
Subject: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Tue, 10 Nov 2009 23:27:51 GMT

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

<http://kotaku.com/5401542/rumor-eas-cuts-include-cc-team-pandemic-maxis--more>

Apoc's twitter: Just wanted to let you guys know that I am safe, haven't quite hit my nine lives yet => But a somber day nonetheless, to say the least

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Tue, 10 Nov 2009 23:35:59 GMT

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

It is kinda like putting a sick dog to sleep. It is the humane thing to do.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 00:00:23 GMT

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

Maxis?! What the hell?! I thought Spore and the Sims series' were huge money generators for EA?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [ChewML](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 00:25:01 GMT

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

I am officially a EA hater now... that is just dumb. They fuck everything up.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 00:34:00 GMT

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

Chew wrote on Tue, 10 November 2009 18:25I am officially a EA hater now... that is just dumb. They fuck everything up.

Hey, they're a company. Chances are, the C&C franchise just doesn't bring home the bacon like it used to.

Plus, with console systems becoming the main mode of gaming, you can bet that genres like C&C

which don't translate well to systems like the XBOX and PS3 will face more pressure like this in the future.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [halo2pac](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 03:21:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Put renegade on the f***-box and the @\$station and the wiiwii and watch how fat they get off there bacon.

Also I place the first bid on xwis and the renegade source code

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Wiener](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 07:41:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If I were EA, I'd have done the same after ra3

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 09:17:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lets face it, the C&C franchise died when they originally disbanded Westwood, all these mock-C&C games EA have made since then are just a pathetic attempt to fix that mistake.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 09:34:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

danpaul88 wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 03:17 Lets face it, the C&C franchise died when they originally disbanded Westwood, all these mock-C&C games EA have made since then are just a pathetic attempt to fix that mistake.
Yeah, although RA3 was nice, despite the overly done story. C&C4 looks pretty good though, to be honest. I just hope the story is well done.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 10:04:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

danpaul88 wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 01:17 Lets face it, the C&C franchise died when they originally disbanded Westwood, all these mock-C&C games EA have made since then are just a pathetic attempt to fix that mistake.

Generals was fun.
But yeah, you're basically right.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 11:10:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

TIME FOR DREGANIUS' MASSIVE RANT ON C&C EVERYONE!

Make sure to get some popcorn from the lobby!

DREGGY RANT!The C&C series was amazing up until the day that Westwood was eradicated by those EA fiends. Their disgusting, mutilated FREAK replacements of C&C broke my heart, and although I played C&C3 and enjoyed it, as far as story goes NO game in the series beyond Westwood's era is worthy of the C&C title, for the storyline and general 'character' of GDI and Nod, and the Allies and Soviets in those games were magnificently perfect.

Here's what it was like for me. GDI was the UN elected defenders of the world against terrorism, etc. Nod was a rag-tag group, that through Kane, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the Tiberium anomaly, rose to great power and eventually gained technological advances that confused, and outmaneuvered GDI, however they lacked the massive arsenal GDI had and thus could not afford an all-out war. GDI seemed to continuously quell Nod, but Nod kept coming back with more, like stealth technologies, then lasers, and then things like cyborgs and aircraft developed from alien (Scrin) technology. GDI fought back, and advanced too, but in a typical military fashion (and the walkers were pretty cool too, and made some relevant sense).

That, in my heart, was C&C.

Then C&C3 came in to the picture. Everything seemed to rewind backwards a little and then fast-forward along a different line. I was heavily confused when Nod had Militia, for originally they equipped their soldiers with Pulse Rifles and armor, not machine guns. The cyborgs were completely taken out of the picture. Nod also completely lost their alien technology. Then came the suicide bombers. That completely ruined it for me. "WHAT THE FUCK IS THIS SHIT?" echoed throughout my neighborhood when I saw Suicide Bombers in my troops list. Wow, so Nod Infantry has gone back to its Soviet-Collapse days?

As for vehicles, they've gone back to C&C 95 days. The Attack Bike and Buggy is exactly the same as 95, and Nod's main battle tank can't burrow anymore, in fact it's just like the Light Tank, but, just like the Bike and Buggy, shinier. Oh at least they have a flame tank! Now, let's go underground again and ambush the enemy. What? No subterranean movement?! COME ON!

Oh, wow, now we have a Beam Tank and an Avatar mech! Cabal move over, there's a new mech in town. The Avatar mech was about the ONLY thing I liked for Nod. The Beam Cannon was just like a shitty Nod Artillery. Stealth Tank technology seems to be intact like in 95 and Tiberian Sun,

but Nod's stealth technology was rendered obsolete by 2 facts.

1: Stealth Generators could never be stealthed themselves (Pointless much?)

2: So many units could now reveal stealthed units, (instead of one Sensor Relay that actually needed to be strategically placed to work with utmost efficiency) so now you could send 3 Pitbulls in with your rush of 10 Predators and call it a day. The fact that Nod harvesters were now invisible was a nice feature. Too bad Stealth technology was now completely fucked to obsolete shit.

GDI took several steps backwards too. They reverted to their walkers completely but for Juggernauts. Why? Surely the walkers were working fine beforehand otherwise they wouldn't be mass-produced in Tiberian Sun, so don't go for a "Prototype" argument. Secondly, EA slapped railguns on a heap of things, because they're so blue and shiny and go boom when you shoot them at things, which completely messes up the balance when Nod's infantry are now a load of pathetic civvies armed with uzi's and AK's (again) when you think about it realistically. Even the APC was nerfed (although they gave it a gun), it used to be amphibious! That made for some serious strategic strikes to work well. Since they replaced GDI's awesome walkers with shitty tanks, EA HAD to give them something new, something of an upgrade... Right..? Nope. Not a damn thing.

Then came the Scrin. They were just weird. I mean, I had no idea how the fuck to play them, but apparently everyone spammed ships and won.

Now, let's move to Red Alert. The reason I liked Red Alert is because it toyed with the timeline a bit, and asked what would happen if these Einstein wasn't dead, if Nikola Tesla sold his inventions to the Russian Military (Side note, Edison is a massive hipster faggot, as Dover would say, for stealing Tesla's inventions), etc etc. This slightly varied timeline was awesome. Then, again, EA flexed their massive fag-muscle and cocked everything up.

Red Alert 2 only received a slight dose from the fag-muscle. Psychic domination, weather machines, radiation launchers, etc. That stuff wasn't bad, although it was getting kinda iffy at that stage. And then, EA looked into Pandora's Underwear drawer and shit hit the mother-fucking fan.

"OK GUYZ LETS GIV RUSHENZ ATK BAERZ INSTED OF DOGZ LULZ! O AND DEN WE CAN GIEV BOTES TREDZ AND SHIT! OH OH OH LETS PUT JAPAN IN AS A RASE OV SUPATEKNOADVANS D PEEPL WIF SYKIK SKOOLGURLZ AND MEK-STUFF LIEK OFF GUNDEMZ N STUFF LOLOLOLOL!"

I rest my case. Apparently, EA even stated that RA3 was not to be taken as a serious game, and that it was a completely silly idea, aka "IDIFTL".

Is it just me, or is EA run by a bunch of 4Chan dicks and /b/ fags? It would make a LOT of sense if this were true.

For anyone with the balls to read that entire post, kudos to you. Have a Klondike bar.

EDIT: Keep in mind that this rant is my personal point of view.

Rant over, QFT.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 11:54:36 GMT

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

Everyone should be quite happy that the team managed to make 4 new C&C games and finish the Tiberian history. C&C3 was actually a great game, I played it competitively online for about 500'ish games which was about the lifespan of the game. KW wasn't bad at all either, I didn't like RA3 but I guess that's personal preference.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 15:05:33 GMT

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

Dreganius wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 12:10TIME FOR DREGANIUS' MASSIVE RANT ON C&C EVERYONE!

Make sure to get some popcorn from the lobby!

DREGGY RANT!The C&C series was amazing up until the day that Westwood was eradicated by those EA fiends. Their disgusting, mutilated FREAK replacements of C&C broke my heart, and although I played C&C3 and enjoyed it, as far as story goes NO game in the series beyond Westwood's era is worthy of the C&C title, for the storyline and general 'character' of GDI and Nod, and the Allies and Soviets in those games were magnificently perfect.

Here's what it was like for me. GDI was the UN elected defenders of the world against terrorism, etc. Nod was a rag-tag group, that through Kane, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the Tiberium anomaly, rose to great power and eventually gained technological advances that confused, and outmaneuvered GDI, however they lacked the massive arsenal GDI had and thus could not afford an all-out war. GDI seemed to continuously quell Nod, but Nod kept coming back with more, like stealth technologies, then lasers, and then things like cyborgs and aircraft developed from alien (Scrin) technology. GDI fought back, and advanced too, but in a typical military fashion (and the walkers were pretty cool too, and made some relevant sense).

That, in my heart, was C&C.

Then C&C3 came in to the picture. Everything seemed to rewind backwards a little and then fast-forward along a different line. I was heavily confused when Nod had Militia, for originally they equipped their soldiers with Pulse Rifles and armor, not machine guns. The cyborgs were completely taken out of the picture. Nod also completely lost their alien technology. Then came the suicide bombers. That completely ruined it for me. "WHAT THE FUCK IS THIS SHIT?" echoed throughout my neighborhood when I saw Suicide Bombers in my troops list. Wow, so Nod Infantry has gone back to its Soviet-Collapse days?

As for vehicles, they've gone back to C&C 95 days. The Attack Bike and Buggy is exactly the same as 95, and Nod's main battle tank can't burrow anymore, in fact it's just like the Light Tank, but, just like the Bike and Buggy, shinier. Oh at least they have a flame tank! Now, let's go underground again and ambush the enemy. What? No subterranean movement?! COME ON!

Oh, wow, now we have a Beam Tank and an Avatar mech! Cabal move over, there's a new mech in town. The Avatar mech was about the ONLY thing I liked for Nod. The Beam Cannon was just like a shitty Nod Artillery. Stealth Tank technology seems to be intact like in 95 and Tiberian Sun, but Nod's stealth technology was rendered obsolete by 2 facts.

1: Stealth Generators could never be stealthed themselves (Pointless much?)

2: So many units could now reveal stealthed units, (instead of one Sensor Relay that actually needed to be strategically placed to work with utmost efficiency) so now you could send 3 Pitbulls in with your rush of 10 Predators and call it a day. The fact that Nod harvesters were now invisible was a nice feature. Too bad Stealth technology was now completely fucked to obsolete shit.

GDI took several steps backwards too. They reverted to their walkers completely but for Juggernauts. Why? Surely the walkers were working fine beforehand otherwise they wouldn't be mass-produced in Tiberian Sun, so don't go for a "Prototype" argument. Secondly, EA slapped railguns on a heap of things, because they're so blue and shiny and go boom when you shoot them at things, which completely messes up the balance when Nod's infantry are now a load of pathetic civvies armed with uzi's and AK's (again) when you think about it realistically. Even the APC was nerfed (although they gave it a gun), it used to be amphibious! That made for some serious strategic strikes to work well. Since they replaced GDI's awesome walkers with shitty tanks, EA HAD to give them something new, something of an upgrade... Right..? Nope. Not a damn thing.

Then came the Scrin. They were just weird. I mean, I had no idea how the fuck to play them, but apparently everyone spammed ships and won.

Now, let's move to Red Alert. The reason I liked Red Alert is because it toyed with the timeline a bit, and asked what would happen if these Einstein wasn't dead, if Nikola Tesla sold his inventions to the Russian Military (Side note, Edison is a massive hipster faggot, as Dover would say, for stealing Tesla's inventions), etc etc. This slightly varied timeline was awesome. Then, again, EA flexed their massive fag-muscle and cocked everything up.

Red Alert 2 only received a slight dose from the fag-muscle. Psychic domination, weather machines, radiation launchers, etc. That stuff wasn't bad, although it was getting kinda iffy at that stage. And then, EA looked into Pandora's Underwear drawer and shit hit the mother-fucking fan.

"OK GUYZ LETS GIV RUSHENZ ATK BAERZ INSTED OF DOGZ LULZ! O AND DEN WE CAN GIEV BOTES TREDZ AND SHIT! OH OH OH LETS PUT JAPAN IN AS A RASE OV SUPATEKNOADVANSND PEEPL WIF SYKIK SKOOLGURLZ AND MEK-STUFF LIEK OFF GUNDEMZ N STUFF LOLOLOLOL!"

I rest my case. Apparently, EA even stated that RA3 was not to be taken as a serious game, and that it was a completely silly idea, aka "IDIFTL".

Is it just me, or is EA run by a bunch of 4Chan dicks and /b/ fags? It would make a LOT of sense if this were true.

For anyone with the balls to read that entire post, kudos to you. Have a Klondike bar.

EDIT: Keep in mind that this rant is my personal point of view.

Rant over, QFT.

Agreed.

@ Goztoe

C&C3 wasn't a bad game, but it shouldn't have been marketed as a 'third tiberium war' game. In terms of units it was more C&C1.5 and as far as gameplay goes it didn't have the RA(2) or TS feel in any way.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 17:45:48 GMT

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

Dreganius wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 11:10<GIANT RANT>

Boy, that took some reading, but you have summed it up pretty well there.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:22:59 GMT

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

It was a great run, guys; now what?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Omar007](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:29:27 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 16:05Dreganius wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 12:10TIME FOR DREGANIUS' MASSIVE RANT ON C&C EVERYONE!

Make sure to get some popcorn from the lobby!

DREGGY RANT!The C&C series was amazing up until the day that Westwood was eradicated by those EA fiends. Their disgusting, mutilated FREAK replacements of C&C broke my heart, and although I played C&C3 and enjoyed it, as far as story goes NO game in the series beyond Westwood's era is worthy of the C&C title, for the storyline and general 'character' of GDI and Nod, and the Allies and Soviets in those games were magnificently perfect.

Here's what it was like for me. GDI was the UN elected defenders of the world against terrorism, etc. Nod was a rag-tag group, that through Kane, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the Tiberium anomaly, rose to great power and eventually gained technological advances that confused, and outmaneuvered GDI, however they lacked the massive arsenal GDI had and thus could not afford

an all-out war. GDI seemed to continuously quell Nod, but Nod kept coming back with more, like stealth technologies, then lasers, and then things like cyborgs and aircraft developed from alien (Scrin) technology. GDI fought back, and advanced too, but in a typical military fashion (and the walkers were pretty cool too, and made some relevant sense).

That, in my heart, was C&C.

Then C&C3 came in to the picture. Everything seemed to rewind backwards a little and then fast-forward along a different line. I was heavily confused when Nod had Militia, for originally they equipped their soldiers with Pulse Rifles and armor, not machine guns. The cyborgs were completely taken out of the picture. Nod also completely lost their alien technology. Then came the suicide bombers. That completely ruined it for me. "WHAT THE FUCK IS THIS SHIT?" echoed throughout my neighborhood when I saw Suicide Bombers in my troops list. Wow, so Nod Infantry has gone back to its Soviet-Collapse days?

As for vehicles, they've gone back to C&C 95 days. The Attack Bike and Buggy is exactly the same as 95, and Nod's main battle tank can't burrow anymore, in fact it's just like the Light Tank, but, just like the Bike and Buggy, shinier. Oh at least they have a flame tank! Now, let's go underground again and ambush the enemy. What? No subterranean movement?! COME ON!

Oh, wow, now we have a Beam Tank and an Avatar mech! Cabal move over, there's a new mech in town. The Avatar mech was about the ONLY thing I liked for Nod. The Beam Cannon was just like a shitty Nod Artillery. Stealth Tank technology seems to be intact like in 95 and Tiberian Sun, but Nod's stealth technology was rendered obsolete by 2 facts.

1: Stealth Generators could never be stealthed themselves (Pointless much?)

2: So many units could now reveal stealthed units, (instead of one Sensor Relay that actually needed to be strategically placed to work with utmost efficiency) so now you could send 3 Pitbulls in with your rush of 10 Predators and call it a day. The fact that Nod harvesters were now invisible was a nice feature. Too bad Stealth technology was now completely fucked to obsolete shit.

GDI took several steps backwards too. They reverted to their walkers completely but for Juggernauts. Why? Surely the walkers were working fine beforehand otherwise they wouldn't be mass-produced in Tiberian Sun, so don't go for a "Prototype" argument. Secondly, EA slapped railguns on a heap of things, because they're so blue and shiny and go boom when you shoot them at things, which completely messes up the balance when Nod's infantry are now a load of pathetic civvies armed with uzi's and AK's (again) when you think about it realistically. Even the APC was nerfed (although they gave it a gun), it used to be amphibious! That made for some serious strategic strikes to work well. Since they replaced GDI's awesome walkers with shitty tanks, EA HAD to give them something new, something of an upgrade... Right..? Nope. Not a damn thing.

Then came the Scrin. They were just weird. I mean, I had no idea how the fuck to play them, but apparently everyone spammed ships and won.

Now, let's move to Red Alert. The reason I liked Red Alert is because it toyed with the timeline a bit, and asked what would happen if these Einstein wasn't dead, if Nikola Tesla sold his inventions to the Russian Military (Side note, Edison is a massive hipster faggot, as Dover would say, for stealing Tesla's inventions), etc etc. This slightly varied timeline was awesome. Then, again, EA flexed their massive fag-muscle and cocked everything up.

Red Alert 2 only received a slight dose from the fag-muscle. Psychic domination, weather machines, radiation launchers, etc. That stuff wasn't bad, although it was getting kinda iffy at that stage. And then, EA looked into Pandora's Underwear drawer and shit hit the mother-fucking fan.

"OK GUYZ LETS GIV RUSHENZ ATK BAERZ INSTED OF DOGZ LULZ! O AND DEN WE CAN GIEV BOTES TREDZ AND SHIT! OH OH OH LETS PUT JAPAN IN AS A RASE OV SUPATEKNOADVANS D PEEPL WIF SYKIK SKOOLGURLZ AND MEK-STUFF LIEK OFF GUNDEMZ N STUFF LOLOLOLOL!"

I rest my case. Apparently, EA even stated that RA3 was not to be taken as a serious game, and that it was a completely silly idea, aka "IDIFTL".

Is it just me, or is EA run by a bunch of 4Chan dicks and /b/ fags? It would make a LOT of sense if this were true.

For anyone with the balls to read that entire post, kudos to you. Have a Klondike bar.

EDIT: Keep in mind that this rant is my personal point of view.
Rant over, QFT.

Agreed.

@ Goztoe

C&C3 wasnt a bad game, but it shouldnt have been marketed as a 'third tiberium war' game. In terms of units it was more C&C1.5 and as far as gameplay goes it didn't have the RA(2) or TS feel in any way.

I think exactly the same about the C&C games as you Dreg, but as EWD said i dont think C&C3 was that bad. I do miss the feeling TS had though.

RA3 is not good imo though. That just kicks the idea of RA1/2 away and into a new crappy story

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:36:11 GMT

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

PROTIP: RA3 is just as corny as RA2 was.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:41:20 GMT

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

Yeah, I think C&C's best days were with Westwood. I've spent more time playing Renegade, C&C 95, Tiberian Sun and Red Alert 2 individually than any of the EA C&C games combined x 2.

I didn't like Generals as it was not a C&C game, it brought a lame singleplayer, and did not bring anything new to the RTS table. It was pretty much just a modern warfare version of War Craft. MidEast Crisis and MidEast Crisis 2 was what Generals should have been.

I didn't like the 4 year gap where no C&C games were made and the community was completely neglected.

I liked C&C3's gameplay, but not its less than consistent story.

I didn't really play RA3.

I probably will not be even buy C&C4 for reasons I cannot mention.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:44:53 GMT

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

Dreganius wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 03:10TIME FOR DREGANIUS' MASSIVE RANT ON C&C EVERYONE!

Make sure to get some popcorn from the lobby!

DREGGY RANT!The C&C series was amazing up until the day that Westwood was eradicated by those EA fiends. Their disgusting, mutilated FREAK replacements of C&C broke my heart, and although I played C&C3 and enjoyed it, as far as story goes NO game in the series beyond Westwood's era is worthy of the C&C title, for the storyline and general 'character' of GDI and Nod, and the Allies and Soviets in those games were magnificently perfect.

Here's what it was like for me. GDI was the UN elected defenders of the world against terrorism, etc. Nod was a rag-tag group, that through Kane, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the Tiberium anomaly, rose to great power and eventually gained technological advances that confused, and outmaneuvered GDI, however they lacked the massive arsenal GDI had and thus could not afford an all-out war. GDI seemed to continuously quell Nod, but Nod kept coming back with more, like stealth technologies, then lasers, and then things like cyborgs and aircraft developed from alien (Scrin) technology. GDI fought back, and advanced too, but in a typical military fashion (and the walkers were pretty cool too, and made some relevant sense).

That, in my heart, was C&C.

Then C&C3 came in to the picture. Everything seemed to rewind backwards a little and then fast-forward along a different line. I was heavily confused when Nod had Militia, for originally they equipped their soldiers with Pulse Rifles and armor, not machine guns. The cyborgs were completely taken out of the picture. Nod also completely lost their alien technology. Then came the suicide bombers. That completely ruined it for me. "WHAT THE FUCK IS THIS SHIT?" echoed throughout my neighborhood when I saw Suicide Bombers in my troops list. Wow, so Nod Infantry has gone back to its Soviet-Collapse days?

As for vehicles, they've gone back to C&C 95 days. The Attack Bike and Buggy is exactly the same as 95, and Nod's main battle tank can't burrow anymore, in fact it's just like the Light Tank, but, just like the Bike and Buggy, shinier. Oh at least they have a flame tank! Now, let's go underground again and ambush the enemy. What? No subterranean movement?! COME ON!

Oh, wow, now we have a Beam Tank and an Avatar mech! Cabal move over, there's a new mech in town. The Avatar mech was about the ONLY thing I liked for Nod. The Beam Cannon was just like a shitty Nod Artillery. Stealth Tank technology seems to be intact like in 95 and Tiberian Sun, but Nod's stealth technology was rendered obsolete by 2 facts.

1: Stealth Generators could never be stealthed themselves (Pointless much?)

2: So many units could now reveal stealthed units, (instead of one Sensor Relay that actually needed to be strategically placed to work with utmost efficiency) so now you could send 3 Pitbulls in with your rush of 10 Predators and call it a day. The fact that Nod harvesters were now invisible was a nice feature. Too bad Stealth technology was now completely fucked to obsolete shit.

GDI took several steps backwards too. They reverted to their walkers completely but for Juggernauts. Why? Surely the walkers were working fine beforehand otherwise they wouldn't be mass-produced in Tiberian Sun, so don't go for a "Prototype" argument. Secondly, EA slapped railguns on a heap of things, because they're so blue and shiny and go boom when you shoot them at things, which completely messes up the balance when Nod's infantry are now a load of pathetic civvies armed with uzi's and AK's (again) when you think about it realistically. Even the APC was nerfed (although they gave it a gun), it used to be amphibious! That made for some serious strategic strikes to work well. Since they replaced GDI's awesome walkers with shitty tanks, EA HAD to give them something new, something of an upgrade... Right..? Nope. Not a damn thing.

Then came the Scrin. They were just weird. I mean, I had no idea how the fuck to play them, but apparently everyone spammed ships and won.

Now, let's move to Red Alert. The reason I liked Red Alert is because it toyed with the timeline a bit, and asked what would happen if these Einstein wasn't dead, if Nikola Tesla sold his inventions to the Russian Military (Side note, Edison is a massive hipster faggot, as Dover would say, for stealing Tesla's inventions), etc etc. This slightly varied timeline was awesome. Then, again, EA flexed their massive fag-muscle and cocked everything up.

Red Alert 2 only received a slight dose from the fag-muscle. Psychic domination, weather machines, radiation launchers, etc. That stuff wasn't bad, although it was getting kinda iffy at that stage. And then, EA looked into Pandora's Underwear drawer and shit hit the mother-fucking fan.

"OK GUYZ LETS GIV RUSHENZ ATK BAERZ INSTED OF DOGZ LULZ! O AND DEN WE CAN GIEV BOTES TREDZ AND SHIT! OH OH OH LETS PUT JAPAN IN AS A RASE OV SUPATEKNOADVANS D PEEPL WIF SYKIK SKOOLGURLZ AND MEK-STUFF LIEK OFF GUNDEMZ N STUFF LOLLOLOL!"

I rest my case. Apparently, EA even stated that RA3 was not to be taken as a serious game, and that it was a completely silly idea, aka "IDIFTL".

Is it just me, or is EA run by a bunch of 4Chan dicks and /b/ fags? It would make a LOT of sense if this were true.

For anyone with the balls to read that entire post, kudos to you. Have a Klondike bar.

EDIT: Keep in mind that this rant is my personal point of view.

Rant over, QFT.

If EA was run by 4Chan, you'd expect a much more thoroughly entertaining game than the shitfest that was RA3.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 13:36PROTIP: RA3 is just as corny as RA2 was.

Agreed. RA2 sucks too.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:47:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RTS games nowadays aren't ment to be played for more than 15 mins per match and more than 6-9 months after their release.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:50:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 13:47Bad RTS games nowadays aren't ment to be played for more than 15 mins per match and more than 6-9 months after their release.

Fixed, since StarCraft shits all over your point.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:51:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 22:50Goztow wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 13:47Bad RTS games nowadays aren't ment to be played for more than 15 mins per match and more than 6-9 months after their release.

Fixed, since StarCraft shits all over your point.
Starcraft was released in 1998. Starcraft is nowhere near being a recent RTS game.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 11 Nov 2009 21:56:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 13:51Dover wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 22:50Goztow wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 13:47Bad RTS games nowadays aren't ment to be played for more than 15 mins per match and more than 6-9 months after their release.

Fixed, since StarCraft shits all over your point.
Starcraft was released in 1998. Starcraft is nowhere near being a recent RTS game.

How convenient that there is going to be a new StarCraft released sometime in the next six months (Hopefully) that will carry on the tradition of the first!

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [nopol10](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 00:28:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As much as many dislike how C&C4 is going, we all have to hope that they make it as good as they can since there's not much sense in praying for Westwood to rise from the dead and get the C&C franchise back from EA to carry it in the direction they envisioned in the first place.

Also, C&C3 & KW weren't bad in terms of multiplayer. The story however felt like utter nonsense (especially when it was meant to be serious unlike RA2 or RA3).
I just hope that this isn't the end of C&C (forever that is, knowing EA however, it probably will surface in a few years time).

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [halo2pac](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 04:29:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If c&c was run by 4chan wouldn't we be all victims of ddoses and identity fraud?also flys in a bot web?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 06:01:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

danpaul88 wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 03:17Lets face it, the C&C franchise died when they originally disbanded Westwood, all these mock-C&C games EA have made since then are just a pathetic attempt to fix that mistake.
i thought generals was entirely fun as fuck to play
there was no tiberium and there was no ore, but that didn't change the fact that it worked out and had a good balance in it

instead of going with some fictional storyline EA pumped out a RTS equivalent of Modern Warfare and applied Command and Conquer to the present day world

what was so bad about generals and zero hour? no cyborg commando? no Tanya? who the fuck cares, it was still a fun game that i played the living shit out of

my opinion on cnc 4 (shared by others) is it should just pick up where tiberian sun left off and act like cnc 3 never happened

they have the technology and the potential now to make the game what it was meant to be then it's all set up for them; why start taking crazy-assed shot-in-the-dark hope-this-works risks for no reason at all? it's absolutely ridiculous but that's the way EA seems to work (or doesn't work, with 1,500 jobs being cut)

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 09:05:41 GMT

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

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 15:36PROTIP: RA3 is just as corny as RA2 was.

No, corny best describes the C&C storyline that takes itself seriously - those two were entertaining.

Generals = easily the best C&C, but the dweebs hated it for excluding Kane and his evil Brotherhood!!!11 Hardcore C&C fans = a very special kind of losers.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 10:57:49 GMT

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

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 12 November 2009 09:05GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 15:36PROTIP: RA3 is just as corny as RA2 was.

No, corny best describes the C&C storyline that takes itself seriously - those two were entertaining.

Generals = easily the best C&C, but the dweebs hated it for excluding Kane and his evil Brotherhood!!!11 Hardcore C&C fans = a very special kind of losers.

Most people don't quite "hate" generals, they just hate that they named it C&C. It had nothing to do with C&C, and the style was much more similar to Warcraft than C&C. If they just called it something different, no one in the C&C community would have given a shit.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 11:15:14 GMT

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

I actually quite like Generals, I just don't think of it as a C&C game, but a franchise in it's own right. They slapped the C&C brand on it just so they could sell more copies.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Omar007](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 13:04:12 GMT

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

danpaul88 wrote on Thu, 12 November 2009 12:15: I actually quite like Generals, I just don't think of it as a C&C game, but a franchise in it's own right. They slapped the C&C brand on it just so they could sell more copies.

Indeed

Although i didnt really liked Generals w/o ZH. ZH made me play it actually

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 16:40:09 GMT

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

Very sad to hear this.

Atleast I have all the C&C games...can always boot up the older titles and feel nostalgic.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [RoCk2Star](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 21:08:42 GMT

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

Generals was and is a cnc, but it was new kind of saga. Theres tiberium saga about Nod and GDI, Red Alert saga about Allies and Soviets and the generals saga about Chinese,American,GLA war. I love C&C3 and KW, especially C&C3 it game play is just amazing, feels a bit oldschool. I never liked ra3 due to that it feels and looks really gay..

Gen was quite good balanced but ZH ... is just frustrating even if its addictive.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 21:17:48 GMT

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

Generals didn't really have much of a story, lol. Some of the gameplay was nice, though. Still, they coulda called it something different.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 21:27:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 15:17: Generals didn't really have much of a story, lol. Some of the gameplay was nice, though. Still, they coulda called it something different.

In my opinion, story is what helped kill C&C. The series started off gritty, and had a generally realistic schtick, with some loony stuff thrown in like a quasi-terror group/corporation which had phallic structures that fired lasers, barracks with fists sticking out of them, and a bald leader with a penchant for leather and turtlenecks.

But then both storylines just got really dumb, with too much crazy shit like aliens, mechanical bears and Japanese people. Plus, you had to know some backstory to get enjoyment, and that limits new people from the series.

I think EA understood this when they created Generals. The storyline was accessible because it fit the times when it was released, and that is great for a wide audience. Terrorists? Check! Conniving Chinese Commies? Double Check!!

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 21:38:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BAD story is what killed it. TD's and RA's stories were, yeah, honestly best. TS kinda overdid it, but the atmosphere was pretty nice, and the Firestorm was a bit less cheesy (and the Nod campaign wasn't quite as bad in TS). RA2 definitely set the path for shitty story, though. The missions themselves were fun, but the cutscenes were the beginning of the end.

C&C3 definitely just way overdid it.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 22:07:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Those live action cutscenes from the first two games are ridiculously cheesy...I remembered them as really cool back when I was a kid, but when I replayed those games a few years ago, I felt embarrassed. The same goes for Jedi Knight...just in case anyone else here was blown away by the story and the cutscenes back in '97. They're all great games, but the story aspect just doesn't stand the test of time.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 22:16:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 16:07 Those live action cutscenes from the first two games are ridiculously cheesy...I remembered them as really cool back when I was a kid, but when I replayed those games a few years ago, I felt embarrassed. The same goes for Jedi Knight...just in case anyone else here was blown away by the story and the cutscenes back in '97. They're all great games, but the story aspect just doesn't stand the test of time.

Yeah, but the first C&C was made back in like, 1995, so I'd expect them to be cheesy by today's standards, although I haven't watched them for ages. Still, the games afterwards just took it way too far. I figured EA would've toned down the storylines/subject matter to be more consistent with the prevailing attitudes of today, but I guess that's why they made Generals.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 22:33:25 GMT

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

I didn't think TD and RA were all that cheesy, honestly. They were pretty straightforward and didn't have overly huge cutscenes usually. TS definitely started the trend, though it wasn't all that bad still.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 14 Nov 2009 00:11:19 GMT

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

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 16:33 I didn't think TD and RA were all that cheesy, honestly. They were pretty straightforward and didn't have overly huge cutscenes usually. TS definitely started the trend, though it wasn't all that bad still.

The first couple games did have some cheese, but that was part of their 'tongue-in-cheek' charm.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 14 Nov 2009 07:59:25 GMT

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

danpaul88 wrote on Thu, 12 November 2009 05:15 I actually quite like Generals, I just don't think of it as a C&C game, but a franchise in it's own right. They slapped the C&C brand on it just so they could sell more copies.

it didn't have kane or soviets in it, but everything else looked exactly like any other command and conquer game

you build a base, you build units, you destroy the enemy doing the exact same thing
there are resources to collect, there are superweapons, there are hero units

how did you decide Command & Conquer is restricted to the tiberium storyline and the red alert storyline? because that's where Westwood left off? who's to say they wouldn't have made

Generals on their own later on, and if they had would you still say it's not a C&C game? come on now

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Chuck Norris](#) on Sat, 14 Nov 2009 10:36:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here's something nobody mentioned. What does this mean for TT and any potential patch for Renegade? Knowing they're done after C&C4, I doubt they'll spend any time with the Renegade community.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [RoCk2Star](#) on Sat, 14 Nov 2009 11:01:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I really hate TT, it looks like the game thats made by mentally disabled people..

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 14 Nov 2009 13:33:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RoCk2Star wrote on Sat, 14 November 2009 05:01 I really hate TT, it looks like the game thats made by mentally disabled people..
Pretty sure Chuck meant Tiberian Technologies, if you were replying to him, lol.

Also, liquid, going by that logic, if you slapped "C&C: Old Ages" onto Warcraft, does that suddenly make it a good C&C game?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sat, 14 Nov 2009 13:35:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chuck Norris wrote on Sat, 14 November 2009 11:36 Here's something nobody mentioned. What does this mean for TT and any potential patch for Renegade? Knowing they're done after C&C4, I doubt they'll spend any time with the Renegade community.
We only have to get Apoc to put the patch on the patcher, and we're done :+ So we don't need too much of their time

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 06:32:36 GMT

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

assuming you're done before he loses his job

Quote:Also, liquid, going by that logic, if you slapped "C&C: Old Ages" onto Warcraft, does that suddenly make it a good C&C game?

i haven't played it but apparently it's a cool game

same concept and everything, and had it been made by Westwood and not Blizzard it could very well have a C&C tag on it

why does it has to have tiberium or soviets in it?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 07:05:59 GMT

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

Well here's the low-down. EA sucks, and Blizzard annoy me a bit with the Starcraft series, but that's off-topic.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 10:28:38 GMT

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

I'm a Warhammer 40k fanboy. What can I say?

Terrans = Space Marine rip-off

Zerg = Tyranid rip-off

Protoss = Okay I give them credit for that one.

Not to say I don't like Starcraft, it's awesome fun.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 10:36:10 GMT

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

Dreganius wrote on Mon, 16 November 2009 02:28I'm a Warhammer 40k fanboy. What can I say?

Terrans = Space Marine rip-off

Zerg = Tyranid rip-off

Protoss = Okay I give them credit for that one.

Not to say I don't like Starcraft, it's awesome fun.

Warhammer 40k is just D&D in space. If you're a Warhammer fanboy, you have no right to complain about originality. >:[

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 15:53:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I suck at RTS...stupid units never do what I want them to.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 16:36:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't get why whenever someone says StarCraft isn't the best game ever, people jump down their throats.

PROTIP: It's not. It's good, yes, but it's the RTS equivalent of a fighting game- you have to know 5835357 invisible rules which usually make no sense and unless you can react within 1/10ths of a second you're doomed to fail. This isn't to say it's bad either, but it gets tedious after a few games.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 21:00:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 16 November 2009 08:36you have to know 5835357 invisible rules which usually make no sense and unless you can react within 1/10ths of a second you're doomed to fail. This isn't to say it's bad either, but it gets tedious after a few games.

It's fine if you think StarCraft isn't the best game ever, but posts like this show me that you either haven't played very much of it or are being intentionally misleading.

StarCraft is the RTS equivalent of Chess. The rules are actually stupidly simple, and there are very few "special" or "invisible" rules. It's from understanding these rules and their application on a deep level that make up skill differences. To use an analogy, both a Chess Grand Master and an average Chess player both know that pawns can start out moving two spaces instead of the usual one, but the Grand Master better understands the application. This is the hallmark of great strategy games--Simple rules, deep gameplay.

Of course quick reactions are plus, but you don't need to have superhuman micro to play (Although it's an obvious advantage, just like it would be in any game). Especially in low-level play where shit like Nukes and slow-ass units like BCs and Carriers are prevalent, you have more than enough time to react. Although I'll grant you that to some extent what you're talking about applies to Zerg vs Zerg match, if only because those games are typically over so very quickly that every unit and every small advantage matters tremendously.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [RoCk2Star](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 19:28:04 GMT

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

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 16 November 2009 16:53I suck at RTS...stupid units never do what I want them to.

Cause ur retard @ micro. Try using mouse, helps tbh.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 20:14:32 GMT

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

got me, polandball!

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 21:04:15 GMT

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

Dreganius wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 04:10TIME FOR DREGANIUS' MASSIVE RANT ON C&C EVERYONE!

Make sure to get some popcorn from the lobby!

DREGGY RANT!The C&C series was amazing up until the day that Westwood was eradicated by those EA fiends. Their disgusting, mutilated FREAK replacements of C&C broke my heart, and although I played C&C3 and enjoyed it, as far as story goes NO game in the series beyond Westwood's era is worthy of the C&C title, for the storyline and general 'character' of GDI and Nod, and the Allies and Soviets in those games were magnificently perfect.

Here's what it was like for me. GDI was the UN elected defenders of the world against terrorism, etc. Nod was a rag-tag group, that through Kane, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the Tiberium anomaly, rose to great power and eventually gained technological advances that confused, and outmaneuvered GDI, however they lacked the massive arsenal GDI had and thus could not afford an all-out war. GDI seemed to continuously quell Nod, but Nod kept coming back with more, like stealth technologies, then lasers, and then things like cyborgs and aircraft developed from alien (Scrin) technology. GDI fought back, and advanced too, but in a typical military fashion (and the walkers were pretty cool too, and made some relevant sense).

That, in my heart, was C&C.

Then C&C3 came in to the picture. Everything seemed to rewind backwards a little and then fast-forward along a different line. I was heavily confused when Nod had Militia, for originally they equipped their soldiers with Pulse Rifles and armor, not machine guns. The cyborgs were completely taken out of the picture. Nod also completely lost their alien technology. Then came the suicide bombers. That completely ruined it for me. "WHAT THE FUCK IS THIS SHIT?"

echoed throughout my neighborhood when I saw Suicide Bombers in my troops list. Wow, so Nod Infantry has gone back to its Soviet-Collapse days?

As for vehicles, they've gone back to C&C 95 days. The Attack Bike and Buggy is exactly the same as 95, and Nod's main battle tank can't burrow anymore, in fact it's just like the Light Tank, but, just like the Bike and Buggy, shinier. Oh at least they have a flame tank! Now, let's go underground again and ambush the enemy. What? No subterranean movement?! COME ON!

Oh, wow, now we have a Beam Tank and an Avatar mech! Cabal move over, there's a new mech in town. The Avatar mech was about the ONLY thing I liked for Nod. The Beam Cannon was just like a shitty Nod Artillery. Stealth Tank technology seems to be intact like in 95 and Tiberian Sun, but Nod's stealth technology was rendered obsolete by 2 facts.

1: Stealth Generators could never be stealthed themselves (Pointless much?)

2: So many units could now reveal stealthed units, (instead of one Sensor Relay that actually needed to be strategically placed to work with utmost efficiency) so now you could send 3 Pitbulls in with your rush of 10 Predators and call it a day. The fact that Nod harvesters were now invisible was a nice feature. Too bad Stealth technology was now completely fucked to obsolete shit.

GDI took several steps backwards too. They reverted to their walkers completely but for Juggernauts. Why? Surely the walkers were working fine beforehand otherwise they wouldn't be mass-produced in Tiberian Sun, so don't go for a "Prototype" argument. Secondly, EA slapped railguns on a heap of things, because they're so blue and shiny and go boom when you shoot them at things, which completely messes up the balance when Nod's infantry are now a load of pathetic civvies armed with uzi's and AK's (again) when you think about it realistically. Even the APC was nerfed (although they gave it a gun), it used to be amphibious! That made for some serious strategic strikes to work well. Since they replaced GDI's awesome walkers with shitty tanks, EA HAD to give them something new, something of an upgrade... Right..? Nope. Not a damn thing.

Then came the Scrin. They were just weird. I mean, I had no idea how the fuck to play them, but apparently everyone spammed ships and won.

Now, let's move to Red Alert. The reason I liked Red Alert is because it toyed with the timeline a bit, and asked what would happen if these Einstein wasn't dead, if Nikola Tesla sold his inventions to the Russian Military (Side note, Edison is a massive hipster faggot, as Dover would say, for stealing Tesla's inventions), etc etc. This slightly varied timeline was awesome. Then, again, EA flexed their massive fag-muscle and cocked everything up.

Red Alert 2 only received a slight dose from the fag-muscle. Psychic domination, weather machines, radiation launchers, etc. That stuff wasn't bad, although it was getting kinda iffy at that stage. And then, EA looked into Pandora's Underwear drawer and shit hit the mother-fucking fan.

"OK GUYZ LETS GIV RUSHENZ ATK BAERZ INSTED OF DOGZ LULZ! O AND DEN WE CAN GIEV BOTES TREDZ AND SHIT! OH OH OH LETS PUT JAPAN IN AS A RASE OV SUPATEKNOADVANS D PEEPL WIF SYKIK SKOOLGURLZ AND MEK-STUFF LIEK OFF GUNDEMZ N STUFF LOLOLOLOL!"

I rest my case. Apparently, EA even stated that RA3 was not to be taken as a serious game, and that it was a completely silly idea, aka "IDIFTL".

Is it just me, or is EA run by a bunch of 4Chan dicks and /b/ fags? It would make a LOT of sense if this were true.

For anyone with the balls to read that entire post, kudos to you. Have a Klondike bar.

EDIT: Keep in mind that this rant is my personal point of view.

Rant over, QFT.

Spot on EXCEPT that you left out the tiberium growth aspect. CnC -> Tib sun -> Firestorm all showed tiberium mutating in a way that in each progressing game it became more diverse, created more interesting mutations, and had more interesting affects on the environment. Then CnC3 came along and took a shit on that idea. TIBERIUM GROWS FROM TREES?!?! WE THINK NOT, NOW IT COMES OUT OF CONVENIENTLY PLACED HOLES IN THE GROUND, WHY THE ENTIRE CRUST HASN'T CAVED IN WHO KNOWS. And don't forget that "weed" vanished off the face of the earth, as did any neat plant life or growth that firestorm introduced. Ion storms are gone as well for some reason. And suddenly Nod's interest in using tib as a weapon is gone. Also, if walkers were seen as a bad prototype was does nod jump all over the idea in cnc 3?

Ah well, as for EA shutting CnC down, I can't say I'm surprised, its EA. Although, its about flipping time they shut maxis down, their games have been heading down hill ever sense sim city 2004. Sims 3 seemed like a clone of sims 2 to me, although I only played it for like 4 seconds before I remember how much I disliked 2 and quit playing.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Renx](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 17:03:09 GMT

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

TS was the last C&C game.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 18:22:28 GMT

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

I think the only way to save C&C would to put it on the Company of Heroes Engine and let the Renegade (SAGE/RAGE) engine die. I hate the new Toon' look of the games since Red Alert 2 and the direction it's been taken ever since then.

Think how bad ass the next Red Alert would of been with realistic graphics on a modern engine. IE:

Now add Tesla Coils and your all set.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 18:31:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crysis looks better

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 18:55:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oblivion165 wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 12:22I think the only way to save C&C would to put it on the Company of Heroes Engine and let the Renegade (SAGE/RAGE) engine die. I hate the new Toon' look of the games since Red Alert 2 and the direction it's been taken ever since then.

Think how bad ass the next Red Alert would of been with realistic graphics on a modern engine. IE:

Now add Tesla Coils and your all set.

I actually like C&C4's look. C&C3 was shit as I couldn't fucking tell what unit was what (they did the graphics horribly there... I don't mean they had low res textures or low poly models, I mean they hardly put effort into diversifying the units to make them easier to recognize). RA3 was, yeah, a little too cartoony sometimes, but it was still better than C&C3 IMO.

I actually find it kind of funny, 99% of the C&C community bitches and moans and complains about how gameplay takes priority over graphics... yet 99% bitch about how "OMG CARTOONY AND LAME" RA3 looks. What the fuck?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [The Party](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 20:06:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 12:31Crysis looks better

You have a lot of freedom in that game, you can pick what and where you want to go.

Also which piss-ant mod deleted my other post in this thread?

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 20:09:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 10:55I actually find it kind of funny, 99% of the C&C community bitches and moans and complains about how gameplay takes priority over graphics... yet 99% bitch about how "OMG CARTOONY AND LAME" RA3 looks. What the fuck?

Why? The gameplay sucks too. If it wasn't for the C&C logo and vaguely related storyline, Everything after TS would be generic shovelware.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 21:37:58 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 14:09GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 10:55I actually find it kind of funny, 99% of the C&C community bitches and moans and complains about how gameplay takes priority over graphics... yet 99% bitch about how "OMG CARTOONY AND LAME" RA3 looks. What the fuck?

Why? The gameplay sucks too. If it wasn't for the C&C logo and vaguely related storyline, Everything after TS would be generic shovelware.

It was a little more balanced than C&C3's crock of bullshit. Admittedly I haven't quite played it yet, maybe I need to, and maybe it really IS crap... but from what I can see, it seems like a lot of people don't like it BECAUSE it's actually fairly balanced and isn't a HURRRR I KILL U IN 5 SECONDS LOL EARLY GAME

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 22:00:59 GMT

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

The G-Man wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 14:06JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 12:31Crysis looks better

You have a lot of freedom in that game, you can pick what and where you want to go.

Also which piss-ant mod deleted my other post in this thread?

Crysis has powered suits and stuff.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 20 Nov 2009 22:47:48 GMT

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

I played over 500 online games of C&C3 in the first 8 months of its release. The gameplay was good. The balance wasn't perfect but was sufficient. The games were quick, which was a good thing. Overall C&C3 ws a very OK C&C game in my critical mind.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Sat, 21 Nov 2009 13:22:54 GMT

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

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 13:55

I actually find it kind of funny, 99% of the C&C community bitches and moans and complains about how gameplay takes priority over graphics... yet 99% bitch about how "OMG CARTOONY AND LAME" RA3 looks. What the fuck?

I actually love the way RA3 feels and handles, they will have no complaints from me on that part.

I haven't seen the graphics for C&C4 yet, Ill take a look...

Yeah that's not bad at all. I am more of a fan of the original WW2 themes instead of the Tiberium universe but they stopped making those long ago.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [The Party](#) on Sat, 21 Nov 2009 22:10:47 GMT

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

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 14:00The G-Man wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 14:06JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 12:31Crysis looks better

You have a lot of freedom in that game, you can pick what and where you want to go.

Also which piss-ant mod deleted my other post in this thread?

Crysis has powered suits and stuff.

They are actually Nano Suits, gosh! Get it right.

Subject: Re: The Apparent End of C&C?

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 21 Nov 2009 23:26:19 GMT

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

The G-Man wrote on Sat, 21 November 2009 16:10JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 14:00The G-Man wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 14:06JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 20 November 2009 12:31Crysis looks better

You have a lot of freedom in that game, you can pick what and where you want to go.

Also which piss-ant mod deleted my other post in this thread?

Crysis has powered suits and stuff.

They are actually Nano Suits, gosh! Get it right.

Does Marcellus Wallace look like a bitch?
