

---

Subject: Re: EA and BF2

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sun, 12 Jun 2005 19:26:54 GMT

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

---

Trielite Forums  
VitaminousWe were expecting a lot from it, but overall, it was a huge disappointment.

I have to say, Battlefield 2 is a failure like most games that had been released by EA and its sub-studios since the middle of 2004.

Ever since Dice got bought by Electronic Arts all they produced was shit, to be frank.

Battlefield: Vietnam being the first game of the series to suck, with its broken promises and major bugs... Now, we're in 2005, and there are two upcoming releases of the Battlefield franchise to be released by EA, Battlefield 2, and Battlefield: Modern Combat, which is going to be the first game on the franchise to be on the home gaming consoles.

So yeah, let me sum up this preview of the full game Dice has given us.

Graphically, I couldn't really say it's not pretty, but due to hardware restrictions, which are major (\*cough\* sponsorship \*cough\*) in every way possible, the game looks like... Ass. It's not the base requirements that bother me the most, but really the restrictions. Then, there are the resolutions... Unlike in many other games, they are not restricted by the hardware, but by the engine, I must say that this was one of the problems I had with Battlefield: Vietnam, not being able to fully experience the game graphically. Result? Graphics end being poor and non-cripsy, aka: not interesting. Dice pretends they have made a new graphics engine for Battlefield 2, and the more I'm playing, the more I'm doubting, just look at the distance limitations! TRY TO FLY A PLANE WITHOUT FINDING YOURSELF LOADING TERRAIN GRAPHICS, the drawing distance limitations were even better in Battlefield 1942 for fucks sake, hence why I think that they just modded the existing engine and nothing else.

Sound? Didn't really have issues with it, as long as the hardware renders it it should sound good/great. What's laughable is that Creative is a 'sponsor' and most of their existing hardware is listed as incompatible.

Gameplay, I must say that the new 'fragdoll' physics give it a nice twist, but unlike in games like Counter-Strike: Source or Far Cry, you'll never end up seeing dead bodies in funny positions. (There's a TINY learning curve for original Battlefield 1942/Desert Combat users, mainly due to the physics again.) The controls are well located, the AI seems to be quite familiar (BF:V + i.e.: bots crashing their H1s into M1A2s if they're in the way, then realising a minute later that it's in the way and they should take another path (seriously)), plus they didn't include a 32 players(+) Single Player version of the map given in the demo, telling me that they still haven't found a way to get the bots to fly properly (now that some planes are working differently).

I haven't had the chance to try the Commander mode again, so I can't really comment on the RTS part of the game, apart from that the whole gameplay is pretty much like Battlefield 1942's but better. The addition of voice chat like in most FPS nowadays was a good thing, too bad it's more compressed than Valve's own 'version'. Oh, almost forgot about the balance, again they're still having the same issues they had with Battlefield: Vietnam when it was released (i.e.: underpowered weapons and over powered one), and yeah that's about it, most sides seem to be equal.

Overall I don't think it's worth buying, unless they do MAJOR improvements in the next 2 weeks or so, because it's going to end up being another piece of shit like Battlefield: Vietnam.

---