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

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 09:00:12 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49An unknown reason doesn't equal no reason. EVERYTHING has a reason, and mood swings are no different. As you already mentioned chemical imbalances in the brain is one thing. Ask anyone that sky dives, they have their reasons, ranging from conquering one's fear to doing it for the rush. NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

I knew you were going to say that. Perhaps I spoke too soon. I don't necessarily mean that people don't always do things for a reason. What I mean to say is more on the lines of people don't always do things for a logical reason.

Conquering one's fears is an arguable logical reason to do something. It really depends on what you're doing and how it affects your life.

Doing something "for the rush" is not a logical reason. In fact, doing anything for entertainment value isn't logical. Having fun isn't logical. It's just an emotional pleasure one gets. Hell, most of the things that we know and have become accustomed to in modern society is pretty illogical. The point of our lives is to hunt, eat, sleep and die. Money, housing, jobs, communities, morals, are all tacked on illogical ways of our life. Just because we find reason to do them, it doesn't make it logical when compared to what are bare primitives of life really are.

Everything has a reason, but not everything uses a logical reason. Someone might be faced with impossible odds to overcome an obstacle. Their reasoning is to overcome the challenge, but it defies logic as the odds are highly against them. However, just because logic says it won't work, that doesn't mean that a person won't try.

What I was getting at with the skydiving example is this. The person who invented it decided one day to jump from a high altitude and hope that enough wind could be caught so it would slow them down so they could land safely. But who decides to risk something like that for any logical reason? No one, that's who. It takes illogical notions to progress in life. If you live your life following logical reasoning, then nothing new or exciting (enough) will happen.

I'm sorry you see things that way, but I could see a perfectly logical explanation for any of those things. You have a very skewed idea of what "logic" entails, and for that I pity you.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47Why's that?

Because generally speaking anime is pretty faggy.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47Perhaps I didn't explain it well enough.

First of all, I didn't say one production radius would completely fill an entire base. You can have multiple radii in a single base.

Then all it is is an arbitrary limitation on where I can place my buildings, and if C&C's sidebar system didn't have enough of that already.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47 Second of all, just because you have a sped up production speed for one queue, doesn't mean you're only using one production structure. Let me clarify:

If you play RA2 and build like 5 War factories and then spam tanks from your single queue, you will notice that tanks will start coming out of multiple war factories, not just one. That's because the building speed is so fast, that one war factory is unable to respond quick enough to produce a second unit right after a first one comes out. So in that case, it is customary that the second-to-primary structure produce the unit instead. And if the speed is increased again, it may even take up to 3 or 4 different war factories to produce the units from a single queue.

My idea would look a little like this:

Three production structures in the same radius share a single production queue. However each structure produces one unit at a time because they are produced so rapidly.

That's still stupid. It's a special case in the War Factory that the building animation can't keep up with unit production if you produce units at a stupidly-fast rate. The barracks, to use your original example, wouldn't do that.

In any case, having units almost always coming out of the primary, occasionally out of the secondary, and never out of any other war factories isn't really that much of an improvement over all units coming out of the primary, and both systems are inferior to all structures being used to their full potential.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 17:47 Now, you asked how a single queue is better for your economy. Think about it for a second.

1 queue takes money for a single unit one at a time. When that unit is produced, money starts to be deducted for the second unit. It's also better because it automatically focuses your resources on a single unit at a time. (This is talking in terms of C&C, because in games like Starcraft, money is deducted instantly when you queue up a unit)

With multiple queues, your resources are being divided in real time and thus your funds end up being depleted much more quickly. You have credits going into creating one unit and credits going into creating another unit at the same time. This is the reason why it is very important to have a surplus of income in a C&C game that uses multiple queues because if you don't and you use multiple production queues, you will find that you have many idle periods in the match where you are waiting on your units because your resources aren't being collected fast enough.

If you require money to create 10 units, you will probably get the units out faster in a single queue than with a multiple queue.

Now, I know what you might be thinking: "Well that's nothing a little micro production management can't fix." And you would be correct. However, if you pause production on one queue to allow another queue to gain full access to all your resources, then what's the difference between doing that and simply having just a single queue?

You seem to be misinformed (Or willfully ignorant) on how the economy in C&C works. If you're

producing something twice as fast, you're losing your money twice as fast also. If a unit costs \$500 and takes 5 seconds to make and you speed him up to where he'll be done in 2.5 seconds, then you're being drained for \$200 a second instead of your original \$100 per second. It would be as if you're producing two units at once. The difference being if I'm producing two units at once, not only am I getting exactly what I purchased but I have the option of producing two different units at a time. This is, of course, assuming you're suggesting each additional structure speeds up production by exactly 100%. Any less and you're getting ripped off, and all the more reason to use the multiple queue system. Any more than 100% and it's WORSE for your economy because you'll be draining resources FASTER.

If you have idle periods in your matches then can I kindly suggest you L2RTS. If you've extended your production capacity beyond what your income can support, then you deserve the idle periods. Take a look at any match from any professional (Or even any high-level) gamer on any RTS and you'll always. always find that once a production structure is placed it almost never sits there idle.

so say we all. wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:36Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 14:49.
NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

you're sounding a bit like cheesesoda and that worries me no ends :/

Taxes suck government sucks blah blah!
