

---

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

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 21 Jul 2009 05:06:05 GMT

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

---

@ Dover: You are welcome! I removed the image assuming you did not like it; after your massive attack, I uploaded it again. LOL!

You pretty much got down all the reasons for why I like the Peon system. MCV system lacks depth and strategy; Peon is more realistic; I prefer how the buildings take time to appear and how you are forced to keep flexible control groups of units to aid yourself in expansion.

nikki6ixx wrote on Mon, 20 July 2009 22:50 People can argue about Generals sucking until they're blue in the face, but from a marketing and sales point of view, it was very successful. For one thing, it was created relatively recently after 9/11. Another thing is that it has a believable world, as opposed to the 'Tiberian Universe' and the Red Alert 2/3 one, which quite a few people regard as rather 'nutty.' This new setting allowed C&C to reach a mass audience made it one of the best selling games in '03.

The game itself rated very highly too, so obviously EA made a very smart move. Plus, it likely brought people into the C&C fold that may have not been interested in the other two universes previously.

I have been saying this in every Generals debate here.

The game was a stunning success in every way, shape, and form and it picked up a prestigious E3 best RTS award.

C&C fanboys don't realize what a MAJOR gap Generals successfully filled. EA made a smart move making a killer 3D RTS game with modern military units that was NOT in the market at that time; at least not anything as advanced as Generals. They cashed in major time and brought more players to RTS gaming with help of a simple "terrorists vs everyone else" plot.

Generals units were awesome as well. I found the factions to be a fresh break; the Chinese faction was both inspirational and well done imo.

---