
Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:25:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Really, Spooky is talking about something different to what people are usually called a point whore over (at least in my experience).

If someone calls you a point whore for keeping the enemy in their base with tanks, after you won the advantage in the initial skirmishes... they're nuts. What do they want you to do, lay off them for a while, so that they have a better shot of winning?

However, even when you're sieging with tanks, you can be too conservative about it. IMO, you should always be looking for an opening to win the game outright, rather than a points victory. It might be the case that there is never an opening, so you can't rush in to hit an unrepaired building, but that's different. It's very annoying though, when you see a wide open opportunity to move in closer and take out a structure, but your tanks won't move, happily blasting away at the one being repaired.

You might argue that camping the closest building is less risky than moving further in, but if all your best players are up front all game, you're giving the enemy more time to sneak in the back way and steal your win. It's different when it's near the end of a very close game, but otherwise, I often suspect tank campers won't rush in, because they have a fragile points lead on their teammates.

Edit: Goztow, I was talking about people on my own team, so I can't kill them.

And Spooky, the enemy may well be even less skilled than the supposed point whore, but I don't think that fact grants him immunity to criticism. If you're a bad team player, you're a bad team player.
