

---

Subject: Re: Fixing... Points?

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 09 Sep 2008 22:48:35 GMT

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

---

s0meSkunk wrote on Tue, 09 September 2008 18:40 But 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.

No, it makes the team who was losing feel astonished for 5 min until the next game starts and makes the losing team pissed, angry, and tempts them to leave the game and not play for another week. What really makes people get hyped and feel good is if they actually came back FAIRLY and won a game. Because then, the final losing team can understand why they lost and reflect on it. However if they lost because people used snipers to steal points for no damage, then they will just leave.

Do you honestly think it is fair for a weapon to get so many points and provide no counter for the opposing team to win those points back? IMO, something that gets a lot of points should also GIVE a lot of points back.

s0meSkunk wrote on Tue, 09 September 2008 18:40 The 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 was just a word I used to sound grammatically correct. I assume using it all the time even when I'm not assuming things. And even so, it was a figure of speech. I've proven that it was not an intentional implementation from Westwood, therefore it is 'safe to assume' meaning I can say something without fear of it being rebutted for lack of evidence.