
Subject: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [u6795](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 02:04:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's finally happened.

http://www.pcgamer.com/archives/2008/02/21208_-_red_ale.html

http://cncden.com/newtemps2008/ra3_magpic.jpg

<http://www.commandandconquer.com/> << teaser image, pointing to Valentines day as the official announcement date.

Fuck yeah?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 02:10:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nais!

I hope.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 02:36:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hope this is real and not just teasing us

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 03:02:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Let's hope they go back to their RA1 roots with this, and not butcher it like RA2...

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 03:03:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RA2 and YR ROCKED!

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 03:05:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:03RA2 and YR ROCKED!

Which part, exactly? The endings where Tanya discovers Soviet leaders in hammer-and-sickle underpants? The part where Yuri gets locked up for being "A bad, bad man", the GIs that outrange tesla coils, or the overpowered superweapons?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 03:14:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 21:05{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:03RA2 and YR ROCKED!

Which part, exactly? The endings where Tanya discovers Soviet leaders in hammer-and-sickle underpants? The part where Yuri gets locked up for being "A bad, bad man", the GIs that outrange tesla coils, or the overpowered superweapons?
Screw the story, it's the gameplay that matters to me.
and the overpowered superweapons can be disabled, you know...

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 03:55:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:14Dover wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 21:05{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:03RA2 and YR ROCKED!

Which part, exactly? The endings where Tanya discovers Soviet leaders in hammer-and-sickle underpants? The part where Yuri gets locked up for being "A bad, bad man", the GIs that outrange tesla coils, or the overpowered superweapons?
Screw the story, it's the gameplay that matters to me.
and the overpowered superweapons can be disabled, you know...

I'm buying a complete package, not just gameplay. You know what you call a game without very much story? The Dead Or Alive series.

And saying it's okay, because the superweapons can be disabled is like saying the AWP can be disabled, so Counter-Strike is a perfectly balanced game.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 04:40:44 GMT

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

If it's as convoluted as that RA2 mess, then I'm not interested.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [bisen11](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 04:57:00 GMT

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

So long as they do away with mind control it should be fairly good. I wonder what a third faction could be if they were to make one though. Maybe they'll make all the countries have somewhat different armies like in Zero Hour and Kane's Wrath.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Canadacd](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 05:08:26 GMT

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

This had better start to fucking link the timelines together. RA2 messed up the story enough.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 05:47:52 GMT

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

RA1 had a perfect ending for Soviets. It linked greatly with TD.

RA2 was supposed to continue on from RA1 if the Allies won, but it REALLY doesn't feel like that. It was mostly a gameplay game. So I'm hoping that RA3 makes more sense of things somehow. And doesn't have a comical approach to it, and a bit more of an actual warfare feeling to it.

Don't get me wrong, I still love the gameplay of RA2 and its modability. I just didn't like the Single Player quite as much. Hopefully RA3 will have both gameplay AND story.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 06:23:37 GMT

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

THANK YOU!

May I point you to this stubborn mule:
<http://forums.ea.com/mboards/thread.jspa?threadID=336279&start=0&tstart=0>

Starting from my post on page 6, read the replies.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 07:08:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 21:02Let's hope they go back to their RA1 roots with this, and not butcher it like RA2...

I Think That The Game Is Already Bad.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 10:44:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Red Alert, the game with which it all started for me... I'm very excited over this!

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 12:24:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If any of you have noticed, Kane appears in RA1, idk the era, 1940's, 50's? He then appears in 1995, whenever TS took place, and in 2047, without ageing one bit.. kinda messed up there.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 12:33:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

I started with RA2 with the PC though, so <3 love.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Zion](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 13:43:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cnc95fan wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 12:24If any of you have noticed, Kane appears in RA1, idk the era, 1940's, 50's? He then appears in 1995, whenever TS took place, and in 2047, without ageing one bit.. kinda messed up there.

He was cloned multiple times.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [reborn](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 13:45:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The messiah cannot die.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Renx](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 14:41:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [_SSnipe_](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 15:04:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:03RA2 and YR ROCKED!
i agree

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 15:16:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 16:59:25 GMT

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

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 06:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has a lot more depth than RA1.

I started with RA2 with the PC though, so <3 love.

I'll agree with that RA wasn't that fun for me, RA2 was much more fun I thought the story was fine.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 17:38:14 GMT

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

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:16Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has a lot more depth than RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

Well, that was probably because they released it very quickly after TD, because everybody wanted more. And because it was released in 1996. And because it was released in 1996, it wasn't like everything could look amazing because of the computer technology at the time.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 18:24:00 GMT

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

what the...? I'm quite surprised. Although the Red Alert series is not true C&C (Tiberium is the only true universe), I'm surprised they are working on so many C&C projects. First C&C3, now Kane's Wrath, Tiberium, now this :S

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Zion](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 18:28:06 GMT

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

rm5248 wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 17:38People wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:16Stuff.

Well, that was probably because they released it very quickly after TD, because everybody

wanted more. And because it was released in 1996. And because it was released in 1996, it wasn't like everything could look amazing because of the computer technology at the time.

What was on your mind at the time of writing that? I usually do something like that when my mind is elsewhere.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Stefan](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 18:32:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [mrÄÅz](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 18:43:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tiberian Wars Mod.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Stefan](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 19:29:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

More screenies

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [bisen11](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 19:31:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Star Craft 2 engine? lol

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 19:49:34 GMT

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

troopr02 wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 11:24 what the...? Im quite surprised. Although the Red Alert series is not true C&C (tiberium is the only true universe), im surprised they are working on sooo many C&C projects. First C&C3, now kains wrath, tiberium, now this :S

They have to make up for the time when they sat on their asses and let all the Westwood veterans move on to other game developers.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 20:00:19 GMT

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

Them screenies are looking hot.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 20:18:02 GMT

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

Is this a seperate game from EA or a mod? Looks like a mod to me from those SS.

Dover wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 21:05{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:03RA2 and YR ROCKED!

Which part, exactly? The endings where Tanya discovers Soviet leaders in hammer-and-sickle underpants? The part where Yuri gets locked up for being "A bad, bad man", the GIs that outrange tesla coils, or the overpowered superweapons?

Well, Dover...what more can you expect from a product made by the American entertainment machine?

I too hated the fact it showed Russians as inferior and stupid but hey, it's a game and we both know that in real-life, Russians would kick ass and won't take shit lying down.

But reagarless, I kicked ass with the Soviets when I was online. I loved the game for it's vibrant color, graphics, gameplay, entertainment, and replay value. I hated the usual bias but hey, it's a game.

As for the superweapons, I agree they were overpowered but the expansion YR with the Force Shield kinda made it a bit balanced. Along with that, if you focus on a mobile defense (with vehicles) rather than power-consuming defenses like Tesla Towers, then you would be better prepared against an opponent who attacks (or Chrono's in) after creating a Weather Storm over your base.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 20:53:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:16Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

It Was The Game Play That Was Good I Think.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 21:00:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 14:53IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:16Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

It Was The Game Play That Was Good I Think.

I enjoyed the missions, but after you played RA2, it's hard to go back to RA1, it's just too simple, I did enjoy the yaks.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [ForceEdge](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 21:22:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RA3 about time, but I wont get that worked up about this like i did for C&C3, (for me, C&C3 turned out to be good but not that great, the storyline and gameplay). The screenies look great tho. The same applies to KW, looks ok but not expecting something great.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 21:37:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

those ss's look like a generals mod... you can basically see overlords, battlemasters and paladins if you look hard enough

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 22:00:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Its the same engine, so what? so was cnc3.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 00:35:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 12:18|s this a seperate game from EA or a mod?
Looks like a mod to me from those SS.

Dover wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 21:05{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Tue, 12 February 2008 19:03RA2 and YR ROCKED!

Which part, exactly? The endings where Tanya discovers Soviet leaders in hammer-and-sickle underpants? The part where Yuri gets locked up for being "A bad, bad man", the GIs that outrange tesla coils, or the overpowered superweapons?

Well, Dover...what more can you expect from a product made by the American entertainment machine?

I too hated the fact it showed Russians as inferior and stupid but hey, it's a game and we both know that in real-life, Russians would kick ass and won't take shit lying down.

But reagardless, I kicked ass with the Soviets when I was online. I loved the game for it's vibrant color, graphics, gameplay, entertainment, and replay value. I hated the usual bias but hey, it's a game.

I can understand the bias. The bias was there in RA1, too. Making the Soviets the "bad guys".

But I thought there was a war going on in RA2. World leads in underwear? This is war, right? I don't want a lulzfest. Yuri commited Genocide, right? Brought the world to the brink of destruction? And he's getting "locked up"? That's it? For fucks sake.

You call it a story? I call it a shitfest.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 00:38:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 13:00 thrash300 wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 14:53 IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:16 Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41 IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33 RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

It Was The Game Play That Was Good I Think.

I enjoyed the missions, but after you played RA2, it's hard to go back to RA1, it's just too simple, I did enjoy the yaks.

This missions in RA1 had significance. You were fighting a war, and it felt like a war. Not "HAY COMRAD GENRAL U NEED MIND CONRTOL PRESIDANT DUGAN KTHX? VLADMIR CANT DO IT HES MAKING SEXY TIME WITH SUPERMODEL AND RUBBER DUCKIE IN HOTTUB LOL!", which is what you get in RA2.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 00:39:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 16:35 You call it a story? I call it a shitfest.

That about sums it up.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 01:37:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't like the look of those screenshots looks far too much like Generals and I'm sure people know my opinion about Generals.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 01:41:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That game just screams Generals/C&C 3, the Allied War Factory looks just like the GDI War Factory, and the tanks look just like Scorpions.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [OWA](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 02:13:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Woo, red alert!

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [bisen11](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 02:56:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ethanal wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 20:41 That game just screams Generals/C&C 3, the Allied War Factory looks just like the GDI War Factory, and the tanks look just like Scorpions.

Well everyone knows that the Generals and Red Alert Universes are connected so why not use the same engine? lol

But seriously, doesn't look too bad. At least it probably won't be graphics intensive on crappy comps.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Creed3020](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 03:37:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 05:44 Red Alert, the game with which it all started for me... I'm very excited over this!

Same here. RA1 was where all my gaming started, and I wouldn't be here today if it were not for my friend who introduced me to RA1 that one day I was at his house.

This news is huge and really surprised me...wow still in shock.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 03:42:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 18:38 IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 13:00 thrash300 wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 14:53 IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:16 Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41 IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February

2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has a lot more depth than RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

It was the game play that was good I think.

I enjoyed the missions, but after you played RA2, it's hard to go back to RA1, it's just too simple, I did enjoy the yaks.

This mission in RA1 had significance. You were fighting a war, and it felt like a war. Not "HAY COMRADE GENERAL YOU NEED MIND CONTROL PRESIDENT DUGAN KTHX? VLADMIR CANT DO IT HES MAKING SEXY TIME WITH SUPERMODEL AND RUBBER DUCKIE IN HOT TUB LOL!", which is what you get in RA2.

All you have to do is look at the trailers here is the original trailer for the first Command and Conquer Red Alert I think:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FvdJdthIFoU>

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 05:11:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bisen11 wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 20:56 Ethenal wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 20:41 That game just screams Generals/C&C 3, the Allied War Factory looks just like the GDI War Factory, and the tanks look just like Scorpions.

Well everyone knows that the Generals and Red Alert Universes are connected so why not use the same engine? lol

But seriously, doesn't look too bad. At least it probably won't be graphics intensive on crappy comps.

I'm not talking about the engine, I expected them to keep the Sage engine, but the models for the structures and vehicles have too many similarities to Generals for my tastes.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 05:32:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It looks absolutely nothing like Generals... Generals' graphics where all boxy and lame. The textures where bland and lacked any sort of detail, and the water looked like a cheap knockoff of Renegade's water.

Granted it was an RTS like this game... I have to give it a 2/10 on the scale of similarity.

What it does look like is Starcraft II.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 05:42:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uh, it looks very much like Generals. I'm not talking about the graphics detail, I'm talking about the similarities between that "tank-like" unit and the scorpion tank from Generals. Very similar if you ask me.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [LR01](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 08:08:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Red Alert total conversation for C&C3, looks like to me

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 09:32:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ah great, it looks all cartoony again. Well, let's hope the gameplay and story will be good...

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 15:31:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.ea.com/redalert/main.jsp>

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 17:20:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Red Alert 3 Website...with armies fielding wacky and wonderful weapons and technologies such

as Tesla coils, heavily armed War Blimps, teleportation, armored bears, intelligent dolphins, floating island fortresses, and transforming tanks.

I don't want wacky and wonderful, god dammit! Give me grit! Give me RA1!

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 17:28:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My question is: WTF does "the East" have to do with Red Alert anything?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 17:29:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PlastoJoe wrote on Thu, 14 February 2008 11:28My question is: WTF does "the East" have to do with Red Alert anything?
EA Games. Does that answer your question?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [bisen11](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 19:33:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So is RA3 taking place after the Soviet Victory in Yuri's Revenge?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 19:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wooo-hooo... floating bases, and bears.

Where do I sign up?...

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 20:12:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I got the EA C&C newsletter today, and among it, I found this quite amazing:

<http://www.ea.com/cncmovies/tiberium.html>

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 20:14:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did they finally put that back up? They launched it months ago but put it offline due to copyright problems.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 23:42:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WOW, this game is for real! I got the EA newsletter today. Awesome. I sure hope that they make that big 2 barreled tank as attractive like the Apocalypse tank.

Dover wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 18:35 You call it a story? I call it a shitfest.

I never called it a story. Who cares if the story was outrageously funny? I enjoyed the gameplay. Nuff said.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 00:20:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And nobody cares that these are just C&C3 objects basically and just redone a tiny bit for it? I mean FFS the Allied War Factory looks like the GDI War Factory.

In my opinion they my as well call it "C&C3: Red Alert 3".

FFS, though I guess you can't expect anything from EA but pure LAZINESS.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 01:02:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R.I.P. Red Alert...

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 01:07:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am sure they will change certain structures and units. I sure hope so...that pig-like double barreled tank does not deserve to stay. But looks like EA will be making heaps of money by making games like this using the C&C theme.

The way the words in the site are written, it looks like they are going to keep the humorous, whacky, funny formula of RA2.

The bright maps is something I will definitely enjoy. I hope the Soviet babe in the poster (with a Dragunov sniper rifle) is a controllable unit.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 02:43:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

EA is murdering the C&C series and its alternate universes. ./ They're just taking advantage of the C&C name just for promotion.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 02:49:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I fear on the FPS side, EA will bring out those BF style expansions...those stupid "booster" packs BS.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 04:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That has already started with Tiberium really and now they want to mess up the rest of the series with C&C3/Generals: RA3

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Renx](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 04:58:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why the need for 3 factions? Why can't it just be good vs bad like in the good old days?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Renx](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 05:02:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 11:16Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

jesus christ... it was 1996 ffs. It probably won an award for graphics that year, or several. And who the hell ever bought a (real) C&C game for the graphics? I could care less about the graphics in an RTS game because the draw to it is for the strategy involved, not for the pretty eye lashes you see on some elf when you zoom in.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 15:11:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renx wrote on Thu, 14 February 2008 23:02IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 11:16Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

jesus christ... it was 1996 ffs. It probably won an award for graphics that year, or several. And who the hell ever bought a (real) C&C game for the graphics? I could care less about the graphics in an RTS game because the draw to it is for the strategy involved, not for the pretty eye lashes you see on some elf when you zoom in.

I'm saying RA2 had more to offer then what was in RA1.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2008 21:54:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LR01 wrote on Thu, 14 February 2008 03:08Red Alert total conversation for C&C3, looks like to me

Yeah.

Kinda funny when I was playing RenAlert, and it was way popular back then. I had a quote saying "get Renegade 2 at www.renalert.com"

People always complained about it because it was a mod and not a Renegade 2. I always replied if Westwood was to make a Renegade 2 it wouldn't be much different.

Here's the prove EA makes games based on 1 engine and then milks it out for cash flow

KA-CHING!

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 16 Feb 2008 00:00:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One thing struck my eye when skimming through the various blurbs about RA3: Co-Op campaigns.

As for the rest... EA is too addicted to superweapons, rush-happy balancing, and special abilities. I mean, come on- the Ion Cannon was supposed to be a precision-strike weapon and C&C3 turned it into a fucking nuclear death beam. Smaller units die too quickly to make a difference in battle, forcing players to have vast resource operations just to keep ahead of loss replacement, and there is almost no room at all in some newer games for small-scale tactics that require patience and micromanagement in order to pull off. Instead, everything depends on having more firepower concentrated in one place than the other guy, which in turn usually depends on either massing fucktons of units and rushing or teching up and deploying superweapons and top-tier units (also in mass quantities). I can't stand to play modern RTS head-to-head just because of how mind-fuckingly shallow the matches are. I suck horribly at them, but I don't even feel motivated to try and get better- because the 'better' you are, the shorter the matches get, and the less time you have to do the crazy, sneaky, snowball's-chance-in-hell shit that used to make RTS so much of a blast to play.

RA3 is just going to be more of the same damned thing. It might be a fun little game for a while, but will ultimately not be so memorable as its progenitors.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 17 Feb 2008 22:39:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Fri, 15 February 2008 07:11Renx wrote on Thu, 14 February 2008

23:02IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 11:16Renx wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:41IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 08:33RA1 was pretty boring and dull for me, yeah it was fun to play, but RA2 has alot more depth then RA1.

Are you drunk? RA2 had the depth of a pie plate

Too few units in RA1, everything looked crap and was just slow.

jesus christ... it was 1996 ffs. It probably won an award for graphics that year, or several. And who the hell ever bought a (real) C&C game for the graphics? I could care less about the graphics in an RTS game because the draw to it is for the strategy involved, not for the pretty eye lashes you see on some elf when you zoom in.

I'm saying RA2 had more to offer then what was in RA1.

Zero Hour had "more to offer" than RA2.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [OWA](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 00:22:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 22:39
Zero Hour had "more to offer" than RA2.
Pity Zero Hour didn't have a story, but instead a situation.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 03:28:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Fri, 15 February 2008 18:00One thing struck my eye when skimming through the various blurbs about RA3: Co-Op campaigns.

As for the rest... EA is too addicted to superweapons, rush-happy balancing, and special abilities. I mean, come on- the Ion Cannon was supposed to be a precision-strike weapon and C&C3 turned it into a fucking nuclear death beam. Smaller units die too quickly to make a difference in battle, forcing players to have vast resource operations just to keep ahead of loss replacement, and there is almost no room at all in some newer games for small-scale tactics that require patience and micromanagement in order to pull off. Instead, everything depends on having more firepower concentrated in one place than the other guy, which in turn usually depends on either massing fucktons of units and rushing or teching up and deploying superweapons and top-tier units (also in mass quantities). I can't stand to play modern RTS head-to-head just because of

how mind-fuckingly shallow the matches are. I suck horribly at them, but I don't even feel motivated to try and get better- because the 'better' you are, the shorter the matches get, and the less time you have to do the crazy, sneaky, snowball's-chance-in-hell shit that used to make RTS so much of a blast to play.

RA3 is just going to be more of the same damned thing. It might be a fun little game for a while, but will ultimately not be so memorable as its progenitors.

I have to agree with alot of what you said, all the new RTS games are just super weapon fests.

I would play RA2 more, but it crashes everytime I try to go online. :/

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 08:04:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hardly see any super weapon used in C&C3 online. Then again: my average game time is around 9 minutes (+/- 60 % wins).

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 08:14:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One Winged Angel wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 16:22Dover wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 22:39

Zero Hour had "more to offer" than RA2.

Pity Zero Hour didn't have a story, but instead a situation.

It did too have a story, and I find it's story more rewarding that RA2's.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [OWA](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 11:51:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 08:14One Winged Angel wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 16:22Dover wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 22:39

Zero Hour had "more to offer" than RA2.

Pity Zero Hour didn't have a story, but instead a situation.

It did too have a story, and I find it's story more rewarding that RA2's.

What like "OH NOES THE TERRORISTS HAVE A MISSILE STOP THEM NOW!" is a good story? Don't make me laugh.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 15:42:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover, I think you hate RA2 too much. It is awesome.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 16:08:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ethenal wrote on Thu, 14 February 2008 00:42Uh, it looks very much like Generals. I'm not talking about the graphics detail, I'm talking about the similarities between that "tank-like" unit and the scorpion tank from Generals. Very similar if you ask me.
I'm not seeing any similarities...

The closest thing I see is that Soviet tank that kinda looks like an Overlord tank... but it is a stretch at best..

I mean the only similarities is that it has treads, is red, has a star on the top, and has two barrels. It looks completely different in every other way.

If looks like anything else in the C&C series, it looks like a Mammoth tank from TD or maybe Renegade (just not as blocky).

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 18:12:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would say it's mostly C&C3 with some Generals, if you don't agree it looks like C&C3 FFS look at the Allied War Factory!

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 18:15:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

heh, yeah, probably a mod of their own game. ./ Lazy bastards.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 19:33:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To be fair, RA1 was technologically the same as TD- same engine, same look (right down to the

sprites used for the units, many of which were identical in every way to their TD counterparts)- it just had more depth and variety in gameplay than its predecessor. I think we can all agree that RA1 was a very different game in the end despite being visually identical to TD.

However, I agree that EA is just being lazy by re-using the same engine, because the odds are pretty good that RA3 will make no major additions or alterations to gameplay. They're essentially doing what was done with BF2142- make some minor tweaks, change the look and a couple key units, and call it a new game. The basic concept behind the game will remain the same- rushfest, superweapon spamfest, call it what you will- and the concept behind what EA calls an RTS these days just doesn't make it to the level of the games we know as classics of the genre(TD, RA1, Warcraft II, Starcraft, Homeworld, Total Annihilation, etc).

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 19:35:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where has originality gone!?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 19:49:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Down the tubes of EA's marketing department, put into the blender known as EA's development company, and going to come out the ass of EA's production facilities.

Fun.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 21:20:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One Winged Angel wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 03:51Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 08:14One Winged Angel wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 16:22Dover wrote on Sun, 17 February 2008 22:39

Zero Hour had "more to offer" than RA2.

Pity Zero Hour didn't have a story, but instead a situation.

It did too have a story, and I find it's story more rewarding than RA2's.

What like "OH NOES THE TERRORISTS HAVE A MISSILE STOP THEM NOW!" is a good story? Don't make me laugh.

Not only is the plot more engrossing and believable in Zero Hour, but it has one clear, concise ending (Unlike RA2 with it's open-ended, canon-killing, two-possible-ending shit). That's something that Westwood never quite figured out.

Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 07:42Dover, I think you hate RA2 too much. It is awesome.

The game is okay, I guess. It's even good in small doses, but every time I play the campaign I burn up with anger at the thought that THIS is RA1's sucessor.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 21:23:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 15:20Not only is the plot more engrossing and believable in Zero Hour, but it has one clear, concise ending (Unlike RA2 with it's open-ended, canon-killing, two-possible-ending shit). That's something that Westwood never quite figured out.

Did it ever occur to you that westwood probably intended RA2's storyline to be that way?

I mean, honestly, if westwood wanted a realistic storyline, then I'm pretty sure they'd do a decent job at it.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 21:25:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally Blue wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 13:23Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 15:20Not only is the plot more engrossing and believable in Zero Hour, but it has one clear, concise ending (Unlike RA2 with it's open-ended, canon-killing, two-possible-ending shit). That's something that Westwood never quite figured out.

Did it ever occur to you that westwood probably intended RA2's storyline to be that way?

I mean, honestly, if westwood wanted a realistic storyline, then I'm pretty sure they'd do a decent job at it.

Intending a story line to be shit doesn't make it any less shitty.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 21:49:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 15:25Originally Blue wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 13:23Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 15:20Not only is the plot more engrossing and believable in Zero Hour, but it has one clear, concise ending (Unlike RA2 with it's open-ended, canon-killing, two-possible-ending shit). That's something that Westwood never quite figured out.

Did it ever occur to you that westwood probably intended RA2's storyline to be that way?

I mean, honestly, if westwood wanted a realistic storyline, then I'm pretty sure they'd do a decent job at it.

Intending a story line to be shit doesn't make it any less shitty.
I didn't think it was shit.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 18 Feb 2008 21:54:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:open-ended, canon-killing, two-possible-ending shit
Didn't Tiberian Sun have the same thing? What with the world being terraformed into a tiberium paradise and all.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [OWA](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 00:04:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 21:20
Not only is the plot more engrossing and believable in Zero Hour, but it has one clear, concise ending (Unlike RA2 with it's open-ended, canon-killing, two-possible-ending shit). That's something that Westwood never quite figured out.

Hah, the open-ended endings is one of the many factors that makes the older C&C games so great. It keeps the fans talking about what they think will happen next and it allows for great discussions and theories to be crafted. People are still talking about RA2's ending today. Generals kind of stopped with no plot twists or anything so it's not talked about as much storywise.

Zero Hour is more of a parody of the ongoing situation in the middle east which, to be honest, is in the news nearly every day. Plus, serious games like Gens and ZH bore me to death. RA2, Renegade and the rest of the C&C Universe series of games are differant, compared to something that is based on something that we see a lot of in real life, without being overly serious.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 02:23:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well assuming that the story in TS followed the GDI ending as firestorm goes into, we have to assume that Kane was killed and McCain goes and dies later. But the Nod campaign says that the world is covered in tiberium. Therefore Firestorm and CNC3 couldn't happen.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 09:50:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

{SB}Lone0001 wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 13:12I would say it's mostly C&C3 with some Generals, if you don't agree it looks like C&C3 FFS look at the Allied War Factory!

There's no denying in that.

Imo a good General/C&C3 mod would be a Red Alert 3.

But why not use a good working product? And make alot more profit out of it without having to rebuild it from scratch. EA has it on the right end here.

If Renegade 2 would have came out it would have been based on a more advanced w3d engine type.

That's why I have so much respect for the mods's like Reborn, Renalert. ecta because thats the closest to a Renegade 2 youle ever get.

And you can't beat good gameplay. Graphic's won't do the trick for me. And I think that this counts for most people.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 11:22:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One Winged Angel wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 16:04Hah, the open-ended endings is one of the many factors that makes the older C&C games so great. It keeps the fans talking about what they think will happen next and it allows for great discussions and theories to be crafted. People are still talking about RA2's ending today. Generals kind of stopped with no plot twists or anything so it's not talked about as much storywise.

That's a polite way of saying nobody knows what's going on, so they all make shit up (Westwood included). The open-ended endings is what helps make RA2 so silly, since if the Soviets win RA1 (And they do exactly half the time), the rest of the series goes out the window. Same goes for Tiberium Sun and Tiberium dawn.

The "theories" you're talking about usually involve trying to explain how Tanya hasn't aged in 30+ years but even appears younger. Or trying to explain how the Sears Tower is present even though it hasn't been constructed in the time that RA2 is supposed to take place in, or how the World Trade Center was included, even though it wasn't complete by that time.

Combine that with what the RA3 website describes as "wonderful and wacky" mechanics and plot-twists (mind control? time-travel? giant squids and dolphins? The result isn't a game. It's a parody. It's Monty Python does Red Alert.

One Winged Angel wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 16:04Zero Hour is more of a parody of the ongoing situation in the middle east which, to be honest, is in the news nearly every day. Plus, serious games like Gens and ZH bore me to death. RA2, Renegade and the rest of the C&C Universe series of games are differant, compared to something that is based on something that we see a lot of in real life, without being overly serious.

War is serrious. There's nothing lulzy about it. Why should it make for a lulzy game?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 17:45:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 20:23Well assuming that the story in TS followed the GDI ending as firestorm goes into, we have to assume that Kane was killed and McCain goes and dies later.

I assume you meant McNeil?

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 17:55:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HOLY CHRIST, JOHN MCCAIN KILLED KANE!

DAMN YOU MCCAIN! WHY COULDN'T RON PAUL BE THE REPUBLICAN CANIDATE, INSTEAD OF A PROPHETIC LEADER KILLING BASTARD.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 18:13:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 05:22War is serrious. There's nothing lulzy about it. Why should it make for a lulzy game?

If you're given a serious game with no trace of excitement or intrigue,

Dover wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 05:22The result isn't a game.

It's a war simulator.

I'd prefer a game over a simulator any day.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 19 Feb 2008 18:54:11 GMT

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

Agreed, it's tiring seeing games that constantly try and simulate reality. I'm quite certain most people play video games BECAUSE of the unrealistic aspect.

I'd take Sonic the Hedgehog (Or any other classicly unrealistic game) over any simulator any day.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 20 Feb 2008 03:37:05 GMT

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

RA1 isn't realistic either. I find it hard to imagine that in reality it would take more than a few rockets to disable a tank, and I'm sure what nukes would wipe out entire cities instead of blowing up a power plant and scratching up buildings around it.

However, unrealistic does not necessarily mean lulzy. RA1 is unrealistic but not lulzy. C&C 3 is not realistic. Generals/Zero Hour is not realistic. RA2 is not realistic, but is also very, very lulzy.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [OWA](#) on Thu, 21 Feb 2008 00:56:35 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 11:22

That's a polite way of saying nobody knows what's going on, so they all make shit up (Westwood included). The open-ended endings is what helps make RA2 so silly, since if the Soviets win RA1 (And they do exactly half the time), the rest of the series goes out the window. Same goes for Tiberium Sun and Tiberium dawn.

The "theories" you're talking about usually involve trying to explain how Tanya hasn't aged in 30+ years but even appears younger. Or trying to explain how the Sears Tower is present even though it hasn't been constructed in the time that RA2 is supposed to take place in, or how the World Trade Center was included, even though it wasn't complete by that time.

Combine that with what the RA3 website describes as "wonderful and wacky" mechanics and plot-twists (mind control? time-travel? giant squids and dolphins? The result isn't a game. It's a parody. It's Monty Python does Red Alert.

You know what's going on for a lot of it. There are just a few things that are open to interpretation. Like, for example: "Did Yuri really get eaten by a dinosaur at the Soviet ending of YR?", "What happened to Vladimir in YR?" and "How the hell does Kane keep coming back and what was that wierd scene at the end of Firestorm all about?"

It's down to opinion my friend. No one is "right" and no one is "wrong". I do agree that RA2 was pretty stupid at places but I really loved the cheesy characters and the unit voices. I do a bit of acting so sometimes I try and replicate the accents that some of the RA2 units did for lols. I really liked RA2 for it's style as you can't really find anything else out there like it

Dover wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 11:22 War is serious. There's nothing lulzy about it. Why should it make for a lulzy game? War doesn't always have to be serious in games.

Subject: Re: Command & Conquer: Red Alert 3
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 21 Feb 2008 01:28:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 February 2008 11:45 Muad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 18 February 2008 20:23 Well assuming that the story in TS followed the GDI ending as firestorm goes into, we have to assume that Kane was killed and McCain goes and dies later.
I assume you meant McNeil?

Sorry, my bad.
