

---

Subject: Re: C&C 3

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 05 May 2006 04:20:43 GMT

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

---

EA has plenty of FPS titles with no story at all. How much work went into the singleplayer aspect of any of the Battlefield games, eh? Best-selling series, despite the most recent installment being rife with bugs and exploits. Why? Huge amount of time devoted to the multiplayer aspect of the game, next to nothing for singleplayer.

You could say the same for Half-Life, really. Which do you think sold more copies of Half-Life 2, the beautifully crafted singleplayer experience...or Counter-Strike Source? Valve included a remake of that particular mod with their release for a very specific reason; it would attract a huge crowd of multiplayer-only gamers to buy a game already famous for being one of the greatest FPS games of all time.

Why do people buy Halo? Sure, the story kicks ass- but the actual gameplay of the campaign is somewhat repetetive, and the physics are...well, crap. Halo 2 improved on the physics a bit (not much), but you know what made BOTH games best-sellers? Multiplayer mayhem. Split-screen buddy blasting in full 3D.

Look at it this way: the average gamer plays through the singleplayer campaign twice, maybe three times at the most (assuming that it has the standard Easy, Normal, and Hard settings). That's...what, 30 hours at the most for your average FPS campaign mode? Now look at multiplayer. A great many players will still be playing 2 hours or more per day FOR SEVERAL YEARS. It makes sense that multiplayer is what most publisher/developer matchups pay the most attention to. There are exceptions, of course (The Elder Scrolls series, for example), but the real money is in getting a whole bunch of human players together and letting them have at it.

---