
Subject: C&C 4 Coming!!!!

Posted by [rockstar256](#) on Thu, 09 Jul 2009 20:57:05 GMT

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

<http://www.commandandconquer.com/cnc4/index.html>

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

Posted by [sloscha](#) on Thu, 09 Jul 2009 21:34:42 GMT

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

yes there's already a topic about this

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

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Fri, 10 Jul 2009 00:21:11 GMT

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

Tbh I'm not that excited about it. EA just keeps making them worse. I didn't even buy the C&C3 expansion or even try any of the redalrt3 stuff.

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 12 Jul 2009 22:02:41 GMT

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

So how do you know they are making them better or worse if you didn't try anything past the initial release?

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

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 13 Jul 2009 03:18:39 GMT

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

luv2pb wrote on Thu, 09 July 2009 19:21Tbh I'm not that excited about it. EA just keeps making them worse. I didn't even buy the C&C3 expansion or even try any of the redalrt3 stuff.

Don't even bother mate and save your money to spend on some other game. C&C 3 was ridiculous and RA3 tops even that.

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 13 Jul 2009 23:42:01 GMT

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

He speks liez.

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

Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Tue, 14 Jul 2009 03:36:13 GMT

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

You all take c&c too seriously for it's storyline, if you look past all that those are actually pretty fun games, same with generals and zero hour, those were the funnest rts' I've ever played, and still are.

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 15 Jul 2009 00:23:28 GMT

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

I disagree, Generals was horrible.

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 15 Jul 2009 07:27:09 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 July 2009 17:23 I disagree, Generals was horrible.

lol.

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

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 16 Jul 2009 18:08:17 GMT

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

EDIT: nvm

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 17 Jul 2009 01:15:00 GMT

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

lol2u.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 18 Jul 2009 03:44:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

generals and zero hour were both good games
explain why you disliked them, if you can

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 18 Jul 2009 08:51:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquidv2 wrote on Fri, 17 July 2009 20:44generals and zero hour were both good games
explain why you disliked them, if you can

Don't bother. He's adverse to logic and reasoning.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sat, 18 Jul 2009 12:50:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The only thing I like about RA3:

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sun, 19 Jul 2009 02:49:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 03:51liquidv2 wrote on Fri, 17 July 2009 20:44generals and
zero hour were both good games
explain why you disliked them, if you can

Don't bother. He's adverse to logic and reasoning.
oh
so he's a woman

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 19 Jul 2009 03:07:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In the thread where Dover was intent on arguing about Generals, he assumed I was arguing with

him and now he is on my case because he doesn't think I have any valid points to defend my opinion. (which, by the way, you don't need a reason to have an opinion, Dover, because if you have a means to back up your opinion, then that isn't called an opinion, it's called a "theory." Or, if the back up info is "proof," then it would be called a "fact." An opinion is merely someone's personal presumption or idea of something. An opinion can be right, it can be wrong, or it can just be plain ridiculous, but having the means to backup your opinion doesn't make your opinion any less than an opinion... it just makes the person less of an idiot.)

However, I feel like discussing Generals in this thread, so lets have at it then.. just as long as you aren't a complete fagsack about it.

The main reasons why I don't like Generals are:

-It looked like it was tossed together.

Regardless if they put incredible or lackluster amounts of detail into specific models, it looked like everything used a different artstyle that clashed with one another. So once everything was brought together, it looked kind of awkward, imo. (Also, why did the trees dance? The wind isn't THAT strong...)

-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.

-Plot?

It may have had a "plot," but it had no story.. It's basically: a fictional war breaks out and things happen. Then the next thing you know, you see credits! The game was probably meant for multiplayer action over single player action.. however, if that was the case, why bother with a campaign at all? (Also, "Eva" in the briefings/loading was just embarrassingly tacked-on.)

-Unlikeable factions

I can't find the ability to gain a liking for any of the 3 factions. They all seem to just be there. There really isn't any info on them other than they are supposed to represent different modern-day nations and countries..

The US was too high and mighty, the GLA was just a big "Lol we're terrorists!" cliché, and China was just.. well they were just "there."

-Too slow

The pace of the game seemed to slow. Even when I changed the game speed in the options, the infantry and vehicles all seemed to move in slow motion.

-Preferences

1. I prefer the MCV system to the cliché mainstream dozer style system. (Dover said it had a name, but I forgot it.) C&C has always been about the MCV. I can respect that since Generals was a new unique 'universe' in the franchise that they were experimenting different "routes," but, imo, I don't like the style. I'm fine with using it, I just prefer using the MCV style.

2. The control bar on the bottom of the screen was annoying. I prefer the side bar. It didn't take up 3/4 of the screen and allowed the game to be viewed from it's own area of the screen.. rather than the control panel being pasted over the gameplay itself. Also, I don't really remember, but could you "lower it" to see more of the screen? Or am I confusing that with starcraft?

3. Camera was too low! You couldn't see anything! The viewing angle should have been zoomed out more so you have a larger field of view. (Was that fixed in ZH? I don't remember..)

However, 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.

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

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sun, 19 Jul 2009 07:19:23 GMT

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

I sense a...

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

Posted by [Devlin](#) on Sun, 19 Jul 2009 13:44:54 GMT

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

now you guys explain why do you dislike CNC3 RA3...

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 19 Jul 2009 21:54:34 GMT

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

You sense that an image was deleted?

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 20 Jul 2009 16:21:13 GMT

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

Ah, R315r4z0r my friend. I knew you couldn't stay away. :)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]In the thread where Dover was intent on arguing about Generals, he assumed I was arguing with him and now he is on my case because he doesn't think I have any valid points to defend my opinion. (which, by the way, you don't need a reason to have an opinion, Dover, because if you have a means to back up your opinion, then that isn't called an opinion, it's called a "theory." Or, if the back up info is "proof," then it would be called a "fact." An opinion is merely someone's personal presumption or idea of something. An opinion can be right, it can be wrong, or it can just be plain ridiculous, but having the means to backup your opinion doesn't make your opinion any less than an opinion... it just makes the person less of an idiot.)

Either we have differing definitions of what constitutes an opinion or you have some wacky beliefs. It's very rare that a person holds an opinion for no reason. Someone or something has given him reason to believe the way he does. This is his reasoning, his "proof". Without these initial "points", the person in question isn't convinced and there is no opinion. You don't have to back up your opinions, true, but only in the same sense that you don't have to post on these forums or you don't have to drive on the correct side of the road.

Also, if I read that last statement correctly, you just called yourself an idiot (Or, at the very least, not "less of an idiot) for refusing to validate your opinions up until now. I applaude your

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]However, I feel like discussing Generals in this thread, so lets have at it then.. just as long as you aren't a complete fagsack about it.

I could say the same for you. Try not to get so butthurt this time.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]The main reasons why I don't like Generals are:

-It looked like it was tossed together.

Regardless if they put incredible or lackluster amounts of detail into specific models, it looked like everything used a different artstyle that clashed with one another. So once everything was brought together, it looked kind of awkward, imo. (Also, why did the trees dance? The wind isn't THAT strong...)

If you're referring to how the GLA units look different from the USA units, and the USA units look different from the Chinese units, then DUUHHHH. That's like complaining about how in StarCraft the art-style used with the Zerg is so different from the art-style used with the Protoss. It's an intentional art direction choice to give each faction a unique flavor. This isn't anything unique to Generals. Notice how vastly different the Allied and Soviet structures look in RA2? And how they clash aesthetically when put in the same base?

I won't even ask how you can conjecture about how strong the wind is when you have nothing but the trees to go by.

R315r4z0r 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 Missiles or Gatling 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)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Plot?

It may have had a "plot," but it had no story.. It's basically: a fictional war breaks out and things happen. Then the next thing you know, you see credits! The game was probably meant for multiplayer action over single player action.. however, if that was the case, why bother with a campaign at all? (Also, "Eva" in the briefings/loading was just embarrassingly tacked-on.)

"Fictional war, some things happen, game over" is a summery of every C&C game. When you dismiss the entire plot with the words "thing happen", you can't complain.

I'm not sure what you mean about Eva. She fills the same role she has in every C&C game. There's nothing different about Eva in Generals and Eva in any other C&C.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Unlikeable factions

I can't find the ability to gain a liking for any of the 3 factions. They all seem to just be there. There really isn't any info on them other than they are supposed to represent different modern-day nations and countries..

What more do you need? There are much flimsier excuses for factions. The GDI are the assumed nondescript good guys. The Soviets in Red Alert are generic stereotypical russians. The Terrans in StarCraft are just "the humans". This is the way RTSes work. Why blame Generals for it?

R315r4z0r 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!" cliché, and China was just.. well they were just "there."

You're reading too much into something that isn't there.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Too slow

The pace of the game seemed to slow. Even when I changed the game speed in the options, the infantry and vehicles all seemed to move in slow motion.

Infantry are slow. This shouldn't be a surprise to you

I would assert that Generals is fairly fast. With the rise in air power and superweapons, the deciding moments in battles goes by faster than before.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Preferences

1. I prefer the MCV system to the cliché mainstream dozer style system. (Dover said it had a name, but I forgot it.) C&C has always been about the MCV. I can respect that since Generals was a new unique 'universe' in the franchise that they were experimenting different "routes," but, imo, I don't like the style. I'm fine with using it, I just prefer using the MCV style.

See 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.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]2. The control bar on the bottom of the screen was annoying. I prefer the side bar. It didn't take up 3/4 of the screen and allowed the game to be viewed from it's own area of the screen.. rather than the control panel being pasted over the gameplay itself. Also, I don't really remember, but could you "lower it" to see more of the screen? Or am I confusing that with starcraft?

The 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.

3. Camera was too low! You couldn't see anything! The viewing angle should have been zoomed out more so you have a larger field of view. (Was that fixed in ZH? I don't remember..)

R315r4z0r 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.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Mon, 20 Jul 2009 17:31:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This seems like it should be in hot topics if anywhere...

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 20 Jul 2009 19:33:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This "omfg Generals is horrible!!!11!1" debate has been done to the death. And on every occasion, those saying it was a fine game won.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 01:44:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Surprisingly, 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21

Also, if I read that last statement correctly, you just called yourself an idiot (Or, at the very least, not "less of an idiot) for refusing to validate your opinions up until now. I applaude your Yes, you would be correct. I realized that when I was proof reading my post, but left it in because it's the best way I could express my idea.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21If you're referring to how the GLA units look different from the USA units, and the USA units look different from the Chinese units, then DUUHHHH. That's like complaining about how in StarCraft the art-style used with the Zerg is so different from the art-style used with the Protoss. It's an intentional art direction choice to give each faction a unique flavor. This isn't anything unique to Generals. Notice how vastly different the Allied and Soviet structures look in RA2? And how they clash aesthetically when put in the same base?

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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21I won't even ask how you can conjecture about how strong the wind is when you have nothing but the trees to go by.

I'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.

Dover 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 Tesla Coils or Patriot Missiles or Gatling 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 summarize, 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 "Fictional war, some things happen, game over" is a summery of every C&C game. When you dismiss the entire plot with the words "thing happen",

you can't complain.

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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 I'm not sure what you mean about Eva. She fills the same role she has in every C&C game. There's nothing different about Eva in Generals and Eva in any other C&C.

That'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...

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 What more do you need? There are much flimsier excuses for factions. The GDI are the assumed nondescript good guys. The Soviets in Red Alert are generic stereotypical russians. The Terrans in StarCraft are just "the humans". This is the way RTSes work. Why blame Generals for it?

There 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 R315r4z0r 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!" cliché, 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?

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 Infantry are slow. This shouldn't be a surprise to you

I would assert that Generals is fairly fast. With the rise in air power and superweapons, the deciding moments in battles goes by faster than before.

Actually, I think that point was more of my fault for not remembering the actual game over the demo. The units in the demo were so slow it's hard to forget. (That goes for infantry as well as vehicles.)

Also, I'm not actually talking about game pace, but the pace the units themselves moved at, which, like I said, I think I'm confusing it with what I remember from the demo... so that's my bad.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 See 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 The 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07 However, 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.

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 03:00:18 GMT

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

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 spamable. (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 Gatling 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 summarize, 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 missiles 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 emphasis 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[The US was too high and mighty, the GLA was just a big "Lol we're terrorists!" cliché, 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 referring 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 vanguard 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 their 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)

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

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 03:50:48 GMT

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

People can argue about Generals sucking until they're blue in the face, but from a marketing and sales point of view, it was very successful. For one thing, it was created relatively recently after 9/11. Another thing is that it has a believable world, as opposed to the 'Tiberian Universe' and the Red Alert 2/3 one, which quite a few people regard as rather 'nutty.' This new setting allowed C&C to reach a mass audience made it one of the best selling games in '03.

The game itself rated very highly too, so obviously EA made a very smart move. Plus, it likely brought people into the C&C fold that may have not been interested in the other two universes previously.

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

Posted by [YazooGang](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 04:24:47 GMT

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

<http://planetcnc.gamespy.com/fullstory.php?id=159284>

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

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 05:06:05 GMT

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

@ Dover: You are welcome! I removed the image assuming you did not like it; after your massive attack, I uploaded it again. LOL!

You pretty much got down all the reasons for why I like the Peon system. MCV system lacks depth and strategy; Peon is more realistic; I prefer how the buildings take time to appear and how you are forced to keep flexible control groups of units to aid yourself in expansion.

nikki6ixx wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 22:50 People can argue about Generals sucking until they're blue in the face, but from a marketing and sales point of view, it was very successful. For one thing, it was created relatively recently after 9/11. Another thing is that it has a believable world, as

opposed to the 'Tiberian Universe' and the Red Alert 2/3 one, which quite a few people regard as rather 'nutty.' This new setting allowed C&C to reach a mass audience made it one of the best selling games in '03.

The game itself rated very highly too, so obviously EA made a very smart move. Plus, it likely brought people into the C&C fold that may have not been interested in the other two universes previously.

I have been saying this in every Generals debate here.

The game was a stunning success in every way, shape, and form and it picked up a prestigious E3 best RTS award.

C&C fanboys don't realize what a MAJOR gap Generals successfully filled. EA made a smart move making a killer 3D RTS game with modern military units that was NOT in the market at that time; atleast not anything as advanced as Generals. They cashed in major time and brought more players to RTS gaming with help of a simple "terrorists vs everyone else" plot.

Generals units were awesome as well. I found the factions to be a fresh break; the Chinese faction was both inspirational and well done imo.

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 05:35:05 GMT

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

Starbuck wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 22:06@ Dover: You are welcome! I removed the image assuming you did not like it; after your massive attack, I uploaded it again. LOL!

Not at all. I didn't see it the first time around. I love it. Again, thank you very much. :D

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

Posted by [slosha](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 16:20:45 GMT

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

RTS FTL!

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 17:47:07 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00'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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00'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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00 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.

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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00 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 missiles 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 emphasis 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00 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.

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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00 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 no 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00 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 referred to with words like "Shadowy" and Kane is referred 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.

Dover 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00HAR HAR.

I was referring 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 vanguard 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.

Dover 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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00But 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.

Of 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.)

-Most of your negatives are opinions. I tend to like having structures simply appear on the battlefield.

-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.

-You're third point is a play off of the second point. Just like multiple production centers, having multiple MCVs made structure building faster.

-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.

-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.

As 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?"

-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.

-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.

-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.

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.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 23:00It 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. I'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 where the control bar overlapped and obscured your view of the gameplay experience. In all the C&C titles prior to Generals, the 'sidebar' was its own division of the screen. It didn't overlap the game screen 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://odyssey.cncsaga.com/images_cnc4/2.png

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 23:37:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

blah blah blah, generals/zero hour is still fun to play. Currently playing CNC3 and very enjoyable as well.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 22 Jul 2009 00:02:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's got its fun aspects yes, but I just don't like it. Why is that so difficult to understand?

Generals is the game equivalent to rap music.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Wed, 22 Jul 2009 01:40:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

generals was probably more like grunge than rap music, you're one of the old metalheads that hates it

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Wed, 22 Jul 2009 04:24:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you want story read a book.

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

Posted by [YazooGang](#) on Wed, 22 Jul 2009 05:01:52 GMT

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

bakerrrr wrote on Tue, 21 July 2009 21:24If you want story read a book.

Westwood guys should of made a tiberium war book so that no one can make up what happens next.

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 22 Jul 2009 06:21:45 GMT

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

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 missiles 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 emphasis 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 referred to with words like "Shadowy" and Kane is referred 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 argument 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 fictitious 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 referring 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 vanguard 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 truly 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 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 abilities well, that's no excuse for their conspicuous 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 abilities 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 silliness (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 committed 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.

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 23 Jul 2009 01:31:48 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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.

There is a difference between trying to enjoy something and not being able to enjoy something.

My main reason for playing C&C games is to play the single player and skirmish. After I've done that, I move onto multiplayer. The campaign and story, however, is the selling point for me when it comes to the game. For Generals to lack heavily in terms of an enjoyable story, it makes my opinion of it very poor.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 "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.

Of course it sounds like a "poor ripoff." That's because it uses the same acronym. But the title is one thing, what it actually does is something else.

In Tiberium, EVA is a strategic AI that gives you advise on how to handle situations logically as well as give you information which may be key to your missions.

In Red Alert, Lt. Eva is a briefing officer that is used to twist the way a mission is under taken when compared to Tiberium.

In Generals, it's a mix of the two. I suggested making it its own unique flare to the game rather than taking aspects of the previous games (other than the name, obviously.)

As for the uniqueness of the MCV and sidebar, I meant that it's different in structure when compared to other RTS games out there. Name a single, non-C&C, modern day RTS game that uses a building system similar to the MCV. You can't because there is none (or if there is, I haven't heard of it.) What I'm getting at with that is that it is a step away from mainstream. It's a taste of something different for those of us who want it.

The Peon system has it's fun and positive aspects over the MCV just as the MCV does over the

Peon system. But that doesn't mean that one system should be the total standard for which RTS games are based off of. Nothing should ever be definitive as there is always people who enjoy it another way.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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. Yes, I understand that, but there's more to it than that.

Perhaps I'm explaining it to you the wrong way. The USA, GLA and China are all based off of real world nations and organizations. As such, they don't require much explanation because the players should already understand who they are (unless they live in a cave somewhere in the middle of the Outback). However, it's that aspect of using the modern-day real world that makes the factions unlikeable, imo.

Maybe it's just my own personal opinion.. I don't like games that the characters/factions are ideally virtual real-world people/armies. Along with the campaign requirement I mentioned above, that's just another turn-off for me.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 It's the same thing! Instead of the past it's the near future! It's still a fictitious war with a touch of science fiction!

No, one's a fictitious war based off of the implication of current events. 'This could happen in our world.' The other is a fictitious war based off of implication of historical changes. 'What if we changed this part of history and allowed these ideas to work?'

Ones a "this could happen tomorrow" and the other is "this could never happen but what if it did?"

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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 truly 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.

When it comes to reasoning for liking music, I have different feelings than you. Although I understand where you're coming from, it's not like that with me. I like certain genres of music simply because I unexplainably do. I like to listen to some and not to others.. not based on any real reasons... or at least reasons I can perceive.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Which is why I welcome your input.
Point taken.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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. I have also stated on many occasions in this thread that the MCV system wasn't realistic and have also stated that being realistic doesn't count as a good or bad fact. Games should be fun to play through their own means. If one finds a realistic game fun, that doesn't mean that only realistic games are fun.
Harder to balance? Maybe, but what difference does it make?
General detriment? That's your opinion.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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.

...

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.

Again, that's your opinion. I preferred it over multiple queues. When C&C3 introduced multiple queues, I was a bit discouraged (and was joined by a decent size group of other people.) I even created my own gameplay mechanic idea to meet halfway between the two systems. I'll explain it if you're curious, but for the time being I'll leave it out.

Personally, I find that multiple queues lead to spamming... which is exactly what C&C3 was: "Spam-tacular."

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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.
I'll give you the point about defending against capturing.. however the refund points have been corrected since C&C3. Now the price you get back is a ratio to the damage you've taken. If you try to sell a \$2,000 structure just before it's destroyed, you get maybe \$20-\$50, if you're lucky. If you sell it when it's at full HP, then you get half of what it cost to purchase (in this case it would be \$1,000).

It may have the same principle on paper, but the effect it has on gameplay is to a much lesser scale. Not to mention the fact each player has the ability to do it.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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 abilities well, that's no excuse for their conspicuous 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 abilities 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. I was originally planning to say "weren't able to" but I realized that wasn't true. I settled on wasn't necessary because, exactly as you said, you can have a good game without the use of abilities.

Also, how does the idea that a single unit from either Generals or C&C3 can sway your opinion in favor of them when EVERY unit in RA3 had game-changing abilities?

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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)? Copy/pasting isn't a form of entertainment value. People want simple standards for things like work or office programs because it makes the program easier to work with when used in conjunction with other programs and it gets the job done faster.

With games, however, it's a different story. Doing something different for the sake of doing it different will give you an appeal to a new audience of people/fans. Something doesn't have to be original or different to be good, only if it doesn't want to be boring.

Where's the fun if all RTS games used the same game mechanics?

Also, C&C3 had that implemented cause the self proclaimed "pros" said so. Like I said earlier, there were many people, including myself against it, and I even suggested my own gameplay mechanic that met halfway.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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 silliness (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 committed 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. You're overreacting to the "weird," "wacky," "zaney" aspects you mention because they aren't really that apparent. They are only in the main idea of the technology used, which still seems pretty solid. The theories were disproven (or never followed up on) in the real world, but that doesn't necessarily make them "wacky." The game's light hearted, not humorous. However, 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.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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. Which is exactly my point. Just because you don't see it, doesn't mean it isn't happening.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 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. You can brush it off by saying "just move the camera" but my point is "why should I have to?"

Just like in web site designing, every bit of space counts as well as how many times you require the person to click around. You want someone to have maximum access to basically everything at any given time. If someone has to do even the simplest of tasks to get what they want, it's a demerit. For example, you shouldn't have to scroll the webpage down to click a button to get to another page.

It might not be a big deal in the onlook of the situation, but it really makes a difference if the issue didn't exist to begin with.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [havoc9826](#) on Fri, 24 Jul 2009 05:11:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GameTrailers just released a world exclusive trailer here. Discussion topic here.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [_SSnipe_](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 08:40:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The part i dont like,
Quote:
Command & Conquer 4 will reveal the epic conclusion of the Tiberium Saga.

Who will win

P.S. Check out trailer on there site...makes you cant wait any longer

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 16:23:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 There is a difference between trying to enjoy something and not being able to enjoy something.

My main reason for playing C&C games is to play the single player and skirmish. After I've done that, I move onto multiplayer. The campaign and story, however, is the selling point for me when it

comes to the game. For Generals to lack heavily in terms of an enjoyable story, it makes my opinion of it very poor.

And that's what I'm talking about. You're choosing to hate the game for what it isn't rather than enjoy it for what it is. You're not even trying to have fun with it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 Of course it sounds like a "poor ripoff." That's because it uses the same acronym. But the title is one thing, what it actually does is something else.

In Tiberium, EVA is a strategic AI that gives you advise on how to handle situations logically as well as give you information which may be key to your missions.

In Red Alert, Lt. Eva is a briefing officer that is used to twist the way a mission is under taken when compared to Tiberium.

In Generals, it's a mix of the two. I suggested making it its own unique flare to the game rather than taking aspects of the previous games (other than the name, obviously.)

They do the samn damn thing in either situation. You're nitpicking. There's no difference. Besides, is it that hard to accept that it could be the same Lt. Eva in both games? It's a person with the same name that holds the same job for the same country with practically the same voice.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 As for the uniqueness of the MCV and sidebar, I meant that it's different in structure when compared to other RTS games out there. Name a single, non-C&C, modern day RTS game that uses a building system similar to the MCV. You can't because there is none (or if there is, I haven't heard of it.) What I'm getting at with that is that it is a step away from mainstream. It's a taste of something different for those of us who want it.

The "mainstream" is what it is for a reason. Because it works and because it's superior. Why do all action/RPG games use some form of a red bar and/or a number to indicate the health of a character? Because it works, and games that mix it up (For example, Soul Reaver) are ususally sub-par at best and terribad at worst.

As for a non-C&C modern RTS, Dune II. If you say it isn't modern, it's Wikipedia page says otherwise:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dune_IIDune II established a format that would be followed for years to come, and was the first to use the mouse to move units, allowing players to fluidly interact with their troops.[1] As such, Dune II was the first modern real-time strategy game. Striking a balance between complexity and innovation, it was a huge success and laid the foundation for the coming Command & Conquer, the Warcraft series, and many other RTS games.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 The Peon system has it's fun and positive aspects over the MCV just as the MCV does over the Peon system. But that doesn't mean that one system should be the total standard for which RTS games are based off of. Nothing should ever be definitive as there is always people who enjoy it another way.

You can always find one wackjob that will find an inferior control scheme more fun or more beneficial in some way, but that doesn't make it true. There are a lot of people who are against

advancing the control system in the upcoming SC2 because they feel it would lead to a decrease in player skill level. In the end, any given Blizzard game (Which all use the peon system) outsell any given C&C game. As a capitalist, I'm sure you can appreciate that the free-market has spoken, and it has said that the peon system is superior?

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 Perhaps I'm explaining it to you the wrong way. The USA, GLA and China are all based off of real world nations and organizations. As such, they don't require much explanation because the players should already understand who they are (unless they live in a cave somewhere in the middle of the Outback). However, it's that aspect of using the modern-day real world that makes the factions unlikeable, imo.

Maybe it's just my own personal opinion.. I don't like games that the characters/factions are ideally virtual real-world people/armies. Along with the campaign requirement I mentioned above, that's just another turn-off for me. [/color]

You see, you're telling me your opinion, but you're not saying WHY. We can't have a discussion if it's just going to devolve into talking about our feelings.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 No, one's a fictitious war based off of the implication of current events. 'This could happen in our world.' The other is a fictitious war based off of implication of historical changes. 'What if we changed this part of history and allowed these ideas to work?'

Ones a "this could happen tomorrow" and the other is "this could never happen but what if it did?"

You're nitpicking.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 When it comes to reasoning for liking music, I have different feelings than you. Although I understand where you're coming from, it's not like that with me. I like certain genres of music simply because I unexplainably do. I like to listen to some and not to others.. not based on any real reasons... or at least reasons I can perceive.

Nobody, and this includes you, likes something for no reason. You have a reason for liking what you do. All you're doing is hiding behind your (Real, or perceived) ignorance. Do some soul-searching, and get back to me on why you enjoy what you do.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 I have also stated on many occasions in this thread that the MCV system wasn't realistic and have also stated that being realistic doesn't count as a good or bad fact. Games should be fun to play through their own means. If one finds a realistic game fun, that doesn't mean that only realistic games are fun. Harder to balance? Maybe, but what difference does it make? General detriment? That's your opinion.

I guess I should stop using the word "realistic", because although it's true, it really isn't my point. My main point is that it's harder to balance which makes it subsequently less-balanced. It closes off strategic options that would be open to a player under the peon system and generally takes away from the game more than it adds.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31

Again, that's your opinion. I preferred it over multiple queues. When C&C3 introduced multiple queues, I was a bit discouraged (and was joined by a decent size group of other people.) I even created my own gameplay mechanic idea to meet halfway between the two systems. I'll explain it if you're curious, but for the time being I'll leave it out.

Personally, I find that multiple queues lead to spamming... which is exactly what C&C3 was: "Spam-tacular."

And? All C&C games have been spam-tacular. This isn't because of multiple production queues but because the units are poorly balanced. Even with a single production queue, most C&C games encourage the mass production of a single type of unit, which is something that just wouldn't fly in most other RTSes.

Again, explain to me how when I have 30 War Factories built all my tanks come out of one of them, and why I can't make 30 tanks at once. That's retarded, there's just no other word for it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 I'll give you the point about defending against capturing.. however the refund points have been corrected since C&C3. Now the price you get back is a ratio to the damage you've taken. If you try to sell a \$2,000 structure just before it's destroyed, you get maybe \$20-\$50, if you're lucky. If you sell it when it's at full HP, then you get half of what it cost to purchase (in this case it would be \$1,000).

It may have the same principle on paper, but the effect it has on gameplay is to a much lesser scale. Not to mention the fact each player has the ability to do it.

"Each player has the ability to do it" doesn't and shouldn't come into the equation. If you're losing a building or it's about to get captured and you can't save it, then you deserve to have it get blown up or captured. That's it. End of story. If you get 50 credits out of it, that's 50 credits more than you deserve.

Not to mention the free units you get when you sell things, in some cases high-tier units like Shadow Teams for selling...a secret shrine I think? I don't know I'm having a brainfart.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 I was originally planning to say "weren't able to" but I realized that wasn't true. I settled on wasn't necessary because, exactly as you said, you can have a good game without the use of abilities.

Also, how does the idea that a single unit from either Generals or C&C3 can sway your opinion in favor of them when EVERY unit in RA3 had game-changing abilities?

I'm looking more at games like StarCraft and WarCraft that have "caster" units that have multiple supportive abilities which is something you just don't see in C&C (With the exception of Black Lotus in generals, I suppose). I see the limited availability of such units as part of the reason competitive C&C is such a spamfest.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 Copy/pasting isn't a form of entertainment value.

People want simple standards for things like work or office programs because it makes the program easier to work with when used in conjunction with other programs and it gets the job done faster.

With games, however, it's a different story. Doing something different for the sake of doing it different will give you an appeal to a new audience of people/fans. Something doesn't have to be original or different to be good, only if it doesn't want to be boring.

Where's the fun if all RTS games used the same game mechanics?

Also, C&C3 had that implemented cause the self proclaimed "pros" said so. Like I said earlier, there were many people, including myself against it, and I even suggested my own gameplay mechanic that met halfway.

I truly pity you if you think the HUD a game uses (Since that's basically what this is coming down to, if it's at the side or at the bottom) affects how fun that game is to any major degree.

I'd like to hear your own gameplay mechanic, but judging by your opinions I've heard so far I'm willing to predict I'm not going to like it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 You're overreacting to the "weird," "wacky," "zaney" aspects you mention because they aren't really that apparent. They are only in the main idea of the technology used, which still seems pretty solid. The theories were disproven (or never followed up on) in the real world, but that doesn't necessarily make them "wacky." The game's light hearted, not humorous.

Lol

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 However, 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.

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 Which is exactly my point. Just because you don't see it, doesn't mean it isn't happening.

No, in Renegade it IS happening because you can kill off hotwires and engineers and stop repairs and such. In other C&C games it ISN'T happening because nothing you do will stop repairs short of the player running out of money.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 You can brush it off by saying "just move the camera" but my point is "why should I have to?"

Because the game doesn't play itself.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 Just like in web site designing, every bit of space counts as well as how many times you require the person to click around. You want someone to have maximum access to basically everything at any given time. If someone has to do even the simplest of tasks to get what they want, it's a demerit. For example, you shouldn't have to scroll the webpage down to click a button to get to another page.

It might not be a big deal in the onlook of the situation, but it really makes a difference if the issue didn't exist to begin with.

You're making a big deal out of nothing. The controls in Generals are sub-par but not terrible. There's certainly room for improvement, but isn't there always?

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 16:41:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23 making a big deal out of nothing.

This pretty much sums up this entire thread.

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 18:31 However, 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?

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 16:55:24 GMT

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

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 09:44Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31 However, 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?

You know, the more I looked into your claims, the more it seemed to me that it was just bad players on the forum bitching instead of playing the game and getting better.

nikki6ixx wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 09:41Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23making a big deal out of nothing.

This pretty much sums up this entire thread.

One could argue it sums up this entire sub-forum.

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 17:33:26 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:55so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 09:44Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23R315r4z0r 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?

You know, the more I looked into your claims, the more it seemed to me that it was just bad players on the forum bitching instead of playing the game and getting better.

The ZH Community patch was made by some of the best ZH players there...

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 18:31:47 GMT

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

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 10:33Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:55so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 09:44Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23R315r4z0r 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?

You know, the more I looked into your claims, the more it seemed to me that it was just bad players on the forum bitching instead of playing the game and getting better.

The ZH Community patch was made by some of the best ZH players there...

You're missing the point. Some professional StarCraft players have made comments like "Oh, Terran is overpowered" or "Protoss lategame vs Terran provides too much mobility with Recall, that's imbalanced", and I'm sure given the chance they would alter the game so suit their definition of balanced, but that isn't the case. The game is what it is, and rather than patch it over, what should be done is learn to counter whatever the "overpowered" tactic is. It's not impossible.

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 18:34:55 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:31so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 10:33Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:55so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 09:44Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23R315r4z0r 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?

You know, the more I looked into your claims, the more it seemed to me that it was just bad players on the forum bitching instead of playing the game and getting better.

The ZH Community patch was made by some of the best ZH players there...

You're missing the point. Some professional StarCraft players have made comments like "Oh, Terran is overpowered" or "Protoss lategame vs Terran provides too much mobility with Recall, that's imbalanced", and I'm sure given the chance they would alter the game so suit their definition of balanced, but that isn't the case. The game is what it is, and rather than patch it over, what should be done is learn to counter whatever the "overpowered" tactic is. It's not impossible. With emphasis on "SOME" professional players?

Because, you know, virtually everyone thought China was underpowered.

Oh btw, are you proposing not to patch games at all anymore because nobodies input could be trusted?

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 19:40:05 GMT

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

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:34 With emphasis on "SOME" professional players? Because, you know, virtually everyone thought China was underpowered.

Oh btw, are you proposing not to patch games at all anymore because nobodies input could be trusted?

...Let me give you a specific examples on what I mean. This, this, and this are three Terran vs Protoss games of StarCraft on two maps that are widely acknowledged to favor Protoss fairly heavily, but the Terran player deals with it fairly well in both situations, because he's a highly-competant StarCraft player. Lesser-skilled players would crumble to the odds being stacked against them where their canned build orders don't work. A skilled player adapts to his situation. In the first video he reacts flawlessly to a powerful early rush and holds his own into the

lategame. In the second game he completely reverses the odds by getting an early containment on his opponent. In the third he uses an unorthodox build to counter his opponents unorthodox build. The point I'm trying to make here is that being underpowered or unfavored doesn't mean you can't win. Rather than bitch about it, be the better player and win anyway.

By the way, you can skip the first 1/4 or so of the videos unless you're interested in listening to music or reading lots of Korean text or listening the commentators talking about pre-game stuff.

And yes, I would propose that games shouldn't be patched anymore by the community. The game is what the developers make it, love it or leave it.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 20:01:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 14:40 The point I'm trying to make here is that being underpowered or unfavored doesn't mean you can't win. Rather than bitch about it, be the better player and win anyway.what? using the underpowered race when your skill is exactly or a bit above the enemies skill means EXACTLY that you can't win.

Quote:

And yes, I would propose that games shouldn't be patched anymore by the community. The game is what the developers make it, love it or leave it.

Man is that a stupid attitude or what.

Basically you say "Sorry TT, but I dont want you to implement the pointfix (man this is gonna turn into a pointfix debate in a matter of an hour hopefully!) because Westwood was too stupid/lazy to do it.

Btw, Highlevelplayers usually have a much higher understanding of the game mechanics than the developers.

btw#2, the patch got approved by EA iirc.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 20:18:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:01what? using the underpowered race when your skill is exactly or a bit above the enemies skill means EXACTLY that you can't win.

No, it doesn't. Everything has a counter, and if the game is truly that imbalanced then nobody would play it. Watch the videos. In each the unfavored player comes out on top by playing unconventionally or pre-empting is opponent.

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:01

Man is that a stupid attitude or what.

Basically you say "Sorry TT, but I dont want you to implement the pointfix (man this is gonna turn into a pointfix debate in a matter of an hour hopefully!) because Westwood was too stupid/lazy to do it.

Btw, Highlevelplayers usually have a much higher understanding of the game mechanics than the developers.

btw#2, the patch got approved by EA iirc.

That's difference. From an update perspective, Renegade is a dead game. If the developers have given up on a game, then the community can step in. Otherwise it's just self-serving.

As for high-level players having a better understanding, they are also self-serving and have a vested interest in things changing to favor their faction/unit/tactic/whatever. Balancing a game requires you to be impartial, which game developers are and players may or may not be.

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 20:54:03 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 15:18so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:01what? using the underpowered race when your skill is exactly or a bit above the enemies skill means EXACTLY that you can't win.

No, it doesn't. Everything has a counter, and if the game is truly that imbalanced then nobody would play it. Watch the videos. In each the unfavored player comes out on top by playing unconventionally or pre-empting is opponent. Why would nobody play it? practically every rts out there is somewhat imbalance and favors one race or another. ZH was just a bit more extreme, nothing major. Im playing WiC on a competitive level and its quite imbalanced. it still was played on CPL. (granted, CPL died shortly after, but anyway)

Quote:

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:01

Man is that a stupid attitude or what.

Basically you say "Sorry TT, but I dont want you to implement the pointfix (man this is gonna turn into a pointfix debate in a matter of an hour hopefully!) because Westwood was too stupid/lazy to do it.

Btw, Highlevelplayers usually have a much higher understanding of the game mechanics than the developers.

btw#2, the patch got approved by EA iirc.

That's difference. From an update perspective, Renegade is a dead game. If the developers have given up on a game, then the community can step in. Otherwise it's just self-serving.

As for high-level players having a better understanding, they are also self-serving and have a vested interest in things changing to favor their faction/unit/tactic/whatever. Balancing a game

requires you to be impartial, which game developers are and players may or may not be.
SO WAS ZH. EA had abandoned it.

I'm a highlevel WiC Airplayer and I still condoned a change that nerfed air in the beta for patch 11.
Is your theory disproved now?

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 21:00:33 GMT

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

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:54Why would nobody play it? practically every rts out there is somewhat imbalance and favors one race or another. ZH was just a bit more extreme, nothing major. Im playing WiC on a competitive level and its quite imbalanced. it still was played on CPL. (granted, CPL died shortly after, but anyway)

Nobody would play it if the imbalance was really terrible (Like in Nox, which had the potential to be real fun but was imbalanced as hell). If people still play ZH it means the imbalance isn't that bad and people need to stfu about it.

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:54SO WAS ZH. EA had abandoned it.

I'm a highlevel WiC Airplayer and I still condoned a change that nerfed air in the beta for patch 11.
Is your theory disproved now?

EA abandoned ZH already? I didn't know that. Whatever.

And no. You're just the exception to the rule.

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

Posted by [ErroR](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 21:02:37 GMT

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

if it's the end of the tiberium series maybe they'll release the beta
/offtop

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 21:27:13 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 16:00so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:54Why would nobody play it? practically every rts out there is somewhat imbalance and favors one race or another. ZH was just a bit more extreme, nothing major. Im playing WiC on a competitive level and its quite imbalanced. it still was played on CPL. (granted, CPL died shortly after, but anyway)

Nobody would play it if the imbalance was really terrible (Like in Nox, which had the potential to be real fun but was imbalanced as hell). If people still play ZH it means the imbalance isn't that bad and people need to stfu about it.

The imbalance is/was bad, BUT:

casual gamers dont mind imbalances or cant see them. Also, the balance may or may not be better on lowerlevel games because of limited knowledge. Highlevelgamers might still stay because the other two races are somewhat balanced and fun enough to play. They might also have a money incentive. (I frankly dont know if cw.cc ever gave out money prizes for ZH)

Quote:

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 13:54SO WAS ZH. EA had abandoned it.

I'm a highlevel WiC Airplayer and I still condoned a change that nerfed air in the beta for patch 11. Is your theory disproved now?

EA abandoned ZH already? I didn't know that. Whatever.

And no. You're just the exception to the rule.

EA abandoned ZH after Patch 1.03 I believe. 1.04 was then largely made (everything safe for one bugfix)by the community. EA only made it an official patch, all the balancing changes were community made.

1.05 is, as far as i know, still only unoffical and not ea approved. but i dont know about that.

going a bit back to the issue at hand btw, wasnt tiberian sun insanely inbalanced as well?

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 22:05:17 GMT

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

ignores last bunch of posts in this thread

When I was posting my last rebuttal in this thread, I wanted to do it quickly because I got home from work late and wanted to do other things after. I didn't think making the post would take that long so I figured I'd give it a whirl.

Well, it took 1 and a half hours to compose (distractions and all.) Most of the time was taken from formatting the post with the quote by quote breakdown.

So, in this post I'm just going to take your main idea that you've started to form with all your posts and combine it into one argument:

You are apart of the group of people that are so fixed on how they've seen something one way that you want everything to be a "clone" of it. A lot of people were like this when C&C3 was in

development. Many people kept on suggesting things that would have made C&C3 a Tiberian Sun clone.

One of my ongoing points is that no game should be stremelined with other games of the same genre. It doesn't matter at all if one way is better or worse than another way. You wouldn't buy two different bottles of soda and expect them to taste the same. You wouldn't buy two mystery novels and expect them to play out the same. Just like different games shouldn't use the same structure and format, even if they are in the same genre. Different games are made for the reasons that people have different tastes. A game is not based on your opinion and your opinion alone.

Starcraft should play different than Generals. Tiberian Sun should play different than World in Conflict. Stormride should play different than Halo Wars. And they do. If a game wants to share some basic ideas from another game, that's perfectly fine, but once they take all the core mechanics from one game and copy it into their own game and simply just change the units used and call it the "standard" then that's when things get boring.

If you don't like a game, you don't play it. It's as simple as that. There are different games for that reason. If all games played the same way, then people who don't like how it's played would be completely out of luck.

So realize that your opinion on how a game should be isn't the only opinion that matters. Logical or not, people have their own ways of seeing things. And just because you like to look for reasoning in things, doesn't mean you're always right about it. If you can't find a reason in something and argue that it's wrong, it doesn't make you right, just arrogant. Not everything has reason. And everything shouldn't always have reason either. It's what makes life interesting. If you judge your way through life using logic and reasoning alone, then you've never really lived at all. Like my signature says, "Kick logic to the curb and do the impossible!"

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 22:41:18 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 15:05*ignores last bunch of posts in this thread*

When I was posting my last rebuttal in this thread, I wanted to do it quickly because I got home from work late and wanted to do other things after. I didn't think making the post would take that long so I figured I'd give it a whirl.

Well, it took 1 and a half hours to compose (distractions and all.) Most of the time was taken from formatting the post with the quote by quote breakdown.

So, in this post I'm just going to take your main idea that you've started to form with all your posts and combine it into one argument:

You are apart of the group of people that are so fixed on how they've seen something one way that you want everything to be a "clone" of it. A lot of people were like this when C&C3 was in development. Many people kept on suggesting things that would have made C&C3 a Tiberian Sun

clone.

One of my ongoing points is that no game should be stremelined with other games of the same genre. It doesn't matter at all if one way is better or worse than another way. You wouldn't buy two different bottles of soda and expect them to taste the same. You wouldn't buy two mystery novels and expect them to payout the same. Just like different games shouldn't use the same structure and format, even if they are in the same genre. Different games are made for the reasons that people have different tastes. A game is not based on your opinion and your opinion alone.

Starcraft should play different than Generals. Tiberian Sun should play different than World in Conflict. Stormride should play different than Halo Wars. And they do. If a game wants to share some basic ideas from another game, that's perfectly fine, but once they take all the core mechanics from one game and copy it into their own game and simply just change the units used and call it the "standard" then that's when things get boring.

In theory, this is a sound idea, but in practice you quickly find there is good difference and bad difference. Pepsi is sweeter than coke, and that's different and good. Poo-flavored soda is different and bad. That's why although things (Be it soda, games, whatever) are never identical, they are always similar. Why do modern RTSes involve issuing commands to units with your mouse? Doesn't the fact that EVERY RTS does this make it boring? No, it makes it smart.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 15:05If you don't like a game, you don't play it. It's as simple as that. There are different games for that reason. If all games played the same way, then people who don't like how it's played would be completely out of luck.

You're absolutely right, and case in point is that more people play StarCraft and WarCraft than C&C, therefore their system is superior. The people have spoken. It's been 11 years since StarCraft was released and they still have a very very active professional scene (One that is GROWING and not SHRINKING, mind you). How can you argue with that?

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 15:05So realize that your opinion on how a game should be isn't the only opinion that matters. Logical or not, people have their own ways of seeing things. And just because you like to look for reasoning in things, doesn't mean you're always right about it. If you can't find a reason in something and argue that it's wrong, it doesn't make you right, just arrogant. Not everything has reason. And everything shouldn't always have reason either. It's what makes life interesting. If you judge your way through life using logic and reasoning alone, then you've never really lived at all. Like my signature says, "Kick logic to the curb and do the impossible!"

I love how you accuse me of being stuck in my ways when you refuse to apply logic to any arguement you make in any debate I've seen you post on. Everything is logical. It's a matter of seeing it or not. Have you ever stopped and considered that you might be the one who's wrong? The evidence is certainly against you.

Show me one thing that is devoid of reasoning. I dare you. And don't use some dumb copout like "God LOL!".

And not to flame, but your signiture is retarded. Emotions and feelings lie and lead people to false

conclusions. Logic doesn't. Again, have you ever stopped and considered that you might be the one who has it wrong?

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 22:57:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

since this is for some reason now about logic and reason and its also 1 am, i am going to post WEIRD IMAGES!!!!
and then log off.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 23:01:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 15:57 since this is for some reason now about logic and reason and its also 1 am, i am going to post WEIRD IMAGES!!!!
and then log off.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 26 Jul 2009 18:45:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [_SSnipe_](#) on Sun, 26 Jul 2009 19:44:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Stop fucking spamming plz just have one real post without fucking spamming, anyways cnc4 is going kinda make me sad knowing once your done, ts is done, after that all we have left is generals and red alert series

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 26 Jul 2009 19:51:16 GMT

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

Let me answer this by saying that

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

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 26 Jul 2009 19:58:26 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 17:41 Emotions and feelings lie and lead people to false conclusions. Logic doesn't.

Damn right. Church attendance rose after 9/11; the motivator was fear. So it can be concluded that fear motivates people to look to imaginary supercreatures for insta-help. lol

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 26 Jul 2009 21:33:18 GMT

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

I offially declare this thread the cute sayings, logic and communism thread.

-

"Things bought from money I dont have as a reward for something I haven't donet yet. Pure reason may never win."

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 27 Jul 2009 00:44:39 GMT

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

@ Dover

A few things things.

You asked me to explain to you one example that doesn't use logic or reasoning. Well I have one answer: Women.

But seriously, emotion. Emotions don't use logic or reason in all cases. One might start feeling

depressed or anxiety for an unknown reason. And don't go and start talking about "chemical imbalances in the brain" because that's not what I'm getting at. Things we do can be compelled through emotion, regardless of if the action is logical or not. Look at the person who invented sky diving.

If you don't wish to disbelieve something that is core in how your life is run, then that's totally fine by me. I'm not going to try and change how you run your life.

Also, fyi, my signature is a quote from an anime called "Tenga Topa Gurren Lagaan." It's not my direct words, but my implication on how the fictional quote be applied to life (whether it works or not).

Now, secondly, I forgot to reply to this in my last post. You asked me to share my idea about the production structures that takes the best of both worlds. This is what I came up with:

When you build a production structure, say a barracks, you put it on the map and then are allowed to queue up and produce infantry.

Now, when the barracks is set up, you would be given a certain "radius" around that structure. If you build another barracks inside of that radius, then you wouldn't be given a second queue, but rather an increase in how fast your units are produced. And I mean two barracks means infantry and made at half the speed. (So if you produce a rifleman in 5 seconds with one barracks, you would produce two riflemen in 5 seconds if you had two barracks). There would be a maximum speed of x3 (you could make more than 3 production structures in the same radius, but it would be a waste of time and money (for a lack of better thought)). And one more thing: the total amount of power consumption between similar production structures in the same radius would be less than similar production structures out of the same radius.

If you were to make a second barracks outside the radius of the first, then you would be given a second infantry queue to simultaneously produce infantry from different structures.

Working either way has their own advantages. A sped up single queue of units is better for your economy while a multi-queue is better for multi-pronged attacks.

And it makes logical sense too. Different bases would produce out different groups of units. While structures that are closer together would use their combined resources, staff and facilities to reach a common goal faster.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 27 Jul 2009 03:36:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wow shut the fuck up you angry bitch

i'm really excited, this is what i always thought cnc3 should have looked like so for me it's better late than never

they should have never gotten rid of the walker units

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Mon, 27 Jul 2009 03:51:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

needs more explosions imo

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 27 Jul 2009 19:49:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 26 July 2009 17:44 You asked me to explain to you one example that doesn't use logic or reasoning. Well I have one answer: Women.

Har har.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 26 July 2009 17:44 @ But seriously, emotion. Emotions don't use logic or reason in all cases. One might start feeling depressed or anxiety for an unknown reason. And don't go and start talking about "chemical imbalances in the brain" because that's not what I'm getting at. Things we do can be compelled through emotion, regardless of if the action is logical or not. Look at the person who invented sky diving.

An unknown reason doesn't equal no reason. EVERYTHING has a reason, and mood swings are no different. As you already mentioned chemical imbalances in the brain is one thing. Ask anyone that sky dives, they have their reasons, ranging from conquering one's fear to doing it for the rush. NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 26 July 2009 17:44 If you don't wish to disbelieve something that is core in how your life is run, then that's totally fine by me. I'm not going to try and change how you run your life.

You're completely missing the point again. This isn't about changing or convincing.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 26 July 2009 17:44 Also, fyi, my signature is a quote from an anime called "Tenga Topa Gurren Lagaan." It's not my direct words, but my implication on how the fictional quote be applied to life (whether it works or not).

Again, not to flame, but if the saying comes from an anime it only makes it that much faggier.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 26 July 2009 17:44 Now, secondly, I forgot to reply to this in my last post. You asked me to share my idea about the production structures that takes the best of both

worlds. This is what I came up with:

When you build a production structure, say a barracks, you put it on the map and then are allowed to queue up and produce infantry.

Now, when the barracks is set up, you would be given a certain "radius" around that structure. If you build another barracks inside of that radius, then you wouldn't be given a second queue, but rather an increase in how fast your units are produced. And I mean two barracks means infantry and made at half the speed. (So if you produce a rifleman in 5 seconds with one barracks, you would produce two riflemen in 5 seconds if you had two barracks). There would be a maximum speed of x3 (you could make more than 3 production structures in the same radius, but it would be a waste of time and money (for a lack of better thought)). And one more thing: the total amount of power consumption between similar production structures in the same radius would be less than similar production structures out of the same radius.

If you were to make a second barracks outside the radius of the first, then you would be given a second infantry queue to simultaneously produce infantry from different structures.

Working either way has their own advantages. A sped up single queue of units is better for your economy while a multi-queue is better for multi-pronged attacks.

And it makes logical sense too. Different bases would produce out different groups of units. While structures that are closer together would use their combined resources, staff and facilities to reach a common goal faster.

I'm glad EA ignored you. That proposal presents the worst of both worlds. Speeding up production of a production queue is a poor consolation prize when compared to the ability to diversify your forces or get the full effect of the structure you're paying for. In addition it forces you to create multiple bases to get the second queue you payed for, which is unnessessarily difficult when not using the peon system.

You're deluding yourself if you think there's anything logical about a complex of 30 war factories when there's only one tank coming out of one of them. Explain to me how a sped-up single queue is "better for your economy"? You're spending the same amount of resources and getting the same amount of units in the same time frame, it's just they're producing in a roundabout illogical manner.

I payed for a second war factory, so I deserve a second war factory, not an upgrade to my first.

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Mon, 27 Jul 2009 22:36:54 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 14:49. NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

you're sounding a bit like cheesesoda and that worries me no ends :/

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 00:47:24 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49: An unknown reason doesn't equal no reason. EVERYTHING has a reason, and mood swings are no different. As you already mentioned chemical imbalances in the brain is one thing. Ask anyone that sky dives, they have their reasons, ranging from conquering one's fear to doing it for the rush. NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

I knew you were going to say that. Perhaps I spoke too soon. I don't necessarily mean that people don't always do things for a reason. What I mean to say is more on the lines of people don't always do things for a logical reason.

Conquering one's fears is an arguable logical reason to do something. It really depends on what you're doing and how it affects your life.

Doing something "for the rush" is not a logical reason. In fact, doing anything for entertainment value isn't logical. Having fun isn't logical. It's just an emotional pleasure one gets. Hell, most of the things that we know and have become accustomed to in modern society is pretty illogical. The point of our lives is to hunt, eat, sleep and die. Money, housing, jobs, communities, morals, are all tacked on illogical ways of our life. Just because we find reason to do them, it doesn't make it logical when compared to what are bare primitives of life really are.

Everything has a reason, but not everything uses a logical reason. Someone might be faced with impossible odds to overcome an obstacle. Their reasoning is to overcome the challenge, but it defies logic as the odds are highly against them. However, just because logic says it won't work, that doesn't mean that a person won't try.

What I was getting at with the skydiving example is this. The person who invented it decided one day to jump from a high altitude and hope that enough wind could be caught so it would slow them down so they could land safely. But who decides to risk something like that for any logical reason? No one, that's who. It takes illogical notions to progress in life. If you live your life following logical reasoning, then nothing new or exciting (enough) will happen.

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49: Again, not to flame, but if the saying comes from an anime it only makes it that much faggier. Why's that?

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49: I'm glad EA ignored you. That proposal presents the worst of both worlds. Speeding up production of a production queue is a poor consolation prize when compared to the ability to diversify your forces or get the full effect of the structure you're paying for. In addition it forces you to create multiple bases to get the second queue you payed for, which is unnessessarily difficult when not using the peon system.

You're deluding yourself if you think there's anything logical about a complex of 30 war factories when there's only one tank coming out of one of them. Explain to me how a sped-up single queue is "better for your economy"? You're spending the same amount of resources and getting the same amount of units in the same time frame, it's just they're producing in a roundabout illogical manner.

I payed for a second war factory, so I deserve a second war factory, not an upgrade to my first. Perhaps I didn't explain it well enough.

First of all, I didn't say one production radius would completely fill an entire base. You can have multiple radii in a single base.

Second of all, just because you have a sped up production speed for one queue, doesn't mean you're only using one production structure. Let me clarify:

If you play RA2 and build like 5 War factories and then spam tanks from your single queue, you will notice that tanks will start coming out of multiple war factories, not just one. That's because the building speed is so fast, that one war factory is unable to respond quick enough to produce a second unit right after a first one comes out. So in that case, it is customary that the second-to-primary structure produce the unit instead. And if the speed is increased again, it may even take up to 3 or 4 different war factories to produce the units from a single queue.

My idea would look a little like this:

Three production structures in the same radius share a single production queue. However each structure produces one unit at a time because they are produced so rapidly.

Now, you asked how a single queue is better for your economy. Think about it for a second. 1 queue takes money for a single unit one at a time. When that unit is produced, money starts to be deducted for the second unit. It's also better because it automatically focuses your resources on a single unit at a time. (This is talking in terms of C&C, because in games like Starcraft, money is deducted instantly when you queue up a unit)

With multiple queues, your resources are being divided in real time and thus your funds end up being depleted much more quickly. You have credits going into creating one unit and credits going into creating another unit at the same time. This is the reason why it is very important to have a surplus of income in a C&C game that uses mutliple queues because if you don't and you use mutliple production queues, you will find that you have many idle periods in the match were you are waiting on your units because your resources aren't being collected fast enough.

If you require money to create 10 units, you will probably get the units out faster in a single queue than with a multiple queue.

Now, I know what you might be thinking: "Well that's nothing a little micro production management can't fix." And you would be correct. However, if you pause production on one queue to allow another queue to gain full access to all your resources, then what's the difference between doing that and simply having just a single queue?

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 09:00:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49An

unknown reason doesn't equal no reason. EVERYTHING has a reason, and mood swings are no different. As you already mentioned chemical imbalances in the brain is one thing. Ask anyone that sky dives, they have their reasons, ranging from conquering one's fear to doing it for the rush. NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

I knew you were going to say that. Perhaps I spoke too soon. I don't necessarily mean that people don't always do things for a reason. What I mean to say is more on the lines of people don't always do things for a logical reason.

Conquering one's fears is an arguable logical reason to do something. It really depends on what you're doing and how it affects your life.

Doing something "for the rush" is not a logical reason. In fact, doing anything for entertainment value isn't logical. Having fun isn't logical. It's just an emotional pleasure one gets. Hell, most of the things that we know and have become accustomed to in modern society is pretty illogical. The point of our lives is to hunt, eat, sleep and die. Money, housing, jobs, communities, morals, are all tacked on illogical ways of our life. Just because we find reason to do them, it doesn't make it logical when compared to what are bare primitives of life really are.

Everything has a reason, but not everything uses a logical reason. Someone might be faced with impossible odds to overcome an obstacle. Their reasoning is to overcome the challenge, but it defies logic as the odds are highly against them. However, just because logic says it won't work, that doesn't mean that a person won't try.

What I was getting at with the skydiving example is this. The person who invented it decided one day to jump from a high altitude and hope that enough wind could be caught so it would slow them down so they could land safely. But who decides to risk something like that for any logical reason? No one, that's who. It takes illogical notions to progress in life. If you live your life following logical reasoning, then nothing new or exciting (enough) will happen.

I'm sorry you see things that way, but I could see a perfectly logical explanation for any of those things. You have a very skewed idea of what "logic" entails, and for that I pity you.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47 Why's that?

Because generally speaking anime is pretty faggy.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47 Perhaps I didn't explain it well enough.

First of all, I didn't say one production radius would completely fill an entire base. You can have multiple radii in a single base.

Then all it is is an arbitrary limitation on where I can place my buildings, and if C&C's sidebar system didn't have enough of that already.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47 Second of all, just because you have a sped up production speed for one queue, doesn't mean you're only using one production structure. Let me clarify:

If you play RA2 and build like 5 War factories and then spam tanks from your single queue, you will notice that tanks will start coming out of multiple war factories, not just one. That's because the building speed is so fast, that one war factory is unable to respond quick enough to produce a second unit right after a first one comes out. So in that case, it is customary that the second-to-primary structure produce the unit instead. And if the speed is increased again, it may even take up to 3 or 4 different war factories to produce the units from a single queue.

My idea would look a little like this:

Three production structures in the same radius share a single production queue. However each structure produces one unit at a time because they are produced so rapidly.

That's still stupid. It's a special case in the War Factory that the building animation can't keep up with unit production if you produce units at a stupidly-fast rate. The barracks, to use your original example, wouldn't do that.

In any case, having units almost always coming out of the primary, occasionally out of the secondary, and never out of any other war factories isn't really that much of an improvement over all units coming out of the primary, and both systems are inferior to all structures being used to their full potential.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47: Now, you asked how a single queue is better for your economy. Think about it for a second.

1 queue takes money for a single unit one at a time. When that unit is produced, money starts to be deducted for the second unit. It's also better because it automatically focuses your resources on a single unit at a time. (This is talking in terms of C&C, because in games like Starcraft, money is deducted instantly when you queue up a unit)

With multiple queues, your resources are being divided in real time and thus your funds end up being depleted much more quickly. You have credits going into creating one unit and credits going into creating another unit at the same time. This is the reason why it is very important to have a surplus of income in a C&C game that uses multiple queues because if you don't and you use multiple production queues, you will find that you have many idle periods in the match where you are waiting on your units because your resources aren't being collected fast enough.

If you require money to create 10 units, you will probably get the units out faster in a single queue than with a multiple queue.

Now, I know what you might be thinking: "Well that's nothing a little micro production management can't fix." And you would be correct. However, if you pause production on one queue to allow another queue to gain full access to all your resources, then what's the difference between doing that and simply having just a single queue?

You seem to be misinformed (Or willfully ignorant) on how the economy in C&C works. If you're producing something twice as fast, you're losing your money twice as fast also. If a unit costs \$500 and takes 5 seconds to make and you speed him up to where he'll be done in 2.5 seconds, then you're being drained for \$200 a second instead of your original \$100 per second. It would be as if you're producing two units at once. The difference being if I'm producing two units at once, not only am I getting exactly what I purchased but I have the option of producing two different

units at a time. This is, of course, assuming you're suggesting each additional structure speeds up production by exactly 100%. Any less and you're getting ripped off, and all the more reason to use the multiple queue system. Any more than 100% and it's WORSE for your economy because you'll be draining resources FASTER.

If you have idle periods in your matches then can I kindly suggest you L2RTS. If you've extended your production capacity beyond what your income can support, then you deserve the idle periods. Take a look at any match from any professional (Or even any high-level) gamer on any RTS and you'll always find that once a production structure is placed it almost never sits there idle.

so say we all. wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:36Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 14:49.
NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

you're sounding a bit like chees soda and that worries me no ends :/

Taxes suck government sucks blah blah!

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 09:58:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 28 July 2009 12:00

so say we all. wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:36Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 14:49.
NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

you're sounding a bit like chees soda and that worries me no ends :/

Taxes suck government sucks blah blah!
startled

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Tupolev TU-95 Bear](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 20:07:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This should be in HoF

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 23:36:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 28 July 2009 05:00Because generally speaking anime is pretty faggy.
I find this funny (whether your intending it to be or not) because you are doing what you say I do.

Why do you think it's faggy?

Dover wrote on Tue, 28 July 2009 05:00 You seem to be misinformed (Or willfully ignorant) on how the economy in C&C works. If you're producing something twice as fast, you're losing your money twice as fast also. If a unit costs \$500 and takes 5 seconds to make and you speed him up to where he'll be done in 2.5 seconds, then you're being drained for \$200 a second instead of your original \$100 per second. It would be as if you're producing two units at once. The difference being if I'm producing two units at once, not only am I getting exactly what I purchased but I have the option of producing two different units at a time. This is, of course, assuming you're suggesting each additional structure speeds up production by exactly 100%. Any less and you're getting ripped off, and all the more reason to use the multiple queue system. Any more than 100% and it's WORSE for your economy because you'll be draining resources FASTER.

If you have idle periods in your matches then can I kindly suggest you L2RTS. If you've extended your production capacity beyond what your income can support, then you deserve the idle periods. Take a look at any match from any professional (Or even any high-level) gamer on any RTS and you'll always find that once a production structure is placed it almost never sits there idle.

Not necessarily. Lets say you have 1000 credits and are using multiple queues. You wish to construct two tanks, one via each production facility. However, the a single tank costs 700 credits. If you were to queue up a tank for each queue, you would run out of money before a single tank is produced. But if you had just a single queue that simply produced the units twice as fast, then you would at least get one unit out into the field before your resources got depleted. And, it would be in half the time of the normal queue speed.

However, it still goes to show that there really wouldn't be very much difference between the two methods, gameplay wise. Multiple queues just makes it easier for the game to play itself. (Just so long as you have the resources to back you up)

Personally, I would prefer to have a steady trickle of a single unit being produced every 3 seconds rather than two units being produced every 6 seconds. It might be the same in the long run, but at least it gives you some more forces to work with while you wait.

And I never suggested my general C&C matches composed of long idle periods of time. I was giving an advisory tip as to why it's important to make sure you have more money than you're looking to spend.

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

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 29 Jul 2009 00:16:55 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Tue, 28 July 2009 04:00

Because generally speaking anime is pretty faggy.

Dont be ignorant plx K TY

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

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 10 Aug 2009 18:23:03 GMT

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

I kinda preferred RA2's method of dealing with multiple production structures. C&C3's just overcomplicated it a bit. Yeah, it's nice to be able to have diversity in what you build, but seeing as how C&C shaped up to be... I dunno, it just felt almost overwhelming.

Then again, that was also C&C3.

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

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 13 Aug 2009 04:45:04 GMT

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

Until somebody gives me terrain deformation again, it's still all a step backwards from TS. That one feature alone added a depth that simply doesn't exist in the newer games- to say nothing of the other environmental hazards. Forget all the pre-release bullshit promises for one second and the game still has more depth than the entire rest of the series- combine the environments and dynamic terrain from TS with newer features like garrisoning and you'd have a real winner.

If, that is, you didn't ruin it all by putting in too many and too powerful superweapons and epic units, too few defensive units, structures, and abilities, combined with obscenely fast build rates and weak-as-paper structure armor. Which EA would.

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 14 Aug 2009 11:02:13 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 12 August 2009 21:45 Until somebody gives me terrain deformation again, it's still all a step backwards from TS. That one feature alone added a depth that simply doesn't exist in the newer games- to say nothing of the other environmental hazards. Forget all the pre-release bullshit promises for one second and the game still has more depth than the entire rest of the series- combine the environments and dynamic terrain from TS with newer features like garrisoning and you'd have a real winner.

If, that is, you didn't ruin it all by putting in too many and too powerful superweapons and epic units, too few defensive units, structures, and abilities, combined with obscenely fast build rates and weak-as-paper structure armor. Which EA would.

Too few defensive units/structures? Hah. I bet you were one of the people who bitched on and on about the Scrin air units out-ranging your air defense, huh? Fast build rates? Welcome to 2009, we've come a far way from WarCraft 1. Superweapons keep the game from becoming a macro-fest of "Who can produce the most Medium Tanks?", and epic units open up new strategies (Like dropping a mothership on the enemy base). Options are invariably good.

And for that matter, Terrain deformation didn't do anything for the game besides piss me the fuck

off. Whatever you might think, that one feature didn't give the game any depth at all, and any attempt to bring realism to Tiberian Sun is a lost cause.

In short, L2RTS.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [infusi0n](#) on Sun, 16 Aug 2009 02:33:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I dont know, I think they are still not 100% against the idea of an C&C FPS.

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 19 Aug 2009 00:08:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Options are invariably good.

Bingo. Which means that if I'd like the option of turtling, there should be a viable way of doing that which won't ruin me economically because there's a unit which can clear multiple towers simultaneously if they so happen to be closely placed enough to create the interlocking fields of fire which are necessary to make said static defenses effective. Yes, said unit is weakly armored and is eaten alive by aircraft, but unless you catch it before it opens fire you'll still be out a few thousand credits... which defeats the purpose of having a static defense that can stand up on its own until backup arrives. Compare this to earlier artillery units which, while powerful, required numbers and support to be a real threat. You've really gotta try to make any offensive unit not at least pay for itself, whereas most defensive units and structures never get a chance to pay themselves off in enemies destroyed. Useless structures do not present strategic options, they present a resource sink (in power use and credits) that contributes nothing to base security. That's a cake or death decision, much like throwing basic infantry into the teeth of heavy anti-infantry units or using missile troopers instead.

And, at the risk of sounding like a broken record, walls. If options are invariably good, why remove the option of creating a basic passive defense to slow down and impede attacks? Yes, I'm aware they were poorly coded and couldn't be properly implemented by release. That's what patches are for.

L2RTS is an exceedingly stupid sentiment considering that the present generation of RTS games has grown out of a single play style in older titles. Which is to say that there are fewer options for a player of a modern RTS title than there are for players of older titles. That the lost tactics, strategies, and abilities were not the most popular choices is utterly irrelevant, because...

Quote:Options are invariably good.

QED.

And for the record, I don't even play these games online; I haven't played an RTS against a stranger in years. Just in case you wanted to keep pushing the "well you must be pissed that you keep getting your ass whooped" angle. Because we all know that you can only be right if you've got a good ladder ranking.

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

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 19 Aug 2009 00:29:49 GMT

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

I agree with Nukelt here.

It's not as though C&C3 was anything more than a tank spam fest, too, y'know. If anything it had LESS strategic options, thanks to the shitfest of multi-role units and units that cost less and dealt more damage. Defense was practically removed, it all came down to who had a better economy and could pump out more units.

Sure, superweapons helped, but in the end you'd be killing them before it even goes off.

TS may have had a few annoying features, but they were still features and options. You had less turtling, but defenses still helped (Except for AA, which were practically useless).

It's very possible to keep a lively and strategic game without it being C&C3. And C&C4 seems to set out to do that. What harm would there be in adding more tactical depth and features?

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

Posted by [infusi0n](#) on Fri, 21 Aug 2009 00:47:58 GMT

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

I'll be buying C&C4 even tho I don't like RTS games. It is atleast C&C in the proper universe (tiberium) and everyone should do the same atleast to just show support for the C&C brand. Enough sales= FPS game?
