
Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 11:22:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One Winged Angel wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 16:04Hah, the open-ended endings is one of the many factors that makes the older C&C games so great. It keeps the fans talking about what they think will happen next and it allows for great discussions and theories to be crafted. People are still talking about RA2's ending today. Generals kind of stopped with no plot twists or anything so it's not talked about as much storywise.

That's a polite way of saying nobody knows what's going on, so they all make shit up (Westwood included). The open-ended endings is what helps make RA2 so silly, since if the Soviets win RA1 (And they do exactly half the time), the rest of the series goes out the window. Same goes for Tiberium Sun and Tiberium dawn.

The "theories" you're talking about usually involve trying to explain how Tanya hasn't aged in 30+ years but even appears younger. Or trying to explain how the Sears Tower is present even though it hasn't been constructed in the time that RA2 is supposed to take place in, or how the World Trade Center was included, even though it wasn't complete by that time.

Combine that with what the RA3 website describes as "wonderful and wacky" mechanics and plot-twists (mind control? time-travel? giant squids and dolphins? The result isn't a game. It's a parody. It's Monty Python does Red Alert.

One Winged Angel wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 16:04Zero Hour is more of a parody of the ongoing situation in the middle east which, to be honest, is in the news nearly every day. Plus, serious games like Gens and ZH bore me to death. RA2, Renegade and the rest of the C&C Universe series of games are differant, compared to something that is based on something that we see a lot of in real life, without being overly serious.

War is serrious. There's nothing lulzy about it. Why should it make for a lulzy game?
