Subject: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Spoony on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 11:14:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I believe the word "pointwhore" is a word used by sore losers to make themselves feel better about the fact they're losing to someone better than themselves.

Tanks can attack buildings from long range. What the "pointwhore!" whiners always fail to grasp is that the siege strategy is COMPLETELY POSSIBLE TO COUNTER. Yes, "possible". Not "impossible".

If someone is sieging you with artillery, lights or meds, here is what you do about it.

Get tanks and kill their tanks.

If you try to do this and you fail, then I ABSOLUTELY GUARANTEE YOU that one of the following statements is true:
1. The opposing team has greater tankskill than your team (yes, there is such a thing as "tankskill", believe it or not)
2. The opposing team has better teamwork than your team, in the sense that they are focusing more players into the overall sieging effort.
3. both of the above

So, let's summarize that even further to make the point more apparent.
If you try to rush their sieging units and fail, then one of the above is true:
1. the enemy is more skilled than you
2. the enemy has better teamwork than you
3. both of the above

If either or both of the above are true, then surely the enemy DESERVES to be beating you. Claiming the sieging tactic to be "lame" or whatever you want to call it is asinine, because it is perfectly possible to counter it. If you have a greater level of skill and teamwork to your opponent, you WILL counter it. If you have a roughly even level of skill and teamwork, you have a fighting chance of countering it. If you don't have the same level of skill and teamwork, you'll fail.

Now, on to the "OMFG POINTWHORE GET SOME SKILL!" part. The classic whine dished out by sore losers is that it doesn't take skill to shoot a building with a tank.

This is technically true, but it is taking the entire situation out of its necessary context.

It does not take skill to put C4 on a building's MCT. The skill and strategy is required to get you there in the first place and defend it if necessary once it's placed.
It does not take skill to rush a building with a flamer or stank, you just press accelerate and the left mouse button for god's sake. The skill and strategy is doing it at the opportune time.
It does not take skill to lay a beacon down. The skill and strategy is doing it at the opportune time and defending it effectively.
So, what about tanks? It doesn't take skill to shoot a building with a tank. The skill comes into play when your opponent tries to stop you.

If a skilled player has a tank sieging a building, and an unskilled player rushes them to try to make them stop, the skilled player will win, and the sieging player can go on sieging.
If an unskilled player has a tank sieging a building, and a skilled player rushes them to try to make them stop, the skilled player will win, and the siege will be broken.

Correct usage of tanks can truly demonstrate a player's skill. Tankfighting is one of the most skilful aspects of this game.

So: a quick summary. If someone's sieging you, get your team organised, get tanks, and do something about it. If you try this and fail, the enemy is better than you. Instead of throwing out the good ol' "pointwhore" whine, learn some sportsmanship and accept the fact you lost fair and square thanks to a more skilled, better organised opponent.

Discuss...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Goztow on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 11:25:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No need to discuss, only applaud.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by CarrierII on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 11:26:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

claps

(No sarcasm intended or felt)

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by puddle_splasher on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 11:34:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

A very accurate statement and worthy of special praise

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Crimson on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 12:06:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by MexPirate on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 12:17:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There are two types of "pointwhore" the players who actually aren't (as described above) and the retards who choose to buy an art/mrls in a public server and do nothing the whole game but find the easiest spot to hit a building and do it for the entire game whilst the rest of the team struggles with the enemy, failing to help kill tanks/infantry/harvester in order to aid the team unless they are under direct attack. These people also fail to switch target when it would aid the team or move forward/rush even when it would likely lead to the destruction of a building (But could result in the loss of their precious 450 cred vehicle).

These are the people who claim to be uber 1337, chasing nothing but the MVP for the entire game.

Most players however seem unable to comprehend the difference between these retards and sieging players carrying out a winning strategy.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Tunaman on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 12:24:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Haha then there's people who call you a pointwhore if you shoot them in the face with a tank. =]

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Spoony on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 12:28:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ralphzehunter wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 07:24Haha then there's people who call you a pointwhore if you shoot them in the face with a tank. =]
Yeah, that is just absolutely priceless. Ironically that tends to originate from the same people who spend the whole game shooting tanks with a ramjet.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Sniper_De7 on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 12:49:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree. As i've always said that the people who make up the "whore" part (pointwhore/killwhore) Is just some lame excuse for them to make themselves feel better that they're losing. There are times where it may not be good to go for points (if the other team has no refinery and you're the only one really trying to hit their base) Even then, if the points are near... It would be worth it. Seriously though, if you're being "sieged" to put it, on say, field - the best thing for the other team to do to counter it is buy some vehicles, and all attack the same target. with a combined effort of MRLS, Med, and even havoc when the tank limit goes out, you should be able to kill their

vehicles.

on a side note, damn I love this milk guy

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by m1a1_abrams on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:05:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I've got to agree with MexPirate.

Spoony, you always say that the aim of the game is for your team to win. Many players on public servers buy their Arty/MRLS ASAP, then sit in one spot for the entire game. In itself, that isn't bad strategy, so long as the enemy lets them keep doing it... it's just when their team starts losing, they don't change strategy, because they could lose precious ladder. Instead they keep doing exactly the same thing, for as long as possible, so that they will not lose any ladder in the event of a loss, or maintain their high score in the event that their team makes a comeback.

I think it's perfectly fair to criticise the kind of players who seek only to improve their personal standings, regardless of whether it is the best way to ensure a win for the team. The term "point whore" is more often than not used inappropriately, but your piece has completely ignored the original definition.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by NukeIt15 on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:08:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Alternately, if you can't get vehicles out the gate for one reason or another (say you have no good engi support)- Under and Field are good examples, since the base entrances are choke points which can easily be bottled up by the enemy- you can buy a bunch of anti-vehicle infantry and go to town on them. Three or four anti-vehicle troops can really do a number on a siege/blockade, and they're much harder to hit than another tank would be (forgetting for a moment that they also gain loads more points for killing tanks than enemy snipers do for killing them).

No, tanks aren't that hard to kill, artiller/MRLS even less so. If you can't kill armor, you're either being outplayed or under-supported.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Goztow on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:12:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

m1a1_abrams wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 15:05I've got to agree with MexPirate.

Spoony, you always say that the aim of the game is for your team to win. Many players on public servers buy their Arty/MRLS ASAP, then sit in one spot for the entire game. In itself, that isn't bad

---

strategy, so long as the enemy lets them keep doing it... it's just when their team starts losing, they don't change strategy, because they could lose precious ladder. Instead they keep doing exactly the same thing, for as long as possible, so that they will not lose any ladder in the event of a loss, or maintain their high score in the event that their team makes a comeback.

I think it's perfectly fair to criticise the kind of players who seek only to improve their personal standings, regardless of whether it is the best way to ensure a win for the team. The term "point whore" is more often than not used inappropriately, but your piece has completely ignored the original definition.Even if these people exist, you have no excuse for not killing them so they are obliged to change strategy if they want to keep any hope on keeping their precious ladder.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Spoony on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:15:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

m1a1_abrams wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 08:05I've got Spoony, you always say that the aim of the game is for your team to win. Many players on public servers buy their Arty/MRLS ASAP, then sit in one spot for the entire game. In itself, that isn't bad strategy, so long as the enemy lets them keep doing it... it's just when their team starts losing, they don't change strategy, because they could lose precious ladder. Instead they keep doing exactly the same thing, for as long as possible, so that they will not lose any ladder in the event of a loss, or maintain their high score in the event that their team makes a comeback.
Yet if the enemy doesn't kill them, the enemy's even less skilled and less organised than the person you're calling a pointwhore.

m1a1_abrams wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 08:05I think it's perfectly fair to criticise the kind of players who seek only to improve their personal standings, regardless of whether it is the best way to ensure a win for the team. The term "point whore" is more often than not used inappropriately, but your piece has completely ignored the original definition.
That's because the original definition is a big steaming pile of crap.

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, Spoony 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 Spoony, 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.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Spoony on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:29:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

m1a1_abrams wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 08:25If 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.
Yet it seems to happen almost every game I play these days. I get tired of explaining why they're wrong in-game and just figured it'd be easier if there was a nice publicly viewable thread I could point them to.

m1a1_abrams wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 08:25And Spoony, 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.
If you're a bad team player, the enemy should be able to kill your tank by ganging up on you.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by m1a1_abrams on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:34:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

True, but should we call not criticise these players for their bad strategy? That's what you're doing if you call them a point whore. It's not exactly the best way to do it, because people don't respond well to insults, but the point still stands.

They may win one game with your team, due to poor opposition, but they could just as easily contribute to your losing the next, if you're facing better opponents.

Edit: In response to this Quote:Yet it seems to happen almost every game I play these days. I get

tired of explaining why they're wrong in-game and just figured it'd be easier if there was a nice publicly viewable thread I could point them to

I don't mean to criticise your thread as a whole. I agree with everything that you said in your first post. I'm only pointing out that there is a legitimate reason to call someone out for their bad teamplay... although progably not for insulting them by comparing them to a prostitute, LOL. I guess the kind of players I described are not much of a problem in the clan games that you play, since you wouldn't have them on your team in the first place. And presumably, if you were in a good clan, you wouldn't be playing opposition like that. They are frustrating to play with on public servers though. People who play on pubs aren't so interested in the competitive side, but many of us still wish to promote good team play. It's more fun that way.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by jnz on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:39:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i think "pointwhoring" is a good tatic for keeping the other team busy.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Sniper_De7 on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 13:51:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It would be stupid to rush in some cases if you're sieging. Granted, everyone wants a win by basekill. But if the other team has tanks in their base it is almost a given to wait until all or most of the opposing teams vehicles are gone before rushing. Even then, instead of rushing you could just move in. I mean GDI's main strategy in field isn't exactly even shooting at buildings all together, but rather lay back to the point where a bunch of vehicles can fire on the same target. Not exactly point-whoring, it's just pretty much the most efficient way to win. You don't *have* to move in and attack the HoN. When gse still played clanwars and we fought some clans we didn't just charge in each time. We waited till the right time after we killed a bunch of vehicles first. It is a lot easier to defend than it is to attack. A rush *could* work without killing the vehicles; but who's really going to want to risk their team's win if they don't have to?

One thing that "grinds my gears" is people who complain about hillcamping on hourglass. Having at *least* one person on the hill, just to tell your team what vehicles they have and where they are is important enough, not only that.. but you could keep one busy repairing while doing it... *plus* you have an extra person defending if htey came from middle instead of sitting in your base with havocs camping around the fire.

Yes... if you eliminate the rule of no hillcamping, people on the other team will HAVE to try and kill you on the hill instead of just staying inside their base. I mean unless you want to keep Hourglass to be officially the most boring map ever, you wouldn't make the rule. And before it gets said, yes... it is possible to stop people that are on the hill, GDI or Nod. No, you might not be able to do it yourself if the other team has some coordination and other people helping them take the hill. Otherwise, if htey do have too many on the hill, it leaves their base open on the side.

and yes, i've met people who just stay attacking the buildings when there's an enemy in front of them. I'd more sooner just call them morons than i would for any other term. I just use them as a meat shield and eventually they'll have to fight back or they die, either way's good for me.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by m1a1_abrams on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 14:52:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No hill camping on Hourglass is a pretty stupid rule, yeah. The map seems to have been designed for it, since like you say, if you don't fight over the hill, there's very little else to do.

There's nothing moronic about camping all game, every game, if that's the best way to win on a certain map. It would only be moronic if you ignored the enemy units and their efforts to control the hill... or didn't turn around to aid the base defence, even though you're aware that a big rush is inbound. Plenty of people do that last part.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by OWA on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 16:15:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Lol Pointwhoring. People who wait to get the last shot on a building annoy me somewhat, even though I can be accused of doing it from time to time .

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Tunaman on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 16:32:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I could technically be called a "pointwhore" because I do stuff like that when I'm in public servers, but I usually kill more buildings than everyone else and I put making sure my team wins first, then my stats.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Jerad2142 on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 17:08:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Unfortunately although I agree with most of it I can't agree with all of it, there is one condition that pointwhore would be correct. Lets say the game starts (30 vs 30) all of a sudden 2/3 of your team quit (10 vs 30). The enemy moves in with there 30 against your 10 and pull out the sniper rifles and mammoths (unless its Nod, then its a mix of flame tanks, stealth tanks, and light tanks). You can't hold out against that, so they destroy your barracks, refinery, and war factory. But then instead of killing your power plant and ending the game, they just go and get the sniper rifles and

start shooting anything that moves (flame tanks in front of buildings to). That is killwhoring.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Sniper_De7 on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 18:35:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I bet in that highly unlikely 30v30 game and somehow 20 people leaving that if a teamd idn't finish the other team, it was because they were repairing the last building. (say there was a hand of nod left and they just sat inside with techs) If i was the only one able to attempt to win I'm not going to keep dying by SBHs and stuff that camp there when my team isn't really helping. But in either case, if your team is losing that badly, why are you even trying. There gets to a point where it's impossible for a team to win. You're only delaying the slow game for your teammates by repairing meanwhile the teammates die over and over. If that be the case, the people who are killing you are not at fault, but more so the people repairing. They're just doing what was intended. There generally never is a WHOLE team that will just snipe. There will always be some that will keep buying tanks, even if they're not good in them. Just don't repair.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by BlueThen on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 18:41:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

A pointwhore to me is a n00b who hides in the back of his base and abuses bugs to earn points and credits which is unfair to the other team and the other players.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by =HT=T-Bird on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 20:22:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree with many of the points raised in this thread.

To quote WNxGhost's joinmessage:

Renegade is a tank game.

My own point:
Snipers don't win games, tanks do. How often (even on Islands) have you seen a sniper-beacon rush through the tunnels win a game? I certainly haven't to the best of my recollection...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by trooprm02 on Fri, 13 Apr 2007 23:56:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Agreed but this is a totally different story when it comes into play on public servers (bigger ones namely) and server that allow hill cmaping on hourglass. When you have 8 vehciles camping the WF on lets say mesa in a 40 player server, most of those players suck and are just hiding inbetween each other hoping not to get hit and to rack up enough points to be MVP and maybe even for the ladder points

---

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by puddle_splasher on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 07:57:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trooprm02 wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 18:56 MVP and ladder points

That is not for all of us. As stated above, find a way to crush us. That does not mean using a Havoc against a Med tank, like a lot of players attempt.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by i0ncl0ud9 on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 08:10:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I get people that sit and hit buildings while I am the one shooting tanks, although sometimes I still get more points than them while they are hitting the buildings

---

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by JohnDoe on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 13:31:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quite an opinion piece indeed.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by Spoony on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 16:59:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

trooprm02 wrote on Fri, 13 April 2007 18:56Agreed but this is a totally different story when it comes into play on public servers (bigger ones namely) and server that allow hill cmaping on hourglass. When you have 8 vehciles camping the WF on lets say mesa in a 40 player server, most of those players suck and are just hiding inbetween each other hoping not to get hit and to rack up enough points to be MVP and maybe even for the ladder points
They don't suck worse than the enemy does if they can't stop them.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by trooprm02 on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 17:38:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

True

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by hsq91 on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 18:21:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

lol i like points whoring on some maps, hourglass with gdi med shootin ob without taking a hit. I pointswhore to draw enemy's tanks attention to come at me, n i kill their tanks without even losing mine cuz they suck at shooting me while i can shoot em better. So mostly i pointswhore while making a trap for tanks to come n i kill em, not just sit n shoot buildings. Mostly on hourglass i just use a stank as NOD waiting for pointswhorer tanks to come n i kill . And some other map i use MAs n i'm good at killin tanks with buncha movements with MAs even from far away. So mostly i pointswhore to draw tanks' attention to come to me n i kill em

---

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - "Pointwhore"
Posted by puddle_splasher on Sat, 14 Apr 2007 19:21:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Any replys to "point whoring on newmaps"?