R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31There 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.

And that's what I'm talking about. You're choosing to hate the game for what it isn't rather than enjoy it for what it is. You're not even trying to have fun with it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31Of 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.)

They do the samn damn thing in either situation. You're nitpicking. There's no difference. Besides, is it that hard to accept that it could be the same Lt. Eva in both games? It's a person with the same name that holds the same job for the same country with practically the same voice.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31As 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 "mainstream" is what it is for a reason. Because it works and because it's superior. Why do all action/RPG games use some form of a red bar and/or a number to indicate the health of a character? Because it works, and games that mix it up (For example, Soul Reaver) are ususaly sub-par at best and terribad at worst.

As for a non-C&C modern RTS, Dune II. If you say it isn't modern, it's Wikipedia page says otherwise:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dune_IIDune II established a format that would be followed for years to come, and was the first to use the mouse to move units, allowing players to fluidly interact with their troops.[1] As such, Dune II was the first modern real-time strategy game. Striking a balance between complexity and innovation, it was a huge success and laid the foundation for the coming

Command & Conquer, the Warcraft series, and many other RTS games.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31The 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.

You can always find one wackjob that will find an inferior control scheme more fun or more beneficial in some way, but that doesn't make it true. There are a lot of people who are against advancing the control system in the upcoming SC2 because they feel it would lead to a decrease in player skill level. In the end, any given Blizzard game (Which all use the peon system) outsell any given C&C game. As a capitalist, I'm sure you can appreciate that the free-market has spoken, and it has said that the peon system is superior?

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31Perhaps 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.[/color]

You see, you're telling me your opinion, but you're not saying WHY. We can't have a discussion if it's just going to devolve into talking about our feelings.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31No, 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?"

You're nitpicking.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31When 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.

Nobody, and this includes you, likes something for no reason. You have a reason for liking what you do. All you're doing is hiding behind your (Real, or perceived) ignorance. Do some soul-searching, and get back to me on why you enjoy what you do.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31I 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.

I guess I should stop using the word "realistic", because although it's true, it really isn't my point. My main point is that it's harder to balance which makes it subsequently less-balanced. It closes off strategic options that would be open to a player under the peon system and generally takes away from the game more than it adds.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31
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."

And? All C&C games have been spam-tacular. This isn't because of multiple production queues but because the units are poorly balanced. Even with a single production queue, most C&C games encourage the mass production of a single type of unit, which is something that just wouldn't fly in most other RTSes.

Again, explain to me how when I have 30 War Factories built all my tanks come out of one of them, and why I can't make 30 tanks at once. That's retarded, there's just no other word for it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31I'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 $2,000structure 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.

"Each player has the ability to do it" doesn't and shouldn't come into the equation. If you're losing a building or it's about to get captured and you can't save it, then you deserve to have it get blown up or captured. That's it. End of story. If you get 50 credits out of it, that's 50 credits more than you deserve.

Not to mention the free units you get when you sell things, in some cases high-tier units like Shadow Teams for selling...a secret shrine I think? I don't know I'm having a brainfart.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31I 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?

I'm looking more at games like StarCraft and WarCraft that have "caster" units that have multiple supportive abilities which is something you just don't see in C&C (With the exception of Black Lotus in generals, I suppose). I see the limited availability of such units as part of the reason competitive C&C is such a spamfest.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31Copy/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.

I truly pity you if you think the HUD a game uses (Since that's basically what this is coming down to, if it's at the side or at the bottom) affects how fun that game is to any major degree.

I'd like to hear your own gameplay mechanic, but judging by your opinions I've heard so far I'm willing to predict I'm not going to like it.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31You'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 doesn't necessarily make them "wacky." The game's light hearted, not humorous.

Lol

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31However, 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.

Are we talking about faction balance? I don't think any past C&C games have had faction-balance problems.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31Which is exactly my point. Just because you don't see it, doesn't mean it isn't happening.

No, in Renegade it IS happening because you can kill off hotwires and engineers and stop repairs and such. In other C&C games it ISN'T happening because nothing you do will stop repairs short of the player running out of money.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31You can brush it off by saying "just move the camera" but my point is "why should I have to?"

Because the game doesn't play itself.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 22 July 2009 18:31Just 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.

You're making a big deal out of nothing. The controls in Generals are sub-par but not terrible. There's certainly room for improvement, but isn't there always?