
Subject: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Tue, 14 Feb 2006 21:36:27 GMT

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

Worst Case Scenario

Map: Under, Estimated number of people: 20

Almost everyone on GDI buys vehicles, and block the entrance to the Nod base, and Nod only buys 2 artilleries(or almost none) and try to defend, but no one repairs the artilleries or buys any more or any other vehicles.

Who do you think is going to win? GDI of course.

I feel that Infantry in Renegade is a bit underpowered, because they have limited ammo, and they don't do as much damage as vehicles, unless the are used in groups of at least 3(which is rare)

This ammo limit is a bit annoying, and it makes infantry less usefull too.

I think that at least the basic Infantry should have infinite ammo.

Vehicles on the other hand are much more useful in almost any kind of situation.

Yes, 5 Raveshaws can destroy whole army of tanks, but for base attacking, they are not that good.

I can't think of any thing else right now, but you get the idea.

In most games that I play on n00bstories.com servers(those are mostly the only servers that I play on), if team A buys many vehicles and team B does not, team B is doomed(on any map).

The point is, if most people on your team prefer only infantry, your team is doomed.

One more thing that I wanted to say. For past few days that I have been playing, the teams are hardly ever balanced. It is usually like this: one team full of noobs(mostly), other has 3 more more good players(with very fast computers of course) who do all the work. And also, often I am one of the few people who repair others.

Usually 2 out of 15 people (or more likely one) repair others, which makes me think that many people are forgetting that this is a team based strategy game. One person alone can't really do squat.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 01:34:41 GMT

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

Two words: Chem Sprayer.

Edit: Actually, lemme add a little to that. With a Chem Sprayer, I have a 92% success rate of owning a Mammoth Tank and about a 60% success rate of taking out a Medium Tank.(Medium Tanks have an easier time hitting targets at point-blank for some reason.) The only thing I really have trouble with are APCs with their focus on me or Humm-Vees with similar focus.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [ghost](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 01:41:11 GMT

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

Two words: Obby Gun.

And no infantry can pwn most vechs...thats if your on high ground and or got them far enough away from base to pore hell upon them with bullets

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 02:09:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dr. Lithius wrote on Tue, 14 February 2006 20:34Two words: Chem Sprayer.

Edit: Actually, lemme add a little to that. With a Chem Sprayer, I have a 92% success rate of owning a Mammoth Tank and about a 60% success rate of taking out a Medium Tank.(Medium Tanks have an easier time hitting targets at point-blank for some reason.) The only thing I really have trouble with are APCs with their focus on me or Humm-Vees with similar focus.

What happens when you attack tanks that actually have people in them? Chem Warriors suck. They are funny as a joke, but they suck.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 04:13:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 14 February 2006 21:09Dr. Lithius wrote on Tue, 14 February 2006 20:34Two words: Chem Sprayer.

Edit: Actually, lemme add a little to that. With a Chem Sprayer, I have a 92% success rate of owning a Mammoth Tank and about a 60% success rate of taking out a Medium Tank.(Medium Tanks have an easier time hitting targets at point-blank for some reason.) The only thing I really have trouble with are APCs with their focus on me or Humm-Vees with similar focus.

What happens when you attack tanks that actually have people in them? Chem Warriors suck. They are funny as a joke, but they suck.

Then your retarded. If they have people in them depending on who they are, kill them too. Chem Warriors are the best infantry in my opinino next to the 1000 units.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 04:54:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tell you what, you get a Chem Warrior, I'll get a Medium Tank. If you can get 100 HP off me, I'll give you \$100.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 04:59:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 14 February 2006 23:54 Tell you what, you get a Chem Warrior, I'll get a Medium Tank. If you can get 100 HP off me, I'll give you \$100.

tell you what, you get in mammoth, if i can take 250 off you then you give me a pat on the back. I dont want your moeny.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 05:48:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The only way a Chem Warrior can damage a Mammoth is if it can get right next to it. I'm not sure what you think I'd be doing while you ran up to me. And even then, if I'm smart enough to use the shells rather than the rockets (which I am), it's still not very hard at all to kill you.

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?

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 07:49:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you kill a med, light, arty or APC with an infantry on your own, it's not thanks to your skill, it's thanks to the driver's lack. Anyone with a brain will never lose a vehicle to an infantry player in a one-on-one situation (except maybe to a ramjet)

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 09:02:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Only a retarded team would only rely on vehicles or only on infantry. You need a combination of both to win a good game .

Both teams have vehicles. If you find vehicles to be overpowered, use them .

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 13:13:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Wed, 15 February 2006 09:02 Only a retarded team would only rely on vehicles or only on infantry. You need a combination of both to win a good game .

Both teams have vehicles. If you find vehicles to be overpowered, use them .

We both know you just clicked reveal message so don't bother ignoring it.

His point was that in public servers on Renegade these days, most people are idiots and prefer to grab a ramjet or a stealth black hand and go solo rather than buy a tank and rely on teamwork.

I know this for a fact as yesterday I went on Renegade for the first time in around 8 months and killed every building on complex with a med tank, a MRLS and a mate whilst the other team was pricking around with snipers and stealths.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 13:43:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chem warriors work so well that in clanwars if you had 10 of them and it's a 60% chance of killing med tanks and 92% on mammoths. So on field we rush out with 10 chem warriors and get only get 6 med tanks with our chem warriors. and if they're using mammoth tanks - oh well then we can get them all!

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 14:15:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 14 February 2006 21:54 Tell you what, you get a Chem Warrior, I'll get a Medium Tank. If you can get 100 HP off me, I'll give you \$100. I'd take that bet, but once I widdle off 100 Armor Points, I know you'd just whine and say "That wasn't 100 HP! You lose! rofl."

Now, what I neglect to mention is that most of the time, the Medium Tanks, Mammoth Tanks, MRLS Trucks, and other things I open fire on are distracted by opening fire on our base. So, I sneak around the back and return fire from the flank. I can usually utterly decimate a Mammoth Tank if its by its lonesome and there are no Sniper units around. And yes, I do mean even if it's using shells as opposed to Tusk Missiles.

You're entitled to your opinion, mrpirate. But I will fight you tooth and nail on the usefulness of the Chem Warrior and Mutant Initiates because I know I'm right. I have proven this to myself time and time again in the field of battle and will willingly get a FRAPs video to prove it if I have to.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 15:20:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hate to toot my own horn, but I do know a few things about how to win a game of Renegade. And to be honest, Chem Warriors as a strategy really aren't up there. Neither are SBHs, or Tiberium Rifle Sydneys. I'm not saying it's impossible to destroy anything with those units, it's just that it's least efficient way to do it. So unless you're trying to prove that you're really THAT much better than whomever you're attacking, what's the point?

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 15:29:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just because you play against morons doesn't mean you're right. Anyone with a brain, even if they were getting killed by a chem warrior and they were a med tank, could easily just run in one direction and get away. that's not to say that the med tank wouldn't have headshotted you anyways. If it was true that chem warriors were better than tanks, then a barrage of chem warriors vs tanks would be better.

My point in the last post was that in a scenario where people don't suck (ie clanwars, or just up against anyone who at least knows how to play the game), you won't stand a single chance against them. Albeit you could maybe lose a mammoth tank to one if he didn't really know you were coming, i guess, but still any decent person would check every now and then to be able to see it in the first place. most any unit *can* kill a tank; it doesn't necessarily mean that if you can kill random idiots with it and not good people that they're better than tanks themselves.

There's a reason why people who are actually good at this game and if they wanted to win a game, they don't buy chem warriors - they buy med tanks or artys and when a team that follows

suit and buys tanks themselves, or even helps in repairing an artillery, they normally win. The only thing Chem warriors would even be effective is close range, and in any situation a med tank can easily back off and shoot the chem warrior from farther away. Can't really do anything about that, can you?

and by the way, in almost any situation any unit is particularly good against mammals since they're so pathetically big and slow. all you need is a corner or something to keep going back if the mammoth decides to try and follow and kill you, only, his big ass sticks out so you can hit him while he can't hit you. and you can do this while effectively killing other tanks as well! Not be dependent that it's going to be a lone mammoth, who sucks(well it's pretty much given if it's going to be a lone mammoth, since med tanks are much more adaptable to any situation), and that the mammoth tank driver is not smart enough to look behind him every now and then. only then when he meets the said requirements, then you can go and run out into the field with a chem warrior. Instead I'll buy the tank so that we can actually hold the field and have a useful unit there.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 16:44:03 GMT

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

You just enjoy the shit out of trying to prove me wrong, don't you, Sniper? Fine. Whatever. Sure. "I play against disorganized idiots. My victories with the Chem Warrior and Sydney have all been just dumb luck. I really have no skill for the game and apparent bad taste in Infantry."

There you are. Quote that and masturbate your ego. Afterall, it's what you were aiming for, isn't it?

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 16:52:38 GMT

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

Dr. Lithius wrote on Wed, 15 February 2006 10:44>You just enjoy the shit out of trying to prove me wrong, don't you, Sniper? Fine. Whatever. Sure. "I play against disorganized idiots. My victories with the Chem Warrior and Sydney have all been just dumb luck. I really have no skill for the game and apparent bad taste in Infantry."

There you are. Quote that and masturbate your ego. Afterall, it's what you were aiming for, isn't it?

actually I'm just promoting tanks. If any person said SBHs/tibsydneys/chemwarriors are worth while, are just doing the opposite of what it should be. It's just you really *can't* argue against me when I say a med tank can easily get away from a chem warrior if it wanted to, and that only idiots wouldn't be able to. Therefore, no matter what statistics about 60% killing ratios, then the 40% actually had a clue to what they were doing. Maybe if you realize that the game is more about going in the back of bases and shooting at vehicles with snipers, you'll instead try and help your teammates by being effective by buying tanks.

I'm not the only one who thinks that chem warriors are useless infantry. Just because you ARE

wrong doesn't mean you have to be all defensive. It's not so terrible to just admit you were wrong, and maybe, just maybe learn something from being wrong. This is the *tactics* part of the forum where if you want to learn how to play more effectively. I'm only enforcing it. Teach players to run out into the field with chem warriors and say that they're good against vehicles is just wrong. I'm just reinforcing Terminators point - that yes, a group of organized tanks will more than likely win against a team that, instead of being a team, decided to run out with chemical warriors. If you want to think that I'm personally attacking you, that's fine - But I'm not. By the way i didn't really say that YOU sucked, i said that people who would lose to a chem warrior when they're a med tank can't possibly be good. how on Earth you thought I said you sucked because of it is beyond me

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 03:17:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dr. Lithius wrote on Wed, 15 February 2006 11:44 You just enjoy the shit out of trying to prove me wrong, don't you, Sniper? Fine. Whatever. Sure. "I play against disorganized idiots. My victories with the Chem Warrior and Sydney have all been just dumb luck. I really have no skill for the game and apparent bad taste in Infantry."

There you are. Quote that and masturbate your ego. Afterall, it's what you were aiming for, isn't it?

Dont worry Lithius, me and you can sit here and KNOW to ourselves that we are right. Like you said "we have the skill, the driver was an idiot. We are incompetent fools to think that Chem warriors wreck the shit out of tanks."

Im telling you man. Chem warriors are the way to go when your low on cash, and tanks are around. Hell, even for extra points and you dont want to waste money that bad. Ill use chem warrior of LCG or SBH or even Sniper anyway.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 04:36:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's like the collective souls of the newbie clans we used to beat as gse have manifested themselves in the Tactics and Strategies section of the Renegade Public Forums.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 05:59:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am sorry people, but I don't find Chem Warrior very useful, unless you are fighting in small tunnels, or if you want to play with harvester like cat with mouse. Chem warrior is sort of step up from flame trooper, because it much better in every way, and the

only advantages that flame trooper has is that it is free and can survive a bit more hits from explosive weapons, but this advantage is not that useful anyway. It is almost like rocket officer and gunner on GDI. There really is no reason to get Rocket Officer, because gunner is much better. But there is one difference here, while flame trooper has at least some advantages, GDI rocket officer has none.

Anyway, I think that at least the free infantry should have infinite ammo, to make it more useful.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 06:26:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Terminator 101 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 00:59I am sorry people, but I don't find Chem Warrior very useful, unless you are fighting in small tunnels, or if you want to play with harvester like cat with mouse.

Chem warrior is sort of step up from flame trooper, because it much better in every way, and the only advantages that flame trooper has is that it is free and can survive a bit more hits from explosive weapons, but this advantage is not that useful anyway.

It is almost like rocket officer and gunner on GDI. There really is no reason to get Rocket Officer, because gunner is much better. But there is one difference here, while flame trooper has at least some advantages, GDI rocket officer has none.

Anyway, I think that at least the free infantry should have infinite ammo, to make it more useful.

Infinite ammo with infantry would make it unbalanced. Think about it. Raveshaw with infinite ammo. Thats insane that they never have to reload, they could minch any tank. Blah, not worth it.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 06:27:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank god he said free infantry, then

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 12:21:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, if you wanna get downright technical, all Infantry Units should have infinite ammo. That's how it worked in Tiberian Dawn, afterall. I guess there was a shortage of ammo between Tiberian Dawn and Tiberian Sun or something. :o

And I still stand by what I said. I find the Chem Sprayer more useful than the Laser Chaingun unless I'm dealing with Orcas or vehicles some good distance away. I also find Sydney to be

useful in a lot of situations, thanks to her decent range and splash damage.(Except against, of course, Tiberium Mutants and Chem Sprayers. But thanks to Clan Fanatics like you, I generally don't have to worry about such things! ^_^) Don't call me a "n00b" just because of my preferences. What works for some people may not work for all people, afterall. I'm just telling you that despite what you might say, these Infantry units work for me.

That aside, I never said I don't roll out on to the field with a Mobile Artillery/MRLS Truck or Light Tank/Medium Tank from time to time. Hell, I always cruise around in Humm-Vees/Buggies on n00bstories, since it can't be demolished in two seconds by three Soldiers and a Shotgunner anymore.(Nine times out of ten, I'm usually the first person out there with an off-road vehicle, opening fire on infantry, bothering the Harvester(mostly just to freak the other team out), etc.) We were just talking about Infantry more than anything, is all.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [Renegade](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 16:32:40 GMT

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

Dr. Lithius wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 07:21Well, if you wanna get downright technical, all Infantry Units should have infinite ammo. That's how it worked in Tiberian Dawn, afterall. I guess there was a shortage of ammo between Tiberian Dawn and Tiberian Sun or something.

And I still stand by what I said. I find the Chem Sprayer more useful than the Laser Chaingun unless I'm dealing with Orcas or vehicles some good distance away. I also find Sydney to be useful in a lot of situations, thanks to her decent range and splash damage.(Except against, of course, Tiberium Mutants and Chem Sprayers. But thanks to Clan Fanatics like you, I generally don't have to worry about such things! ^_^) Don't call me a "n00b" just because of my preferences. What works for some people may not work for all people, afterall. I'm just telling you that despite what you might say, these Infantry units work for me.

That aside, I never said I don't roll out on to the field with a Mobile Artillery/MRLS Truck or Light Tank/Medium Tank from time to time. Hell, I always cruise around in Humm-Vees/Buggies on n00bstories, since it can't be demolished in two seconds by three Soldiers and a Shotgunner anymore.(Nine times out of ten, I'm usually the first person out there with an off-road vehicle, opening fire on infantry, bothering the Harvester(mostly just to freak the other team out), etc.) We were just talking about Infantry more than anything, is all.

Well said. I agree with you 100%

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 17:31:09 GMT

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

cheekay77 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 01:26Terminator 101 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 00:59

Anyway, I think that at least the free infantry should have infinite ammo, to make it more useful.

Infinite ammo with infantry would make it unbalanced. Think about it. Raveshaw with infinite

ammo. Thats insane that they never have to reload, they could minch any tank. Blah, not worth it.

Don't answer this one. Everione on this board knows the answer already.

P.S: I was going to say "are you ****ing idiot?" but since I am allways polite, I decided not to.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [MrWiggles](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 17:37:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lithius, if you could get 100 armour off pirates med without him shooting you in your face, I would also pay you \$100. In fact, if you could take off 100 armour on mine, spoonys, or de_7's med with your chem warrior I'd pay you \$100.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 17:38:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

edits out his stupidity, seeing as this post turned into a serious discussion again

MrWiggles wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 10:37Lithius, if you could get 100 armour off pirates med without him shooting you in your face, I would also pay you \$100. In fact, if you could take off 100 armour on mine, spoonys, or de_7's med with your chem warrior I'd pay you \$100. Could I get that in writing? 'cause firing for three seconds straight while avoiding being run over or shot at really isn't that big of an issue for me. You did say "Armour," did you not? Don't write a check your ass can't cash, mate. :3

Now, if you meant to say "Health Points" instead, that would prove an admirable challenge. I'd have to last through 18 seconds of darting and dodging shell splash, gunfire, and being run over, and go through one reload before I wittled down the 500 total health.(Do the math yourself! Chem Spray does about 334 damage per tank of Chemical mix.) So if you meant "Health Points," I'm pretty sure you'd win that bet. "Armour Points"? Not even a challenge.

Edit: And for the record, it takes about 29 seconds(and two reloads) for a lone Chem Sprayer to take down a Medium Tank. It takes about 44.5 seconds(and three reloads) for a lone Chem Sprayer to take down a Mammoth Tank. Also, as mentioned before, one tank of Chem Spray does 334 damage to a Heavy Armor vehicle while one Laser Chaingun..."clip"? While one Laser Chaingun "clip" does 320. Just thought I'd throw those stats out there.

Second Edit: Keep in mind, as a Chem Warrior, I am right on top of the tank. Rather, right next to it. Close as I can get without being street pizza. Chem Spray has a dispursal to it as it's a spray, not a solid. Thanks to mrpirate for bringing this to my attention.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mripirate](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 18:31:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's a misleading statistic, because an LCG Black Hand does that amount of damage from anywhere within its range, while the Chem Warrior has to be right the fuck next to the tank to do maximum damage. I really wonder what you think a tank is going to be doing while you saunter up to it.

P.S. Lithius, what server(s) do you usually play in, and under what name? Just curious.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 18:58:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Edit: And for the record, it takes about 29 seconds(and two reloads) for a lone Chem Sprayer to take down a Medium Tank. It takes about 44.5 seconds(and three reloads) for a lone Chem Sprayer to take down a Mammoth Tank. Also, as mentioned before, one tank of Chem Spray does 334 damage to a Heavy Armor vehicle while one Laser Chaingun..."clip"? While one Laser Chaingun "clip" does 320. Just thought I'd throw those stats out there.

That only proves the point that anyone who can't take down a chemical warrior in 29 seconds doesn't deserve to be in a med tank

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 19:06:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I could not have said it any better [Sniper_De7](#)

Dr. Lithius wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 12:38it takes about 29 seconds(and two reloads) for a lone Chem Sprayer to take down a Medium Tank. It takes about 44.5 seconds(and three reloads) for a lone Chem Sprayer to take down a Mammoth Tank. Also, as mentioned before, one tank of Chem Spray does 334 damage to a Heavy Armor vehicle while one Laser Chaingun..."clip"? While one Laser Chaingun "clip" does 320. Just thought I'd throw those stats out there.

Interesting, I did not know that. But even if it is true, it is still safer to shoot tanks at long range, because if you are going against people who have fast computer, they will always hit you at close range, no mater how much you dodge.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 19:16:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 11:31 That's a misleading statistic, because an LCG Black Hand does that amount of damage from anywhere within its range, while the Chem Warrior has to be right the fuck next to the tank to do maximum damage. I really wonder what you think a tank is going to be doing while you saunter up to it. Easy enough to answer... Most tanks are usually busy opening fire on Nod's buildings, or usually, their Harvester. It's stunningly easy to "sneak up" on someone driving a tank.

Quote:P.S. Lithius, what server(s) do you usually play in, and under what name? Just curious. The server varies, but I've been hanging around n00bstories.com's server more often than not. The username is usually "DLithius". Sometimes it's "SC2Fwiffo" when I feel Spathi enough for it. (And here I'll assume the reference went woosh...right over everyone's heads.)

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 19:46:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It is quite clear to me that Dr Lithius plays against the cream of the Renegade community.

I'm sorry, but I find the idea of a chem trooper destroying a med tank rather funny. I'm not disputing the fact you've done it countless times, I'm disputing the fact you've done it against a player with any discernable ability to use a med.

I'm sure I could go into a public server, buy an engineer and pistolwhip a Mobius with it (on XWIS, it's a virtual certainty). That doesn't mean engineers are better suited to combat than Mobius, it means the mobius couldn't aim for shit

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 19:56:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alright! Fine! I get the point! "The people on n00bstories suck," is what you're saying! Okay, fine! Whatever!! Fucking move along already! Elitests... Clan members... You're all alike. You take a good thing and fuck it up for everyone else who dare be different! God forbid someone have some oddball strategy that works for them. If it's not the usual run-of-the-mill bullshit but it works, then "the people you play against must suck"! God...

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 22:17:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey calm down man. If I understand other people correctly, nobody is saying that your strategy is worthless... just that it's really unreliable and even though it may work well on occasion, most of the time you won't get chance to put it into effect. I try crazy, off-the-wall strategies too, just for something different... it's fun because if you can make it work, it's rewarding knowing it's that much harder to pull off.

All we are saying is that while Chem Warriors killing tanks is **possible**, the fact that not many people attempt it shows that it's not something that works very often. Your first post here kind of suggested that Chem Warriors are **the** answer to tanks, which is what all this dissent is about. They are **a** answer to tanks, in very specific circumstances, but way down there on the list of effective anti-tank weapons.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 22:51:38 GMT

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

Christ, no one is saying you suck or any other bullshit you're talking about. All we're saying is that chemical warriors, are **not** better than tanks - and not even close.

Let me put it into an example to make it more obvious. Say, the best player who ever played this game decided to buy a chemical warrior. There isn't anything he could do that anyone else couldn't do with it to make a person who was in a med tank (and was at least average) to be able to AT LEAST kill him by splash, even if he couldn't get a body/headshot on him. What I'm saying is that what a chemical warrior can do is limited. There is no above and beyond where someone who was so great could outperform anyone else in it. You just **can't** beat the fact that a med is faster and could easily run away from it. You just **can't** beat the fact that it has longer range. and you just **can't** beat the fact that it takes a whole few seconds to even shoot at the ground and kill him with splash if you didn't even want to kill him. That is the point I've been trying to get acrossed. The point is not saying that a group of people suck, i was just saying that anyone who would lose to a chemical warrior does. THAT was my point. If you want to go ahead and interpret whichever way you want, then go ahead. But I've laid it out countless times, over and over.

I mean if you seriously can explain to me how a person in a med tank couldn't run away even if they were dying from a chemical warrior? Maybe - just maybe - if you can explain such things I'd give some credit. But take for instance Under, it takes 29 seconds to kill a med? By that time I'd make it from the front of Nod's base to the front of GDIs. Hence why you can be infinity good with a chemical warrior, but you just can't beat someone who is smart enough to be able to utilize what the game gives him.

If you want to go ahead and use chemical warriors, then so be it. I know there are people out there who can't use tanks. If I had to give them advice I'd say for them to actually keep using them so they'd get better. Enough so that instead of being limited to infantry only, they have a variety. And pretty much **all** infantry is limited. Why? Because a tank driver can out-tech (if they have tech/hotwire) than the damage given by the infantry. That is why it's **much** more effective to use tanks.

So if you don't want to utilize any of this, then fine. I don't honestly give a flying fuck if you didn't. So don't come in here crying as if we're trying to change your gameplay because I can only hope you can make your own choices just as much as anyone else.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 01:53:55 GMT

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

Terminator 101 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 12:31
cheekay77 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 01:26
Terminator 101 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 00:59
Anyway, I think that at least the free infantry should have infinite ammo, to make it more useful.

Infinite ammo with infantry would make it unbalanced. Think about it. Raveshaw with infinite ammo. Thats insane that they never have to reload, they could minch any tank. Blah, not worth it.

Don't answer this one. Everione on this board knows the answer already.

P.S: I was going to say "are you ****ing idiot?" but since I am allways polite, I decided not to.

your the fucking moron. Read what i said. Reload as in, have to go back to the hand and PURCHASE THE RELOAD/REFILL OPTION. Whos the retard now?

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 02:34:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You, for still not realizing he said FREE infantry (i.e. Soldier, Flamethrower, etc.), despite the fact that it is in bold.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 03:21:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

deleted

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 12:58:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheekay77 wrote on Fri, 17 February 2006 01:53
Terminator 101 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 12:31
cheekay77 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 01:26
Terminator 101 wrote on Thu, 16 February 2006 00:59

Anyway, I think that at least the free infantry should have infinite ammo, to make it more useful.

Infinite ammo with infantry would make it unbalanced. Think about it. Raveshaw with infinite ammo. Thats insane that they never have to reload, they could minch any tank. Blah, not worth it.

Don't answer this one. Everione on this board knows the answer already.

P.S: I was going to say "are you ****ing idiot?" but since I am allways polite, I decided not to.

your the fucking moron. Read what i said. Reload as in, have to go back to the hand and PURCHASE THE RELOAD/REFILL OPTION. Whos the retard now?

You're*

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [MrWiggles](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 17:20:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why don't a few of us, me, pirate, spoony and lithius all join the same server tonight. We could prolly use spoonyserv if spoonys ok with that. The 3 of us join GDI, Litius on Nod. Then, sum1 buys a med, litius a chem warrior and we each take turns shooting lithius in the face to prove out point. I mean, there's no point in argueing semantics without proving anything... I'm not even going to include de_7 because he would put us all to shame...

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 17:29:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

why on earth are you putting an underscore after de

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 20:33:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Despite everything that has been said, chem warriors are still useful for other purposes...for example...few people know about the flamethrower/chem thrower's armour shield against explosives. Chem throwers can take about double the hurt than any other soldier against c4, meaning they can run through a bitch of a mining job and survive...much to the happiness of their teammates for getting rid of a minefield faster than a technician. it also means they can survive longer in a building where enemy engineers are tossing remotes (or proxies) at all the enemies present. Do you realise what this means? In an APC rush, a chem warrior is really useful as he'll eliminate practically any mining job and STILL live to plant his C4.

They're also useful on occasion early on - for example on Canyon. An early chem rush sometimes succeeds in taking out the ref...

I wouldn't go so far as to say they were cream of the crop in eliminating med tanks. They ARE a guaranteed killing machine when e.g. they sneak up on MRLS. I've used the chemical warrior a lot

before, just for the sake of posing myself a challenge and trying to take the skill I have and turn the chem into a useful unit. It doesn't always work...but then again, what does?

Edit: And if you guys are going ahead with this match with chem warrior vs a med, you'll be paying big bucks. It's really easy to take 100 armour pts off of a surprised med regardless of how good the med driver is -- does being good in a med mean you can move it away quicker? Nope. To avoid 100 damage you'll have to get a lucky HS, or body shot and finish them off with splash damage. There might not even be time enough for 2 shells...my money will be on lithius.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [RTsa](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 20:58:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It really depends a lot on the situation. Think of a med shooting the airstrip on volcano. It's driving around on top of it, trying to shoot in it to kill the techie repairing it. A chem trooper can easily sneak up on the med from PP or ref. And it will most likely do more than 100 damage, but I do doubt it'll kill the med if the driver's at all decent.

Now, if it was a mammoth, the chem trooper really has a chance. The mammoth being so slow the chem can outrun it.

In the situation of the mammy, the chem trooper is a good buy if you have 300 credits or something like that.

(but you could also get an engi as well, of course)

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 21:36:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MrWiggles, Sniper_De7 had already calmed the point down back to a reasonable level. Must you insist on beating this dead horse until it's a fine paste?

Also, I refuse to participate in your little "Let's take turns shooting Lithius in the head" thing until I can get that "\$100.00/100 Armor" deal in writing. With your signature at the bottom. You get something written/printed up and signed in your handwriting, then we'll talk. All I know is that it takes all of three seconds to melt off 100 points of damage at point-blank, and not terribly much longer at other ranges. In that time, you will most likely get a whole two shells off (or just one if you're really unprepared), and there's no gaurentee either of them will actually hit, much less kill me before I can melt off the 100 Armor Points.

Subject: Re: Vehicles vs Infantry
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 26 Mar 2006 02:53:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To settle this once and for all:

- The chem Trooper, with his big, crimson head, is NOT the greatest asset to play with. The advantages of tiberium shielding are meaningless when everything that has a tiberium weapon also has a pistol to hit that nice, big head of his.
- The chem Sprayer is a great weapon, dealing massive damage up close.

If the tank is preoccupied with something else (And tanks almost always are), a chem trooper (Or better yet, another soldier using a chem sprayer) should have NO TROUBLE taking a medium tank down to about half it's life. By Dr. Lithius's calculation, that's a little over a chem tank's worth of damage. That's easily attainable for anybody with a reasonable amount of experience with Renegade and the chem sprayer.

Destroying the tank is another matter. It's pathetically easy to kill infantry at short ranges using a tank.

It's exponentially harder if the tank driver knows the chem trooper is coming (I'm sure this is what MrPirate was thinking). For example, if MrPirate positions himself in the middle of C&C_Field and waits for Dr. Lithus to come around, he can just use the tank's vastly superior range to take down Lithus before he gets anywhere near the tank. Even if Lithus does manage to somehow approach the med, tanks are faster (Except the mammy), and he can easily back away while taking potshots at poor Lithus.

My point being that the chem sprayer is a fantastic weapon, assuming you can get close enough to use it. If you can't, you're better off with a laser chain gun and a good rock to hide behind.
