
Subject: Modern vidya powerhouses

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 07:22:35 GMT

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

So, as most of us know, the biggest names in modern gaming are- for the most part- FPS's. There's exceptions (Starcraft, World of Warcraft, Minecraft, etc), but it's a pretty obvious trend (Call of Duty, Battlefield, Halo, Half Life, Counterstrike, etc). There's also usually common gameplay themes- you're one dude who goes up against entire armies, for the most part. Or, for the multiplayer, you just kill eachother. Pretty simple stuff for the most part.

But back in the day, before the jump to 3D, there was a little bit more variety. Not THAT much (I don't want to say "hurr modern games are nothing but FPS" and then glorify old games as if they were all unique gems), but still- you had platformers, fighting games, and RPG's as the "big boys".

That's not to say modern games lack variety, but most of the change from the norm seem to be exceptions. StarCraft, while part of a rather large genre of games, is one of the few RTS's to gain huge attention (and was made right around the jump to 3D anyway and only has 2 games in the series). C&C is great, but its following is pretty damn low, and it's pretty much the second biggest RTS series... so you can't much say RTS's are a "popular genre".

The only other one I can honestly say somewhat prevails is the MMO genre- but those tend to be extremely split communities, rather than seen as a genre.

The question is, why? 3D games offer more variety than 2D ones do, yet it seems like there's one, maybe two, popular genre's of videogames these days. Sure, there are exceptions- but they're just that, exceptions.

Take for example, the platformer genre. It's not like people won't buy them- Mario is still a hugely successful game series. Spyro was even started in 3D, and it worked fairly well. But it seems like designers are skittish of making 3D platformers, usually putting them on the back of their to-do list.

I, for one, would love to see, say, a 3D Castlevania game (I'm sure there was one, but it obviously flopped). Or Sonic picking itself up again as a regular, popular series (which it CAN do, Sega just needs to stop being retarded). Or Spyro being brought back and actually being good.

Is it the consumers? Are the majority of people really okay with FPS's being the majority of their games? Or the developers/puplishers?

TL;DR: why vidjyagaems no variety? discuss.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 07:42:09 GMT

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

according to E3 theres lots of INNOVATION in vidya

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 14:24:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pretty sure there's quite a few 3D Castlevania games that were popular(for Castlevania). They're no Mario or anything, but they're definitely there.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [slosha](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 17:08:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 02:22
Is it the consumers? Are the majority of people really okay with FPS's being the majority of their games? Or the developers/puplishers?
The answer is yes. They give people what they want. And people want FPS's. Gone are the days of experimentation. It's all about money, just like music and movies.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 17:09:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The amount of variety between modern FPS games is equivalent to the amount of variety between old-school arcade style games.

Sure arcade games might have had different "objectives" but they were still a couple pixels going from point A to point B. Just as FPS games all have you pointing and shooting a gun at some target.

So, technically, the variety of popular games hasn't really changed at all in the last 20 years.

That's why it isn't about playing popular games but finding those hidden gems that no one ever talks about... like Renegade, for instance.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 19:56:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You forgot racing and sports games.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 20:33:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 10:09The amount of variety between modern FPS games is equivalent to the amount of variety between old-school arcade style games.

Sure arcade games might have had different "objectives" but they were still a couple pixels going from point A to point B. Just as FPS games all have you pointing and shooting a gun at some target.

So, technically, the variety of popular games hasn't really changed at all in the last 20 years.

That's why it isn't about playing popular games but finding those hidden gems that no one ever talks about... like Renegade, for instance.

I dunno man, that's kinda reaching. Sure, Mario and Sonic had similar objectives (reach the end of the stage by going right), but they were both pretty damn different.

Then you had Castlevania, a pretty balls-to-the-wall difficult game series, with the later ones having you explore the map rather than just going from point A to point B.

Sure, a lot of the platformers had similar gameplay mechanics- collectible items (Rings, coins, hearts, bananas, whatever), but the way the game used them was always different (Rings doubled as a shield, hearts were used for sub-weapons, etc).

When you break it down, there's ultimately various similarities between almost every game- it's the way they handle them that matters. IE:

- Resources, sometimes in the form of collectibles. Health, ammo, life, air (in water sections of games), and all that count as resources.
- Opposition, or the thing that's keeping you from reaching the goal.
- Levels, which need to change regularly in order to keep the game from getting boring. Can even be one massive world, as long as there are separate environments that are atleast somewhat defined.
- Player control/user interaction

These are things that pretty much every game ever has in common. However, a lot of older games change up the approach to all these basic elements. I feel like newer ones do not.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 20:44:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 01:22Or Spyro being brought back and actually being good.

File Attachments

1) [ROFLDragon.png](#), downloaded 365 times



Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 20:53:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(._.)

... (;_;

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2011 23:24:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 16:33l dunno man, that's kinda reaching. Sure, Mario and Sonic had similar objectives (reach the end of the stage by going right), but they were both pretty damn different.

Then you had Castlevania, a pretty balls-to-the-wall difficult game series, with the later ones having you explore the map rather than just going from point A to point B.

Sure, a lot of the platformers had similar gameplay mechanics- collectible items (Rings, coins, hearts, bananas, whatever), but the way the game used them was always different (Rings doubled as a shield, hearts were used for sub-weapons, etc).

But you can also say the same thing about popular games today. Like you said, most popular games today are just FPS games. An FPS is a shooter from first person perspective, so that is an obvious common similarity between all of them. But there are differences enough between them that separate them into their own games.

For instance, do all FPS games allow you to go into stealth a mode like in Crisis?

A popular game is a popular game, you cannot deny that fact. Despite the copy paste formula that is Call of Duty, it still sells bazillions off copies in the first weeks of its launch. Developers do make a wide variety of games, hence my comment about finding hidden gems... but the fact that people tend to gravitate to the same generic types of games is what makes those games so popular and stand out.

It really isn't the developers limiting the market with poor variety, it's the consumers only being interested in such a small variety of the games that are out there. That's why I said that if you're the type of person who wants something different, you have to look past what is popular and find the games that people overlooked.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 14 Sep 2011 14:16:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fps are the worst games (apart from jrpgs obviously) these days, but i blame this on the gamer demographic changing. they're mostly a console genre these days and i don't enjoy on rails

cinematic takedown gameplay, but minorities, frat boys and similar groups love that shit.

platformer/stealth games still put out big and somewhat decent titles and that's always been a console genre.

pc games are still going strong, they've just changed. dotalikes are huge, wow is huge, diablo 3 will be huge, starcraft has a pretty big following and the autism games are very popular.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 14 Sep 2011 20:11:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PC games that were strong are still strong. Games like WoW are an example of this. But that doesn't represent gaming on the platform as a whole.

Overall, PC gaming is really losing it's momentum. It's already been overshadowed by console gamers to the point where most "gamers" don't even consider the PC as a viable platform.

And companies like Microsoft aren't helping when they release news like incorporating Xbox Live into Windows 8 in order to bring console and PC gaming together.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 15 Sep 2011 00:10:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd take the bitching about PC gaming slow death more seriously if the people complaining weren't a bunch of nineteen year old spergs who played Deus Ex or System Shock 2 three months ago.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 15 Sep 2011 08:46:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H2Nbn4bjf6s>

pc gaming ain't dead, you can now play GOTY LoL on the go!

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 22 Sep 2011 01:20:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 16:24
But you can also say the same thing about popular games today. Like you said, most popular

games today are just FPS games. An FPS is a shooter from first person perspective, so that is an obvious common similarity between all of them. But there are differences enough between them that separate them into their own games.

For instance, do all FPS games allow you to go into stealth a mode like in Crisis?

Yes there are differences, but at their core, a lot of them are awfully similar. The most radically different examples I can think of are the Battlefield games (and other games like it), which have a bigger perspective and such and are even somewhat strategic.

But then that's like Mario and Castlevania... both are platformers. Sure, one involves saving a princess, and the other involves killing Dracula, but stripped to their cores, they share many similarities. And there's nothing wrong with that, but there were other big genre's at the time than just platformers.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 16:24

A popular game is a popular game, you cannot deny that fact. Despite the copy paste formula that is Call of Duty, it still sells bazillions off copies in the first weeks of its launch. Developers do make a wide variety of games, hence my comment about finding hidden gems... but the fact that people tend to gravitate to the same generic types of games is what makes those games so popular and stand out.

I dunno- even movies still have some diversity in their popular genres, regardless of how shitty they are. And that's a medium that's given us gems such as MICHAEL BAY'S Transformers (A MICHAEL BAY FILM MADE BY MICHAEL BAY), Final Destination 3573, and ____ Movie.

The question isn't just "hurr y modurn gaems so bad" (there's plenty of those questions and subsequent, probably factual answers), it's more like "why the hell are they almost all one genre?".

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 12 September 2011 16:24

It really isn't the developers limiting the market with poor variety, it's the consumers only being interested in such a small variety of the games that are out there. That's why I said that if you're the type of person who wants something different, you have to look past what is popular and find the games that people overlooked.

I disagree- Assassin's Creed and various other games sell quite well, and I'm sure someone would buy a game that's basically Assassin's Creed but set in a gritty post-apocalyptic setting (with minor tweaks and changes naturally, but still the same at its core). I'd probably even buy it.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 22 Sep 2011 01:38:55 GMT

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

Ultimately the problem comes down to an issue of popular franchises eclipsing others. People aren't really interested in trying new things when they are perfectly happy with what they have.

Call of Duty does so well that people don't bother to look past it in search of other games to play.

It does happen occasionally, Assassin's Creed is an example, but in comparison, it's still dwarfed

by the popularity of Call of Duty.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 22 Sep 2011 16:36:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lol shitting on transformers aka 3x action movie of the year and michael bay, director of modern classic bad boys 2. you hear that odd toilet flushing sound, forums poster george zimmer? there goes your posting cred

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 22 Sep 2011 19:58:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 21 September 2011 18:38 Ultimately the problem comes down to an issue of popular franchises eclipsing others. People aren't really interested in trying new things when they are perfectly happy with what they have.

Call of Duty does so well that people don't bother to look past it in search of other games to play.

It does happen occasionally, Assassin's Creed is an example, but in comparison, it's still dwarfed by the popularity of Call of Duty.

yeah, but that's like TV execs saying "why make anything other than gritty cop shows? people all like them". Sure, alot of people enjoy cowwa doody, but a production company could make even MORE money if they had a wider variety of games under them, because they'd have a wider audience buying their company's games (Even if they're not all necessarily buying the same games).

Granted, if a company is GOOD at what they make (IE: Valve), I don't mind them being a bit more limited. But when you're a big monopoly, you might as well broaden your spectrum a little bit.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 23 Sep 2011 14:16:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, but my point is that there ARE other good games out there. We don't need to wait for devs to make them; they already exist. The problem lies in the fact that people don't play them because they are too engrosed in things like Call of Duty... and that in turn lowers their popularity and their overall success (and thus their likelihood of sequels)

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 23 Sep 2011 16:51:27 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 23 September 2011 07:16people don't play them
lol wut

Look at MineCraft, Mario, Zelda, and Pokemon- all hugely successful games/franchises.

See, customers aren't just one giant wave with all the same tastes- while you might have 3 million CoD players (I dunno the numbers, just an example), if another game garners 2 million players, they could be a completely different set of people.

So if a company owns BOTH those games, they would effectively have 5 million unique customers (just an example, of course- there'd likely be at least a few people who'd play both).

Sure, having boatload of sales is nice (thus creating the idea of "WHO CARES WHO'S BUYING AS LONG AS WE SELL ALOT"), but any remotely intelligent businessman will tell you that having just one group of people buying your products isn't the smartest plan. You want mixed demographics, especially if your product is more or less ends up a "flavor of the month" type of deal.

So from a business standpoint, it doesn't make much sense. From an artistic standpoint (hurr vidyagames cannot into art, shutup), it's frustrating as hell.

Subject: Re: Modern vidya powerhouses
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 24 Sep 2011 20:29:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't mean that literally nobody plays other games..

From a statistical standpoint, Call of Duty eclipses all other games out there in terms of initial sales. People play that game. That doesn't mean that they don't play other games or that other people don't play other games. It just means that the number of people who buy Call of Duty is vastly greater than the number of people who buy other games.

If you walk into a crowded room and talk to someone at random, chances are more likely that they have played or heard of Call of Duty than mostly any other game franchise out there.

But anyway, I think we are getting off topic. You've kinda answered you're own initial question. There is plenty of variety in games today even if sales of popular games say otherwise.
