
Subject: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 14:06:55 GMT

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

frankly, yes; it does.

How do you define skill? It's not the same as teamwork by a long shot. Granted some maps are not suited to 1v1s, but on a good map (basically field or most rush maps), how do you win? Pistol skills in the early game, tankskills, and most importantly, quick thinking and the ability to capitalise on an advantage. Do none of those qualify as "skill"? As opposed to, say, a team simply deciding to stank rush? It doesn't take THAT much skill to attack a building with a stank.

Imho 1v1s do prove skill, they just require a different kind of skill than larger games need. I can't argue against that fact it's always funny to see someone say "1v1?" when they're losing an argument, though.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 15:13:15 GMT

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

I agree, I 1 vs 1 a lot and nubs just leave, I always stick around until the game ends, then say gg and goodbye if I am about to leave, I dont just leave and let the game end. Plus 1 vs 1, your expected to mine, defend, rush, and pointwhore all at once, if you have a team of 5+ players, you do only 1-2 of those things the entire game and take it relaxed, in 1 vs 1, you sit on the edge of your seat, looking around every corner and defend/attack.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 15:34:51 GMT

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

1on1? Renegade isn't balanced for this stuff. Some Maps are impossible to win with base destruction. And because you can't watch a whole base alone AND attack it's pretty much luck.

Forexample a beacon is practicaly doom for the defender on maps like islands or compley/canyon. Check all buildings + killing the beaconddefender AND disarm it is pretty much impossible.

the winner of a 1on1 is pretty much random

just say you are about to attack the enemy base and right when you are insidehis base you hear "beacon planted" you can now choose, Selfkill or run. both takes about 20sec or more to get to the PED/or a structure. now you have to kill the other guy. if he shows up. also think of the guarding timed. Oh and maybe it was just a fake.

Some people own with infantry yes. But in a standart game i don't run into them with infantry If there is a good sniper on the enemy team i usually tend to show him the flaws of sniperrifles with my tank.

Also in Renegade it's nearly imposible to create a fair 1on1 situation, it's all about distance cover, char, vehicle, who-sees-who-first.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 15:49:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony 1on1? :>

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 19:33:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't do 1v1's. I do dodge. I never really accept them. My reason is clear and simple. I do not play Renegade to be the best or to have skill. I play Renegade to have fun. I don't care if I'm a n00b or not.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 19:48:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

n0 1t do34nt!!111one!!!

Too bad that 90% of people would disagree, and 100% of those people, even know its because they blow

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 20:07:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

said the man whose name is trooprm02.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [w0dka](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 20:49:27 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 14:33I don't do 1v1's. I do dodge. I never really accept them. My reason is clear and simple. I do not play Renegade to be the best or to have skill. I play Renegade to have fun. I don't care if I'm a n00b or not.

my opinion. Maybe thats the point i like Renegade more then other FPS it'S a bit more funny and less progaming.

A guy who is superior with rawjet's is volnerable to even a noob in a medtank

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 21:43:47 GMT

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

Surth wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 15:07said the man whose name is trooprm02.

What? M2M? G_G

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 21:54:24 GMT

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

Want a game?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 23:03:12 GMT

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

pub n00bs have no idea what skill is so there never gona agree wit spoony

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 23:05:46 GMT

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

SoQReaL wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 18:03pub n00bs have no idea what skill is so there never gona agree wit spoony

I'm guessing this message will make me a n00b...

Skill isn't really a fact, it's more of a opinion. Taken differently from each person's point of view and perspective. Personally, I think skill is different in sperate areas of challenges and such. So being skillful at ren can mean anything... Let's say, being skillful at modding, at 5 v 5's, etc. 1v1s are hard, but they don't make you really skillful at the rest of ren.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 23:24:15 GMT

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

SoQReaL wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 18:03pub n00bs have no idea what skill is so there never gona agree wit spoony

So far I am a "pub n00b" but I fully agree with Spoony.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 10:19:11 GMT

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

Quote:

Skill isn't really a fact, it's more of a opinion. Taken differently from each person's point of view and perspective. Personally, I think skill is different in sperate areas of challenges and such. So being skillful at ren can mean anything... Let's say, being skillful at modding, at 5 v 5's, etc. 1v1s are hard, but they don't make you really skillful at the rest of ren. There are some skills, like Pistol, Tankaim and such which you will need in every Renegade game, be it 1on1, 2on2 or 4on4. So, 1on1 does prove superior Pistolskills if nothing else.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 11:19:56 GMT

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

bullshit surth .. 1v1 field.. you need brains? you need to be able to didge and pistol the guy.

Then depending on what you buy if you save harv? or harvwalk..
its all about tankfighting and brains..

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 11:21:03 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 18:05SoQReaL wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 18:03pub n00bs have no idea what skill is so there never gona agree wit spoony
I'm guessing this message will make me a n00b...

Skill isn't really a fact, it's more of an opinion. Taken differently from each person's point of view and perspective. Personally, I think skill is different in separate areas of challenges and such. So being skillful at ren can mean anything... Let's say, being skillful at modding, at 5 v 5's, etc. 1v1s are hard, but they don't make you really skillful at the rest of ren.

LOL w.e if a skilled person joins a 5v5 game.. the skillfull guy gets his team to win...

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 11:22:21 GMT

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

I dont understand your message tbh.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 11:38:37 GMT

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

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34 1on1? Renegade isn't balanced for this stuff. Some Maps are impossible to win with base destruction. A win on points is a win. Westwood specifically designed the game as such.

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34 And because you can't watch a whole base alone AND attack it's pretty much luck. No, it's using quick thinking to know when to attack and when to defend.

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34 For example a beacon is practically doom for the defender on maps like islands or complex/canyon. Check all buildings + killing the beacon defender AND disarm it is pretty much impossible. That's why they cost 1000.

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34 the winner of a 1on1 is pretty much random. In that case, I'd love to know why certain players consistently win them...

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34 Some people own with infantry yes. But in a standard game I don't run into them with infantry. If there is a good sniper on the enemy team I usually tend to show him the flaws of sniperrifles with my tank. Firstly someone who gets a sniper in a 1v1 is an idiot unless the enemy's lost the WF/strip, secondly on most maps you definitely need good infantry skills to secure an early advantage.

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34 Also in Renegade it's nearly impossible to create a fair 1on1 situation, it's all about distance cover. You mean who's skilled and savvy enough to use cover to their advantage, and quick-witted

enough to get there in good time?

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34char

You mean who's got the brains to know what infantry to use and the skill to use it effectively?

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34vehicle

see above, but replace "infantry" with "vehicle"

w0dka wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 16:34who-sees-who-first.

...what are you looking for if not your only opponent?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Jamie or NuneGa](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 11:44:55 GMT

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

i think this point needs to be emphasized!!

1v1's are boring

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 12:24:02 GMT

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

One flaw about 1on1 btw: Spawnluck can spell doom on you.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 13:49:59 GMT

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

WHO THE FUCK CARES

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 13:51:55 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 07:38...

uhm... some people play 1on1 seriously? interesting fact.

Nah... nothing for me. I deeply hate RTS-Games like WC3, CnC in Multiplayer mode. After a hard day i didn't want to play alone vs. someone who wants to kill me.

Renegade is for me the feeling to help a buddy in danger and, maybe get help if i am in danger of getting filled up with bullets from a apc.

But back to topic. Yep i suck at 1on1. But i'm good at team based action where you can work together.

big fun, big rush on Field rushing out with 5 lights and a art in the back is especially for me much more fun then running around defending, attacking and staying alive the whole time trying to fill every single role. I'm not in hurry, i want to play my char and not the whole barracks and war factory simultaneously.

1on1 as a test of skills? No! For me it's like letting a swimmer fight vs. Vladimir Klitschko.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 13:53:23 GMT

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

NuNeGa wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 06:44i think this point needs to be emphasized!!

1v1's are boring

Each to their own. My point isn't whether 1v1s are enjoyable - nobody can arbitrarily decide that because it'll always be an opinion, not a fact - this thread's to debate the often-stated assertion that it doesn't prove skill.

W0dka, I'm interested to hear your answer to my question in the first post: How do you define skill?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 14:10:24 GMT

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

Skill for me?

Work in teams, know when your allie needs help and also know when someone could help you.

Comunication, a few jokes, quick discussions what to do next, what does who where when?

Knowing the game, when do what, what is in this situation useless? Which unit is perfect for which job?

hit that you want to hit, know how to drive/shoot.

1on1 simple misses the first two points :/

i love the feeling being part of a team solving a problem. If this problem is something javabased or a whole siege on field doesn't matter.

If you want to fight me fight me and my team. This is my usually answer for "lol n00b 1on1?"

1on1 is too much competition for me. i miss the fun there.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 14:13:49 GMT

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

ok, whos your team?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 14:28:21 GMT

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

those guys i actually playing with. Maybe a bunch friends i get to play renegade, a few public players, if i'm GDI, GDI is my team if Nod, Nod is my team.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 15:05:42 GMT

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

lol public server n00bs..

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 16:03:58 GMT

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

w0dka wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 09:10Skill for me?

Work in teams, know when your allie needs help and also know when someone could help you.

Comunication, a few jokes, quick discussions what to do next, what does who where when?
This is teamwork, not skill. They're both vital, but they're completely different things.

w0dka wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 09:10Knowing the game, when do what, what is in this situation useless? Which unit is perfect for which job?

hit that you want to hit, know how to drive/shoot.

Everything in this part is vital for 1v1s. And if they constitute skill, how can you claim that 1v1s

don't require skill?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 17:56:04 GMT

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

1 V 1's do need skill, but they don't make you better than a person who say, cannot pistol like you, but can play as part of a team in larger game.

1 v 1's do not prove EVERYTHING. (Sorry Troop, they DO NOT. No, really.)

Thread over.

Edit - Yep. Spooky's right (Post below this one)

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Spooky](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 17:59:11 GMT

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

pretty much, yeah. They prove skill, but they don't prove what it takes to win bigger games, which is skill AND teamwork. They also don't mean you've won the argument unless the argument is "I'm better than you at 1v1s"

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 23:08:16 GMT

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

SoQReaL wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 10:05lol public server n00bs..

n00b referring to players who are new or behave like they are new to a game. usually in a insulting way. Why you want to insult me?

And whats wrong with public games, sure i would prefer if anyone work together but a public server offers you the opportunity for quick action, a game with a huge battle, everywhere action.

@Spooky

I think teamwork is skill. Why? You need to learn how to work with your team. When just say they will handle it, trust them. Work so they can help you and you help them. A team is not a bunch of guys who screw your work or don't get things done that you wouldn'T get done.

Simple thing:

Field, Your're GDI Nod filled Field with Arts, Lights maybe a tech out there. You're Team decide to retake field with Med'S covered by a mlrs maybe. A fakeion is planted, hopefully one nod guy is retreating you rush out.

Situation a)

You' re Med gets focused,
you can retreat and repair,
rush to a enemy and try to C4 him or
drive to a friendly tank to repair it from behind.

Situation b)

You're Friends Med gets focused
you can just fire at the enemy hope he fix it himself/retreat
block the hits from the enemys with your med to get him a few extra seconds
hop out and repair him

in all two situations you have to learn what is the right choice.
Adn don'T start with TS2 ... vital seconds.... hectic screaming...X want to say Y what to do... all
this isn't good for overal performance.

But you're right with 1on1 it takes skill, but i personally didn't like the way . changed my mind a bit.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 23:55:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have a horrible pistol and I almost always win 1v1's..

it muzt be luckz!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!111111111

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Spony](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 03:03:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Compared to who?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 10:13:04 GMT

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

Quote:

Adn don'T start with TS2 ... vital seconds.... hectic screaming...X want to say Y what to do... all this isn't good for overal performance. lol.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 11:27:22 GMT

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

I think (always have done) 1v1 skill is far more important that any other skill in Renegade. When I played Ren to be better then the rest I was always willing to 1v1 people to test my skill.

The reason I think 1v1 skill is more important is because if you can't think for yourself and win the game using your tactics then whats the point trying to play online. Anyone, even a newbie can get a tank and join the battlefield to hit a building, that in my opinion doesn't really mean shit, yeah ok its teampay but said person is acting on what he sees everyone else doing. That im my book isn't skill.

At the end of the day, skill is skill and teampay is teampay. If you're in a large game, being skillful by yourself isn't going to win the game.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 11:50:30 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 06:27

At the end of the day, skill is skill and teampay is teampay. If you're in a large game, being skillful by yourself isn't going to win the game.

mmmmm i beg to differ, im sure plenty have people have turned "large games" on there side due to there skill. E.G Rushin there air/weps with a tech GG

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 12:29:25 GMT

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

SoQReaL wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 12:50Caveman wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 06:27

At the end of the day, skill is skill and teampay is teampay. If you're in a large game, being skillful by yourself isn't going to win the game.

mmmmm i beg to differ, im sure plenty have people have turned "large games" on there side due to there skill. E.G Rushin there air/weps with a tech GG

Im not saying that is not possible, it is very possible that a single good player has tilt the game into there teams favor. However, In a large game like 10v10 and up, 1 single person does not win the game no matter how good they are. You might be godlike but if 10 people come at you you might pistol a few of them but you will die.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 12:39:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Caveman wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 08:29SoQReaL wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 12:50Caveman wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 06:27
At the end of the day, skill is skill and teamplay is teamplay. If you're in a large game, being skillful by yourself isn't going to win the game.

mmmmm i beg to differ, im sure plenty have people have turned "large games" on there side due to there skill. E.G Rushin there air/weps with a tech GG

Im not saying that is not possible, it is very possible that a single good player has tilt the game into there teams favor. However, In a large game like 10v10 and up, 1 single person does not win the game no matter how good they are. You might be godlike but if 10 people come at you you might pistol a few of them but you will die.

Actually it is possible to beat the game with 1 person. I guess it really depends on the skill of all of the other players. This one time it was the same people, it was a 15 vs 15 player game one time and thhis guy, "xii", had like MVP*6. He musta been really good, but he could have benn hacking. Not sure weather he was or not.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 12:41:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MVP*6 in 15v15 -> spent a lot of time in arts or mrls probably. That requires no skill whatsoever.

Sneaking with a tech doesn't necessarely require skill either. Remember the quote Spoony posted "I'm hiding behind a rock"?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Caveman](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 15:12:04 GMT

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

The Elite Officer wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 13:39Caveman wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 08:29SoQReaL wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 12:50Caveman wrote on Fri, 28 September 2007 06:27

At the end of the day, skill is skill and teamplay is teamplay. If you're in a large game, being skillful by yourself isn't going to win the game.

mmmmm i beg to differ, im sure plenty have people have turned "large games" on there side due to there skill. E.G Rushin there air/weps with a tech GG

Im not saying that is not possible, it is very possible that a single good player has tilt the game into there teams favor. However, In a large game like 10v10 and up, 1 single person does not win the game no matter how good they are. You might be godlike but if 10 people come at you you might pistol a few of them but you will die.

Actually it is possible to beat the game with 1 person. I guess it really depends on the skill of all of the other players. This one time it was the same people, it was a 15 vs 15 player game one time and thhis guy, "xii", had like MVP*6. He musta been really good, but he could have benn hacking. Not sure weather he was or not.

What and this Xil dude won the match single handed.. No support from his team whatsoever in a 15v15. Very very unlikely.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 15:50:28 GMT

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

No he was not in an arty or MRLS, he also was not sneaking with a tech either. He was playing really good. I think that everybody (even me)was a nOOB, and like I said earlier he could have been hacking. If he was, he musta been playing it well. But no joke he had like MVP*6 wehn I finally left the game.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Sat, 29 Sep 2007 12:15:07 GMT

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

aint hard to get mvp.. lmao

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Sat, 29 Sep 2007 15:59:31 GMT

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

It may not be too hard to sneak in with a tech, but to actually DO something with it, instead of getting killed...
That takes alittle more skill.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 29 Sep 2007 23:15:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You do realize that a player can receive MVP even if they were on the losing team. (I happen to know Xii, he's an APC whore.)

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Sun, 30 Sep 2007 19:57:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ethenal wrote on Sat, 29 September 2007 19:15You do realize that a player can receive MVP even if they were on the losing team. (I happen to know Xii, he's an APC whore.)

I know another APC whore,
.Dot anyone?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Fri, 05 Oct 2007 12:39:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

w0dka wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 19:08SoQReaL wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 10:05lol public server n00bs..

n00b referring to players who are new or behave like they are new to a game. usually in a insulting way. Why you want to insult me?

And whats wrong with public games, sure i would prefer if anyone work together but a public server offers you the oppurtunity for quick action, a game with a huge battle, everywhere action.

@Spoony

I think teamwork is skill. Why? You need to learn how to work with your team. When just say they will handle it, trust them. Work so they can help you and you help them. A team is not a bunch of guys who screw your work or don't get things done that you wouldn'T get done.

Simple thing:

Field, Your're GDI Nod filled Field with Arts, Lights maybe a tech out there. You're Team decide to retake field with Med'S covered by a mlrs maybe. A fakeion is planted, hopefully one nod guy is retreating you rush out.

Situation a)

You' re Med gets focused,
you can retreat and repair,
rush to a enemy and try to C4 him or
drive to a friendly tank to repair it from behind.

Situation b)

You're Friends Med gets focused
you can just fire at the enemy hope he fix it himself/retreat
block the hits from the enemys with your med to get him a few extra seconds
hop out and repair him

in all two situations you have to learn what is the right choice.
Adn don'T start with TS2 ... vital seconds.... hectic screaming...X want to say Y what to do... all
this isn't good for overal performance.

But you're right with 1on1 it takes skill, but i personally didn't like the way . changed my mind a bit.

Can I say owned???

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 06 Oct 2007 03:09:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, you can't.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Sat, 06 Oct 2007 07:42:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did someone seriously say that TS2 would be a bad thing LOL?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 06 Oct 2007 09:09:23 GMT

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

Tunaman[quote title=Tunaman wrote on Sat, 06 October 2007 02:42Did someone seriously say that TS2 would be a bad thing LOL?

Yeah, that was pretty much the "climax" of the thread.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 06 Oct 2007 21:13:12 GMT

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

I haven't ever played a formal 1 v 1, but I'm going to assume the quick thinking necessary to jump from repairing a building, to keeping the enemy occupied, and then a moment later demolishing one their own structures, would require quite a bit of skill.

And SoQReal, quit harping at "public server 'n00bs" . You know, some people just play for the fun of it, and enjoy playing on a server that has a variety of skill levels. To me, that's what makes this game so fun to play.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Sun, 07 Oct 2007 14:56:18 GMT

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

no ... this game is fun because of the tank fights ingame imo.. mrls > stanks these days

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 08 Oct 2007 07:40:04 GMT

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

BartGg wrote on Sun, 07 October 2007 09:56no ... this game is fun because of the tank fights ingame imo.. mrls > stanks these days

The stank driver is gay that's why.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 05:40:41 GMT

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

Really? Because unless the MRLS is stupid, and gets three on him before he gets one, he will usually kill the stank.

I've never lost a fight against a Stank, in ANY vehicle aside from humvee's and APC's (which, I usually dont lose with..)

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 06:48:32 GMT

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

A non-gay Stank will sneak up on a MLRS and get 2 shots before the MRLS can react...and there were a couple times when I did not even get scratched.

And I can understand why MRLS can kill Stanks when clogged up near the base entrances (Field) and in the vehicle passageways in certain maps (Mesa, Hourglass, etc).

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 06:50:06 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 09 October 2007 02:48A non-gay Stank will sneak up on a MLRS and get 2 shots before the MRLS can react...and there were a couple times when I did not even get scratched.

And I can understand why MRLS can kill Stanks when clogged up near the base entrances (Field) and in the vehicle passageways in certain maps (Mesa, Hourglass, etc).

An MRLS doesnt belong in the open. Alone.
Period.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 07:00:41 GMT

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

to be honest. MRLS> all if you can use them good.. because a 6 lock is pretty fuckin nasty

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 15:50:17 GMT

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

BartGg wrote on Tue, 09 October 2007 03:00to be honest. MRLS> all if you can use them good.. because a 6 lock is pretty fuckin nasty

If you are not a nOOB and you can successfully drive the MRLS, you can really own. But mostly only nOOBs drive them so....they get killed easily and that causes no one to think that highly of the MRLS.

Back on to topic

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 18:02:31 GMT

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

If your stank gets killed by a MRLS then I feel sorry for you...

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Tue, 09 Oct 2007 18:25:29 GMT

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

whatever tuna. on field the med @hill shooting front. normally gets a splash hit on the stank then the mrls is like hi.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Wed, 10 Oct 2007 02:01:12 GMT

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

Um, 1v1's are sorta a big deal. Its show how a player goes about with very basic skills/strategies, within the first 1min, most people can tell how the match is gonna go based on what that player has choosen to do, how they faugh early in the game and etc. I'd much rather be better @ 1v1's which atleast shows basic tactics, than bigger server play because 1)thats where all the new kids go straight to anyway, and 2)theres alot of big servers that don't focus on TP anyway. Also not to say public servers are bad, considering they make of (I'd say) 75% of total games, there a good thing.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 10 Oct 2007 08:07:22 GMT

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

So, in a nutshell, what you are saying is that the highest and most worthy game type is a 1v1 duel- in a game which was designed from the ground up as a team-based game?

No, I do not agree. Whatever the mechanical skills a 1v1 requires, it does not test every aspect of gameplay and therefore cannot be a test of a player's skill or lack thereof at playing the actual game as designed.

Does playing a lot of 1v1's make a person better at certain aspects of Renegade which carry over into team games? Absolutely. Here's the problem-

Let's say that Joe Schmoe decides he's going to become a certifiable ReneGod. He hears on the grapevine that 1v1 is the best way to make him a skilled player in short order. Let's leave him and check back in a few months, shall we?

time passes

...so here's our boy Joe after three months of playing 1v1s. He knows exactly what characters to buy, what vehicles to drive, what buildings to attack and defend, what tactics to use... and when to do all of these things. He's become a real crack shot and can really dominate those tunnels with his pistol.

Now let's drop dear Mr. Schmoe into a full-scale game- say, 16v16. He drops in, confidence high, and prepares to kick some ass. He fails miserably. Let's take a look at why:

- Multiple threats instead of just one. Sure, there are as many people on his team as there are on the other side, but sooner or later- probably sooner, and frequently- he's going to find himself fighting more than one person at once. However good of a shot he may be by now, and however good he is at multitasking, he just can't deal with this because he's never acquired that sort of awareness. He's never been flanked before, barring some deception- but trickery doesn't shoot from two directions at once.

- Competition for team resources. Sure, Joe knows that a Med is his best shot at some points and kills at this point in the game, and- gosh darn it!- he knows just how to use that tank to the best possible effect. But he's got a problem: there aren't any vehicle slots available. Oops. Now he needs to face up to the fact that he can't be the star player all the time, and maybe take a supporting role. Which brings me to the next point...

- Ability to play supporting roles. Supporting roles don't exist in 1v1. Either you do it yourself, or it doesn't get done. You never have to just hang on and trust that someone else will do just as well. You'll never be called on to go out there and fix the hell out of a friendly tank while it moves and fights the enemy, you'll never be afforded the opportunity to pop off shots at an enemy tank while it fights your teammates, and you'll certainly never pull double-duty as taxi while you're driving an APC around. All of a sudden, Joe is expected to perform as part rather than whole, and he's never done that before.

- Ability to work in spite of a bad team. Sometimes you have to kick ass all by yourself in order to get the job done- and you'd think that this is where 1v1 skill would really come in handy. The big hitch in that assumption is that in a 1v1 you don't have any deadweight. You'll never have to worry about a bunch of fools buying Orca after Orca even though half the enemy team consists of Sakuras. You won't have to worry about who does or doesn't have your back when you go off rushing. All the accountability is on you, and you never have to shoulder anyone else's responsibility but your own. Granted, that responsibility may be an entire team's worth of duties, but you can at least rest assured that the other guy has the same set of problems- in a team game, you don't have that assurance. The enemy team may well be acting as a coordinated whole while yours is falling apart, and you need to do what you can to limit the damage while fighting the twin threats of incompetence on your side and extreme competence on the other. Teamwork in spite of a bad team is adding the weight of your experience to one or more players who frankly need all the help they can get.

The list goes on and on and on. Yes, there are plenty of people who are good at both 1v1 and teamplay; good for them. Kudos. For the rest of the world, it just looks stupid to take skill in one area and attribute it to another or to mark that other as a 'test' of skills acquired in one. It is never, ever that simple. Not in a game, and certainly not in life.

Skill is more than just an understanding of when to do what and why. It is more than the ability to point and click with great accuracy. It is more than the patience and awareness needed to deal with many players on the field instead of just two. It is all of those things combined, rolled together, and blended. 1v1 may improve on a great many skills, but it hardly makes you the master of the game- that title belongs to the person who can jump into any type of game and consistently kick ass while- in team games- being of real value to the other people on the field. Lone wolf tactics work very well when you're in a situation that calls for them, and those situations do crop up fairly often in Ren- however, the bulk of the game (and of any game designed for teamplay) is learning to coordinate with the efforts of other players, and where necessary to fill in the gaps left by the shortcomings of others. The trick is to do so even when you can't rely on others to cooperate with you.

I realize that you're setting 'skill' as something wholly different from 'teamwork,' but what you define as 'skill' is in fact many different skills which contribute to a player's overall competence and proficiency in the game. Overall skill requires teamplay just as much as any of the skills needed to win a duel- so 1v1 does not, in fact, prove skill. It proves skills, plural, but not all of them, and a player who does nothing but 1v1 will not have all of the skills needed to succeed in a larger game- just like a person who always plays team games won't have all of the skills needed in a 1v1, because they are dropped into a gameplay environment which is unfamiliar to them.

The two sets of skills are not mutually exclusive, but there are skills in either sort of game- team or duel- which do not carry over to the other and therefore cannot be tested using the other sort of game. To use an analogy, that same logic could be used to pull an airline pilot from his seat, strap him into an F-22, and tell him that if he doesn't succeed at every task laid out for him then he must be a bad pilot. Sure, they're both planes- just like 1v1 or team games are both Renegade. That doesn't make the skills required for one the same as the skills required for the other. Basic skills remain the same, true- but there's a whole mess of other stuff that just doesn't hold true for both. Would you pull an Immelman in a loaded 747? No? Well, you wouldn't lone-wolf an APC into the enemy base with a whole team defending it, either. You can't dismiss skills covered by the heading of 'teamplay' as just knowing when to rush any more than you can simplify 1v1 skills down to predicting where your enemy will be so as to capitalize on their weakness. It's much, much more complicated than that.

I play team games, and team games exclusively. You may reasonably infer that I'd be crap squared at 1v1, to exactly the same degree that our posterboy Joe Schmo couldn't hack it as a team player. 1v1 proves only that a player is good at 1v1- nothing more, nothing less. Yes, that requires lots of skill- skill and patience- but so does learning teamplay. Most folks just dismiss that because they learned the teamplay skills (or failed to) when they first started playing.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Wed, 10 Oct 2007 09:35:12 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 10 October 2007 03:07...

Ah.... that was a good text to read... maybe explains a few things i was unable to explain.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Wed, 10 Oct 2007 10:50:49 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 10 October 2007 04:07So, in a nutshell, what you are saying is that the highest and most worthy game type is a 1v1 duel- in a game which was designed from the ground up as a team-based game?

No, I do not agree. Whatever the mechanical skills a 1v1 requires, it does not test every aspect of gameplay and therefore cannot be a test of a player's skill or lack thereof at playing the actual game as designed.

Does playing a lot of 1v1's make a person better at certain aspects of Renegade which carry over into team games? Absolutely. Here's the problem-

Let's say that Joe Schmoie decides he's going to become a certifiable ReneGod. He hears on the grapevine that 1v1 is the best way to make him a skilled player in short order. Let's leave him and check back in a few months, shall we?

time passes

...so here's our boy Joe after three months of playing 1v1s. He knows exactly what characters to buy, what vehicles to drive, what buildings to attack and defend, what tactics to use... and when to do all of these things. He's become a real crack shot and can really dominate those tunnels with his pistol.

Now let's drop dear Mr. Schmoie into a full-scale game- say, 16v16. He drops in, confidence high, and prepares to kick some ass. He fails miserably. Let's take a look at why:

- Multiple threats instead of just one. Sure, there are as many people on his team as there are on the other side, but sooner or later- probably sooner, and frequently- he's going to find himself fighting more than one person at once. However good of a shot he may be by now, and however good he is at multitasking, he just can't deal with this because he's never acquired that sort of awareness. He's never been flanked before, barring some deception- but trickery doesn't shoot from two directions at once.

- Competition for team resources. Sure, Joe knows that a Med is his best shot at some points and kills at this point in the game, and- gosh darn it!- he knows just how to use that tank to the best possible effect. But he's got a problem: there aren't any vehicle slots available. Oops. Now he

needs to face up to the fact that he can't be the star player all the time, and maybe take a supporting role. Which brings me to the next point...

- Ability to play supporting roles. Supporting roles don't exist in 1v1. Either you do it yourself, or it doesn't get done. You never have to just hang on and trust that someone else will do just as well. You'll never be called on to go out there and fix the hell out of a friendly tank while it moves and fights the enemy, you'll never be afforded the opportunity to pop off shots at an enemy tank while it fights your teammates, and you'll certainly never pull double-duty as taxi while you're driving an APC around. All of a sudden, Joe is expected to perform as part rather than whole, and he's never done that before.

- Ability to work in spite of a bad team. Sometimes you have to kick ass all by yourself in order to get the job done- and you'd think that this is where 1v1 skill would really come in handy. The big hitch in that assumption is that in a 1v1 you don't have any deadweight. You'll never have to worry about a bunch of fools buying Orca after Orca even though half the enemy team consists of Sakuras. You won't have to worry about who does or doesn't have your back when you go off rushing. All the accountability is on you, and you never have to shoulder anyone else's responsibility but your own. Granted, that responsibility may be an entire team's worth of duties, but you can at least rest assured that the other guy has the same set of problems- in a team game, you don't have that assurance. The enemy team may well be acting as a coordinated whole while yours is falling apart, and you need to do what you can to limit the damage while fighting the twin threats of incompetence on your side and extreme competence on the other. Teamwork in spite of a bad team is adding the weight of your experience to one or more players who frankly need all the help they can get.

The list goes on and on and on. Yes, there are plenty of people who are good at both 1v1 and teamplay; good for them. Kudos. For the rest of the world, it just looks stupid to take skill in one area and attribute it to another or to mark that other as a 'test' of skills acquired in one. It is never, ever that simple. Not in a game, and certainly not in life.

Skill is more than just an understanding of when to do what and why. It is more than the ability to point and click with great accuracy. It is more than the patience and awareness needed to deal with many players on the field instead of just two. It is all of those things combined, rolled together, and blended. 1v1 may improve on a great many skills, but it hardly makes you the master of the game- that title belongs to the person who can jump into any type of game and consistently kick ass while- in team games- being of real value to the other people on the field. Lone wolf tactics work very well when you're in a situation that calls for them, and those situations do crop up fairly often in Ren- however, the bulk of the game (and of any game designed for teamplay) is learning to coordinate with the efforts of other players, and where necessary to fill in the gaps left by the shortcomings of others. The trick is to do so even when you can't rely on others to cooperate with you.

I realize that you're setting 'skill' as something wholly different from 'teamwork,' but what you define as 'skill' is in fact many different skills which contribute to a player's overall competence and proficiency in the game. Overall skill requires teamplay just as much as any of the skills needed to win a duel- so 1v1 does not, in fact, prove skill. It proves skills, plural, but not all of them, and a player who does nothing but 1v1 will not have all of the skills needed to succeed in a larger game- just like a person who always plays team games won't have all of the skills needed in a 1v1,

because they are dropped into a gameplay environment which is unfamiliar to them.

The two sets of skills are not mutually exclusive, but there are skills in either sort of game- team or duel- which do not carry over to the other and therefore cannot be tested using the other sort of game. To use an analogy, that same logic could be used to pull an airline pilot from his seat, strap him into an F-22, and tell him that if he doesn't succeed at every task laid out for him then he must be a bad pilot. Sure, they're both planes- just like 1v1 or team games are both Renegade. That doesn't make the skills required for one the same as the skills required for the other. Basic skills remain the same, true- but there's a whole mess of other stuff that just doesn't hold true for both. Would you pull an Immelman in a loaded 747? No? Well, you wouldn't lone-wolf an APC into the enemy base with a whole team defending it, either. You can't dismiss skills covered by the heading of 'teampay' as just knowing when to rush any more than you can simplify 1v1 skills down to predicting where your enemy will be so as to capitalize on their weakness. It's much, much more complicated than that.

I play team games, and team games exclusively. You may reasonably infer that I'd be crap squared at 1v1, to exactly the same degree that our posterboy Joe Schmoie couldn't hack it as a team player. 1v1 proves only that a player is good at 1v1- nothing more, nothing less. Yes, that requires lots of skill- skill and patience- but so does learning teampay. Most folks just dismiss that because they learned the teampay skills (or failed to) when they first started playing.

Didn't read a word of it.
Stop posting novels

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 10 Oct 2007 21:16:05 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 10 October 2007 03:07So, in a nutshell, what you are saying is that the highest and most worthy game type is a 1v1 duel- in a game which was designed from the ground up as a team-based game?

No, I do not agree. Whatever the mechanical skills a 1v1 requires, it does not test every aspect of gameplay and therefore cannot be a test of a player's skill or lack thereof at playing the actual game as designed.

Does playing a lot of 1v1's make a person better at certain aspects of Renegade which carry over into team games? Absolutely. Here's the problem-

Let's say that Joe Schmoie decides he's going to become a certifiable ReneGod. He hears on the grapevine that 1v1 is the best way to make him a skilled player in short order. Let's leave him and check back in a few months, shall we?

time passes

...so here's our boy Joe after three months of playing 1v1s. He knows exactly what characters to buy, what vehicles to drive, what buildings to attack and defend, what tactics to use... and when to do all of these things. He's become a real crack shot and can really dominate those tunnels with his pistol.

Now let's drop dear Mr. Schmoe into a full-scale game- say, 16v16. He drops in, confidence high, and prepares to kick some ass. He fails miserably. Let's take a look at why:

- Multiple threats instead of just one. Sure, there are as many people on his team as there are on the other side, but sooner or later- probably sooner, and frequently- he's going to find himself fighting more than one person at once. However good of a shot he may be by now, and however good he is at multitasking, he just can't deal with this because he's never acquired that sort of awareness. He's never been flanked before, barring some deception- but trickery doesn't shoot from two directions at once.

- Competition for team resources. Sure, Joe knows that a Med is his best shot at some points and kills at this point in the game, and- gosh darn it!- he knows just how to use that tank to the best possible effect. But he's got a problem: there aren't any vehicle slots available. Oops. Now he needs to face up to the fact that he can't be the star player all the time, and maybe take a supporting role. Which brings me to the next point...

- Ability to play supporting roles. Supporting roles don't exist in 1v1. Either you do it yourself, or it doesn't get done. You never have to just hang on and trust that someone else will do just as well. You'll never be called on to go out there and fix the hell out of a friendly tank while it moves and fights the enemy, you'll never be afforded the opportunity to pop off shots at an enemy tank while it fights your teammates, and you'll certainly never pull double-duty as taxi while you're driving an APC around. All of a sudden, Joe is expected to perform as part rather than whole, and he's never done that before.

- Ability to work in spite of a bad team. Sometimes you have to kick ass all by yourself in order to get the job done- and you'd think that this is where 1v1 skill would really come in handy. The big hitch in that assumption is that in a 1v1 you don't have any deadweight. You'll never have to worry about a bunch of fools buying Orca after Orca even though half the enemy team consists of Sakuras. You won't have to worry about who does or doesn't have your back when you go off rushing. All the accountability is on you, and you never have to shoulder anyone else's responsibility but your own. Granted, that responsibility may be an entire team's worth of duties, but you can at least rest assured that the other guy has the same set of problems- in a team game, you don't have that assurance. The enemy team may well be acting as a coordinated whole while yours is falling apart, and you need to do what you can to limit the damage while fighting the twin threats of incompetence on your side and extreme competence on the other. Teamwork in spite of a bad team is adding the weight of your experience to one or more players who frankly need all the help they can get.

The list goes on and on and on. Yes, there are plenty of people who are good at both 1v1 and teamplay; good for them. Kudos. For the rest of the world, it just looks stupid to take skill in one area and attribute it to another or to mark that other as a 'test' of skills acquired in one. It is never,

ever that simple. Not in a game, and certainly not in life.

Skill is more than just an understanding of when to do what and why. It is more than the ability to point and click with great accuracy. It is more than the patience and awareness needed to deal with many players on the field instead of just two. It is all of those things combined, rolled together, and blended. 1v1 may improve on a great many skills, but it hardly makes you the master of the game- that title belongs to the person who can jump into any type of game and consistently kick ass while- in team games- being of real value to the other people on the field. Lone wolf tactics work very well when you're in a situation that calls for them, and those situations do crop up fairly often in Ren- however, the bulk of the game (and of any game designed for teamplay) is learning to coordinate with the efforts of other players, and where necessary to fill in the gaps left by the shortcomings of others. The trick is to do so even when you can't rely on others to cooperate with you.

I realize that you're setting 'skill' as something wholly different from 'teamwork,' but what you define as 'skill' is in fact many different skills which contribute to a player's overall competence and proficiency in the game. Overall skill requires teamplay just as much as any of the skills needed to win a duel- so 1v1 does not, in fact, prove skill. It proves skills, plural, but not all of them, and a player who does nothing but 1v1 will not have all of the skills needed to succeed in a larger game- just like a person who always plays team games won't have all of the skills needed in a 1v1, because they are dropped into a gameplay environment which is unfamiliar to them.

The two sets of skills are not mutually exclusive, but there are skills in either sort of game- team or duel- which do not carry over to the other and therefore cannot be tested using the other sort of game. To use an analogy, that same logic could be used to pull an airline pilot from his seat, strap him into an F-22, and tell him that if he doesn't succeed at every task laid out for him then he must be a bad pilot. Sure, they're both planes- just like 1v1 or team games are both Renegade. That doesn't make the skills required for one the same as the skills required for the other. Basic skills remain the same, true- but there's a whole mess of other stuff that just doesn't hold true for both. Would you pull an Immelman in a loaded 747? No? Well, you wouldn't lone-wolf an APC into the enemy base with a whole team defending it, either. You can't dismiss skills covered by the heading of 'teamplay' as just knowing when to rush any more than you can simplify 1v1 skills down to predicting where your enemy will be so as to capitalize on their weakness. It's much, much more complicated than that.

I play team games, and team games exclusively. You may reasonably infer that I'd be crap squared at 1v1, to exactly the same degree that our posterboy Joe Schmoe couldn't hack it as a team player. 1v1 proves only that a player is good at 1v1- nothing more, nothing less. Yes, that requires lots of skill- skill and patience- but so does learning teamplay. Most folks just dismiss that because they learned the teamplay skills (or failed to) when they first started playing. He just said the exact same thing I said... but 5000 words longer. >>

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Thu, 11 Oct 2007 12:15:00 GMT

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

I fail to see how being good with infantry that you gained doing 1v1 would suddenly go apewire

the minute two people came at you. You fight one, go for the other. You're not going to foam at the mouth and crawl up into a fetal position.

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 11 Oct 2007 14:24:23 GMT

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

Sniper_De7 wrote on Thu, 11 October 2007 07:15I fail to see how being good with infantry that you gained doing 1v1 would suddenly go apewire the minute two people came at you. You fight one, go for the other. You're not going to foam at the mouth and crawl up into a fetal position.

there are mp-bots for renegade?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 11 Oct 2007 14:56:59 GMT

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

wodka

there are mp-bots for renegade?

huh?

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 11 Oct 2007 20:28:32 GMT

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

Ah i just want to know from sniper_de how he could kill two teamplaying meatbags....

Subject: Re: Opinion piece of sorts - "1v1 doesn't prove skill"

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Thu, 11 Oct 2007 20:41:38 GMT

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

still don't think anyone follows you.
