
Subject: Re: New C&C game confirmed!

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 27 Oct 2010 22:11:08 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 10:02

If you look at RA2, besides the few goofy scenes, and a semi-believable storyline, you had solid faction armies with realistic infantry, vehicles, and superweapons. It was a pretty good set of armies and navies with a variety of maps to use them on.

...Except the giant squids, WW1 War Blimps (Kirovs), Crazy Ivan, Yuri, and etc. The art style was significantly more cartoony, as well. Compare it to TS, and you'll see what I mean.

Now I will admit, RA3 is MORE over the top so I guess it's a little unfair to say RA2 is AS bad, but RA2 was the game when Westwood went overboard. It didn't even fit with any of the C&C storyline, either... even RA1 did, RA2 was just like "Whelp, time to take a realistic-ish game and make it utterly ridiculous".

RA2's gameplay and missions were fun, I will admit that. But it just felt like they could have done WAY better and made it WAY cooler. Tiberian Sun, although the missions were campy, the game itself had an extremely rich ambiance.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 10:02All I am saying is that RA2 cannot be compared to RA3 and put in the same bunch. EA took it way up the top. They made the game so silly it turned me off. They were so desperate that they even included a poster of all the cheap b*tches with the game.

Kari Wuhrer was just as much, and if Westwood could they would have done just as much media whoring with Zofia, Tanya, and the other female characters. EA's just bigger so they had money to blow. And honestly, I found the Bear vs Flair videos amusing.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 10:02If someone looked for realistic itty gritty warfare and a sobre atmosphere, then RA is the way to go.

I can agree with that, RA1 had a better feel (just not my personal taste).

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 10:02RA2 was a bit more goofy but overall, only a couple scenes qualify as being silly and this can be overlooked when you had good faction armies and navies and good maps and missions. The intro was pretty badass for example. In RA3, pretty much every cutscene was comical garbage.

I dunno, the whole game felt like it just took a step into way goofy territory, and although some parts were serious, it was really hard to take it serious. I mean, atleast in Tiberian Sun, one of the first few cutscenes is a live execution of a traitorous general... which is pretty badass.

This isn't to say RA2 is a bad game- but it was a major departure from the rest of C&C games. If anything, despite its utter lack of story, Generals went back a bit to a RA1-ish feel... RA2, though, really went overboard... then RA3 went even more overboard.

However, RA3- despite me not playing it- seems to have WAY better gameplay. I actually want to buy it sometime, but my comp is a piece of shit and doesn't like certain games.

PS: I play a personal YR mod constantly with some of my friends, that I help make and such. I, by

no means, hate RA2/YR. I just hate it when people point their fingers at RA3 and say "OMG THIS GAME RUINED C&C FOREVEERRRR". They tried to undo some of the gameplay damage they did with C&C3, and figured since they have a shitton of money they'd just hire some professional actors and have some goofy scenes. Which, if Westwood had the same budget, they would have done the same with RA2.
