R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00I'll chose to ignore the "surprisingly".
Why? I meant it as a complement.. As in, normally when you are in a debate, you a decent job at stating points, but I was surprised to find a few flawed in your response.

In that case, I misread that, too. You form very awkward sentences every now and then.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00I'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.
You're right, it isn't a big deal. But you said you wanted reasons and that's one I thought of.

Fair enough.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00I'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.
If I recall correctly, all the trees swayed heavily. Some trees are a given, but every tree did.

What I was getting at when I mentioned the wind was that even in hurricane force winds, heavy and hardwood trees wont sway as much as they do in their animations. I just thought it looked dumb.

And I remember differently. I'll pop in my Zero Hour and find out before my next post.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00I 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.

I don't think the Nod artillery in TS was gamebreaking. It was fun to play against opponents that used them. It was harder to fight against them than the equivalent units in Generals, but I just

don't find it as appealing when dealing with the long-range units in Generals, regardless of how much easier they are to destroy or how slow they are to attack. It's just something about them doesn't sit right with me.

Also, note, I'm not just talking about static base defenses. If I have some units set to guard some position out in the field and they start taking on fire when I'm not looking.. I don't expect them to survive, but I at least want them to fight back or give some indication that they are doing something useful.

Edit:
I think I figured out what annoyed me about the "long-range" units in Generals. It's the fact that they aren't "long-range" at all. Let me explain:
The units in the game are very short sighted, meaning something can be right up in front of them and they won't do crap until the enemy gets close enough for them to "realize." The "long-range" units weren't very long range, but they were what I would consider moderate range. In TS, the Nod artillery attack you from a FAAAAR distance, which explains why the units they attack don't see it coming. That doesn't annoy me because it's logical. However, with something like the rocket-buggy, they basically get up close and personal, which is still considered a "long range" according to the game.

I'd be screaming at my screen: "WHAT ARE YOU? BLIND?! HE IS RIGHT THERE!"

That being said, the artillery units in Generals, such as the Nuke Artillery, didn't bother me because of their long range.

The rocket buggy isn't up close and personal at all. It has a pretty good range on it, and it outranges most other units in the game (I think it just narrowly beats out the Inferno Cannon). The only time it ever has to get up close and personal is if there's an obstacle like a building in the way, because they alone amongst "Artillery" units can't fire over them.

Maybe the 3D confused you? It can be tricky to accurately measure distances in 3D from certain perspectives.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00I'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.
It is very bad, which is my point, and it is much worse than other C&C games, which isn't my point. It's a bad story for the sake of being a story. Who said anything about comparing it to previous C&C games?

However, if you must, the "story" of Generals is much worse than even the story in C&C3, which is also pretty mediocre. At least the C&C3 story had plot twists, depth, and immersion.. not some news caster saying something about politics and then letting you jump into a battle.

The story in Generals could have just been a few missions:
1. Learn of your enemies
2. Learn of your allies (optional)
3. Final strike on your enemies

And it would have turned out the same. All the missions in the game between the beginning and end missions are just pointless filler.

That "something about politics" IS the story. I don't see how you can marginalize the story and then complain about how bad it is. You're not even trying to enjoy it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00You'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.
Not true. EVA was a main character in the Tiberium universe first. The fact that she was in RA2 as a lieutenant was just supposed to be an unrelated reference to previous C&C games. Sort of like the developers trying to be clever.

What they did with Eva in Generals was a rip off. If I was to think of a clever way to implement Eva into Generals, I wouldn't have made her a person or AI, but rather a system or code. Maybe like the spy satellite network or the way they interpret what they are looking at. For example, E.V.A. could stand for "Electronic Visual Analysis." That would have fit the mood of the game and wouldn't have been a rip-off of EVA/Lt. Eva in the other two games.

"Electronic Visual Analysis" sounds like a poor ripoff of "Electronic Video Agent" in Tiberian Sun. And keep in mind there is some intention of tying all three universes together, and the strands of doing so are there. EVA is one example. The many parallels one can draw between the GLA and Nod is another. The pervasive faction that is communist-aligned is a third. There isn't anything "Unoriginal" about a LT. Eva being your guide. This is a C&C game. You may as well be calling your beloved MCV sidebar system a "ripoff" from one game in the series to another.

By the way, the idea of EVA originated in the Dune series just like your beloved MCV sidebar system, so if anyone is unoriginal it's Tiberian Dawn, not Generals.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00Nod'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.
Yes, Nod is mysterious. Mysteries are intriguing and suspenseful. They keep you entertained and make you want to learn more. We do know of their main characteristics in the fictional realm and

they are morale enough for players to even side with or against them. It's like people placing faith in god.

GDI is trying to preserve the world. Their main objective isn't just "lol we're the good guys and we must save the civilians," it's to stop the spread of Tiberium. That's why they were formed in the first place. They are, at their basic roots, a global, militaristic, hazmat team. However, they have their own unique characteristics from Nod and are interesting to follow and read into or possibly side with.

You can make the same arguement for the factions in Generals. The GLA are mysterious (You never do find out who the head honcho is, even in Zero Hour) and their motives beyond simply uprooting foreign imperialism is unknown.

Likewise, the USA aren't just trying to save civilians, but preserve freedom and spread democracy and all that jazz. If you disregard real life, that's pretty unique in an RTS.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00In 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.
You're correct to an extent, but it's not the same. The thing that makes it interesting is exactly that, Hitler never happened. It's an entire new world filled with new technology that makes people want to see what happens in the upcoming events.

Although I admit that my feelings on both Tiberian Dawn and Red Alert 1 are among the lowest in the series, Generals being rock-bottom, they still have a head and shoulders over Generals in terms of story and originality.

It's the same thing! Instead of the past it's the near future! It's still a fictious war with a touch of science fiction!

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00HAR 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?!
I never really said anything about stereotypes in this thread. I was just trying to point out that the factions were too cut and dry. Like the US is just trying to defend the world because they are "oh so powerful," the GLA is fighting for their own reasons and China is like "lolwut?"

If I was on the development team for that game, I would have suggested that they personalize each faction better. Give a few missions or simply a information about what and why their fighting for... you know, instead of just throwing them into the fray after a few sudden strikes and expecting the player to draw their own conclusions by the time the game is over.

You never explicitly stated that the game was stereotypical, but that's what you were getting at.

"The US is high and mighty, the terrorists are desert rats, etc etc".

I would argue that it's fairly obvious why each faction is fighting. Only a hermit would be confused by what's going on, and even he would catch on by mission 3 or so.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00You'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". Yes, but like I said, it's not something that can be debated logically.

For example, if you told me you liked a certain genre of music that I completely disagree with.. how am I supposed to argue about something you enjoy? Regardless of what I say or think, you're still going to listen to it. You aren't going to suddenly develop new preferences simply because I said otherwise.

It's not about pros and cons, its just about your gut feeling about what you like and dislike. There are just some things in this world that you can like or dislike without a true logical reason.

Each genre of music has it's merits, and by analyzing them and the reason behind them, you can arrive a logical conclusion on which is truely better, (at least for one person, as reasons differ from person to person). Nothing is random, and everything has a set of logic behind it.

I'll give you an example. One of my favorite genres of music is Power Metal. I can give you fairly decent sales pitch on why Power Metal is a superior genre of music. It combines the pleasant heaviness of regular music with things it usually lacks, like Melody and clean vocals. You could give me a sales pitch on whatever your favorite genres of music is and we can debate it over. We may not convince each other--And that's not what I'm after in this Generals debate, either--but the result will be a clearer understand on why we like or don't like what we do. You've already expanded your understanding somewhat in this thread. You yourself came to the realization on what exactly about artillery-type units bothers you so much.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47Of course you can't think of any negatives. And I don't think you're lying either. It just so happens that whenever you trying to think of negatives of something that you prefer, you tend to not be able to. It also happens with the positives on the opposing side of the argument. Happens to me all the time.

You have to take an outside source's points and use them rather than make them yourself, because they will always turn out bias. (The outside source can't be a single person either, because the results would be just as bias.)

Which is why I welcome your input.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-Most of your negatives are opinions. I tend to like having structures simply appear on the battlefield.

You may LIKE it, but it's not an opinion that it is unrealistic, harder to balance, and a general detriment to the game rather than a benefit.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-Also, in games prior to Generals, building multiple production centers allowed your production speed to increase dramatically. For example, if you have a single barracks, a soldier might take 6 seconds to build, but with two he might only take 3 or 4. And it increased with even more. There was a limit at one point, but it still gave you more than enough reason to build multiple production structures. Also, there was the fact that each structure was tied together, so if you made one on one side of the map and another on the other side of the map, you could chose which unit came out of which structure. (So you could train a unit and pause it seconds before it was created, then build a production structure in your enemies base and set it to primary, then continue the training and that unit would be made in the enemy base.

Which is inferior to having each structure have it's own production queue, like in C&C and every other RTS. It's a poor consolation prize that I'm still producing one tank at a time with twelve war factories.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-You're third point is a play off of the second point. Just like multiple production centers, having multiple MCVs made structure building faster.

That doesn't even begin to pay off. MCVs are always amongst the priciest units. It's a roundabout, awkward system to simply having a worker unit producing structures, instead of insisting on having them produced invisibly, off-screen.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-I tend to like the global repair and sell commands. Especially since how they work in C&C3 and RA3. How are they unbalanced? Everyone has access to them.

Because I can react quickly and salvage a structure or even an entire base that I cannot or choose not to defend. It softens to blow of losing a building. If you're losing a structure, you're not entitled to half it's value in a refund. You see this all the time especially with buildings that are about to be captured by a rouge engineer. If your building is about to be captured, you shouldn't be allowed to immediately remove it from the battlefield. Games with using the Peon System with repair/sell functions require a worker unit to repair or deconstruct a building, giving the attacking army the ability to stop the process.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-Units lack "abilities" because in the games Generals and prior, it really wasn't necessary to have them (Unless you count things like amplifying tesla coils with tesla troopers in RA2, ect). The only C&C game that really pulls off "abilities" nicely is RA3.

Nothing is necessary. You can have a very simple strategy game without any fanciness like that at all and still be very good and very successful (Like Chess, for example). That said, if such abilities done correctly is helps expand the strategic options open to a player making the game more complex and more deep. Even games as primitive as WarCraft II have them and it's shameful that games as (relatively) new as RA2 lack them. Not being "necessary" is a poor excuse. It isn't necessary to have a limit on how much currency a player can have stored in his war chest at a time either (A-la the silo system), yet it does something to expand the depth and strategy of the game on the macromanagement level.

And I dispute your claim that only RA3 has pulled off "abilities" nicely. The commando units in Generals and C&C 3 live and die by their abilities. And even if C&C games don't do abilties well, that's no excuse for their conspicious absence. They would be a benefit if added, and one of the long-time constraints on their presence is the old "sidebar". Competitive C&C games (Especially pre-Generals) usually devolve into who can produce the larger force of Scorpion Tanks/Battlemasters/Medium Tanks/whatever, with very little force variety. This is a stark contrast to games using the peon system with a robust system of unit abilties like StarCraft, WarCraft, Sins of a Solar Empire, and others, where you stand little chance of winning by producing a ton of one type on units and you practically require a balanced army.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47As for your positives about the Peon system: -More strategy can tend to be more fun. So I agree with you there. But not every game should play the same.. or else there is no point in making different games. If you're going to make a game the same as another game, ask yourself: "Why?"

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-Industry standard? Don't you mean unoriginal mainstream standard? The MCV system may not be the best, but its definitely different than the peon system and stands apart from it.

You're right. I guess other industry standards like ctrl+c being "copy" and ctrl+v being "paste" are "unoriginal", and software engineers should do things differently, just for the sake of doing things differently.

It's the standard because it works best. "Original" and "different" isn't always a good thing. Variety is only a positive if it offers an improvement over what is currently being used, and that's something the MCV/sidebar system just doesn't do. Why do you think it was updated with C&C 3 to bring it closer in line with the peon system (Different production lines, etc)?

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-Expansion. You're making a base, not a city. However, I agree that the peon system expands in a more fun way than the MCV system.

Great. We're in agreement then.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47-Your last few points: Realism and fun aren't always counterparts. C&C isn't about realism, it's about having fun with references to realism. Some people tend to have fun when they mimic real life, some people tend to have fun when they escape from real life. It's a balance, really. I think RA3 pulled off the balance between those two types of people very nicely with the separate building strategies each faction used.

RA3 did nothing of the sort. RA3 was a continuation in the "wacky", "zaney", "nutty" line of games that RA2 began. Don't get me wrong, I enjoy my share of shows like The Animaniacs which are a similar form of humor, but RTS games are about a high level of thinking and planning, and forcing such sillyness (For lack of a better word) clashes dramatically with the game.

But my points weren't so much about realism but balance and the expansion of strategic options. In games with the Peon System an attacking army can stop defenses from being completed while they're in the process of construction. Not only is this realistic, but it's better balanced and properly rewards the attacking army/penalizes the defender for their timing (or lack thereof). It rewards the

better player. If you begin making defenses on one side of your base and get attacked on the other, you're shit out of luck, and you rightly deserve to be. You've commited a strategic blunder. In the MCV system, all you have to do is place your Telsa Coil or whatever it is you're making in a different place, and problem solved. That takes away from strategy, instead of adding to it.

[quote title=R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47]The way I see the MCV system is more like symbolism. All the experiences of the battle being shown to you, the player, through summery. Like, you build a structure and place it instantly is the sped up summery of what really happened, which was a construction crew came out and made the structure using the supplies and tools given to them through the use of the MCV. Or to put it another way, a the MCV system might look and work one way in TD, but it might look more realistic and logical if you are looking at the same situation through a game like Renegade.

We never see building construction in Renegade, so I can't really say, but I imagine if we did it would require engineers or Hotwires/technicians. Workers. Just like the peon system.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 10:47I'm not imagining it, you probably just never noticed. Tiberian Dawn and Red Alert for the N64 and PS1 aside, Generals was the first C&C game were the control bar overlapped and obscured your view of the gameplay experience. In all the C&C titles prior to Generals, the 'sidebar' was it's own division of the screen. It didn't overlap the game sreen but was more of a complement to it. In Generals, C&C3 and RA3, the game screen was expanded to fill your entire monitor and the control bar was placed on top of it. It's not as much of a problem in C&C3 and RA3 because the sidebar is small, partially transparent, and doesn't have pointless solid areas that obscure your view.

Also, yes, you may have the ability to move the control bar out of the way, but then you lose the ability to use it. The sidebar is always there and it takes up minimal room.

General's control style may have been better if it took up less room. Something similar to this: http://odyssee.cncsaga.com/images_cnc4/2.png

Heaven forbid you have to scroll down slightly to see what's behind the command bar. More successful and argueably better games than Generals (Most notably WarCraft III) have much larger "HUDs" (For lack of a better word), and they accomplish their goals much better.

I admit, the "HUD" in that screenshot is superior to that of Generals, and it's not hard to find something that would be, but you're making a bigger deal out of this than the issue deserves. The control scheme in Generals might not be perfect, but it's not near bad enough to begin to impact the game, the way Call to Power 1's was.