
Subject: Re: Starcraft2 beta key
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 24 May 2010 10:21:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]This is reflective of the entire game. Essentially, you're still playing with zealots, marines, zerglings, hydralisks, carriers, battle cruisers, vulture-type vehicles, siege tanks, photon canons, bunkers, same factions, etc., but they've got new features like "they can charge at shit!" which rationalizes the big 2 in Starcraft 2.

Obviously they're the same. It's a game set in the same universe as the first, only four years later. What were you expecting, exactly?

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]I understand that these features, as small as they may seem to me, creates a detrimental difference in gameplay to hardcore fans of the first game, and I don't have a problem with that. I'm saying that I don't need gameplay changes and tweaks, I need a new game, and to me, adding such features to existing units, and adding or replacing 4 units per faction does not constitute a new game.

It's a game set in the same universe as the first, only four years later. What were you expecting, exactly?

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]
Some of the new units aren't all that new either, like the Dragoon replacement is similar in many ways to its predecessor (both looks and usage).

Wrong again. The dragoon was, again, a mindless attack-move unit. It was sturdy, strong against most targets, relatively cheap, at a low teir, and easy and effective to mass produce. The stalker is much more fragile, requires a lot of teching to unlock it's full potential, and is centered around clever micromanagement with the blink ability rather than just A-moving into the enemy army.

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]What I was looking forward to originally was something fresh - for example, Warcraft 3 was a proper sequel to WC2, as it added a (couple?) new factions, and some new features to the RTS genre in general. Tiberian Sun too was nothing like Tiberian Dawn.

And both games have been considered turning points (in a bad way) for the series. WarCraft III, while fun to play, is considered to have butchered WarCraft storyline and set the stage for the lore-shitfest that is World of Warcraft. Tiberian Sun, too, fucked up C&C lore in many key ways. Why would you want to model an RTS on those examples? Especially if the original StarCraft is more successful than both of them combined. If it isn't broke, don't fix it.

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]Judging from the end of Brood War, it seemed like a lot could have changed - the Protoss seemed almost extinct at that point, and the introduction of the New Xel'Naga made me hope for a new faction.

Hardly. What would make you think they were extinct? They lost Auir, sure, but they were by no means limited to that one planet. In Brood War you have an entire budding Protoss civilization on Shakuras.

The Xel'Naga will be making an appearance in the campaign, but why is it a big deal to have them playable? They're supposed to be a race of godlike life-givers. To have them be playable would be as ridiculous as having the Burning Legion playable in WarCraft 3.

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]That's my point - to a large audience of beta testers, this is all very new. To the hardcore SC1 fans like yourself, this is the perfect game, because it offers the same skeleton formula of a game with a different shell to keep it fresh, but not "too different" to feel alienated. To people who've simply played SC1 back when it was new, and eventually got bored of it (like all games after excessive gaming) there isn't enough new mechanics to reel me in for another 3 years and \$150+ after 12 years of waiting.

Then don't buy it. Stick to C&C 3 or some Red Alert 3 or some other garbage, or keep changing games every six months. I don't care. One would think that the release of best RTS since StarCraft 1 would be enough to "reel you in", but to each his own.

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sun, 23 May 2010 22:06]It really depends on what art style you prefer, but graphically, let's compare C&C3 (which was also graphically lacking in 2007), World in Conflict (higher standard in 2007), and Starcraft 2 (2010):

picturesC&C3:

World in Conflict

Starcraft 2

Those StarCraft 2 screenshots are from the pre-beta stages. The current game looks nothing like that, and it will look nothing like it does now when it's released (There have already been many graphical changes since the beta began). Even on the lowest settings, the graphics on the current beta-test build are leaps and bounds above the pictures you've found.