

---

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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Jul 2009 18:31:47 GMT

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

---

so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 10:33Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:55so say we all. wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 09:44Dover wrote on Sat, 25 July 2009 11:23R315r4z0r 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.[/color]

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

You know, the more I looked into your claims, the more it seemed to me that it was just bad players on the forum bitching instead of playing the game and getting better.

The ZH Community patch was made by some of the best ZH players there...

You're missing the point. Some professional StarCraft players have made comments like "Oh, Terran is overpowered" or "Protoss lategame vs Terran provides too much mobility with Recall, that's imbalanced", and I'm sure given the chance they would alter the game so suit their definition of balanced, but that isn't the case. The game is what it is, and rather that patch it over, what should be done is learn to counter whatever the "overpowered" tactic is. It's not impossible.

---