Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!

Posted by Dover on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 03:00:18 GMT

Starbuck wrote on Sun, 19 July 2009 00:19I sense a...

LOL!! Fuckin' saved! Thank you sir.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44Surprisingly, as most of the time when you put forward points, you do them very well. This time, however, you seem to have misread a lot of what I said.

I'll chose to ignore the "surprisingly".

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44
No, I'm referring to the art detail between infantry vs vehicles vs flora vs structures, ect. Not simply between factions, because that's an obvious "Duuhhhh!!!" More or less within the same faction.

I'll admit, the infantry in Generals were pretty ugly, but that's why you don't zoom in to the max to look at them. Still, I don't think there's a bad of a problem as you say there is.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44I'm not conjecting about the wind. I was merely being dramatic. I'm commenting on the tree animations. Why do the trees dance? Even the seemingly heavily rooted hard-wood trees.

I'm really not sure what you're talking about here. Aside from palm trees (Where it's pretty expected), the only "dancing trees" I've seen are the one's "getting down" after getting run over.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[color=red]-Extended reach units.

This, to you, might fall under the "L2RTS" category, however I don't think so. In C&C games prior to Generals, there was always an artillery type unit that was able to hit you from afar and require you to go into action to take it out. Those units never bothered me because it forced you to actually play rather than sit and watch the game play itself.

However, in Generals, I can't really explain why, but the units with the long ranges just pissed me off. Perhaps because there was either a crap load of them (either that or the defense range was small in comparison to the firing range of other units), or the long-range units were cheap and spammable. (The Rocket buggy-thing for the GLA is a good example of what I'm getting at.)

It's one thing to uproot a player so they don't spend the entire match turtling in their base... but it's another thing to make stationary defenses completely useless.

You're absolutely right. L2RTS. Large-scale turtling of any sort in any game is always discouraged, because the more cash you sink into making Telsa Coils or Patriot Missles or

Gattling Guns, the less you're spending on your economy or your army. You'll never win a game by defending to death.

You mentioned the Rocket Buggy in particular. It's true that it has a long range, good damage, and great speed. That said, it's made of glass, and it only takes an air strike or two to wipe out even a large group of them. They also get raped by Crusaders and other point-defense laser units, since all rocket-based units can't touch them. Everything has a counter, and the rocket buggies are no exception. You're just trying to counter them with the wrong thing (Static defense). L2RTS.

Also, if long-range units bother you, you must REALLY hate Tiberian Sun, since that game was won or lost by the Nod Artillery (And the GDI Juggernaut was a pathetic pale imitation of the Nod Artillery's fury)
I left my quote in there because you misread it. Re-read what I said about the long range units in previous C&C games compared to long range units in Generals.

To summerize, I said long range units are good because they prevent a player from turtling in their base all game long. The way they did it in games prior to Generals (as well as in the two games after generals) were the best ways, imo, to implement long range units. The way Generals did it was game breaking.

Why should they bother making it possible to defend stationary areas (and I'm not just talking about defensive structures) when basically the simplest unit can just out range them and defeat the entire purpose of the stationary defense?

It removes a lot of strategy from the strategy game.

Also, on a side note, I'm not looking for the game to play itself, I'm looking to make sure my troops have a brain.

I don't see the difference between how it was done in Generals and how it was done in previous games. Artillery-type units in Generals are nowhere near as gamebreaking as the Nod Artillery in Tiberian Sun. Note that Tomahawk missles and SCUDs can be stopped with simple anti-air defense (lol wtf), rocket buggies can be intercepted by point-defense, and the Chinese artillery units are either fairly ineffective (Inferno cannon) or a huge investment that moves like a fucking snail making it an easy target (Nuke Cannon). Compare that to Nod's Artillery. Cheap, fast (When not deployed, and it even deploys/undeploys very fast), ridiculous range two to three times the range of the runner up, and you can't even stop the damn things with the FireStorm wall tiles. How can you call this a good implementation and call Artillery in Generals game-breaking?

I stand by my previous statement. L2RTS. You're putting way too much emphesis on defense, when it simply doesn't do you that much good, no matter what game you're playing. I want you to note that in the Professional StarCraft scene, Terran Bunkers are built in the enemy base more often than they're built in your own base. This is because the best of the best know that you can't take the firepower in your base on the offensive with you if you build static defense.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44
That's not what I mean. When I said "things happen" I was referring to the idea that generic

events happen. It's not like chapters in a story or creative fictional realm. It's "Do this, do that, game over." No real plot other than "destroy the enemies!"

And even if you want to argue that it is still a story/plot, it's definitely not a good one. It's all face value.. no depth what-so-ever.

I'm not saying the story in Generals was good. I'm saying it's not much worse than those in any other C&C game. No C&C game has a good backstory besides the sequels (Because they have the story of their prequels to build on), and even then you have some abomination backstories (RA2's and RA3's backstory of "LOL THAT NEVER HAPPENED!! MIND CONTROL!! SQUIDS!!"). I agree with you they could have put more thought into the story, but I can't agree with going on and on about it when there's RA2 and RA3 out there which are much, much, much worse.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44That's exactly what I'm getting at. It was very apparent that the only reason why the name "Eva" was in Generals was because it was in Tiberium and Red Alert. "Tacked on" is the feeling I got when I saw it.

If they wanted to make a cameo for Eva, they should of done it more creatively... or at least give some background on her...

You're missing my point. She's "tacked on" in EVERY C&C game. In RA2 she's just "That helper bitch that tells me what to do". In Tiberian Sun she's just "That voice that isn't CABAL (SILOS NEEDED)". In Renegade she's "The option screen". She has mp real background in any C&C game. And that's because she doesn't need one. She's there to fill a role (Prevent the player from getting confused), and she does that just fine.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44There is no depth! In Generals, the factions are what they are because they are. In Tiberium, GDI and Nod have a rich back story to fall back on and give a greater meaning in the story. In Red Alert, the factions there are creatively designed and, as well, are immersed in a well thought out back story.
In Generals, the factions are what they are. There is no reasoning for them to be interesting or likable. They are just thrown into the game and pinned against each other. The same could have been done with any other 3 nations in the world and Generals would have turned out exactly the same.

Nod's backstory in Tiberian Dawn can be summed up with by this little guy:Quoted so black text is readable
And every Tiberium Universe game only builds on that, and in each Nod is refered to with words like "Shadowy" and Kane is refered to with words like "Mysterious". It isn't until the upcoming C&C 4 that we're actually going to get some details. Face it, we the community know next to nothing about Kane's motives, or what his plans actually are. Even games that are supposed to provide more insight like Kane's Wrath left me more confused and raised more questions than it answered.

In Red Alert 1, the backstory is identical to that of Generals, with the exception that the premise is "Hitler never happened", instead of "twenty years in the future". The countries are just there, and rely on the player's understanding of history/current events to fill in the gaps.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[color=red]The US was too high and mighty, the GLA was just a big "Lol we're terrorists!" cliche, and China was just.. well they were just "there."

You're reading too much into something that isn't there.
Depth? You're right, there is none... how could I have been so stupid?

HAR HAR.

I was refering to the stereotypes you were presenting. Each side is presented as adequately positive when playing their campaign and adequately evil when you're facing them as an enemy. It's the same in the Tiberian Universe. GDI holds themselves to be the vangaurd of civilization and see Nod as dangerous terrorists. Nod sees themselves as a liberation front (A global one, at that) and see's GDI as oppressive imperialists. SOUND FAMILIAR?!

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21See my diatribe on opinions at the beginning of this post. It's fine that you prefer one to the other, but you're not saying WHY you prefer one to the other.
I can try, but the thing is: I don't want to. Why? Because my reasoning for my own opinions change constantly. That, and you're just going to rebut it anyway. (Rebutting a preference is stupid, imo. That's like me arguing with you over your taste in music.)

If I had to make a single generalization for why I prefer the MCV system it's because I think it's unique to the C&C franchise. It isn't about mimicking realism, but it's about having fun. I find the MCV system is more fun when compared to the dozer system. Each have their own pluses and negatives, but it's just more fun one way over the other.

..I really don't see a reason to go any further than that in terms of reasoning because it will continue a senseless debate. Why do I think it's more fun? I don't really know, tbh. You can pick at that if you want. But all I know is that after playing both ways for each style of game, I prefer the MCV to the dozer (or whatever you call it).

Perhaps is a reasoning of being bias? If C&C Generals was just Generals, I probably wouldn't make it a point about the dozer system.

You're making an assertion without giving it any support at all, and you admit to it. I suggest you quit bringing it up if you can't offer up anything more substantial than "this is just the way I feel".

But while we're on this topic, let's explore some of the positives/negatives of each system:

Positives of the MCV system:
- "Unique" to the C&C franchise (Even though it's a carry-over from the Dune franchise)
- Was somewhat fixed with C&C 3

Negatives of the MCV system:
- Structures appear on the battlefield unrealistically and stupidly fast
- Limited benefit and no incentive to build multiple unit-producing structures (Up until C&C 3)
- Makes expansion expensive and unwieldy (Until C&C 3, sort of)

- The inability to devote resources to fast-structure production (Until C&C 3, but even then it's still slower than what's capable in non-MCV games)
- Carries with it the global "repair" and "sell" commands, which are not only unrealistic but unbalanced.
- Units lack "abilities" in the sense that they are present in WarCraft, StarCraft, Age of Empires, Sins of a Solar Empire, basically any other RTS and even some TBS (Turn based strategy). This isn't because the game designers lack imagination, but because unless they are a one-trick pony like the MCV, there's just no place to put such a command (Until C&C 3)

No doubt C&C 3 did a lot to fix the sidebar system, but I would argue that even in it's updated form it's still inferior to the peon system and the only reason it was reinstated is because fanbois loooove it so much and bitched until they got it.

Positives of the Peon system:
- The ability to build anything anywhere so long as you control the map well enough to keep your worker alive (A boon to strategy)
- Obviously works well, since it's the industry standard.
- Realistic and balanced use of commands like "repair" and "sell" (that is, you have to have someone actually doing the work)
- Expansion is handled well
- Structures appear on the map at a more realistic and balanced pace.

Negatives of the Peon system:
- ...? Feel free to add your own. I can't think of any. Seriously.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21The control bar at the bottom took up very little of the screen, and it isn't the first C&C to have a bar at the bottom (RA2 was) And yes, you could hide it at-will, so this is a non-issue of a complaint.
In RA2 they had buttons on the bottom of the screen, yes, but you didn't control the entire game from there. And most of the options on the bottom of the screen where visual representations for hotkeys.

The reason why I like the old style side bar is because it's its own portion of the screen and not an overlapping control panel. And it took up a much, much lesser portion of the screen for that matter. The control bar just looked annoying. If they maybe got rid of a lot of the useless garbage in its graphics and just showed the important info, then it wouldn't be so bad.

It doesn't take up much more room in Generals than it does in any other C&C game. You're imagining it. And like I said, you can hide it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 18:44Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07However, overall, my biggest reason for not liking the game is simply because of the setting. I don't like its setting. It just seems lame. They should have put more thought into it.

I get the same feeling for old-school settings.. like WWI or II games, for example. I'm not much of a fan of Call of Duty 1-3 simply because the setting just feels lame.

What?! You say they haven't put enough thought into the setting when you like WWII games? WWII games are so ridiculously overdone that I can't take this complaint seriously at all.I'm leaving my quote there because you completely misread it.

I said I DIDN'T like WWII games because there setting just seems lame to me.

Oh shit. You're right. I completely misread that. My bad, and we can come to an agreement here, then. (Although I genuinely liked Call of Duty 1, because it did what it does very very well, and much better than say the Medal of Honor series, but that's neither here nor there)