
Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:08:24 GMT

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

Here's a list of improvements I've made for the Mammoth Tank in several levels which have received almost no balance complaints. Most people love buying something that's worth the credits.

Cannon\Mammoth Tusk missile range increased to 110 meters.

Cannon damage upgraded to 85 points of Shell warhead.

Also, making the tank fire in quick succession instead of "bam, bam, bam, bam" over and over would make it a bit more powerful.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:22:00 GMT

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

So you increased the rockets to have the same range as the cannon? Holy shit... And you say that this is balanced but having a sniper kill an aircraft in 5 shots isn't?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:25:02 GMT

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

If you're going to argue about balance, provide a reason why.

The Mammoth Tank is slow. It has a lot of armor. The missile range was nerfed way too bad. Why?

What sense does that make? People can sit there and peck away at it from a long range, but it can't do anything back without the missiles. It can't hit Apaches without long ranged missiles. It can't get anti-armor units or anything else without long ranged missiles.

It had them in C&C - why is it so unbalanced here? The fact that it might present a threat now, instead of some laughable target that gets owned quickly?

Just so you know, getting close to the tank means it's difficult for it to hit you with missiles, even more so with longer ranged ones. It increases the minimum distance that the tank can fire at the ground with missiles.

Get close and it can barely touch you.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:38:09 GMT

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

I already fear Mammoths, you must be around shitty drivers all the time to think they suck. Making their most damaging weapon outrange antivehicle infantry is a great plan, I have to say. Oh wait, I forgot that only rockets can be used against vehicles now. Better change Rav and Sydney to have a gun that shoots a laser beam that you can draw on stuff with and does no damage, because their role just got negated to recon.

No air units should be able to fuck with this mammoth, either, now that it has 220% their range. That seems sensible, but snipers definitely shouldn't be able to shoot aircraft down.

Almost twice the range of stealth tanks? Well they're cloaked so it's only fair that if you DO see them you should be able to kill them in 4 or 5 shots from almost twice their range.

Flamers? Who uses those anymore? With almost THREE times the range now, plus more damage, they're only going to be useful before people can afford a mammoth. I guess you could still use light tanks, even though they're outranged by 10% and do about 70% as much damage and have half the health.

Essentially you're making it so the only effective counters are rocket soldiers, which we established in the other thread don't do enough damage to vehicles and are apparently tough to hit with, and artillery, which are fragile. Good plan.

I also see this as a way to make camping sound better for people, if it's applied globally. There's already quite enough of that on Hourglass and Field especially, let's not make it worse.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:41:01 GMT

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

Yeah, so... If you aren't going to argue for why it shouldn't be changed, don't bother posting that half-assed attempt at sarcasm.

Quote:Essentially you're making it so the only effective counters are rocket soldiers, which we established in the other thread don't do enough damage to vehicles and are apparently tough to hit with, and artillery, which are fragile. Good plan.

I NEVER once said Rocket Soldiers were going to be the only effective counter. YOU said that. Simply saying "rocket soldiers should track targets and be the PRIMARY ANTI-AIRCRAFT UNIT" does not mean "ROCKET SOLDIERS = POWNER OF ALL"

Fuck's sake. I expected a bit more intelligence out of someone like you.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:47:16 GMT

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

I can only go off of what you've stated in other threads, man, I don't read minds. Frankly I'm glad I don't.

That post was meant to be half sarcastic and half serious... Why should Mammies be the only tanks that outrange other tank units and anti-vehicle infantry? Why don't meds or LTs get to?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 17:50:28 GMT

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

Mammary tank should be able to do all the things mentioned in Ack's post, but I disagree with speeding up rate of fire. The steady bam bam bam fits the Mammoth profile of strong, steady juggernaut. An armor upgrade at the very least I would say, if we can agree on nothing else.

That, and the missiles should be able to self-track on aircraft just like in the game.

Maybe even just allowing it to fire the missiles AND the cannon at the same time would be enough.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Nightma12](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:01:24 GMT

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

The mammoth tusk missles are supposed to be strong but dont go as far

so.... is there going to be any use for the cannons now?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Homey](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:11:22 GMT

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

In mesa they will rape everything, I agree its good for infantry and aircraft, it is a major disadvantage for nod tanks

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:58:22 GMT

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

That's the point, Mammoth Tanks are supposed to be the best vehicle in the game.

That's why they cost \$1,500. They've got 120mm cannons, they should outrange the 105mm on the Medium Tank and the 75mm on the Light Tank, while doing more damage.

I'm not saying make their rate of fire faster, I'm saying have the cannons fire in quick succession: "bam bam" instead of "bam, bam, bam, bam" which is a bit too powerful and allows it to siege something way too easily.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 18:59:05 GMT

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

I'd agree that the Mammoth Tank isn't as powerful as it should be for its huge price tag. Mammies are useless in Field unless you control the field, otherwise the Nod arties and light tanks can plink away at you quite a bit before you even reach them.

My opinion is that the health/armor stays that same, about 20-30% more range on the ammo, and have it do more damage... say about 20% more of that, too.

I don't really agree with the "it works if you know how to use it". While I'm one of the ones who does actually know when to use a mammy and how to use it, we all know there are a lot of n00bs out there. So if some n00b says "oooh big tank" and buys it, they won't hurt the team as much if they can get a little more bang out of it.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 20:29:33 GMT

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

Note to self for future clan matches: make sure to get GDI.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 22:13:07 GMT

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

As if that isn't preferential anyway. Unless it's Volcano 1v1.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 22:19:34 GMT

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

I always thought the distance of the tusk missiles seemed odd...I mean they are missiles, and for

the size of the mammoth, they should go farther than I can throw something by hand.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2004 23:15:10 GMT

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

spoonyratAs if that isn't preferential anyway. Unless it's Volcano 1v1.

Unless you're playing [FE]XtremePro and he hops out of his Flame Tank in a fit of generosity.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 00:16:16 GMT

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

AircraftkillerI'm not saying make their rate of fire faster, I'm saying have the cannons fire in quick succession: "bam bam" instead of "bam, bam, bam, bam" which is a bit too powerful and allows it to siege something way too easily.

How can you say this when you've just said it be changed to "bam bam" to make it more powerful? Are you suggesting that it be made more powerful than it already is, which is too powerful? I don't get it.

Also:

<http://renegade.the-pitts.net/index.php?s=2b65f69269446feb5593fb050dc394db&act=ST&f=2&t=5801&hl=mammoth&st=15>

Scroll down to your first reply. You said it's a badass motherfucker and basically it kicks ass. What is it now? That it's a badass motherfucker that kicks ass and outclasses every other vehicle, but it's not good enough for it's price tag?

Aircraft really need to be within the mammoths short missile range to be able to missile the mammoth. Their missile ranges are short too, and it evens out.

The tusk missiles fire faster than any vehicle, effectively making it the best vehicle in 1 on 1 combat. The only vehicle that does more damage in a single shot than a mammoth is an artillery, and at that, the mammoth fires at a faster rate, roughly 2 shots for an artillery's one. It also has more armour. It can hit the battlefield safety with engineer support and own everything. It can make the difference and greatly help the team take the field again.

People say "But Nod vehicles can plunk away at it from a distance while it can't do much in return!". Well, that happens to every vehicle. And of course the mammoth'll take the worst of it: it's a slow moving vehicle that can be hit a lot more easily. No change to it except size and speed will deter from that fact. And artillery happen to be built for the purpose of plunking away at a distance. That's the only vehicle you can argue that "plunks away from a distance" because every other vehicle is within range of it's standard cannon shots.

Also: When people argue to change the mammoth, or any other unit for that matter, they always seem to argue from the victims stance. I've never seen "I damage that unit too quickly and I don't

think I should be able to. I think this unit needs to be changed."

Please don't change the mammoth. It's good enough as it is.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 00:28:13 GMT

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

sigh

I said that months ago. You think it's not possible that my opinion can change in the span of five months, or are you just gullible enough to believe that I'm an inanimate object that cannot grow or become anything else?

What I said THEN has little bearing on what I'm saying right NOW... Why? Because I'm not a politician and I'm not supposed to give you "opinion updates" so you know that my stance on certain subjects has changed.

Quote:Aircraft really need to be within the mammoths short missile range to be able to missile the mammoth. Their missile ranges are short too, and it evens out.

No, it doesn't, because the Tusk missile packs can't aim up or down, thus making it impossible to hit any aircraft that flies directly overhead.

Quote:The tusk missiles fire faster than any vehicle, effectively making it the best vehicle in 1 on 1 combat. The only vehicle that does more damage in a single shot than a mammoth is an artillery, and at that, the mammoth fires at a faster rate, roughly 2 shots for an artillery's one. It also has more armour. It can hit the battlefield safety with engineer support and own everything. It can make the difference and greatly help the team take the field again.

...Not really. The Mammoth Tank is still outclassed by a lot of other units, when it should be the strongest of them all. That's why it costs \$1,500. Otherwise we should tone it down to \$1,000 because it's useless at its current price in almost any situation.

It can't make much of a difference because of the enormous amount of points it gives off, in addition to all of its weaknesses.

Quote:People say "But Nod vehicles can plunk away at it from a distance while it can't do much in return!". Well, that happens to every vehicle. And of course the mammoth'll take the worst of it: it's a slow moving vehicle that can be hit a lot more easily. No change to it except size and speed will deter from that fact. And artillery happen to be built for the purpose of plunking away at a distance. That's the only vehicle you can argue that "plunks away from a distance" because every other vehicle is within range of it's standard cannon shots.

That isn't the point here.

Quote:Also: When people argue to change the mammoth, or any other unit for that matter, they

always seem to argue from the victims stance. I've never seen "I damage that unit too quickly and I don't think I should be able to. I think this unit needs to be changed."

That's probably because IT DOESN'T DAMAGE WELL ENOUGH. Ever think of that, champ?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 00:30:30 GMT

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

In C&C/RA the "tusks" weren't as ranged as the Cannon. Why should they be long range, hell, they didn't even hit aircraft. They were specifically Anti-Infantry.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 00:52:48 GMT

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

Yes, they were. Both the Mammoth Tank cannons and Tusk missiles were exactly the same range.

They were anti-aircraft too, for fuck's sake... In both games the Mammoth Tanks used missiles against aircraft. Only in RA were they introduced to the anti-infantry role.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [jonwil](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 01:53:00 GMT

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

About the mammoth tank cannon, it should have a "loaded right now" limit of 2 (like how the pistol only has 12 shots loaded at once).

Then make the time between firing fast.

Then, make the time it takes to reload slower.

Thats how it should work (IMO, I dont know that much about renegade vehicles so I dont know if its possible)

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 10:20:00 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller*sigh*

I said that months ago. You think it's not possible that my opinion can change in the span of five months, or are you just gullible enough to believe that I'm an inanimate object that cannot grow or

become anything else?

What I said THEN has little bearing on what I'm saying right NOW... Why? Because I'm not a politician and I'm not supposed to give you "opinion updates" so you know that my stance on certain subjects has changed.

That's not the point. I won't deny opinions change, but in this case, facts don't. In that post, you passed off facts for reasons why it should be used. Now you're passing off the same "facts" in the opposite way for reasons why it shouldn't be used?

There's a difference between "I think it owns all" and "It owns all". For example,

old post, AircraftkillerIn all seriousness, everything about a Mammoth Tank outclasses every other vehicle... Except the speed. Armor? Nothing beats 600\600 points of heavy armor with the ability to regenerate its health.

Cannons? They're long range, fast firing, and can saturate an area with firepower quickly. Light Tanks don't stand up to it.

Mammoth Tusk missiles? Nothing beats these up close. They're more powerful than the cannons, they do a LOT of splash damage, and they eat up soldiers like there's no tomorrow... AND they lock on to targets, too!

Those are supposed to be facts. Now, because you say so, a mammoth no longer outclasses every other vehicle, the cannons no longer have a decent range, light tanks now stand up to them, etc? Last time I checked, the facts on vehicle schematics on this game stayed the same since nothings been changed. But whatever, I won't embaress this issue any further, it just puts everything into doubt.

The mammoth happens to be the only unit that can combine tank combat with anti-aircraft armaments which also splash kill infantry very easily and lock onto tanks. It can defend a base with support, taking on all types of enemy that attacks it. I'd say that's a pretty damn good deal for \$1500.

It may not be able to hit something directly above it (the only vehicle that can do that anyway is the MRLS, and at that, it's weakly armoured and can be chewn through quickly), but if an orca/apache is staying directly above a vehicle, most especially a mammoth, it's moving at a very slow pace and can be hit easily by anything else in the area, putting the pilot at his/her own risk. Otherwise, the apache/orca will be within range of the missiles for their missiles to hit the mammoth.

Let's be honest. With engineer support, the only problem a mammoth is going to receive on the battlefield is a distant artillery or a well-positioned anti-tank infantry unit. Even at that, the anti tank infantry unit will be within range of the cannons and will eventually be killed. It's just the artillery unit that's the problem, and most certainly so for the mammoth, since it's slow and easy to hit. That problem needs to be dealt with separate anti tank units/tanks for the mammoth to manouver

easier on the field.

You may argue that in a sieged game the mammoth gets ripped open by all the units focusing fire on the base entrance. With engineer support, they'll keep the mammoth alive long enough for it to attack the offending units and fend them off. A mammoth might be the strongest tank in the game, but why should you be able to control any unit that's able to completely clear a field of enemy units focusing their fire on it? This is a team game, and as such, people should be interacting with each other to beat the game no matter how strong one unit is.

AircraftkillerIT DOESN'T DAMAGE WELL ENOUGH. Ever think of that, champ?

Yes, and I also thought of how you said it sieges units too quickly. It's about time we got some facts here, maybe with a data sheet, instead of opinions.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 11:05:56 GMT

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

I'm seeing a lot of people here giving the mammy more credit than it deserves anyway.... gimme an arty and I'll take out a mammy before he even gets me to yellow (and I'm not talking about outranging it) Same with a light tank. They're just horrible in tank fights (probably even worse than stanks), except maybe on the map Mesa. In my eyes, a tank's most important quality is its effectiveness against other tanks, and the mammy doesn't come close to the med, light or arty in that field

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 11:25:59 GMT

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

Artillery aren't fast enough to avoid cannon shots, nor strong enough to withstand about 6/7 of them. The only reason a light tank may beat one is if the light tank/arty has distance between the mammoth and objects to hide in, and the mammoth driver is poor.

With that said, mammoths aren't designed for "1v1" games. All westwood levels were designed for 7v7 or higher play, and as such, the mammoth is a unit that requires support. It's only horrible in combat to the driver that doesn't understand that a slow moving vehicle needs to rely on armour and sheer firepower to do it's job.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [GTCien](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 11:37:23 GMT

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

OMG!

Dont even try to balance the engine itself!

I think everyone is playing Renegade cause of the gameplay!
The mammoth is balanced well!
Of course a mammoth is slow but if hes in the range of his rockets he rockz!!
so dont change the range of the rockets!
If u change it there will be a need of changing a NOD unit to compare with it!

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"
Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 13:08:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with Aircraftkiller on this one. Increasing the missile range would be my only concern, but if the Mammoth were to have anti-aircraft capability (which I think is a good idea), the missiles would need to have at least the same range as the Apache's chain gun.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"
Posted by [Homey](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 14:40:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Increasing it to that much is fuckin stupid, maybe 50m or 55m, either that or have them turn much sharper so u can aim straight up. Also light tanks just don't do enough damage, a little more would benefit them.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 15:46:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can see the same range possibly, but outranging every other vehicle based weapon except for artillery is a little bullshit.

Drkhaze, I'll be adding vehicle damage and armor information to our site this week sometime, so you can get some straight answers as to how much damage what does to what right now, instead of having to wait for someone to throw it up here. If there is anything specific you'd like to know in the meantime I can look it up for you.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 17:36:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why? It's the most expensive vehicle in the game. It's supposed to be the best one you can purchase, that's why the GDI has strength in vehicles. Nod has similar strength in infantry.

The Light Tank does enough damage for a vehicle that's fast, small, and costs \$600.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Homey](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 19:17:49 GMT

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

A med with a hotwire never loses to a light, kinda gay

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 21:21:05 GMT

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

Hence the arty? :rolleyes:

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Tue, 27 Apr 2004 21:27:03 GMT

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

I don't know, I can't remember the last time that a mammoth tank rush on Under has failed.

Besides, I don't understand why the tusks have to be the better weapon, but they are, and they have such HUGE splash damage! I thought they idea was to lay down suppression fire with the cannons until the Mammy can get close enough to deal the real damage with the missiles.

But if the cannons must be improved, why not have them fire in a rapid 1-2 succession, reload, and then repeat. It would more closely resemble the way they worked in RA/C&C and at the same time increase ROF without having to affect cannon damage.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 03:34:30 GMT

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

AircraftkillerWhy? It's the most expensive vehicle in the game. It's supposed to be the best one you can purchase, that's why the GDI has strength in vehicles. Nod has similar strength in infantry.

The Light Tank does enough damage for a vehicle that's fast, small, and costs \$600.

Nod doesn't get some magical infantry unit that outranges all the other infantry (except snipers but both sides get equal units there). I mean, cloaklers are cool and all, but they won't make up for a tank that outranges them and all the other antivehicle infantry.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Battousai](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 04:22:16 GMT

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

mrpirateNote to self for future clan matches: make sure to get GDI.

Will you improve anything on Nod's side to counter the improvement in the mammoth tank?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 05:50:49 GMT

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

They already have nearly invisible vehicles and tanks that drop your FPS like a rock when used en-masse... Why do they need anything else other than a Recon Bike?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 13:59:02 GMT

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

Recon vs Mammy.

Speed and Maneuverability vs Juggernaut with massive weapons.

:twisted:

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 14:08:54 GMT

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

Hahaha, Nod's secret FPS weapon... Get a video card that doesn't suck and suddenly that weapon is worthless.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [spoonyrat](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 15:16:46 GMT

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

Imao. talking about Nod's best weapons, so you guys mention flamers and stanks :rolleyes: ok

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Homey](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 17:53:45 GMT

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

How about making nod shooters heads comparable to gdis?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 18:09:07 GMT

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

DeathgodHahaha, Nod's secret FPS weapon... Get a video card that doesn't suck and suddenly that weapon is worthless.

Video card has nothing to do with it, the emitters aren't very FPS destructive.

It's the CPU processing that kills your framerate, because of the way the projectile is set up.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Deactivated](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 18:26:14 GMT

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

e_fieryflame.w3d is to blame.

It's animated, large emitter that consumes a lot CPU power.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 18:31:37 GMT

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

AircraftkillerThey already have nearly invisible vehicles and tanks that drop your FPS like a rock when used en-masse... Why do they need anything else other than a Recon Bike? Because, by and large, GDI is better.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 18:36:58 GMT

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

In vehicles, yes.

Once again, the fucking emitter has nothing to do with it. I've ran tests on this before by changing the emitter to shoot a few puffs of flame every five seconds and it still dropped my FPS like a rock. It's the weapon itself, the preset coding, not the damn emitter!

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Wed, 28 Apr 2004 23:14:38 GMT

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

hm the idea of the mammy sounds good. And i think the missiles should both have the same range vs infantry and aircraft.

still i think Gdi will get way more powerfull. since snipers get killed from a far range by probly 2 missile shots...

And ravenshaws to how far will they have to stand not being hit by the mammy missile.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Thu, 29 Apr 2004 05:25:48 GMT

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

So if the CPU is the problem and not the video card, why is it that when I switched cards from my Radeon 9800 to a Geforce 4 MX 440 to test this idea that I had FPS drop with the Geforce and not the Radeon? Same CPU, an Athlon 2800+, was used for both tests.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 29 Apr 2004 07:51:19 GMT

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

Do what I did and edit e_flamethrower or whatever the emitter is that it uses, can't remember what it was.

Make it do about 1 emission a second, then try it out and notice what I'm saying is true.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Thu, 29 Apr 2004 10:06:39 GMT

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

Renegade =CPU whore.

Run this with a xp 2500, ore p4 2,5

run this with amd 1000 ore p3 1000

A radeon 9500 on both tests

Ule see the xp 25, and p4 2.5 getting 30-60 AVG in the game

and the p3/amd100 getting 5-15 AVG

btw this counts for a server (50) players.

When u play a map with only ureself in it.

Ule get with both cpu's 60 fps. The more people come the lower the fps, aforcourse everybody knows that .

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Thu, 29 Apr 2004 15:53:36 GMT

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

No shit sherlock, we're not talking about how many people are in a server.

I'm not saying I doubt your explanation ACK, I am just curious why I only get FPS lag from flammers on shitty cards and not good ones. Is it perhaps the way ATI cards draw the flame vs Nvidia?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Thu, 29 Apr 2004 16:41:31 GMT

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

The comparison of a Geforce 4mx440vs a radeon pro 9800 is a bit bad. Geforce 4mx, is just a OCed geforce 2ti wich date's from the year 2000

and against it u put the radeon 9800pro wich is end 2003 .

Im quit sure if u would put up a Geforce 4 Ti 4200 ore even higher a comparable GEforce Fx 5900 against it u wont get down to 10 fps while a flamrush with 7 tanks that all with ure xp 2800 afcourse.. cuz with lslow cpu still bad,anyway

I dont know for wich Cardmaker this game was optimized though,Nvida ore Ati ore none of them?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Thu, 29 Apr 2004 18:18:52 GMT

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

ENGLISH PLZ KTHXBYE

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [EnGiMaN56](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 01:57:52 GMT

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

Perhaps we should focus on game bugs, which many of them arn't posted in the sticky, but any ways Mammy, maybe we can make the turret fire into the middle of the crosshair instead of to the right and left of it, slightly missing a certain position on a tank can make it do less damage unless your host so if we increased the aiming of this tank it could do more better, and the MRLS possibly have a rotating turret, as it is currently fixed to it , it gets very annoying (Rotating turret like the hover MRL in cnc reborn).

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 03:41:10 GMT

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

Reborn sucks, don't bring it up as a case for anything but flushing something down a toilet.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 04:18:58 GMT

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

drkhazeAircraftkiller! I'm not saying make their rate of fire faster, I'm saying have the cannons fire in quick succession: "bam bam" instead of "bam, bam, bam, bam" which is a bit too powerful and allows it to siege something way too easily.

How can you say this when you've just said it be changed to "bam bam" to make it more powerful? Are you suggesting that it be made more powerful than it already is, which is too powerful? I don't get it.

I think he's sayin that it's too powerful the way it is. Also doesn't the Mammy fire in double blasts anyway in C&C.

I say if you can make it like the first C&C do it.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [EnGiMaN56](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 07:50:58 GMT

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

gay opinion alert ren alert sucks just about as much . All i'm saying is the mrl can't shoot behind it, its a sitting duck.

EDIT : spelling

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 07:52:49 GMT

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

Yeah, it sucks so much, that's why it's had over 150,000 downloads and people actually play it online without having to say "hay how come no1 palyz letz organize a 1v1 omg!!!1"

That's also why WS supported it, why EA supported it, and why BHS supports it now. It sucks so bad that almost everyone loves it. :rolleyes:

You're German, aren't you?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [Renx](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 13:46:08 GMT

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

EnGiMaN56*gay opinion alert* ren alert sucks just about as much . All i'm saying is the mrl can't shoot behind it, its a sitting duck.

EDIT : spelling

You're right, that is a gay opinion!

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2004 13:47:46 GMT

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

EnGiMaN56*gay opinion alert* ren alert sucks just about as much . All i'm saying is the mrl can't shoot behind it, its a sitting duck.

EDIT : spelling

You apparently haven't tried it then.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 02:17:37 GMT

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

Aircraftkillerit's had over 150,000 downloads..

For real?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 06:02:18 GMT

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

That's close to how many there are playing Renegade a month.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Sat, 01 May 2004 16:36:49 GMT

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

"how"...

..can you possibly know that?

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 01:06:36 GMT

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

Three words, WOL Ladder Info.

Subject: Mammoth Tank improvements - "Making that thing worth it"
Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Sun, 02 May 2004 07:45:31 GMT

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

WOL is a broken and unreliable source of info at best and unusable at worst, not something I'd take as set in stone truth. Does that account for any GS users as well?
