city centres would be to make a new road/base something especially for the purpose, with no graphics, which is unbuildable but AlwaysOnCityCenter. The only user-visible bit would be the name, which you could call "City Center" or something.

I'll test this approach.

(Might need to take care to remove it via Lua when the city goes away?)

Maybe not needed. Since those tiles are already marked with ruins, it is not odd that units can move on them like on cities.

Also I don't know if the game engine / supplied tilesets make it easy to make an extra with no graphics -- we might want to add a dummy sprite to supplied tilesets for the purpose, if not?)
I think the tileset does not load unless there is gfx for every extra, but keeping roads or ruins as alternate graphic should not break compatibility with other tilesets.

I'll make both patches.

#9 - 2017-07-02 06:13 PM - David Fernandez (bard)
- File civ2civ3-road_alwaysoncitycenter-trunk.patch added

Simplest patch:
Changes roads from AutoOnCityCenter to AlwaysOnCityCenter.
Updates helptext of roads, and sandbox.

#10 - 2017-07-06 12:26 AM - David Fernandez (bard)

Jacob Nevins wrote:

(Might need to take care to remove it via Lua when the city goes away?

Maybe not needed. Since those tiles are already marked with ruins, it is not odd that units can move on them like on cities.

I was wrong, ruins may dissapear when pillaged or when terrain changes, while this "city center" extra would remain. I think it'd require a lua script to remove it properly as you said.

However, I'm not sure if it is worth to introduce a new extra for this purpose, knowing that it won't be possible to remove it in the future (if it appears a better solution) because it'd break savegame compatibility.

I vote to include the simple patch of my previous post in version 2.6 beta, if you agree.

#11 - 2017-07-08 07:18 PM - Jacob Nevins

The 'experimental' ruleset doesn't suffer from this, because its Big Land units can travel on rivers.

#12 - 2017-07-08 07:51 PM - Jacob Nevins
- Status changed from New to Closed
- Assignee set to Jacob Nevins
- Sprint/Milestone set to 2.6.0-beta1

#13 - 2017-07-08 08:26 PM - David Fernandez (bard)

Jacob Nevins wrote:

The 'experimental' ruleset doesn't suffer from this, because its Big Land units can travel on rivers.

Good point. I removed for civ2civ3 the nativity of rivers for big land units because I wanted some disadvantage for wheeled units (like armors) while moving on rivers without bridges.

#14 - 2017-07-11 09:17 PM - Marko Lindqvist

Jacob Nevins wrote:

It's OK to make ruleset changes until 2.6.0-beta1

Can you clarify if you oppose ANY rule changes between beta1 and 2.6.0 final, or only those that break savegame compatibility?

#15 - 2017-07-11 09:24 PM - Jacob Nevins

Can you clarify if you oppose ANY rule changes between beta1 and 2.6.0 final, or only those that break savegame compatibility?

The latter, I think. Tweaking the size of defence bonuses and the like should be fine.

#16 - 2017-09-02 10:41 AM - Jacob Nevins
- Related to Task #694704: civ2civ3: introduce new features for 2.6 added
#17 - 2017-09-02 10:42 AM - Jacob Nevins
- Related to deleted (Task #694704: civ2civ3: introduce new features for 2.6)

#18 - 2017-09-02 10:42 AM - Jacob Nevins
- Blocks Task #694704: civ2civ3: introduce new features for 2.6 added
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