

---

Subject: Re: Some Fixes, Some Ideas

Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Mon, 11 Aug 2008 05:52:51 GMT

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

---

trooprm02 wrote on Sun, 10 August 2008 20:50Saberhawk wrote on Sun, 10 August 2008 17:10

^ This secondary mode? It remains perfectly usable

Listen, im not going to be rude about it, but

a)nobody knows wtf that means (and actually the math even may be wrong), and matching math->gameplay when right click flamer and mrl work perfectly ingame and don't unbalance shit.

b)right click is fair and makes logical sense, it ads a fire mode to 2 useful vehicles, while at the same time not unbalancing gameplay.

c)if you insist on doing something about it, I guess I would accept the animation being redone.....

d)most of the community doesn't support the idea of "fixing it", so I hope you guys already haven't, (kiss, keep it simple silly, dont fix what isn't broken...)

Now im worried about fixes that people won't agree with concerning gameplay that will make EA retract from the idea behind the TT patch because it isn't supported by the community making it all go to waste, atleast for v1 of the patch, as simple as possible we can discuss everything else (points fix, right click, pt stuff) later, so atleast pretend to EA that we are semi-in agreement.

Those two fields define what gets shot out, how fast, etc from primary and secondary fire for a weapon. They are the same. The math isn't wrong. The animation isn't wrong. The code that \*guesses\* where the secondary barrels are did not account for the fact that you could have both primary barrels defined. It is clearly a "logic" bug (as in a not fully defined logic, not a typo or other type of bug). The fact that the secondary fire is defined \*exactly\* like primary fire on the flame tank weapon proves this. The fact that the emitters show up at the correct locations proves this as well.

---