

---

Subject: Re: Do You Like E.A. Games?. I Think.  
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 18 Sep 2008 19:20:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Spoony

Cabal8616 wrote Oh, and I'm reading this thread. I don't think your involvement > his involvement.  
Guess you might wanna re-write that statement. Don't be

arrogent.

uh, are you slow? He's the one who started this LOL MY INVOLVEMENT IS > YOUR INVOLVEMENT pissing match, not me. You don't even know most of what I've done for the community... his

is limited to answering a few questions in the mod forum (wow) and actively attacking EA because he's too selfish to actually consider genuinely helping the games'

communities.

Actually you did start it, or don't you remember?

Spoony wrote on Sun, 20 April 2008 01:46

let's compare EA to you.

EA

What do they want? Consumers to buy their games.

What do they do to achieve it? Make games they think will sell.

Oblivion165

What do you want? EA games.

What do you do to achieve it? Steal them.

EA > you

EA > you

Yeah, you started it there spoony, not oblivion.

-----  
RoShamBo wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 03:46 Spoony wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 08:11 I'm guessing neither of you have made a game the size of C&C3 or a

complete patch for it?

I was replying to that. Or are you writing a game as big as CnC3 and keeping it up to date?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 12:19

roshambo wrote I was replying to that. Or are you writing a game as big as CnC3 and keeping it up to date?

along those lines, yes

RoShamBo wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 13:34

Sounds good, what's it called?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 13:05 Who cares? It's nothing to do with Renegade

Spoony wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 14:27roshambo wroteThen nor did your statment, but you still said it.  
that's because the subject at hand isn't renegade.

It never was, so why did you bring it up... oh yeah, beacuse he asked you what your supposed game you were making was called and that of couse deals with this dissicussion at hand.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 14:27

Oblivion165 wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 15:00So for a rebuttal you went ahead and did exactly what I said you were doing in every post you make. Advance your argument absolutely none and filled it in with more of your person opinion crap.

again, complete nonsense, has no relation whatsoever to anything I've said... you're just spewing this crap to make yourself feel better about the fact you can't refute my arguments.

I'm afraid that I must now disagree, as earlier you did a very nice job of saying something wasn't related to renegade, but it was related to this topic. This is something else that did relate and mattered, but once again your acting like it doesn't. (Look up at previous statement if you can't figure out what I mean).

-----

Spoony wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 09:47R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 03:41No, that is incorrect as well.

The "pros" I referenced earlier had absolutly nothing to do with balance. Balance falls onto Greg Black as well as the rest of the C&C3 community. Not 10 single people who think they are gods.

The only thing that those people did was play it and tell EA if it was "worthy of a C&C title" and how in which ways the game could be better.

I don't know where to begin telling you how wrong you are. Still, I may as well try.

1. "10 single people who think they are gods" - uh, there's no need to slate someone just because they're generally considered to be RTS experts and you're not

2. the "pros" you referenced earlier had EVERYTHING TO DO WITH BALANCE, they were at EA for weeks playing 1v1s constantly against other top players making sure every matchup was fair, if it wasn't fair then they tweaked the strengths of particular units, the game would be altered accordingly and they'd repeat the process the next day.

Tell me, if Westwood were making a Renegade 2, who'd you rather they got to do the alpha testing? People like me or people like you? 'cos I still remember our 1v1...

Well lets see, I bet those 10 people would be the 10 people that when ever they joined a game, everyone else just quit because they new they were going to lose, and it would be a less then enjoyable loss at that.

And if EA spent so much time working on balance tweaks and other stuff, how did they manage to miss so many horribly obvious unbalanced aspects of the game? Half of which you could have observed for free just letting two AI players get at it.

You would want average people playing it, because if you let the best people around play at it, the game will be adjusted to fit them, and make it better for them to play. And the best people are never the majority of the players.

nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 12:01 Acquisitions are a part of doing business. It's good policy: If you can't beat them, buy them. You guys never know... maybe those smaller companies WANTED to be purchased by a major publisher like EA, so their owners, and employees could cash out, and make a mint. Lots of startups in the business world are created for just that reason. Well, I think we can speak for Westwood at least and say they did not want to be bought out, beings over half their employees quit when EA finally started taking control.

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 08:13

Whatever you may think of EA's practices, there are a few facts which just cannot be denied:

1. EA games have consistently shown poorer quality control for several years now, as evidenced by glaringly obvious bugs that couldn't possibly have been missed in a thorough beta (as with the aforementioned jump/damage exploit in BF2).

I don't know about you, but it only makes sense that Standing on your own RDX + Detonation said RDX = Super high jump with no side effects...

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 08:13

2. EA games are frequently just re-hashed clones of previously released EA games, i.e. BF2-2142 and ALL of their licensed sports titles.

Yep, and if their not there will probably be other games made off of them.

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 08:13

3. EA expansion packs barely deserve the name- the prime example here is The Sims, whose expansions consist of a few new items and similar eye-candy for a full-expansion price of \$30 or more.

Northern Strike was so worth it... I mean, I get 4 additional tools to choose from, and all the new maps that came with it I can't join because it tells me to reinstall the game... even after a clean install.

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 08:13

4. Despite all of the above, the lion's share of EA titles consistently receive reviews above 70% and continue to sell millions of copies each year.

Probably comes down to the shiny box factor and hopes that this game will be better then the last...

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 08:13

5. EA shows consistent disregard for community input and favors quick-fix patches rather than permanent, reliable solutions- as in the last C&C3 patch, which altered gameplay aspects (namely the use and placement of power plants) which have long been the cornerstone of tactics in the series rather than addressing the issue beneath the surface (shit builds too damned fast). Their original "fix" for BF2's jump/damage exploit was equally laughable; rather than remove the glitch that allowed jumping players to be immune to damage, they changed it so players could no longer fire weapons while jumping.

Diagnosis, hmm?

What!?! Are you trying to tell us you can jump AND pull a trigger on a gun at the SAME time, thats ridiculous.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 12:20R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 12:57They did not have anything to do with balance. They made blogs on how balance was made, those people were not there for weeks, they were only there to answer questions and test out the game. The only feed back they gave was for gameplay.

Of course there was balance feedback but most likely only slightly. Read Greg Black's "Art of Balancing" blog on the EA website... I don't feel like getting the link. It shows how much work he goes into balancing each unit at a time.

Also, they were the ones who got stuff most other people don't like in. They also requested some other things as well that are liked, however I don't know what they are... you are absolutely dead wrong.

Thats a good point, I like how you said absolutely...

Oh wait there is more... oh but its all just stuff other people or possibly you have said already, which then you tweaked here and there.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 12:22cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 13:14Anybody who bitches about companies like EA, Microsoft, and Apple better never open their own businesses for the sake of not being hypocrites.

I disagree, I think the absolute best thing for retards like Oblivion to do is start a gaming company... then when it fails utterly, they'll either learn some humility, or they'll get even angrier at EA for succeeding where they failed...

You know, I think its rather childish for you to keep picking on people when you disagree, talking about how poor they are and things like that. Especially when there wasn't more then 3 other people that disagreed with him, and the rest all disagree with you.

PS. sorry about bumping such an old topic, I was putting this together as I read though it, and only noticed how old it was once I got to the end.

---