
Subject: Re: New C&C game confirmed!

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 28 Oct 2010 02:46:29 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 19:46R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 14:32In fact, if C&C 3 didn't have cranes, the two games would play almost the exact same way. Yea, oh and aside from the way C&C 3 handles multiple war factories / barracks, or how the terrain under shroud is viewable, or how units work in squads, or how most of the units and defenses are different, or how there's a large variety in super weapons, or how vehicles are upgradeable (through tech buildings), or how the shroud is dynamic (will grow back into places you aren't in), or the turbines, or drones, or the nonbuildable walls, or silos, or the 3 separate factions instead of 2, or how the game is 3D (360 degree view), or how they're in completely different universes.

Actually no. I was originally planning to say "the two games would play exactly the same way" but then I realized things like what you mentioned and then changed it to "almost the exact same way."

However, you have to realize how big an impact on the game the cranes had. The removal of cranes would change the game so drastically that much of the mechanics that made it different from RA2 would actually be more inline.

For example, if there were no cranes, then there would be no ecoboom. The thing with C&C3 is that there were like 10,000 refineries and harvesters in your base at a time. Another refinery meant a lot more money for you. But because of cranes, there was no hindrance when you wanted to buy more. People would build a crane and then spam refineries in one building queue while doing their normal build order in the other. That allowed people to achieve T3 in like 5 minutes. Tanks were pumped out in seconds and just keeping your economy pace up was only doable by making more refineries and soaking up more Tiberium.

Without cranes, you would have to either focus on climbing the tech tree or focus on building your economy. If you chose to build a second Refinery, then you would have to wait for it to finish if you want to build that War Factory.

And that's only one thing that the inclusion of cranes had to the game.

However, most of the other things you mentioned were either aesthetic or just splitting hairs. I said "almost exactly" meaning if you're halfway decent at playing RA2, then C&C3 is right up your ally.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 27 October 2010 21:55

It had nothing to do with the colour palette or the failed real-life technology. It had to do with the feel of the game units.

It's probably just a matter of opinion then. When I see Red Alert, any of them, I see the exact same thing. And I wasn't saying RA1 was realistic because of the colors used, I said the colors used gave the illusion that it was realistic while in reality it was just as cheesy as the others in the series.

Ever since that whole "next-gen" joke about realistic games having brown/grey palettes (*coughcoughGTAIVcoughcough*), I've been looking beyond the horrible shades of color and extensive bloom to see what the game really was. When I look at RA1, I see the basis for RA2.

Granted you probably won't be seeing a communist dictator being poisoned in any of the latest games, but that goes with what I said before about the cut scenes in that game being so serious that it really had an opposite effect.

I do think that RA1 was much more serious than RA2 & RA3 combined, however. But I just cannot see RA1 as a "realistic" game. I'm sorry.

It's more like a bad comedy routine, tbh... You go to this place not knowing what's in store to only find out that guy sucks. You want to leave, but there aren't many people there and you think if you leave you'd hurt the guy's feelings so you stay. But, seeing you stay gives him the wrong idea and he goes on to do more and more until it finally gets to a point where nothing makes sense anymore (RA3).
