

---

Subject: Re: tiberium.com launched

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 18:58:11 GMT

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

---

One Winged Angel wrote on Fri, 08 February 2008 04:37Dover wrote on Sat, 19 January 2008 23:50

That's it? That's the reason people don't like Generals? Because you have a "worker" unit doing building construction instead of the crappy (Before the nice facelift it got in C&C 3) sidebar system?

For fucks sake, learn to recognize progress when you see it.

I'd say Generals was a step back. But this is only opinion. I doubt you'll get anywhere trying to get the point across that Generals was a good game.

RA2 and TS are just more epic. Plus their graphics never age due to the style in which they were created. Generals is looking aged now.

You may prefer Generals, but I prefer RA2. Just like you may prefer maralade on your toast whilst I stick with butter. It's really quite a pointless debate.

Maybe I won't get the point across, but it'll be from the recieving end refusing to accept reason, not from any fault on the giving end.

Generals was a step forward, because for the first time, it was worth a damn to build more than one Barracks/War Factory. In RA2, the only effect was a slightly sped up unit production.

I wasn't even going to get into graphics, but since you meantioned it, Generals features full 3D, instead of 2.5D ala RA2 and TS. Generals may look "aged" compared to more modern RTS, but given that you can still zoom in close enough to see the propaganda on the side of Chinese buildings, It's still beats the tar out of 2.5D graphics, amrite?

---