
Subject: Re: Screen Resolutions

Posted by [Chuck Norris](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 19:55:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 02 July 2008 07:03 Well, it can be, obviously.... As I just demonstrated. And yes, Renegade does get played on a lot of older computers, so it is not wierd to expect some people using that settings. A couple of years ago I only had a GF 2 MX, which ment that running anything above low could cause framedrops.

And well, if you have your 865 integrated graphics then I am sure that if you for ex because your monitors native resolution is 1024Xsomething you will have to play on lowest, and still get some framedrops at times. I don't have the 865 graphics, and my monitor, being a CRT, doesn't have a native resolution (nor is it set to 1024x768). I've tried Renegade on a computer that did have those graphics though. It defaults to all high but you should turn the particles down one notch as, for example, the added effect of flames spreading onto things will slow it down at the highest setting, but at high, even those graphics can play the game reasonably. The GeForce4 MX (GeForce2 level) defaults to high and runs good at high as well. If I remember right, Renegade's requirements were back in the era where they just listed the RAM your video card needed and that it needed T&L and that's basically it. They didn't list the GPU power needed but, for example, an ATi Rage (we're talking pre-Radeon era) would not play the game much more than a slideshow despite meeting that requirement. Yes, it's an advantage of having a constant 60FPS versus an average of 40-50 that drops a bit, but actually seeing something more than the game was designed for is something else, which brings me to this, which is what you questioned at the end of your post.

If it's only an increase of 10, then I guess it's no big deal then. I was thinking we were talking about quite an addition of view (110-115+) here. If you stop and look at the numbers though, 8:5 (16:10) and 8:6 (4:3), it only seems marginally shorter (wider), but they SEEM much wider physically, which is why I thought it'd need a big change.
