

---

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 01:44:01 GMT

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

---

Surprisingly, as most of the time when you put forward points, you do them very well. This time, however, you seem to have misread a lot of what I said.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21

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 applaude your Yes, you would be correct. I realized that when I was proof reading my post, but left it in because it's the best way I could express my idea.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 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?

No, I'm referring to the art detail between infantry vs vehicles vs flora vs structures, ect. Not simply between factions, because that's an obvious "Duuhhhh!!!" More or less within the same faction.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 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.

I'm not conjecting about the wind. I was merely being dramatic. I'm commenting on the tree animations. Why do the trees dance? Even the seemingly heavily rooted hard-wood trees.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 [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 Telsa Coils or Patriot Missles or Gattling 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)

I left my quote in there because you misread it. Re-read what I said about the long range units in previous C&C games compared to long range units in Generals.

To summerize, I said long range units are good because they prevent a player from turtling in their base all game long. The way they did it in games prior to Generals (as well as in the two games after generals) were the best ways, imo, to implement long range units. The way Generals did it was game breaking.

Why should they bother making it possible to defend stationary areas (and I'm not just talking about defensive structures) when basically the simplest unit can just out range them and defeat the entire purpose of the stationary defense?

It removes a lot of strategy from the strategy game.

Also, on a side note, I'm not looking for the game to play itself, I'm looking to make sure my troops have a brain.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 "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.

That's not what I mean. When I said "things happen" I was referring to the idea that generic events happen. It's not like chapters in a story or creative fictional realm. It's "Do this, do that, game over." No real plot other than "destroy the enemies!"

And even if you want to argue that it is still a story/plot, it's definitely not a good one. It's all face value.. no depth what-so-ever.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 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.

That's exactly what I'm getting at. It was very apparent that the only reason why the name "Eva" was in Generals was because it was in Tiberium and Red Alert. "Tacked on" is the feeling I got when I saw it.

If they wanted to make a cameo for Eva, they should of done it more creatively... or at least give some background on her...

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 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?

There is no depth! In Generals, the factions are what they are because they are. In Tiberium, GDI and Nod have a rich back story to fall back on and give a greater meaning in the story. In Red Alert, the factions there are creatively designed and, as well, are immersed in a well thought out back story.

In Generals, the factions are what they are. There is no reasoning for them to be interesting or likable. They are just thrown into the game and pinned against each other. The same could have been done with any other 3 nations in the world and Generals would have turned out exactly the same.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009

20:07[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.

Depth? You're right, there is none... how could I have been so stupid?

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21Infantry 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.

Actually, I think that point was more of my fault for not remembering the actual game over the demo. The units in the demo were so slow it's hard to forget. (That goes for infantry as well as vehicles.)

Also, I'm not actually talking about game pace, but the pace the units themselves moved at, which, like I said, I think I'm confusing it with what I remember from the demo... so that's my bad.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21See 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.

I can try, but the thing is: I don't want to. Why? Because my reasoning for my own opinions change constantly. That, and you're just going to rebut it anyway. (Rebutting a preference is stupid, imo. That's like me arguing with you over your taste in music.)

If I had to make a single generalization for why I prefer the MCV system it's because I think it's unique to the C&C franchise. It isn't about mimicking realism, but it's about having fun. I find the MCV system is more fun when compared to the dozer system. Each have their own pluses and negatives, but it's just more fun one way over the other.

..I really don't see a reason to go any further than that in terms of reasoning because it will continue a senseless debate. Why do I think it's more fun? I don't really know, tbh. You can pick at that if you want. But all I know is that after playing both ways for each style of game, I prefer the MCV to the dozer (or whatever you call it).

Perhaps is a reasoning of being bias? If C&C Generals was just Generals, I probably wouldn't make it a point about the dozer system.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 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.

In RA2 they had buttons on the bottom of the screen, yes, but you didn't control the entire game from there. And most of the options on the bottom of the screen were visual representations for hotkeys.

The reason why I like the old style side bar is because it's its own portion of the screen and not an overlapping control panel. And it took up a much, much lesser portion of the screen for that matter. The control bar just looked annoying. If they maybe got rid of a lot of the useless garbage in its graphics and just showed the important info, then it wouldn't be so bad.

Dover wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 12:21 R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 July 2009 20:07 However, 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. I'm leaving my quote there because you completely misread it.

I said I DIDN'T like WWII games because their setting just seems lame to me.