

---

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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 23 Jul 2009 01:31:48 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 That "something about politics" IS the story. I don't see how you can marginalize the story and then complain about how bad it is. You're not even trying to enjoy it.

There is a difference between trying to enjoy something and not being able to enjoy something.

My main reason for playing C&C games is to play the single player and skirmish. After I've done that, I move onto multiplayer. The campaign and story, however, is the selling point for me when it comes to the game. For Generals to lack heavily in terms of an enjoyable story, it makes my opinion of it very poor.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 "Electronic Visual Analysis" sounds like a poor ripoff of "Electronic Video Agent" in Tiberian Sun. And keep in mind there is some intention of tying all three universes together, and the strands of doing so are there. EVA is one example. The many parallels one can draw between the GLA and Nod is another. The pervasive faction that is communist-aligned is a third. There isn't anything "Unoriginal" about a LT. Eva being your guide. This is a C&C game. You may as well be calling your beloved MCV sidebar system a "ripoff" from one game in the series to another.

By the way, the idea of EVA originated in the Dune series just like your beloved MCV sidebar system, so if anyone is unoriginal it's Tiberian Dawn, not Generals.

Of course it sounds like a "poor ripoff." That's because it uses the same acronym. But the title is one thing, what it actually does is something else.

In Tiberium, EVA is a strategic AI that gives you advise on how to handle situations logically as well as give you information which may be key to your missions.

In Red Alert, Lt. Eva is a briefing officer that is used to twist the way a mission is under taken when compared to Tiberium.

In Generals, it's a mix of the two. I suggested making it its own unique flare to the game rather than taking aspects of the previous games (other than the name, obviously.)

As for the uniqueness of the MCV and sidebar, I meant that it's different in structure when compared to other RTS games out there. Name a single, non-C&C, modern day RTS game that uses a building system similar to the MCV. You can't because there is none (or if there is, I haven't heard of it.) What I'm getting at with that is that it is a step away from mainstream. It's a taste of something different for those of us who want it.

The Peon system has it's fun and positive aspects over the MCV just as the MCV does over the Peon system. But that doesn't mean that one system should be the total standard for which RTS games are based off of. Nothing should ever be definitive as there is always people who enjoy it another way.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 You can make the same arguement for the factions in Generals. The GLA are mysterious (You never do find out who the head honcho is, even in Zero Hour) and their motives beyond simply uprooting foreign imperialism is unknown.

Likewise, the USA aren't just trying to save civilians, but preserve freedom and spread democracy and all that jazz. If you disregard real life, that's pretty unique in an RTS.  
Yes, I understand that, but there's more to it than that.

Perhaps I'm explaining it to you the wrong way. The USA, GLA and China are all based off of real world nations and organizations. As such, they don't require much explanation because the players should already understand who they are (unless they live in a cave somewhere in the middle of the Outback). However, it's that aspect of using the modern-day real world that makes the factions unlikeable, imo.

Maybe it's just my own personal opinion.. I don't like games that the characters/factions are ideally virtual real-world people/armies. Along with the campaign requirement I mentioned above, that's just another turn-off for me.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 It's the same thing! Instead of the past it's the near future! It's still a fictitious war with a touch of science fiction!

No, one's a fictitious war based off of the implication of current events. 'This could happen in our world.' The other is a fictitious war based off of implication of historical changes. 'What if we changed this part of history and allowed these ideas to work?'

Ones a "this could happen tomorrow" and the other is "this could never happen but what if it did?"

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Each genre of music has it's merits, and by analyzing them and the reason behind them, you can arrive a logical conclusion on which is truly better, (at least for one person, as reasons differ from person to person). Nothing is random, and everything has a set of logic behind it.

I'll give you an example. One of my favorite genres of music is Power Metal. I can give you fairly decent sales pitch on why Power Metal is a superior genre of music. It combines the pleasant heaviness of regular music with things it usually lacks, like Melody and clean vocals. You could give me a sales pitch on whatever your favorite genres of music is and we can debate it over. We may not convince each other--And that's not what I'm after in this Generals debate, either--but the result will be a clearer understand on why we like or don't like what we do. You've already expanded your understanding somewhat in this thread. You yourself came to the realization on what exactly about artillery-type units bothers you so much.

When it comes to reasoning for liking music, I have different feelings than you. Although I understand where you're coming from, it's not like that with me. I like certain genres of music simply because I unexplainably do. I like to listen to some and not to others.. not based on any real reasons... or at least reasons I can perceive.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Which is why I welcome your input.  
Point taken.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 You may LIKE it, but it's not an opinion that it is unrealistic, harder to balance, and a general detriment to the game rather than a benefit. I have also stated on many occasions in this thread that the MCV system wasn't realistic and have also stated that being realistic doesn't count as a good or bad fact. Games should be fun to play

through their own means. If one finds a realistic game fun, that doesn't mean that only realistic games are fun.

Harder to balance? Maybe, but what difference does it make?

General detriment? That's your opinion.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Which is inferior to having each structure have it's own production queue, like in C&C and every other RTS. It's a poor consolation prize that I'm still producing one tank at a time with twelve war factories.

...

That doesn't even begin to pay off. MCVs are always amongst the priciest units. It's a roundabout, awkward system to simply having a worker unit producing structures, instead of insisting on having them produced invisibly, off-screen.

Again, that's your opinion. I preferred it over multiple queues. When C&C3 introduced multiple queues, I was a bit discouraged (and was joined by a decent size group of other people.) I even created my own gameplay mechanic idea to meet halfway between the two systems. I'll explain it if you're curious, but for the time being I'll leave it out.

Personally, I find that multiple queues lead to spamming... which is exactly what C&C3 was: "Spam-tacular."

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Because I can react quickly and salvage a structure or even an entire base that I cannot or choose not to defend. It softens to blow of losing a building. If you're losing a structure, you're not entitled to half it's value in a refund. You see this all the time especially with buildings that are about to be captured by a rouge engineer. If your building is about to be captured, you shouldn't be allowed to immediately remove it from the battlefield. Games with using the Peon System with repair/sell functions require a worker unit to repair or deconstruct a building, giving the attacking army the ability to stop the process.

I'll give you the point about defending against capturing.. however the refund points have been corrected since C&C3. Now the price you get back is a ratio to the damage you've taken. If you try to sell a \$2,000 structure just before it's destroyed, you get maybe \$20-\$50, if you're lucky. If you sell it when it's at full HP, then you get half of what it cost to purchase (in this case it would be \$1,000).

It may have the same principle on paper, but the effect it has on gameplay is to a much lesser scale. Not to mention the fact each player has the ability to do it.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Nothing is necessary. You can have a very simple strategy game without any fanciness like that at all and still be very good and very successful (Like Chess, for example). That said, if such abilities done correctly is helps expand the strategic options open to a player making the game more complex and more deep. Even games as primitive as WarCraft II have them and it's shameful that games as (relatively) new as RA2 lack them. Not being "necessary" is a poor excuse. It isn't necessary to have a limit on how much currency a player can have stored in his war chest at a time either (A-la the silo system), yet it does something to expand the depth and strategy of the game on the macromanagement level.

And I dispute your claim that only RA3 has pulled off "abilities" nicely. The commando units in

Generals and C&C 3 live and die by their abilities. And even if C&C games don't do abilities well, that's no excuse for their conspicuous absence. They would be a benefit if added, and one of the long-time constraints on their presence is the old "sidebar". Competitive C&C games (Especially pre-Generals) usually devolve into who can produce the larger force of Scorpion Tanks/Battlemasters/Medium Tanks/whatever, with very little force variety. This is a stark contrast to games using the peon system with a robust system of unit abilities like StarCraft, WarCraft, Sins of a Solar Empire, and others, where you stand little chance of winning by producing a ton of one type on units and you practically require a balanced army.

I was originally planning to say "weren't able to" but I realized that wasn't true. I settled on wasn't necessary because, exactly as you said, you can have a good game without the use of abilities.

Also, how does the idea that a single unit from either Generals or C&C3 can sway your opinion in favor of them when EVERY unit in RA3 had game-changing abilities?

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 You're right. I guess other industry standards like ctrl+c being "copy" and ctrl+v being "paste" are "unoriginal", and software engineers should do things differently, just for the sake of doing things differently.

It's the standard because it works best. "Original" and "different" isn't always a good thing. Variety is only a positive if it offers an improvement over what is currently being used, and that's something the MCV/sidebar system just doesn't do. Why do you think it was updated with C&C 3 to bring it closer in line with the peon system (Different production lines, etc)?

Copy/pasting isn't a form of entertainment value. People want simple standards for things like work or office programs because it makes the program easier to work with when used in conjunction with other programs and it gets the job done faster.

With games, however, it's a different story. Doing something different for the sake of doing it different will give you an appeal to a new audience of people/fans. Something doesn't have to be original or different to be good, only if it doesn't want to be boring.

Where's the fun if all RTS games used the same game mechanics?

Also, C&C3 had that implemented cause the self proclaimed "pros" said so. Like I said earlier, there were many people, including myself against it, and I even suggested my own gameplay mechanic that met halfway.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 RA3 did nothing of the sort. RA3 was a continuation in the "wacky", "zaney", "nutty" line of games that RA2 began. Don't get me wrong, I enjoy my share of shows like The Animaniacs which are a similar form of humor, but RTS games are about a high level of thinking and planning, and forcing such silliness (For lack of a better word) clashes dramatically with the game.

But my points weren't so much about realism but balance and the expansion of strategic options. In games with the Peon System an attacking army can stop defenses from being completed while they're in the process of construction. Not only is this realistic, but it's better balanced and properly rewards the attacking army/penalizes the defender for their timing (or lack thereof). It rewards the better player. If you begin making defenses on one side of your base and get attacked on the other, you're shit out of luck, and you rightly deserve to be. You've committed a strategic blunder.

In the MCV system, all you have to do is place your Telsa Coil or whatever it is you're making in a different place, and problem solved. That takes away from strategy, instead of adding to it. You're overreacting to the "weird," "wacky," "zaney" aspects you mention because they aren't really that apparent. They are only in the main idea of the technology used, which still seems pretty solid. The theories were disproven (or never followed up on) in the real world, but that doesn't necessarily make them "wacky." The game's light hearted, not humorous. However, how that relates to the faction balance.. I don't know.

In RA3 each faction was totally different in terms of balance.

The Allies built using the traditional MCV system with some twists to make it better. They required "tech clearance" per base in order to build higher-tier things. That made using high-tech units and weapons from expansion bases much harder and it required you to strategically plan where you make your technologically advanced expansion bases.

The Soviets also used the MCV system with even more of a twist. They had a global technology pool, so you could build any high-tech unit/weapon anywhere you're able to just as long as you have the unlocking structure somewhere on the map. The catch, however, is that your structures don't "appear" on the map. You chose a structure and then chose where you want to build it. Then the structure will begin to build itself on the map, all the while being vulnerable to attack.

Japan had the most unique form of construction. They had an MCV, but it worked differently than what you're thinking. Their MCV produced building specific "Nano-cores" which would transform into the building they represent at a location you desire. This is the only faction that isn't limited to a build radius. They are able to build anywhere on the map at any time they want, given they are able to transport the nano-core to the desired location. The core took a while to get deployed, all the while being vulnerable to attack. This way of building bares the most resemblance to the peon system.

I preferred using either the Allies or Japan.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 We never see building construction in Renegade, so I can't really say, but I imagine if we did it would require engineers or Hotwires/technicians. Workers. Just like the peon system. Which is exactly my point. Just because you don't see it, doesn't mean it isn't happening.

Dover wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 02:21 Heaven forbid you have to scroll down slightly to see what's behind the command bar. More successful and argueably better games than Generals (Most notably WarCraft III) have much larger "HUDs" (For lack of a better word), and they accomplish their goals much better.

I admit, the "HUD" in that screenshot is superior to that of Generals, and it's not hard to find something that would be, but you're making a bigger deal out of this than the issue deserves. The control scheme in Generals might not be perfect, but it's not near bad enough to begin to impact the game, the way Call to Power 1's was. You can brush it off by saying "just move the camera" but my point is "why should I have to?"

Just like in web site designing, every bit of space counts as well as how many times you require

the person to click around. You want someone to have maximum access to basically everything at any given time. If someone has to do even the simplest of tasks to get what they want, it's a demerit. For example, you shouldn't have to scroll the webpage down to click a button to get to another page.

It might not be a big deal in the onlook of the situation, but it really makes a difference if the issue didn't exist to begin with.

---