

---

Subject: Re: C&C 4 Coming!!!!

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 00:47:24 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49: An unknown reason doesn't equal no reason. EVERYTHING has a reason, and mood swings are no different. As you already mentioned chemical imbalances in the brain is one thing. Ask anyone that sky dives, they have their reasons, ranging from conquering one's fear to doing it for the rush. NOBODY does something for no reason. No exceptions.

I knew you were going to say that. Perhaps I spoke too soon. I don't necessarily mean that people don't always do things for a reason. What I mean to say is more on the lines of people don't always do things for a logical reason.

Conquering one's fears is an arguable logical reason to do something. It really depends on what you're doing and how it affects your life.

Doing something "for the rush" is not a logical reason. In fact, doing anything for entertainment value isn't logical. Having fun isn't logical. It's just an emotional pleasure one gets. Hell, most of the things that we know and have become accustomed to in modern society is pretty illogical. The point of our lives is to hunt, eat, sleep and die. Money, housing, jobs, communities, morals, are all tacked on illogical ways of our life. Just because we find reason to do them, it doesn't make it logical when compared to what are bare primitives of life really are.

Everything has a reason, but not everything uses a logical reason. Someone might be faced with impossible odds to overcome an obstacle. Their reasoning is to overcome the challenge, but it defies logic as the odds are highly against them. However, just because logic says it won't work, that doesn't mean that a person won't try.

What I was getting at with the skydiving example is this. The person who invented it decided one day to jump from a high altitude and hope that enough wind could be caught so it would slow them down so they could land safely. But who decides to risk something like that for any logical reason? No one, that's who. It takes illogical notions to progress in life. If you live your life following logical reasoning, then nothing new or exciting (enough) will happen.

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49: Again, not to flame, but if the saying comes from an anime it only makes it that much faggier.

Why's that?

Dover wrote on Mon, 27 July 2009 15:49: I'm glad EA ignored you. That proposal presents the worst of both worlds. Speeding up production of a production queue is a poor consolation prize when compared to the ability to diversify your forces or get the full effect of the structure you're paying for. In addition it forces you to create multiple bases to get the second queue you paid for, which is unnecessarily difficult when not using the peon system.

You're deluding yourself if you think there's anything logical about a complex of 30 war factories when there's only one tank coming out of one of them. Explain to me how a sped-up single queue is "better for your economy"? You're spending the same amount of resources and getting the same amount of units in the same time frame, it's just they're producing in a roundabout illogical

manner.

I payed for a second war factory, so I deserve a second war factory, not an upgrade to my first. Perhaps I didn't explain it well enough.

First of all, I didn't say one production radius would completely fill an entire base. You can have multiple radii in a single base.

Second of all, just because you have a sped up production speed for one queue, doesn't mean you're only using one production structure. Let me clarify:

If you play RA2 and build like 5 War factories and then spam tanks from your single queue, you will notice that tanks will start coming out of multiple war factories, not just one. That's because the building speed is so fast, that one war factory is unable to respond quick enough to produce a second unit right after a first one comes out. So in that case, it is customary that the second-to-primary structure produce the unit instead. And if the speed is increased again, it may even take up to 3 or 4 different war factories to produce the units from a single queue.

My idea would look a little like this:

Three production structures in the same radius share a single production queue. However each structure produces one unit at a time because they are produced so rapidly.

Now, you asked how a single queue is better for your economy. Think about it for a second. 1 queue takes money for a single unit one at a time. When that unit is produced, money starts to be deducted for the second unit. It's also better because it automatically focuses your resources on a single unit at a time. (This is talking in terms of C&C, because in games like Starcraft, money is deducted instantly when you queue up a unit)

With multiple queues, your resources are being divided in real time and thus your funds end up being depleted much more quickly. You have credits going into creating one unit and credits going into creating another unit at the same time. This is the reason why it is very important to have a surplus of income in a C&C game that uses mutliple queues because if you don't and you use mutliple production queues, you will find that you have many idle periods in the match were you are waiting on your units because your resources aren't being collected fast enough.

If you require money to create 10 units, you will probably get the units out faster in a single queue than with a multiple queue.

Now, I know what you might be thinking: "Well that's nothing a little micro production management can't fix." And you would be correct. However, if you pause production on one queue to allow another queue to gain full access to all your resources, then what's the difference between doing that and simply having just a single queue?

---