Subject: Re: C&C3 Demo and C&C3 Official Website discussion (merged)
Posted by Kanezor on Wed, 28 Feb 2007 04:34:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MaidenTy1 wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 05:40Kanezor wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 02:47That is my personal opinion. I can't believe I fell into yet another trap of EA's. Shame on me.

I played the C&C 3 demo for about 2 hours. I simply cannot believe the stench of Generals that it has. Sure it has some pretty graphics... but coming from EA, that is unsurprisingly just about the only nice thing about it. Oh yeah, and it has a real C&C plotline, but I don't think that's a good thing.

This game is not C&C. This game is Generals with Tiberium.

Way to fuck us over, EA. I just thought you guys were trying to make the community happy. I guess I thought wrong.

I understand every individual word you just said, but string them together into sentences and it becomes totally incoherent.
It's not my fault you're too retarded to understand simple sentences.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Assuming you're not trying to be sarcastic or making fun of those few bashing the game...I was being highly sarcastic while trying to be focused at bashing EA and their work on Generals with Tiberium.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:Hi! We here at EA feel that C&C did not have enough Generals in it. In addition, we believe that we did not sufficiently fuck over the C&C name with the game Generals. So, we have decided to make a C&C Generals mod, and sell it for uber profit! We won't spend uber monies on designing a new engine because it's all right there. And we get the specialized feel of Starcraft with the awesomeness of our own C&C Generals look. And the best part? We get to cut costs because all the engine work has already been done!
I hope you're actually quoting someone else, because I'm not sure what kind of idiot it takes to think that using a modern, perfectly capable engine and just upgrading it is in any-way-what-so-ever a bad thing. I'm sure you'd rather them waste hundreds of thousands of dollars to make an unnecessary new engine instead of just upgrading a current engine to accomplish the exact same thing and putting that money to better use.You could be right. It might not have been better for EA to create a new engine. But my point was that the feel of Generals' engine sucks.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:and even a mouse interface similar to Starcraft!
You mean, "similar to every other modern RTS game", right? Besides, they'll most likely include the option to use the left click instead.

Being that I don't play "every other modern RTS game", no. I mean Starcraft. I played and loved C&C because it was different. Generals with Tiberium changed that.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:If you want to build a lot of infantry, you can just build lots of barracks! How is this different from C&C? It's not! Well, unless you count the fact that you have to tell each barracks to build a unit individually.
No you don't, you just switch tabs on the side bar to build each extra unit, you don't have to go to each barracks to build each unit.Okay, so I didn't mention that you could switch via tabs. So what? My point was that it's the Starcraft-style (oh, forgive me... "every other modern RTS game"-style) of production whereas each building has its own production line. So much for C&C being unique.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:Also, each individual barracks does not get production speed increases if you build more barracks. But don't worry, it's still the same old C&C you like.
I don't see what the big deal is, instead of building two units at a faster rate, you're building two units at the same time at normal rates, you still get two units quicker by building two barracks. I don't see the huge-gotta-bitch-and-whine-about-it difference.The huge-gotta-bitch-and-whine-about-it difference is that it's not C&C. It's Starcraft-style (oh, wait... "every other modern RTS game"-style)... again, so much for C&C being unique.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:If you want more tough units, you can build a technology building. No, that doesn't grant you access to special tougher units.
So, I just imagined the Mammoth Tank and Juggernaught and the other units becoming available only after I built the Command Post and Tech Center, right?I left that part out. I wasn't focusing on the Mammoth Tank and Juggernaught, I was focusing on the upgrades that you have to purchase separately. My mistake.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:What it does do is let you buy things called "upgrades". Don't worry, that's nothing like Starcraft though. You see, in Starcraft, you could buy several upgrades several times. So you see, it's still C&C!
I see you're still confusing "like all other modern RTS games" with "like Starcraft"...

And, no you couldn't buy the upgrades in Starcraft several times, each time you bought an upgrade, a better new upgrade was made available.Only in your eyes am I confusing "like all other modern RTS games" with "like Starcraft". C&C doesn't need to be Starcraft-style to a modern RTS game. Otherwise, it is exactly what you're implying: it fits into "all other modern RTS games" that you can simply pick up off of the shelf, play for a few days or weeks, and then get bored of it because it has absolutely no uniqueness to it.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:We've also felt it necessary to remove the ability to build base walls and gates. It was entirely too unique, and we felt that it detracted from the necessity of building more structures and units. Who cares about walls, anyways? I know I sure don't.
The modders that will add it back in within months of it's release, if walls are not added in a patch or something. CnC3 had walls, they just for some reason removed the ability to build them at the last minute. Wow, an actual valid complaint, must have been an accident, right?I'll ignore your cynical sarcasm at the end.

And who cares about the modders? I for one do not fucking care about mods. I want the real game to be the way it should have been rather than needing modifications to make it the way it should have been. Is that too much to ask? Seriously, think about it.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:We also felt that Generals was pioneering this awesome macro ability. Now instead of being able to tell each unit what to do individually, you can control whole squads of infantry with a single click!
Because 6 people taking 6 direct hits to die is less stupid then 1 person taking 6 direct hits to die? It's only a visual change.What part of NOT unique do you understand? It's a visual change that was not needed.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:While we're changing things, we decided that tiberium trees were entirely too unsightly. They do have a habit of growing tiberium, you know. So instead, we felt that tiberium should come out of large holes in the ground. It doesn't matter how these holes formed, what matters is that tiberium grows out of them.
Damn, a second valid complaint, even though it is a very minor and insignificant one.Yeah, it was rather insignificant... but I figured while I was ranting, I might as well throw it in there. I did actually like the tiberium trees of old.

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Tue, 27 February 2007 09:57Quote:Oh yeah, and it has a real C&C plotline, but I don't think that's a good thing.

This game is not C&C. This game is Generals with Tiberium.

You're ranting about it being bad because it has a few different features then C&C games, but it having a "real C&C plotline" is somehow bad?
No, I'm ranting about it being bad because it has many different features than C&C games and thus doesn't deserve the real C&C plotline.