

---

Subject: Med tank vs Artillery Fraps

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Thu, 03 Jun 2004 05:03:54 GMT

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

---

Obviously, on hilly ground, the Artillery could be driven so that it can get shots off on a Medium Tank when the Medium Tank can't retaliate. But conversely, a Medium Tank could sneak up on an Artillery and do the same thing. Basically, it's whoever's facing uphill has the advantage (or, if they're both facing uphill, whoever has more of their tank exposed to the enemy).

I didn't say there weren't conditions. The Medium Tank beats the Artillery if it can close it fast enough, or the Artillery (stupidly) starts taking shots at the Medium Tank when it is inside the Medium Tank's range. Artillery wins when it can shoot at the Medium Tank at a distance. On hilly ground, whoever can utilize it better wins. I fail to see the problem here. What part of this isn't obvious?

Everyone that posts here has surely beaten superior vehicles with inferior ones, because they utilized their terrain to make them more effective. Who hasn't killed a Medium Tank with a Light Tank, a Mammoth Tank with a Flame Tank, or even a Humvee with a Chem Trooper? This doesn't involve unit balance so much as it involves tactics. Better tacticians win.

I'm not trying to argue a side here -- I'm saying the whole "ARTY SI BETTAR THEN THE MADD TANK" or vice versa is retarded. They both have their pros and cons. In a stand-up fight, the Medium Tank wins. It is the objective of the Artillery to make it as little of a stand-up fight as possible. Hell, it's possible to beat a Mammoth Tank with a Nod Buggy, although the driver of the Mammoth Tank would probably be comatose before that happens.

---