
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.
