

---

Subject: Re: Repair-whores ruined the game

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 23 Mar 2011 14:49:46 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Wed, 23 March 2011 14:48EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 23 March 2011 06:11Dover wrote on Wed, 23 March 2011 05:21R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 22 March 2011 20:03Dover wrote on Tue, 22 March 2011 19:11Running away from losing is exactly what you're describing. "I know we're down to one building and basically have nothing and our opponent has everything. We're actually in pretty much the worst position possible, but let's stay in the game and hope they all simultaneously disconnect, or that they all get out of their tanks and we steal them all!". If there's no reasonable plan for winning (Winning, not just not-losing), you've lost. Accept it and move on.

No, it is not the same. Prolonging your inevitable loss simply means dragging the game out pointlessly. The losing side merely looking for a new chance to appear to win that in all likelihood will never happen. That isn't what I'm talking about. I'm talking about having a few ideas left to try but in order to attempt them, you have to first fend off the enemy attack.

Also, keep in mind I'm talking strictly about base destruction victories. If it's a match where points are involved, it's an entirely different story.

Dragging out the inevitable, huh? I guess you'd have to be in a pretty hopeless situation...

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 22 March 2011 11:42A match isn't over until the end-game scoreboard shows up. Any time before that, anything can happen. I don't care if the enemy has their entire base left while we only have a no-power base defense structure and no credits. Until they make the final blow, the game is still on.

Oh, whoops. And "looking for a chance to appear" sure sounds similar to

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 22 March 2011 11:42It isn't about "whoring" points by repairing, it's about trying to think of a way to pull a miracle come-from-behind attack in those losing moments.

Weren't you the guy with the "play to win" articles? Or was that George Zimmer?...

No. That was me. But hope-based play isn't a stable foundation to play to win on. That's actually playing to lose.

If you're in a situation where there's some reasonable plan to win, by all means go for it. I'm not saying you should auto-quit the minute your harvester dies and your behind. Merely to be realistic and know a checkmate when you see one.

Professional Chess and StarCraft players do play to win. But they're also skilled enough in their craft that they know when they're done.

Considering that I've seen single engineers changing the course of a whole game, I wouldn't call it pointless. Certainly not when you "play to win". Admittedly, if you only have ref or PP left, winning should be next to impossible, but then again the enemy should be able to kill you off in 3 minutes. If it takes longer it means you still got vehicles or high-lvl infantry, which means you're not yet lost. That, or the enemy shows that it killed the other buildings because of a shitload of luck, not

because of skill.

---