
Subject: Re: Modern Warfare 3

Posted by [Homey](#) on Sun, 29 May 2011 22:33:30 GMT

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

ImJamie wrote on Sun, 29 May 2011 08:07kill wrote on Sun, 29 May 2011 04:38Battlefield 3 imo

I always find that battlefield seem to do what call of duty did already.

So battlefield 3 will be a tiny bit better than modern warefare 2...

then modern warefare 3 will come along and be loads better than battlefield 3.

What Fobby said is right. There might be a few copies of each other in small aspects, but typically they are two different gameplay styles for an FPS. Judging by what has been shown so far, MW3 looks like the same reskinned frag game again. Add some new maps, guns and maybe a mode or two and call it a day. BF3 is a complete remake with a brand new engine (which shits all over the COD engine, hell it even makes the current bc2 frosbite engine look crappy) and an environment that is physically destructible. If you look at the two trailers, you'll see that almost everything that happens in BF3 is not cinematic effects, but rather their engine showing what it can do. COD on the other hand is mostly SP cinematic effects which mean fuck all.

To say that one game is better than the other at any point in the past or future is stupid. It boils down to a matter of preference and just that. The two gameplay styles are far enough apart that I don't find they overlap too much. The only main difference I see is that Battlefield progresses forward with every game and it shows in the improving quality of games. For example in bc2 spawnkilling (other than squad spawning) is nearly done away with. Nade spamming is possible, but quite restricted and noobtubes aren't overpowered. IMO Cod really hasn't changed much in a while and isn't worth the \$60 annual cost because the older games aren't that different and look just as good.
