
Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [OWA](#) on Thu, 21 Feb 2008 00:56:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 11:22

That's a polite way of saying nobody knows what's going on, so they all make shit up (Westwood included). The open-ended endings is what helps make RA2 so silly, since if the Soviets win RA1 (And they do exactly half the time), the rest of the series goes out the window. Same goes for Tiberium Sun and Tiberium dawn.

The "theories" you're talking about usually involve trying to explain how Tanya hasn't aged in 30+ years but even appears younger. Or trying to explain how the Sears Tower is present even though it hasn't been constructed in the time that RA2 is supposed to take place in, or how the World Trade Center was included, even though it wasn't complete by that time.

Combine that with what the RA3 website describes as "wonderful and wacky" mechanics and plot-twists (mind control? time-travel? giant squids and dolphins? The result isn't a game. It's a parody. It's Monty Python does Red Alert.

You know what's going on for a lot of it. There are just a few things that are open to interpretation. Like, for example: "Did Yuri really get eaten by a dinosaur at the Soviet ending of YR?", "What happened to Vladimir in YR?" and "How the hell does Kane keep coming back and what was that wierd scene at the end of Firestorm all about?"

It's down to opinion my friend. No one is "right" and no one is "wrong". I do agree that RA2 was pretty stupid at places but I really loved the cheesy characters and the unit voices. I do a bit of acting so sometimes I try and replicate the accents that some of the RA2 units did for lols. I really liked RA2 for it's style as you can't really find anything else out there like it

Dover wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 11:22 War is serrious. There's nothing lulzy about it. Why should it make for a lulzy game? War doesn't always have to be serious in games.
