

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 01:18:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

1 - dual seats on Orcas/Apaches. Gunships aren't one person operations. Plus an gunship would make a h3lluva insertion tool - like a Chinook Jr. with teeth.2 - .50 MGs on medium tanks, Mammoths, and Lights. Tank deadzones are too large, and on the real battlefield the gunner would pop out and ventilate an infantry unit coming up to stick C4 on the treads. It'd also put the fear of God into snipers and premium anti-tank infantry. When you're a passenger in a tank NOW the thing has a 999ammo machine gun weapon in the lower right hand corner. ACTIVATE IT, WW.3 (not new, just modified) - Lockable rockets with shorter ranges. I can avoid 90% of all rocket projectiles fired at me. Unacceptable - this is supposed to be a war set in MODERN TIMES. If you're adept enough to keep a recticle on a target long enough to establish a hard lock, you deserve a direct hit. For comparision purposes I'm thinking of a lock system like that in Unreal Tournament.4 - Give the MLRS a pivoting launch rack a motion of 180 degrees like its real-world counterpart which would enable it to strafe-fire like Nod's Mobile Artillery - even though in real life MLRSes are secured to prevent the backblast from the 227mm rockets (which are completely unguided BTW - another change which should be made - Nod's shells don't curve, nor should 227mm rockets) from throwing the thing on its side.5 - A somewhat larger blast radius for the nuclear beacon coupled with a shorter deploy time for the ION. Let's face it, planting one of those in a well-defended base is hard enough as-is. Offshoot - in Volcano if you placed an ION beacon at the high end of the runway of the airstrip, would it be a one-hit kill?6 (joke) - Why disarm beacons? Just pick the d4mn things up and pitch them someplace safer!

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 03:22:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's not an ION. It's an Ion Cannon Beacon. Sheesh, where the hell do you people come up with these made up acronyms?"ION; MOD; NOD" Sheesh.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 04:07:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

And Why the Hell do you keep on annoying us with that \*\*\*\* FORM POST.WHO CARES WHETHER IT IS NOD OR Nod. PR ION OR Ion Cannon Beacon.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 09:19:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Regardless, he has good points.the tiratary fire (used by pressing on scroll wheel on mouse) could be the .50 gun. And the MRLS could use the swivle motion...[ April 22, 2002: Message

---

edited by: Mammoth ]

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 13:05:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I still think the Chinook needs dual .50 guns on the side , but you need to have passengers to man them, as they would be located on the side. Then you'd have a real insertion/gunship/transport capable to pulling it's weight. It would not be unbalanced as you need 3 ppl to use it effectively, driver, gunner x2. Its probably just me though...Hey ACK, NOD!Thats right, NOD!!!!

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 13:34:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NOD... and ion's not an acronym.... we just don't want to type the whole thing...

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 13:46:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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 turrent 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.

---

---

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 turrent 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.

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 16:26:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

quote:Notice that laser cannons and tiberium weapons are not listen in Jane's or any US Army website. Laser guns dont are on the list but they exist you know!And about the tiberium... It doesnt even excist and lets be happy or els we would all be mutants right about now whhahaha

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 16:28:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No. All these ideas are crap.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 17:46:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

quote:Originally posted by Leadmecca:No. All these ideas are crap.So's what you're doing to this thread, too, Chief.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 22 Apr 2002 18:09:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

All those ideas would make tanks useless for a single person to handle and that's not what most of us want in Renegade. We want to fire up a game and run around having some fun. If we wanted any kind of realism we'd be playing OFP or something. From a gameplay perspective, most of your suggestions are completely off the mark.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 23 Apr 2002 00:43:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i agree thers been many a time where one can simply sneak up on a mammy as an engineer and blow the tank to hell.the 2-person orca gunship idea is also somewhat good.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 23 Apr 2002 00:50:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have an even better idea for you:1) Realize this isn't a real-life emulating game.That's about it. WW has, admirably, chosen to replicate the original C&C game rather than real life military combat. Notice that laser cannons and tiberium weapons are not listen in Jane's or any US Army

---

website.

---

---

Subject: Another one of my patented "New Ideas" posts  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 23 Apr 2002 08:16:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

what's the point of making the MLRS "turret" movable? the rockets can curve anywhere you want them to, and letting the launch rack rotate would remove the minimum range that the MLRS was given.

---