Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by azn5snipr on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:14:03 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Tell me this, why does the humvee have so little armor??? its a great vehicle!!

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Deactivated on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:21:46 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

GDI had funding cut so they had to make the armour from paper.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by azn5snipr on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:23:15 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

thats so stupid

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by blackhand456 on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:25:42 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In real life humvees dont have much armor, The US Army is actually thinking about upgrading the armor on the doors and other parts i actually have a link to the news cast on army's news channel.

http://www.army.mil/srtv/newswatch/

scroll down to up-armored humvee doors

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by SuperFlyingEngi on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:45:41 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Humvees don't have large quantities of armor because they are not tanks.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Aircraftkiller on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:48:12 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Humm-vee is a lightly armored assault unit meant for taking out structures (Great job to WS

for nerfing the machine gun damage versus buildings by 400% :rolleyes: ), infantry, and other lightly armored vehicles.

It should be \$400 credits, but for some reason, they felt it should be \$350. God only knows why the Artillery and MRLS are \$450 instead of \$600 and \$800, respectively.

It's fast, but sacrifices the speed of the Buggy for 25 extra armor and health points. It was like this in TD, too.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by spoonyrat on Fri, 14 May 2004 21:55:17 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Arty's worth 600 at least. Host arty's worth well over 1000

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by blackhand456 on Fri, 14 May 2004 22:45:13 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The artillery may have alot of firepower but it has no armor

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Vitaminous on Sat, 15 May 2004 04:17:47 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(The Nod Artillery vehicle model is based of a real Artillery vehicle used by the former Iraqii army. Cheaper than missile based artllery \*\*--MLRS--\*\*

and as effective, it was meant to give them an advantage over their enemies, I wish I'd know its freaking name)

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Falconxl on Sat, 15 May 2004 05:09:20 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Renegade Nod MobArt is based on this unit:

http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/land/row/g6.htm

The TD Art could be one of several units but is most likely the same Art that Ren Alert modeled they Art after

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by snipbravo on Wed, 26 May 2004 01:03:44 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

if u want a better armored vehicle, buy something that actually contributes to the battle and not just urself.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by gibberish on Wed, 26 May 2004 05:17:54 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

FalconxlThe Renegade Nod MobArt is based on this unit:

http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/land/row/g6.htm

Maximum Range: 39 Km

Westwood seem to have reduced the range significantly.

However the thing that I think is the most ridiculous is that artillery can normally be deployed a long way away from the front and fire over intermediate obstacles to hit a target.

I know this would have caused no end of problems with renegade because of B2B attacks

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Aircraftkiller on Wed, 26 May 2004 06:25:28 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

http://www.renalert.com

If you want "real" Artillery, go there.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Deactivated on Wed, 26 May 2004 07:00:32 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

FalconxlThe TD Art could be one of several units but is most likely the same Art that Ren Alert modeled they Art after

http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/land/m110a2.htm

Artillery battle in Renegade is ridicilous because there is not enough space to make them actually

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Vitaminous on Thu, 27 May 2004 01:49:30 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

FalconxlThe Renegade Nod MobArt is based on this unit:

http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/land/row/g6.htm

The TD Art could be one of several units but is most likely the same Art that Ren Alert modeled they Art after

It looks like it, but I doubt it.

I remember seeing it on Discovery almost a year ago, it was looking a lot more like the Renegade one, this is mostly like a look-alike.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by flyingfox on Tue, 29 Jun 2004 16:40:42 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

By todays standards, I don't think that would be an accurate source you got that from since the BAR probably wasn't even used after the second world war, unless your grandfather kept one or something. Second, the humm-vee in the game, while modeled similar to a real one, doesn't have the same dynamics of a real one. What humm-vee in the world today could withstand 6 anti-tank rockets, over 100 steel-warhead bullets, 4 n00b cannon bullets, several tank shells, C4 explosives, nuclear strikes, grenades, head on collision.. not to mention the tyres never go bust, it never runs out of fuel, it has unlimited M60 ammunition.. and when it does die, it doesn't end up in a wreck, it just blows into pieces never to be seen again, and the driver lives.

If I had a humm-vee like that, I'd be rich just by giving people test drives.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Nodbugger on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 01:12:30 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Id rather have the Mk 19 on it.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Doitle on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 06:40:23 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:the army excepted the idea and bought 300 of the humvee and put 200 in recon and 290 in active service

How does that work?

They have 300. You put 200 in Recon

300

- 200

-----

100

Then they put 290 more in active service?

100

- 290

-----

-190

Did they buy 300, then breed them into 490 humvees then spread them out?

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Hydra on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 06:54:30 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

sw33tA russian American knows more than u Except basic grammar.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Aircraftkiller on Mon, 05 Jul 2004 20:47:50 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's sorry, not srry. I, not i. You end sentences with a period or an elipsis, not nothing at all.

Use punctuation, it's your friend!

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Javaxcx on Mon, 05 Jul 2004 20:49:37 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AircraftkillerIt's sorry, not srry. I, not i. You end sentences with a period or an elipsis, not nothing at all.

Use punctuation, it's your friend!

I wouldn't correct him if I were you. He graduated sniper skool with flying colours.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by U927 on Mon, 05 Jul 2004 23:29:56 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

JavaxcxHe graduated sniper skool with flying colours.

Colors, not colours!

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by Javaxcx on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 00:56:06 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Pfft, lazy Americans.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 03:17:27 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AircraftkillerIt's sorry, not srry. I, not i. You end sentences with a period or an elipsis, not nothing at all.

Use punctuation, it's your friend!

ACK, you're not even using correct punctuation in this post about using correct punctuation. You really need to go back to high school and take some English classes. Maybe you should start by learning about clauses and the proper times to use commas and semicolons.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by PointlessAmbler on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 03:44:31 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No, you're just trying to lash out in some way, no semicolons were required in that post. None.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:01:14 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

PointlessAmblerNo, you're just trying to lash out in some way, no semicolons were required in that post. None.

I can't tell if you're trying to be funny here... While telling me ACK didn't make any mistakes, you made the same mistake that he did.

If you actually look at rules of semicolon usage, you'll see that when you have two independent clauses that are not joined by a conjunction or a correlative, you need to use a semicolon to join them. (Alternately you could use a period and make it two sentences, but you can't merely use a comma.)

## -EXAMPLES-

### INCORRECT:

No, you're just trying to lash out in some way, no semicolons were required in that post. CORRECT:

No, you're just trying to lash out in some way; no semicolons were required in that post. No, you're just trying to lash out in some way. No semicolons were required in that post.

### INCORRECT:

Use punctuation, it's your friend!

**CORRECT:** 

Use punctuation; it's your friend!

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by PointlessAmbler on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:18:12 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Semicolons are misused so much they've almost completely fallen out of common use anyway. Commas are widely accepted in places where semicolons can be.

When you start getting into this level of detail, the English language is poorly documented and people tend to disagree, so as long as people have basic sentence structure right and spell their words correctly, does it really matter? This is a discussion forum, half the people on it can't tell the difference between "your" and "you're" anyway.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:38:47 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

PointlessAmblerSemicolons are misused so much they've almost completely fallen out of common use anyway. Commas are widely accepted in places where semicolons can be.

If by "common use" you mean "common use by the section of society that can't even read at an 8th grade level," then I'd agree with you. But just because a bunch of ignoramuses use commas

incorrectly, that doesn't make it right. Regardless of what the hick down the street who still thinks the Confederates won the Civil War may think, commas are NOT acceptable in place of semicolons. Commas may be widely misused, but that does not mean that their misuse is accepted. It just means that the misuse is rampant.

Also, your first statement is completely wrong. If semicolons were misused a lot, then we would see lots of semicolons all over the place. The real reason you don't see semicolons is that people are dumb fucks who don't realize that there are forms of punctuation other than the comma.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:45:20 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

PointlessAmblerWhen you start getting into this level of detail, the English language is poorly documented and people tend to disagree, so as long as people have basic sentence structure right and spell their words correctly, does it really matter? This is a discussion forum, half the people on it can't tell the difference between "your" and "you're" anyway.

Actually, there's a pretty huge consensus on the proper use of semicolons. I just checked half a dozen or so different sources (on the internet and in textbooks I own) and found absolutely no conflicting rules.

And as for the question of whether or not it matters, you should probably take that up with ACK. He's the one who started this whole thing. The point of my post wasn't "Hey everybody, look how to use a semicolon! Isn't it exciting?" The point of my post was that ACK shouldn't nitpick with people about their grammar mistakes, because he makes countless grammar mistakes himself.

Oh, one other thing -- proper usage of commas and semicolons is part of basic sentence structure.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by flyingfox on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:47:19 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mahkraBut just because a bunch of ignoramuses use commas incorrectly, that doesn't make it right.

:yell:

sry d00d, just couldn't pass that one up.

Also, I think what ACK was really getting at was how annoying it is to read "i" instead of "I", "your" where "you're" should be in place, and so forth. Grammatical errors that go further than that are negligable, as they are rarely noticed. I've seen intelligent men who can argue their point use commas where semicolons or full stops should be used; I don't think it makes someone a tool, just

someone who didn't pay enough attention to their message.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:48:05 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

flyingfoxmahkraBut just because a bunch of ignoramuses use commas incorrectly, that doesn't make it right.

:vell:

sry d00d, just couldn't pass that one up.

?

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by flyingfox on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 05:57:25 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You used that comma incorrectly in the same sentence you called people who use commas incorrectly ignoramuses.

Or am I completely wrong and being an ass? :oops:

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 06:12:07 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

flyingfoxYou used that comma incorrectly in the same sentence you called people who use commas incorrectly ignoramuses.

Or am I completely wrong and being an ass? :oops:

I didn't misuse the comma. The "because blah blah blah" part was an introductory clause. Introductory clauses should be set apart from the rest of a sentence by a comma. If you put the clause at the end of a sentence, however, a comma should not be used.

-CORRECT EXAMPLES-

Because I ate an entire pie, I feel stuffed.

I feel stuffed because I ate an entire pie.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor????

# Posted by sniper12345 on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 13:45:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

None of us have claimed to be correct about anything, why are you so uptight?

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by PointlessAmbler on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 16:05:41 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, even I admitted that I used it incorrectly there by not saying that I was correct.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mrpirate on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 16:12:59 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He wasn't talking to any of you to begin with, so why does it matter if you said you were right or not?

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by flyingfox on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 20:24:36 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mahkral didn't misuse the comma. The "because blah blah blah" part was an introductory clause. Introductory clauses should be set apart from the rest of a sentence by a comma. If you put the clause at the end of a sentence, however, a comma should not be used.

## -CORRECT EXAMPLES-

Because I ate an entire pie, I feel stuffed.

I feel stuffed because I ate an entire pie.

Looking at this again it wasn't the comma I thought out of place. It was the first word after the comma, "that"; I don't think I've seen a sentence like that pass off. The sentence would have looked right if you left out "that":

Quote:But just because a bunch of ignoramuses use commas incorrectly, doesn't make it right.

This would go with your explanation on introductory clauses and the rest of the sentence. Let's look at your examples again; if they were worded in the way the sentence I pointed out was, the first would look like this:

#### Incorrect

Because I ate an entire pie, now I feel stuffed.

Correct

Because I ate an entire pie, I feel stuffed. Now I feel stuffed because I ate an entire pie.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 22:07:09 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually, my sentence needs the 'that'. Without it, the second clause is a dependent clause, and you can't make a sentence by linking together two dependent clauses. One of them needs to be independent.

You can think of an independent clause as something that can be a sentence all by itself. "Because people use commas incorrectly" is not a sentence by itself, and neither is "doesn't make it right." "That doesn't make it right," however, IS a complete sentence by itself.

Incidentally, all the examples you gave at the end are okay. "Now I feel stuffed" and "I feel stuffed" are both independent clauses, so the sentence works either way.

You're not completely off, though. When you use 'that' in place of 'which', you don't put a comma before the 'that', but you would if you used 'which'.

EXAMPLES:

"The garage that my uncle built is falling down."

"The garage, which my uncle built, is falling down."

I used 'that' in a different way though.

EDIT: You could say "People's misuse of commas doesn't make it right." Perhaps that sounds better?

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by PointlessAmbler on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 22:41:31 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Often times sentences that only have one clause are the best.

This thread is total garbage and should be locked and incinerated.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by mahkra on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 05:59:37 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

PointlessAmblerOften times sentences that only have one clause are the best. Actually, it's really a matter of opinion, but the general consensus is that the best writing involves a variety of sentence

structures so as to not become repetitive and boring. The only things you'll find that are written with only one-clause sentences are children's primers. ("Is Spot under the basket? Is Spot in the closet? Where is Spot? Spot is on the sofa!")

## Also, to flyingfox:

I just noticed you're from Scotland, so I might have been wrong to correct you. I don't know the punctuation/grammar rules of British English, but I know they're not exactly the same as those of American English. So for all I know, what you said may be correct under British rules.

Subject: why does the humvee have so little armor???? Posted by PointlessAmbler on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 14:51:01 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Granted, you don't want to be writing the next Dick and Jane or whatever. Writing that way all the time is pretty much the same as mentally beating yourself over the head with a hammer.

But I still think the best place for this topic is the trash compactor.