
Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 03:28:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Fri, 15 February 2008 18:00One thing struck my eye when skimming through the various blurbs about RA3: Co-Op campaigns.

As for the rest... EA is too addicted to superweapons, rush-happy balancing, and special abilities. I mean, come on- the Ion Cannon was supposed to be a precision-strike weapon and C&C3 turned it into a fucking nuclear death beam. Smaller units die too quickly to make a difference in battle, forcing players to have vast resource operations just to keep ahead of loss replacement, and there is almost no room at all in some newer games for small-scale tactics that require patience and micromanagement in order to pull off. Instead, everything depends on having more firepower concentrated in one place than the other guy, which in turn usually depends on either massing fucktons of units and rushing or teching up and deploying superweapons and top-tier units (also in mass quantities). I can't stand to play modern RTS head-to-head just because of how mind-fuckingly shallow the matches are. I suck horribly at them, but I don't even feel motivated to try and get better- because the 'better' you are, the shorter the matches get, and the less time you have to do the crazy, sneaky, snowball's-chance-in-hell shit that used to make RTS so much of a blast to play.

RA3 is just going to be more of the same damned thing. It might be a fun little game for a while, but will ultimately not be so memorable as its progenitors.

I have to agree with alot of what you said, all the new RTS games are just super weapon fests.

I would play RA2 more, but it crashes everytime I try to go online. :/