

Well, saying Pathfinder has some "potentially gamebreaking flaws" is an understatement. Pathfinder is built atop a poorly balanced system and it exacerbated the imbalances. Sure, they tried to reign in the biggest excesses, but at the same time they widened the caster/non-caster divide by nerfing a lot of combat feats (power attack, expanding feat chains, etc.) and sometimes classes outright (rogue, monk), while giving the casting classes more shiny toys (Paragon Surge, Create Pit, better hitpoints, less drawbacks to being a specialist wizard, favored class system rewarding single-classed characters when martial multiclass a ton). Casters can often trivialize encounters with a single spell at just about every level (level 1? Sleep and color spray mainly. Level 3? Create Pit Level 5? The list keeps going) and the divine casters get shiny domain powers and can frequently be more powerful in melee than the martial classes and this is without factoring in possible animal companions and shit. The Summoner's pet Eidolon has been proven to do better damage than an entire Fighter player character and the Summoner has FAR more up his sleeves than the Eidolon.

**Anonymous** 04/09/14(Wed)16:35 UTC-6 [No.31370137](#)

Replies: [>>31370167](#)

[>>31370111](#)

There's just too many trap options in Pathfinder. A dualwield build for instance sounds fine until you realize how many feats you're burning on the build. A Monk sounds cool but it's horribly crippled. (I think Sean K. Reynolds, Pathfinder Designer has been on file saying he hates the Monk class.) The Rogue has been crippled as well (Quick Draw nerf, flat-footed nerfs, tumbling nerfs, sneak attack nerf, new skill consolidations etc making the skill monkey position unnecessary). Even playable classes frequently have archetypes that despite sounding nice and flavorful are actually devastatingly bad, like Vow of Poverty Monk. Whip builds are so ridiculously feat intensive (3 feats on top of exotic proficiency) that very few classes can manage it to proper effect. New combat maneuver system is also really unreliable due to size/str/dex/BAB modifiers strongly favoring monsters and the relevant feat chains are just too long. What all this leads to is a very large number of decisions players can make that would utterly cripple their character. But the Paizo fans will frequently bitch about how it's supposed to be about roleplaying (then why the fuck is Pathfinder such a mechanics-heavy game, eh?) and you're just not a fun guy if you focus on making effective builds, so really if you have a lousy time playing a character that is dead weight it's all your fault for lacking the proper sense of fun.

**Anonymous** 04/09/14(Wed)16:37 UTC-6 [No.31370167](#)

Replies: [>>31370242](#)

[>>31370137](#)

Heck, it's not even an improvement on 3.5

Wizards got improved hit dice, ability to cast out of banned schools, and domain powers. The Divination Wizard has ridiculous initiative and ability to act in a surprise round. They also get to use the new favored class bonus for 1 extra HP each level. Sorcerer got human favored class bonus and crazy bloodline powers, OP archetype called Razmiran Priest, and UMD as a class skill. Clerics gained domain powers and free proficiency with their deity's favored weapon (but lost heavy armor prof.), and Druids can take a Domain over an animal companion (1 domain gives an animal companion with level penalty). Cantrips are at-will, so you can Detect Magic entire dungeons. Half a dozen PrCs (Daivrat, Pathfinder Savant, Magaambyan Arcanist, Veiled Illusionist, Agent of the Grave, Dawnflower Dissident) plus items, feats, and Samsaran Mystic Past Life racial trait let your caster use spells not on the list. Paragon Surge spell breaks almost every caster. Esoteric Training guild boon (not a feat, free benefit for high rep) gives extra spellcasting levels enabling all sorts of degenerate shit. New disable spells that target reflex save. And just in case you're still not sure PF is more caster edition than 3.5, you have retarded crap like the new Arcanist class (a Wizard who casts his prepared spells spontaneously with some stupid good perks) or Scarred Witch Doctor (A Witch who uses CONSTITUTION - a stat that can also get buffed sky high for scary DCs - as his casting stat).

**Anonymous** 04/09/14(Wed)16:39 UTC-6 [No.31370242](#)

Replies: [>>31370267](#)

[>>31370167](#)

Rogues cannot sneak attack with splash weapons, lost most methods to make opponents flatfooted, and now that cross-class skills are so penalty-free, concentration is no longer a skill, skills have been consolidated, and int bonuses now give retroactive skillpoints, the wizard is going to take over their skill monkey role. Trapfinding can now be done by anyone with Perception, which everyone maxes. Cleric/Druid/Ranger is a better trapfinder than the Rogue.

Mundanes got hit worst by losing flaws for feats and many combat feats were nerfed or split up for bigger feat chains. So martial classes aren't as effective at low levels. It's not until level 15 that a PF char's feats are equal to a 3.5 with 2 flaws. Caster feats are unchanged plus new Persistent and Dazing metamagics. Also, new combat maneuver system favors monsters over players due to size, str, and dex modifiers, so players cannot depend on maneuvers against most monsters, making combat maneuver builds a giant trap. At the same time you no longer have access to Tome of Battle martial classes in PF, which were basically genuinely versatile martial classes (and therefore considered too good by Paizo).

**Anonymous** 04/09/14(Wed)16:40 UTC-6 [No.31370267](#)

Replies: [>>31370521](#)

[>>31370242](#)

Monk got nerfed into oblivion. Bards lost their ability to linger performances (and stack multiple performances) (feat & spell taxes to cover this now) and get a shitty rounds/day pool instead of uses/day. So now a Bard's "Inspire Competence" and "Fascinate" is shit because anything worth using it on costs too many rounds. But there's another spell tax (Toilsome Chant) to make Inspire Competence last. It's a dwarf racial spell though. The Bard gets Versatile Performance as a skill multiplier though, but its mechanics are headache inducing.

Meanwhile Paizo does their damndest to make sure every arcane caster can UMD, proving they have no fucking idea what they're doing. Alchemist, Sorcerer, Witch, Magus, and Summoner all get UMD as a class skill. UMD was made so rogues can use magic items, and the two rogue classes were the Thief (now renamed to Rogue) and Bard. Instead Paizo hands it to fucking everyone because they cannot understand what a decent skill system is or character roles. They added a new skill though: Fly. It's the new "caster skill" but also screws over any melee characters who manage to gain flight through buffs or magic items (because these dudes won't get a Fly skill high like most casters).

[>>](#)

**Anonymous** 04/09/14(Wed)16:51 UTC-6 [No.31370521](#)

Replies: [>>31370978](#)

[>>31370267](#)

New Trait system enables all sorts of degenerate crap. Back to UMD, you can get UMD as a class skill

(Dangerously Curious, Underlying Principals) and make it key off of INT (Pragmatic Activator) instead of Cha (Paizo REALLY likes to give their arcane casters UMD, you see). A number of traits allow you to change the primary attribute of skills. And traits like Defensive Strategist (almost Uncanny Dodge), Glory of Old (+1 all saves vs spells & poison), Fate's Favored (+1 to all luck bonuses), Magical Lineage (-1 metamagic costs for 1 spell), Wayang Spellhunter (-1 metamagic cost for 1 spell 3rd level or lower), Hedge Magician (-5% crafting costs), Eastern Mysteries (1/day: +2 to spell DC) among others really do too much for 1 trait.

Heck, Paizo (the makers of Pathfinder) used to be the geniuses who ran Dragon Magazine (which added heaps of 3.5 content) back in the day, and they were INFAMOUS for the poor quality of their work. They're the kind of Designer with a capital D because they have an inflated opinion of themselves and believe they're just brilliant in the face of facts logic, and even careful testing. Also, serious criticism, no matter how lucid and evidenced, is grounds for bans from the Paizo forums because that's considered disruptive and disrespectful - so basically Paizo surrounds themselves with sycophants. It's a toxic community on their boards. Well, predictably, when Paizo went ahead to make their own improved version of 3.5, they failed at actually improving it. Since it was still 3.5 (and WotC was doing everything in its power to discontinue the official 3.5 product line), it got bandwagoned en masse by gamers and 3rd party developers who still wanted to stick with 3.5 products, which gave it such a huge market share.

In the words of one Char Op poster: "Pathfinder was made by people who know terrible things go on in the depths on the CharOp boards, but without any real knowledge of what actually happens."

Nicos Star Voter

I would like to talk about those options that only bring the illusion of choice, I will call them false options. But lets first give the words a precise meaning.

For the sake of this thread A false choise can be one of the following two

- 1)An option that bad that if you take it you are crippling yourself.
- 2) An option that is so good that if you do not taking you are crippling yourself.

As an example of the first cathegory I propose the following

Spoiler:

a) Crossbows

A fighter can specialize in crossbows or in bows. In fact there are archetypes for both styles. But the truth is that bows are so superior compared to cossbows that is not funny. The only reason as a fighter(or ranger or wahtever) t have to be inferior just to play that character concept.

b) Thrown weapons

Same as a).

As an example of the first category I propose the following

Spoiler:

a) Stat boosters

Most character NEEDS these items, this is computed in the CR of the monster. Ther is an expectation embedded in the spirit of PF that a character will have acces to this items sooner or later. So, when a player could buy a belt of f "really cool but not that strong effect" the most common choise is the stat booster item.

Now, you COULD choise the other item, that is not the point. the point is that the other item is, generally speaking, inferior mechanically.

a) Gloves of dueling

Same as a).

c) instant enemy

The ranger smite changed radically the game for rangers. A 10 level ranger with instant enemy is just plain superior than one ranger without access to taht spell to the point.

b) invulnerable rager + superstition + beast totem + come and get me

My problem here is that this combo is so plain better than any other barbarian build that is just unfun. Particulary superstition is a rage power that make barbaria´s mediocre saves to top notch ones with just one rage power. A n purporsely weaker, by a lot. I mean A LOT.

c) Teleprtation subschool

Ok, this one is particularly ridiculous. In exchange of a prety weak attack (that becomes basically useles afther the frist couple of leveles) this subschool give a incredibly strong ability (that is even SU meaning it does not need a cr

I do not like false choises, a crossbowman should not be that inferior that an archer. it is not fair have to sacrifice that much just to play the character concept you have in mind. IMOH Either inferior options have to be improved to t sperior one, or the superior one have to be nerfed.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

I want my water-balloon-throwing fighter to be able to deal the same damage as a longbow-shooting fighter. Why does Pathfinder have trap options for some ranged characters?



Drachasor

Sean K Reynolds wrote:

I want my water-balloon-throwing fighter to be able to deal the same damage as a longbow-shooting fighter. Why does Pathfinder have trap options for some ranged characters?

Well, if there were combat feats for water-balloon throwing, an archetype for water-balloon fighters, and a combat style for water-balloon rangers, then I think there'd be a good argument for such characters being viable. There'd argument for why exactly that was in the official rules at all since it doesn't fit the setting.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

Replace "water-balloon-throwing" with any of the following



axe-throwing  
blowgun-firing  
dagger-throwing  
dart-throwing

javelin-throwing  
sling-using  
spear-throwing

and the complaint is no less ridiculous.

Some options are worse than others because the game actually tries to model that *some options in life are worse than others*. And by "worse" I mean "does less damage per round."

Nicos Star Voter

Sean K Reynolds wrote:

Replace "water-balloon-throwing" with any of the following

axe-throwing  
blowgun-firing  
dagger-throwing  
dart-throwing  
javelin-throwing  
sling-using  
spear-throwing

and the complaint is no less ridiculous.

Some options are worse than others because the game actually tries to model that *some options in life are worse than others*. And by "worse" I mean "does less damage per round."

In life I do not se how a crossbow is worst than a bow in general terms. But the complaint goes beyond that. it is not that a xbow is weaker that a bow is that a crossboman that take two feat tax is still weaker than an archer. I tl idea of having feats in the first place.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

Drachasor wrote:



With regards to the crossbowman, I don't think that's the full story of what is going on. In the long, long ago of 3.0 design, I'm sure that's what was going on. Then I imagine someone said "hey, we should give a bone to people who like c made as a kind of hack on existing rules.

I don't see how Rapid Shot is a "bone" to crossbow users, as it works for all ranged weapons.

Nicos wrote:

In life I do not se how a crossbow is worst than a bow in general terms.

It is for the same reason it is in the game: because you can't fire it as often as you can a bow.

Nicos wrote:

But the complaint goes beyond that. it is not that a xbow is weaker that a bow is that a crossboman that take two feat tax is still weaker than an archer. I think that is against the whole idea of having feats in the first place.

And the dagger fighter can take two extra feats and still deal less damage than a greatsword fighter. *Because daggers can't deal as much damage as greatswords*. There's a reason why soldiers used swords instead of daggers as th

Neo2151

Sean K Reynolds wrote:



Nicos wrote:

But the complaint goes beyond that. it is not that a xbow is weaker that a bow is that a crossboman that take two feat tax is still weaker than an archer. I think that is against the whole idea of having feats in the first place.

And the dagger fighter can take two extra feats and still deal less damage than a greatsword fighter. *Because daggers can't deal as much damage as greatswords*. There's a reason why soldiers used swords instead of daggers as their pr

There is so much wrong with this statement that my head is spinning. :P

Even ignoring the fact that swords were never a soldier's primary weapon, you're making a dishonest comparison: Bows and crossbows exist to fill the exact same niche. Daggers and greatswords do not. (The better comparison i greataxe, since the former is technically always better than the latter - Except the latter isn't so bad that no one ever uses it.)

And the true concern was never even addressed, which is upsetting. With no feats invested, picking up a bow is a better idea than picking up a crossbow. That just makes sense, as crossbows actually are much harder to reload, i might offer (such as shooting while prone) is outweighed by that fact.

*HOWEVER*, a character that invests two *whole* feats into getting better with that crossbow is *STILL* better off just picking up the bow.

That is where the "fun" stops.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

{This is a bad example. A TWF dagger user will eventually do pretty decent damage when full attacks, More than the Greatsowrd user I would say"(Again, once he have the feats).}

TWF dagger wielder can only compete with the greatsword damage if he takes several feats. Thus, my comparison is of a one-dagger-fighter vs. one-greatsword-fighter.

{Well, to nitpick a bit, swords actually weren't that common among soldiers. Historically spears and their kin were used a lot more often by armies.}

Spears were more common in war because they cost less to make than a sword, a point which is irrelevant to adventurers after level 1.

{It seems bad form to trash talk people with legitimate pathfinder complaints.}

I don't consider "Real life weapon X can't be fired as often as real life weapon Y, and I *don't like that the game models reality*" is a legitimate complaint.

Neo2151

thejeff wrote:

Actually, they do have a niche: good simple range weapon that's easy to use untrained.

~If you invest Rapid Reload it's (marginally) better than a bow if you're not strong or can't afford a compound bow. At least until you get iterative attacks.

A longbow is better than a light crossbow. So if the idea is to spend one feat, why spend one feat to make a bad weapon better, but still worse, instead of taking a feat to just be able to use the better weapon? (Ra Weapon Proficiency: Longbow)

If you're talking about a Heavy Crossbow, up the cost to two feats, and remember that even though you do 1 more damage on average, you cannot compare to a Composite bow, and you cannot access the same ranged combat i If you're talking about a Double Crossbow, the cost goes up to three feats, and while you can now take the same archery feats, you still don't compare to a composite bow.

Meanwhile we're hearing about how reality is supposed to be playing a part of design consideration, while swords are still being put on a totally unrealistic pedestal of awesomeness that real-life just doesn't account for? It's just so disingenuous.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

I think I'm done here. I can't provide you with exactly what you want for your favorite thing.



By the way, ten arrows in five seconds (skip to 1:00).

That's not remotely a full draw on a longbow (or even that short bow, I believe). So I'm not sure what's that really supposed to prove.

All the arguments about what is current in the game being realistic fall flat. In Real Life crossbows do equivalent to bonus strength damage, allowing weaker people to draw them back easily using mechanical implements also much easier to aim and provide more consistent performance. But of course, tons of factors that made crossbows good are ignored in the pro status quo arguments -- despite the fact they've been brought up numerous tir

Can't say I'm sad to see you done with the thread if you aren't even addressing the major issues the other side raises.

The fact is, there's a ton of things the game fails to capture about good crossbows. And I don't think in a setting with GUNS (and other bits of higher-end medieval technology) we should be thinking crossbows should be at the low possible.

Though, for that matter, the repeating crossbow isn't realistically an exotic weapon. It's certainly easier to learn to use well than a bow. There so many ways the weapon designs in the game aren't historically accurate that I don't try to stand; the ground so unstable that it's not even there.



Leonardo Trancoso

The new Faq says that i could have only 3 free action per round. Since talk is a free action and reload guns is a free action, when i fire 3 times i a round my char get the mute condition?



ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

I'll tell you what, train how to use a Pathfinder-style firearm, then try to reload it 3 times AND speak coherently about something else at the same time, in six seconds.



Or heck, verbally answer someone's question, answer your cell phone, and drop to the floor, all in six seconds. That's three free actions in one round. Then throw in "open a door" (a move action) and "light a torch with action) in any order you like. Can you do it? Or do you mess up one of them? How many times have you started to say something, and stopped talking in the middle because you're doing something unrelated at the sa Can you do it? Or do you mess up one of them? How many times have you started to say something, and stopped talking in the middle because you're doing something unrelated at the same time? Do you turn down the music in your car w specific address? Your brain really can only handle a certain number of things at a time or in a short period of time.

Why don't you try casting a Quickened Fireball, a standard Fireball, dropping prone, dropping a held item, and talking in a round...

Oh, wait, you can't, because you can't cast Fireballs. Oh, and you probably shouldn't be able to talk much, since you're spending 4 seconds casting spells with verbal components.

If you were to say that this limit applies to low-level characters, I'd say sure, but why couldn't a level 10 gunslinger reload with such blinding speed? This is an irritation I, and many other players, have with the double-standard in ga martial characters vs. casters: if you can't cast spells or use supernatural abilities, you are forever tethered to what is possible for a normal, real life person to perform, even though we are probably all level 1 or 2 NPC classes, with people who have probably reached level 5 or 6.

When that high level wizard is teleporting around existence, bending the universe to his will while he's flying and conjuring creatures out of thin air, your high level fighter is still ponderously reloading his firearm at the speed of some How does that make any sense?

Try talking while performing a task that you are especially practiced and adept at. It's entirely possible to speak while performing some tasks.

The limitation feels arbitrary and artificial in the context of a HEROIC fantasy game.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

yeti1069 wrote:

When that high level wizard is teleporting around existence, bending the universe to his will while he's flying and conjuring creatures out of thin air, your high level fighter is still ponderously reloading his firearm at the speed of some Hollywood stunt st that make any sense?

You either want the game to accurately model what a human being can do without using magic, or you don't want the game to accurately model what a human being can do without using magic. Pick one.

Throwing "but the magic guy can do X!" as an argument is irrelevant when we're talking about the game rules modeling what a human can physically do without using magic.

Unless you're suggesting that a mid-level gunslinger has a **magical** ability to reload a dozen times in six seconds?

137ben

Sean K Reynolds wrote:

yeti1069 wrote:

When that high level wizard is teleporting around existence, bending the universe to his will while he's flying and conjuring creatures out of thin air, your high level fighter is still ponderously reloading his firearm at the speed of some Hollywood stunt st any sense?

You either want the game to accurately model what a human being can do without using magic, or you don't want the game to accurately model what a human being can do without using magic. Pick one.

Throwing "but the magic guy can do X!" as an argument is irrelevant when we're talking about the game rules modeling what a human can physically do without using magic.

Unless you're suggesting that a mid-level gunslinger has a **magical** ability to reload a dozen times in six seconds?

By 16th level, when someone could fire 4 times in a round, a gunslinger can survive falling on their head on hard stone at terminal velocity. Mid-high level people *don't follow the normal rules of physics*. In D&D/PF, that is what "extraor you actually want to restrict a gunslinger (or any other 'non-magical' class) to stuff that only a real person could do, no non-magic class should be allowed to advance beyond level 3.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

The game accurately models what humans can do, for at least some levels of the game. That's so you can understand what your character is capable of, because it's what a real human should be capable of.

So the game spends some of its rules text defining how far you can jump, how easily you can swim, how far you can recognize details, how likely you are to hit something, and how quickly you heal. Because if a 1st-leve feet with a running start, that would break suspension of disbelief. As would a 1st-level character who could swim 20 feet in 1 second. Or hitting a stationary target 100 feet away 100% of the time. Or recovering from So you accept that the rules model those things.

But at some point, you want human characters to start to bend, and even break, the limits of what a real human could do in real life. And you want them to do it without magic.

So, for example, the monk has an extraordinary ability to fall farther, safely, and you accept that the ability starts at level 4, and improves over time, until the monk is eventually able to fall any distance (so long as he's able to make c occasionally, meaning he's catching on ledges, crashing through clotheslines, and so on, slowing his fall).

And that's why a fighter eventually gets armor mastery, the extraordinary ability to ignore damage when wearing armor, so that a hit that penetrates the armor (hits the armor's AC) does less or no damage (presumably because the turn his body so the armor catches the attack on the strongest part).

But you're still accepting that there are certain limits to what a human can do in the game without magic. You accept that a fr20 can make 4 effective attacks in 6 seconds, or perhaps 7 attacks in 6 seconds if using TWF, ITWF, and GT a limit.

And, presumably, a gunslinger20 with two fully-loaded revolvers could fire 4 shots with one and 3 with the other, for a total of 7 attacks in 6 seconds. You accept that as a limit.

But if someone suggests that reloading multiple shells (in addition to taking all 7 of those attacks in 6 seconds) is exceeding the limit of what a person should be able to do in 1 round, you start bringing up the idea that the character So how come the gunslinger gets surplus actions (more actions than the attacks from BAB and GTWF) from being "superhuman," and the fighter doesn't? If the gunslinger also gets all those reload actions, what other cool (and dami should the fighter get on his turn?

Part of the problem with "he can do this because he's superhuman" is because you aren't defining where the line is between "human" and "superhuman." Is it 6th level? 10th level? 15th? 20th? The line seems to be "wherever is cor gets all the actions I want so long as I can justify it in the rules."

There are a lot of ways to cheese the game rules. A lot of those ways arise because of the game's action economy, which is rickety and needs an overhaul. But just because there are ways to exploit the action economy doesn't char

- " Weapon cords were written before the firearm rules.
- " As were the free action rules.
- " The intent of weapon cords was to prevent you from losing a weapon, not to allow you to free-action-drop and quick-draw a second set of weapons for more attacks.
- " The reload time for firearms was a deliberate brake to slow down firearm damage compared to bows (because firearms attack touch AC and therefor hit more often), so that bows would remain a viable character option in the gam
- " The limitations to the action economy setup means that once you improve a reload time to a swift action, the only way you can improve it again is to make it a free action.
- " Which means you're in the "you can take any number of free actions on your turn" zone, which bypasses the damage brake for firearms.
- " Which means you theoretically could quick-draw 100 firearms per round, reload all of them, and drop them in your square, because of that word "any."
- " Which you have to agree is total cheese.
- " So the problem is that you don't agree with what is a "reasonable" number of free action reloads per turn.
- " But when a gunslinger11 with GTWF and two revolvers is able to shoot 6 times in one round, and the archer? is only getting 5, and the gunslinger is attacking touch AC, that's a real problem. If it were just the 1st round, that woul reloads means the gunslinger can do this **every** round.
- " So it's a combo that not only obliterates the archer's damage, but has the gunslinger making a full set of attacks **and** a bunch of reload actions, which means her hands are like lightning compared to the sword-swinging fighter—an be in melee range of his opponents, so the gunslinger is clearly better.

So... problems.

Rynjin

Sean K Reynolds wrote:

Part of the problem with "he can do this because he's superhuman" is because you aren't defining where the line is between "human" and "superhuman." Is it 6th level? 10th level? 15th? 20th? The line seems to be "wherever is convenient t actions I want so long as I can justify it in the rules."

No.

The problem is not that WE aren't defining the line properly.

The problem is that YOU and the rest of your design team, you know, for the game that YOU designed and should have drawn the line for, have not defined the line properly.

With one breath you say "These rules are meant to, after a point, model super-human feats. That is why someone can fall 200 feet and get up without a scratch, with no magical assistance."

But in the other you're saying "No, someone should not be able to reload their guns to the full capacity quickly because that would be unrealistic."

The line is ill-defined in the game itself. The difference between you challenging us to "define the line" and us doing the same to you is that WE had nothing to do with creating the rules.

YOU did.

If you're going to define the line, then do it. Don't jerk other people around by asking them to do something they have no real power over.

If you're not going to do it, that's fine too. But at that point you need to accept that the line is where each individual draws it, and at that point your opinion on where the line lies ceases to be relevant in its entirety.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

I'm not the one saying higher-level PCs are "superhuman." I used "you" over and over in that example. Yeti is the one saying higher-level heroes are "extraordinary," and MrSin is the one saying they're "super human." Their words, not mine.

I don't think the game says characters become superhuman, either. In fact, I doubt the game every specifically says, "at level X, you're basically superhuman, able to do things normal humans in the real world can't do." Their assertion. Their responsibility to prove it.

That's why I keep talking about what a human character *realistically* do in the game: because I don't think there's a point where it officially shifts gears into superhuman capability, so there's no clear point where any of us can sa the superhuman here, and it's time to discard our preconceived notions of what a human is capable of."

In fact, I think the game is pretty haphazard about applying that "superhuman" idea, because there are common "superhuman" abilities in the game that are both extraordinary and available at a relatively low level.

ff Sean K Reynolds Designer, RPG Superstar Judge

I've removed a post. When you're suggesting that I'm playing stupid and being pedantic, you've given up on trying to have a civil conversation. Thread locked.

