

---

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 20 Jul 2009 16:21:13 GMT

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

---

Ah, R315r4z0r my friend. I knew you couldn't stay away. :)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]In the thread where Dover was intent on arguing about Generals, he assumed I was arguing with him and now he is on my case because he doesn't think I have any valid points to defend my opinion. (which, by the way, you don't need a reason to have an opinion, Dover, because if you have a means to back up your opinion, then that isn't called an opinion, it's called a "theory." Or, if the back up info is "proof," then it would be called a "fact." An opinion is merely someone's personal presumption or idea of something. An opinion can be right, it can be wrong, or it can just be plain ridiculous, but having the means to backup your opinion doesn't make your opinion any less than an opinion... it just makes the person less of an idiot.)

Either we have differing definitions of what constitutes an opinion or you have some wacky beliefs. It's very rare that a person holds an opinion for no reason. Someone or something has given him reason to believe the way he does. This is his reasoning, his "proof". Without these initial "points", the person in question isn't convinced and there is no opinion. You don't have to back up your opinions, true, but only in the same sense that you don't have to post on these forums or you don't have to drive on the correct side of the road.

Also, if I read that last statement correctly, you just called yourself an idiot (Or, at the very least, not "less of an idiot) for refusing to validate your opinions up until now. I applaud your

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]However, I feel like discussing Generals in this thread, so lets have at it then.. just as long as you aren't a complete fagsack about it.

I could say the same for you. Try not to get so butthurt this time.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]The main reasons why I don't like Generals are:

-It looked like it was tossed together.

Regardless if they put incredible or lackluster amounts of detail into specific models, it looked like everything used a different artstyle that clashed with one another. So once everything was brought together, it looked kind of awkward, imo. (Also, why did the trees dance? The wind isn't THAT strong...)

If you're referring to how the GLA units look different from the USA units, and the USA units look different from the Chinese units, then DUUHHHH. That's like complaining about how in StarCraft the art-style used with the Zerg is so different from the art-style used with the Protoss. It's an intentional art direction choice to give each faction a unique flavor. This isn't anything unique to Generals. Notice how vastly different the Allied and Soviet structures look in RA2? And how they clash aesthetically when put in the same base?

I won't even ask how you can conjecture about how strong the wind is when you have nothing but

the trees to go by.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Extended reach units.

This, to you, might fall under the "L2RTS" category, however I don't think so. In C&C games prior to Generals, there was always an artillery type unit that was able to hit you from afar and require you to go into action to take it out. Those units never bothered me because it forced you to actually play rather than sit and watch the game play itself.

However, in Generals, I can't really explain why, but the units with the long ranges just pissed me off. Perhaps because there was either a crap load of them (either that or the defense range was small in comparison to the firing range of other units), or the long-range units were cheap and spammable. (The Rocket buggy-thing for the GLA is a good example of what I'm getting at.)

It's one thing to uproot a player so they don't spend the entire match turtling in their base... but it's another thing to make stationary defenses completely useless.

You're absolutely right. L2RTS. Large-scale turtling of any sort in any game is always discouraged, because the more cash you sink into making Tesla Coils or Patriot Missiles or Gatling Guns, the less you're spending on your economy or your army. You'll never win a game by defending to death.

You mentioned the Rocket Buggy in particular. It's true that it has a long range, good damage, and great speed. That said, it's made of glass, and it only takes an air strike or two to wipe out even a large group of them. They also get raped by Crusaders and other point-defense laser units, since all rocket-based units can't touch them. Everything has a counter, and the rocket buggies are no exception. You're just trying to counter them with the wrong thing (Static defense). L2RTS.

Also, if long-range units bother you, you must REALLY hate Tiberian Sun, since that game was won or lost by the Nod Artillery (And the GDI Juggernaut was a pathetic pale imitation of the Nod Artillery's fury)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Plot?

It may have had a "plot," but it had no story.. It's basically: a fictional war breaks out and things happen. Then the next thing you know, you see credits! The game was probably meant for multiplayer action over single player action.. however, if that was the case, why bother with a campaign at all? (Also, "Eva" in the briefings/loading was just embarrassingly tacked-on.)

"Fictional war, some things happen, game over" is a summery of every C&C game. When you dismiss the entire plot with the words "thing happen", you can't complain.

I'm not sure what you mean about Eva. She fills the same role she has in every C&C game. There's nothing different about Eva in Generals and Eva in any other C&C.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Unlikeable factions

I can't find the ability to gain a liking for any of the 3 factions. They all seem to just be there. There really isn't any info on them other than they are supposed to represent different modern-day

nations and countries..

What more do you need? There are much flimsier excuses for factions. The GDI are the assumed nondescript good guys. The Soviets in Red Alert are generic stereotypical russians. The Terrans in StarCraft are just "the humans". This is the way RTSes work. Why blame Generals for it?

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]The US was too high and mighty, the GLA was just a big "Lol we're terrorists!" cliché, and China was just.. well they were just "there."

You're reading too much into something that isn't there.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Too slow

The pace of the game seemed to slow. Even when I changed the game speed in the options, the infantry and vehicles all seemed to move in slow motion.

Infantry are slow. This shouldn't be a surprise to you

I would assert that Generals is fairly fast. With the rise in air power and superweapons, the deciding moments in battles goes by faster than before.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]-Preferences

1. I prefer the MCV system to the cliché mainstream dozer style system. (Dover said it had a name, but I forgot it.) C&C has always been about the MCV. I can respect that since Generals was a new unique 'universe' in the franchise that they were experimenting different "routes," but, imo, I don't like the style. I'm fine with using it, I just prefer using the MCV style.

See my diatribe on opinions at the beginning of this post. It's fine that you prefer one to the other, but you're not saying WHY you prefer one to the other.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07[[color=red](#)]2. The control bar on the bottom of the screen was annoying. I prefer the side bar. It didn't take up 3/4 of the screen and allowed the game to be viewed from it's own area of the screen.. rather than the control panel being pasted over the gameplay itself. Also, I don't really remember, but could you "lower it" to see more of the screen? Or am I confusing that with starcraft?

The control bar at the bottom took up very little of the screen, and it isn't the first C&C to have a bar at the bottom (RA2 was) And yes, you could hide it at-will, so this is a non-issue of a complaint.

3. Camera was too low! You couldn't see anything! The viewing angle should have been zoomed out more so you have a larger field of view. (Was that fixed in ZH? I don't remember..)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07However, overall, my biggest reason for not liking the game is simply because of the setting. I don't like its setting. It just seems lame. They should have put more thought into it.

I get the same feeling for old-school settings.. like WWI or II games, for example. I'm not much of a fan of Call of Duty 1-3 simply because the setting just feels lame.

What?! You say they haven't put enough thought into the setting when you like WWII games? WWII games are so ridiculously overdone that I can't take this complaint seriously at all.

---