

---

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [m1a1\\_abrams](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 06:21:00 GMT

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

---

I agree that infantry should have had infinite ammo and have their weapon strength balanced around that. Some characters (dare I mention the Laser Chaingunner), run out so fast that you feel like you're running all the way back to a PT as often as you're actually being useful outside your base.

However, with everyone playing in 40 player servers, vehicles are not as dominant as you make out. It's the chokepoint maps like Under and Field that are causing the situations you describe, because with only one entrance infantry get trapped behind a wall of splash damage from tank shells exploding. Remember you can only have 7-8 vehicles at any given time, while you can have as many Raveshaws/Sydneys as you have players on your team. In a one-on-one confrontation though, I'd much rather be in a Medium Tank than be a Raveshaw.

Btw, Lithius I swear you are out of your mind, LOL. You have to be desperate (i.e. run out of cash), or bored, to purposefully hunt tanks with a Chem Warrior. Sure, it will do great damage if you get close, but you need the right circumstances and terrain to sneak up on an alert tank driver. The Chem Warrior suffers from the same problems as the Laser Chaingunner... needs to maintain a constant line of sight to kill tanks which means it has to run out into the open... except that unlike the Laser Chaingunner, it has an awful, awful range, is bright green and has a huge head that ANYONE can hit. It's not a reliable character in any shape or form and it's definitely not the answer to tanks. It does have one advantage though... it's inexpensive... but if you can afford something else, why the hell would you buy a Chem Warrior?

---