
Subject: Havoc\Sakura on Ramjet Rifles - Final Word
Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 13:24:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think EA was responsible for the problems during Tiberian Sun's development? Didn't Greg Hjelstrom or someone similar write an article about how the game was released in an incomplete form because of all the problems they had with the game engine... that they had to keep redesigning it over and over until they had no time left to fix things? From what I gather they had more than enough time to complete the game as it should have been, but they spent most of that time trying to fix a broken game engine at the expense of the finer points of the gameplay. I think a lot of the original features had to be left out because of time constraints, but that's not because they weren't given enough time to develop the game. Apparently the engine they developed wasn't even capable of most of the stuff that was left out. If they had taken the time to develop a new engine, the game would have been even more obsolete than it already was when it was eventually released.

That said, I must be one of the few people who thinks that Tiberian Sun turned out pretty good. It wasn't the ground breaking trend setter in the world of RTS games that it was hyped up to be, but as a C&C game it was fine.

Edit: for those interested, here's the excerpt from Tiberian Sun Rules.ini that I mentioned before

Quote:; ***** Warhead Characteristics *****
; This is what gives the "rock, paper, scissors" character to the game.
; It describes how the damage is to be applied to the target. The
; values should take into consideration the 'area of effect'.
; example: Although an armor piercing tank round would instantly
; kill a soldier IF it hit, the anti-infantry rating is still
; very low because the tank round has such a limited area of
; effect, lacks pinpoint accuracy, and acknowledges the fact that
; tanks pose little threat to infantry that take cover.

This does help shed light on why many units take less damage (or can't even be targeted in the first place) from weapons that they should be blown apart by if a direct hit was to be scored. What it's saying is that the RTS game is not to be seen as directly reflecting what's really happening "in the game world". The infantryman being fired upon by the tank is not really standing in plain sight and he isn't really being hit directly by the tank shell... it's representative of something else in this case, rather like a tabletop wargame. The same thinking will apply to why certain units can't fire upon aircraft. You see, the C&C games do follow a certain kind of realism, but it's representative and not directly obvious from what appears to be happening on the screen. With that in mind the "realism argument" does bear some weight, as long as you are talking about the rules of engagement drawn up by the developers to represent real life in the game.
