
Subject: Re: Fixing... Points?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 10 Sep 2008 04:39:07 GMT

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

s0meSkunk wrote on Tue, 09 September 2008 16:02Spoony wrote on Mon, 08 September 2008 15:41

here's a question: if you want a ladder where the top players can be guys who spend all game shooting stuff they don't damage... why don't you make one?

the key word in that question is "you".

I never said that.

Answer my question. If you want a ladder where non-pointsfix games are counted, why don't YOU make one? TT isn't making one because we don't see the slightest point when there is a far superior points system available, where points gained are actually earned.

If you don't answer the question I'll just assume it's laziness and selfishness on your part, shall I?

s0meSkunk wrote on Tue, 09 September 2008 16:02You're being way too arrogant to understand my posts and give any point I mention, even points for your side, and on topics not even relating to the points fix any thought at all.

The flaw in your statement is the rather obvious point that I've responded to pretty much everything you've said, whereas you've dodged the vast majority of what I've said... generally the bits that showed you were categorically wrong about a great deal of different things.

s0meSkunk wrote on Tue, 09 September 2008 16:02You can prove the points fix makes sense, and you can prove the system previously made no sense when vehicles had green health. But you can't prove that Westwood didn't just make it that way on purpose, for whatever reason.

s0meSkunk wrote on Tue, 09 September 2008 16:02

So all this proof talk you mention is really just opinionated "proof," and can never truly be proved anyway.

So I don't like hearing you call it proof.

I guess I'm going to have to take a neutral stance on this, because neither sides arguments can prove anything, and one side just shouts "We proved it!" and the other side just shouts back "No you didn't!" And so then the first side shouts "Well prove how we didn't."

These two posts sum up the anti-pointsfix crowd perfectly.

The FACT (Yes fact, not opinion) that the pointsfix is what the original point system was supposed to be, BY WESTWOOD, has been proven again and again and again, in several different ways. Nobody, NOBODY has refuted a single shred of it, let alone the whole package, LET ALONE proved the opposite viewpoint.

Now, you just said you're going to take a "neutral stance" based on the rather wild assertion that "neither side has proven anything". Crimson's posted a big chunk of what we have proved; there's more if you want it. The anti-pointsfix crowd has proven absolutely nothing.

So, in the light of the fact that one side actually has proven a great deal, which the other side has

spectacularly failed to debunk (or even acknowledge, in many cases) perhaps your "neutral stance" should be reconsidered?

s0meSkunk wroteBut I still don't think I'm wrong in saying that it's great the way the game is now because we have the ability to come back and win from hopeless odds...stuff like that makes people watching get hyped, and feel good.

like I already said... you can still come back from a losing situation on a pointsfix server. There is one difference compared to before:

YOU ACTUALLY HAVE TO EARN IT NOW!

s0meSkunk wroteThe flaw here in this argument that you guys are providing is "it is pretty safe to assume that this was NOT an intention addition to the game."

Growing up I was taught that when you assume, you make an ass out of u and me. Assume? Making a conclusion based on a staggering amount of evidence, none of which has been refuted, and none to the contrary has ever been presented, is "assuming"?

In this next quote, I'll italicise the important part.

s0meSkunk wroteI've been playing on points fixed servers the last few days, and what I see is more opportunity to use flame tanks and stealth tanks and Mammoth tanks without ruining the game, and I don't have to yell at my team mates as much anymore for doing stupid things, and I'm still getting MVP when we win...but when we're losing it's pretty hopeless for come backs : (True colours shining through right there. Crimson and I have both said on different forums how pitiful it is that the "pros" love to treat new players like shit just for buying a stank or a mammoth or fixing the WF or whatever; just some new player who is trying to help his team. It's a disgusting way to act and it's yet another argument against the points bug; it's also very telling that everyone who does this is generally on the anti-pointsfix side of the argument.

s0meSkunk wroteYea, I thought it was fair for the ramjet rifle to get the same points a PIC got from a shooting a vehicle

oh... god...

...please tell me this is an unfortunate series of typos, please...

s0meSkunk wrote(last time I checked they both got the same points in non poits fix) because I thought vehicles have the ability to get SOOO many points, and that's why it made sense for us to be able to get sooo many points off of the vehicles.

oh dear, it wasn't a mistake, you really meant to say something so massively absurd.

here's the colossal flaw.

the reason vehicles have the ability to get big points is BECAUSE THEY DO BIG DAMAGE. that is how the whole points system works (once the green-vehicle bug is fixed, at least...)... the more damage you do, the more points you get.

PICs do decent damage to tanks, so they should get points accordingly. Ramjets don't do shit, so they shouldn't get points for shooting a vehicle. This is blindingly obvious common sense, sorry.

s0meSkunk wroteGet an APC at beginning of the game ASAP and go remote C4 rush a building...and I hated people who would wait to detonate their C4 so they could get the more points, or put down timed C4's to try to get the more points, when we could have totally taken out the building if it wasn't for their bungling.
uhhh... that's nice, what's it got to do with the pointsfix?

s0meSkunk wroteTo me, it's fair to be able to come back and win with points as the alternative because you're trapped in your base and have to defend well for fifteen minutes or more. To me, that was the reward for being able to defend your base without x building and keep the enemy from killing you.
if all you're doing is defending, if the enemy's done more damage than you and has dictated the entire pace of the game, preventing you from playing offensively at all... why do you deserve to win?

s0meSkunk wroteI hate how I can understand what people talk about, but they can never understand what I talk about.
yep, but it hasn't occurred to you why that is...
