

---

Subject: Re: Smash Bros. Brawl

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 13 Mar 2008 11:34:10 GMT

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

---

Whee, console wars. I might aswell jump in for the hell of it.

Anyways.

Renegade actually can be used for decent graphics still. Look at Reborn and many of the mods and such nowadays. They have quite a bit of detail in them. Really, Renegade just lacks reflective materials and a few other things that make most video games "shiney". There's already bloom, detailed shadows, and other various things added in scripts 3.+ . So using Renegade as a reference for a game with bad graphics isn't exactly the best thing. While I agree the graphics still could be upgraded (Mostly physics wise, like ragdoll physics), they're certainly not bad.

Which brings me to another point. PS3 and Xbox360 games focus way too damn much on detail. I recall a game called "Sonic the Hedgehog" or "Sonic Next Gen" as it's called by some people having VERY good graphics, and was one of the first "next gen" games.

But a ton of people say the gameplay is shitty and it doesn't seem to focus on much outside the visuals. I've not played it myself so I can't really say, but it seems as if most games for the PS3/Xbox360 are given the ability to have high visuals. Which means gaming mega-companies like EA who seem to just care about visuals and detail are given the ability to continue to not have to care about gameplay aslong as they can max out the graphics.

Wheras a game with the Wii, having a limit on the graphics is a good thing. Why? This means that game developers for the Wii are pretty much forced to have to make it have good gameplay. Take SSBB for example. I've not played it, but it looks jam packed with TONS of features and gameplay modes. Even the visuals looks acceptable, as it's not an FPS where you're right next to the battlefield and are going to notice if the pebbles in the dirt are bump mapped or modeled.

As far as I'm concerned, if it has great gameplay with graphics that aren't ridiculously shitty, it's a decent game. Because games are meant to be about gameplay. I'm really dissapointed that so many games are about visuals nowadays than they were back in the Genesis and SNES days.

I STILL will play the classic Sonic the Hedgehog games. Granted I've lost my Genesis, but I can still play them on things like the sonic mega collection pack for GC and PS2 (PS2 version for me since I've not gotten a GC), and they're still probably some of my favorite games.

Partly why I really want a Wii is because it's still a video game system that emphasizes gameplay and innovation over insane graphics. While I'll agree that to a certain extent graphics also made a good video game, gameplay should be the most important aspect, THEN graphics. I've never felt you needed a million dollar budget video game story to make a decent video game either, but a combination of all 3 can always make it awesome (Half Life 2, anyone?).

tl;dr: PS3 is if you like graphics, Xbox360 if you like multiplayer console games (And can't afford/don't want to spend the time getting a comp to run those games or just want Halo 3), and Wii is if you like innovative and awesome gameplay.

PS: If the Wii isn't so innovative as you claim, why is it I've never seen a game on the PS2 that allows players to swing around a virtual sword using a virtual controller that has motion tracking? Or on the PS3 or Xbox360 for that matter.

---