
Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 15:22:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

quote:Originally posted by NightAces:Primary fire can be dumbfire rockets, and secondary fire can be seeker rockets Machine guns on the tanks would make them too powerful, because they would be able to take on most units, including aircraft, easily.Placing beacons isn't too hard if you know where to do it and remember to guard it with your life. I do it 9 out of 10 games Though more realistic, the machine gun turret on the chinook is a bad idea. If you could have a chinook with a machine gun, why get an orca or an apache? It would mess up the balance.Heh - don't lecture me on beacon placement - check my number of destroyed structures - my UNOFFICIAL total is over 300 since I prefer to play on non-laddered servers...though more and more people are noticing the Timed C4 I leave as a calling card at every beacon I plant and going for IT first - luckily for me, I cap them anyway and 9 times out of 10 their relief doesn't see it.As I said before, the machine guns ARE on the tanks in the form of an ammunition gauge...yet they just don't work.And yes, I know this isn't meant to be ultra-realistic - that's why I also play Operation Flashpoint, which I credit a good deal of my "cyber-battlefield" skills to.The MLRS NEEDS the pivoting missile cabinet. It isn't fair that Nod's (Happy, ACK?) Artillery has it and the MLRS doesn't. The Arty would still have a slight edge in the fact that it can fire while retreating (very difficult to do in the MLRS).And I call an Ion Cannon Beacon an ION in-game, since a lot can happen in the time it takes to write "ION CANNON/NUCLEAR STRIKE BEACON BEHIND/ON R/L SIDE OF/TOP OF BARRACKS" - typing "ION/NUKE BARRACKS BACK/L/R SIDE/TOP" takes a lot less time - sue me, and seriously, stop calling everyone on minor inaccuracies - you sound like Homer Simpson in the ep where he's correcting the college professor on how to pronounce "Nu-clear."Two person Gunships are a workable and valid idea. The notion of one person controlling both the weapons and avionics of a gunship are kinda outlandish, though I prefer it on tanks as well as gunships. As you said before, the laser chaingunner and Raveshaws/Sakuras weren't in the original game, so there's a flaw in your argument here - not only would they make good fast insertion tools for one and make excellent extraction tools - like a buggy with a h3lluva lot more dimensional range of motion.And even if the Chinook had teeth, face it, no one in their right mind would use it as an attack weapon - it's the only chopper in the game which could actually be downed by cannon and missile fire since it's so slow to maneuver. H3ll, in RA when I didn't have a broadband connection I modified harvesters to have a .50 to keep the infantry away. That wouldn't work here but it worked in the game rather well - for both sides.People have already remarked that snipers are far too powerful in Renegade. An organized team air rushing should HAVE ground cover of Hummers/APCs to keep snipers' heads down until the last possible moment. It's good sense. Place a .50 on a tank and you now have a credible threat to all units within range, something a Main Battle Tank IS and always SHOULD BE.Obviously, to counter this, a few things would have to be implemented. First, bullets should do half the damage to Gunships (not Chinooks, which shouldn't be hanging around hovering anyway) yet sniper fire and premium weaponry should do the original amount of damage. Second, to counter the new lethality of tanks, Orcas and Apaches should have the lockable rockets I talked about. Third, the gun, like the guns on all battletanks, shouldn't have a 360 degree Y-axis range of motion or a fully 90-degree Z-axis range. Fourth, the gun should not be able to be controlled by the driver - ought to promote some teamwork, as most people love taking down air units. Fifth, the lockable rockets' range should prevent gunships from being able to get to maximum cruise height and rain rockets down on enemy positions. Lastly I'm also in agreement with TankMuncha on the .50s on the Chinook only being passenger-controllable. When I'm piloting a Chinook, the last d4mned thing

on my mind would be to stay static to eliminate a unit steadily picking away at my health. The .50s would solely be for fire support while inserting troops into a hostile environment. Raveshaws/Sydneys/and Hav/Saks would still get their bits and pieces out of it before it hit the defenses, the .50s would just give it the ability to keep anti-air inf's heads down enough to the point where they couldn't eliminate the strike altogether before it even got 1/4 the way to its destination. Besides, any team worth its weight will eliminate a Chinook before it gets to its LZ once it hits the range of your base defenses - NOT doing so means you were too busy sniping, buying tanks/choppers to set up an active defense for your base.
