
Subject: Re: New C&C game confirmed!

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 28 Oct 2010 01:55:39 GMT

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

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 17:11...Except the giant squids, WW1 War Blimps (Kirovs), Crazy Ivan, Yuri, and etc. The art style was significantly more cartoony, as well. Compare it to TS, and you'll see what I mean

tbh, we are only comparing RA2 with RA3!

And what do mean "etc" lol...in RA2, only the Dolphin and Squid were the crazy units except that the Dolphins are actually based on real life US Navy stuff. Sure, the Squid was over the top but it was a thousand times better than a ship with mechanical legs or the embarrassing man cannon. The Kirov was outdated stuff as well but it was way cooler than a giant horned red-eyed Japanese mech. The Crazy Ivan was really just a demolitions unit like the Allied SEAL except Crazy Ivan enjoyed his job way too much!

Yuri had only a few completely fictional units and in no way were they as wacky as the ones you had in RA3. Brutes, Floating Disks, Masterminds, and Chaos Drones were the on-off crazy units but they didn't incite the same childish embarrassment that a mechanical legged-ship or a man-cannon vehicle did. Now that was stupid.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 17:11RA2's gameplay and missions were fun, I will admit that. But it just felt like they could have done WAY better and made it WAY cooler. Tiberian Sun, although the missions were campy, the game itself had an extremely rich ambiance.

Agree with you on this. TS was a class of its own when it comes to ambiance. You could taste the dirt in your mouth in the war-torn maps. Add in a high-tech faction of madmen wearing black and red uniforms and it felt as if the war was real!

One of the negatives RA2 got when it came out was it made no real improvement over TS. It was the same engine but beefed up. But what do you mean by "could have done WAY better and made it WAY cooler?"

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 17:11Kari Wuhrer was just as much, and if Westwood could they would have done just as much media whoring with Zofia, Tanya, and the other female characters. EA's just bigger so they had money to blow.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 17:11They tried to undo some of the gameplay damage they did with C&C3, and figured since they have a shitton of money they'd just hire some professional actors and have some goofy scenes. Which, if Westwood had the same budget, they would have done the same with RA2.

There so many things wrong with this assumption tbh! WW just didn't go overboard because they knew what they were doing. How do you explain what WW did for RA2 then?

WW had enough money to make rare collectors edition pewter figurines of the Tesla Trooper and Chrono Legionnaire (not including the cancelled Tanya action figure) which were included in the

collectors edition of RA2. They had the money to do that! So they weren't poor. Instead they channeled it into making something fans can have something solid to remember them and the game by...not by making silly meaningless posters of the female actors in their game cast! That's what EA does.

RA2 feels quiet conservative; WW wanted to make it funny no doubt but they knew which lines to not cross as to make it totally ridiculous. It feels like a game where WW could have taken the wackyness to the max but didn't. But EA sure did with RA3.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 17:11I just hate it when people point their fingers at RA3 and say "OMG THIS GAME RUINED C&C FOREVEERRR".

I understand but that's not what I am saying. I just go nuts when people put RA2 in the same boat as RA3. From someone who enjoyed RA2 for almost everyday for 4 years, RA3 felt like crap. I was so eager to play it as having lived on RA2 for so long, I was looking forward to RA3 but it let me down. It was not a worthy follow-up to RA2 and never will be in my eyes. And thanks to EA, the RA universe is most probably dead.

@ R3:

It had nothing to do with the colour palette or the failed real-life technology. It had to do with the feel of the game units.

And lol at "RA1, RA2 and RA3 are all in the same cartoony boat!"

Build 5 Apocalypse tanks in RA2 and move them around. Listen to their sounds, how intimidating they look, and how realistic they seem and behave and shoot. Watch from 3:05 onwards:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6yhSjiUzTEA&feature=related>

Now try building 5 Apocs in RA3 and do the same thing. Here's a reference:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K844rpUI0FE>

LMFAO! See what happened with the RA3 Apocalypse tank; a loose turret that caused a constant eye sore not to mention looking like a ugly oversized plastic toy! I hate this kind of comical crap.

Another idiotic RA3 unit is the Allied Cyrocopter. First off, what a ugly ass helicopter lol. And to add insult to the already silly game, the Cyrocopter's special power was shrinking enemy units it is used on! ARE YOU KIDDING ME? This was so crap lol and it looked so stupid in-game when the enemy Allied AI used it on my tanks in a skirmish game. I was left staring at the screen in disbelief at the stupidity unfolding on it!

RA2 felt way more real and even with the Yuri faction, the game didn't spiral into insanity in design. I have no idea why EA did this; they should have kept the unit physics from C&C 3. Not to mention that the target outlines for the RA3 units made it even more unbearable. Toys!

The game wasn't what I expected. EA went in a different direction and sure they can't please everybody. But as someone who throughly enjoyed RA2 for 4 years almost everyday and then

eagerly bought RA3 to enjoy the series further, it was a huge let down.
