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

Posted by Herr Surth on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 16:44:30 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

[quote title=Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23]R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31However, how that relates to the faction balance.. I don't know.

In RA3 each faction was totally different in terms of balance.

The Allies built using the traditional MCV system with some twists to make it better. They required "tech clearance" per base in order to build higher-tier things. That made using high-tech units and weapons from expansion bases much harder and it required you to strategically plan where you make your technologically advanced expansion bases.

The Soviets also used the MCV system with even more of a twist. They had a global technology pool, so you could build any high-tech unit/weapon anywhere you're able to just as long as you have the unlocking structure somewhere on the map. The catch, however, is that your structures don't "appear" on the map. You chose a structure and then chose where you want to build it. Then the structure will begin to build itself on the map, all the while being vulnerable to attack.

Japan had the most unique form of construction. They had an MCV, but it worked differently than what you're thinking. Their MCV produced building specific "Nano-cores" which would transform into the building they represent at a location you desire. This is the only faction that isn't limited to a build radius. They are able to build anywhere on the map at any time they want, given they are able to transport the nano-core to the desired location. The core took a while to get deployed, all the while being vulnerable to attack. This way of building bares the most resemblance to the peon system.

I preferred using either the Allies or Japan.[/color]

Are we talking about faction balance? I don't think any past C&C games have had faction-balance problems.you mean apart from everyone?