
Subject: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 23:14:47 GMT

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

<http://www.ps3forums.com/viewtopic.php?t=13763>

Quote:XBox vs. PS2

The CPU

Of course, the Central Processing Unit, the heart of every computer or console. Most of the calculations take place here. The XBox has a Intel processor which runs at a clock-speed of 733MHz. That's a lot higher than the 300MHz at which the PS2 CPU is running. But does that make the CPU better? Nope.

Here's why the PS2 CPU (Emotion Engine) is a lot more powerful:

- Data bus, cache memory as well as all registers are 128 bits on the PS2 CPU while the XBox CPU is 32 bits.

- It has a maximum performance of 6.2GFLOPS while the XBox CPU can only do a bit over 3 GFLOPS.

- It incorporates two 64-bit integer units (IU) with a 128-bit SIMD multi-media command unit, two independent floating-point vector calculation units (VU0, VU1), an MPEG 2 decoder circuit (Image Processing Unit/IPU) and high performance DMA controllers. Yes, this is all ON THE EMOTION ENGINE ITSELF.

Okay now what does this mean? It means that the PS2 can handle heavier physics and 3D engines (and can do more accurate realistic visual effects like splashing water and explosions). It also means that the PS2 can handle a lot more sophisticated Artificial Intelligence programming so that you have intelligent human-like opponents. And with a floating-point calculation performance of 6.2GFLOPS/second, the overall calculation performance of this new CPU matches that of a super computer. This is a completely new CPU architecture especially designed for sophisticated graphics and physics while the architecture of the XBox CPU is pretty old and simple and looks a lot like the architecture of the 486 CPU from back in the early '90s. The architecture of the Emotion Engine really is very sophisticated so I'm not going to explain it in detail here. But simply put the main advantage of the PS2 CPU is that it is subdivided into lots of other tiny powerful processors, all of them designed to do a special task and almost all of them can work independently from each other.

And another thing... the processor inside the box does not say "Pentium III" anywhere. It simply reads "Intel". The XBox's processor is NOT an Intel Pentium III, as Microsoft would have you believe, but in fact a Celeron II. It is a 700mhz Celeron, complete with 128kb of L2 cache (P3 coppermines actually have 256kb L2 cache), but overclocked to a 133mhz FSB, resulting in PIII/Celeron hybrid. What makes it a Celeron II is the fact that it is still using a Coppermine Core, with 8 way set associative L2 cache rather than your typical Celeron 4 way set Level 2 cache. What it ultimately comes down to is that this Coppermine core, which allows Microsoft to market the XBox as a PIII Coppermine, is about a 10% speed increase over the Celeron equivalent of this processor. Is the XBox CPU a Celeron? Not really. Is it a Pentium III CPU in the sense that everyone thinks of a PIII Coppermine? Nope. It's somewhere in between.

The Graphics Chip and VRAM

This is where the images are rendered. The Xbox uses an Nvidia Graphics Processing Unit running at 250MHz and the PS2 uses the Graphics Synthesizer running at 150MHz. Again, judging by these specs the Xbox looks better. The Xbox GPU has a few advantages (or maybe not) over the PS2 GS, for example:

- The Xbox GPU can do 125 million polygons while the PS2 GS can only do 75million polygons
- The Xbox GPU has a max. Resolution of 1920x1080 and the PS2 GS can do 1280x1024

The rest of the graphics chip will be comparable to NV-20 chip, there are a lot of neat effects the Xbox GPU can do with its hardware, but all those effects can be done by the Emotion Engine in software too (while the Xbox' CPU is not powerful enough to do complex visual effects in software).

But the catch is that these advantages (talking about higher resolutions here) don't make a lot of difference on a TV screen, even on an HDTV screen the difference would be barely noticeable (when the console's hardware is used properly). So, is the Xbox Graphics Processing Unit better than the PS2 GS? It doesn't look like it, the architecture of the PS2 GS looks far more advanced. For example, PS2 has a parallel rendering engine that contains a 2,560-bit wide data bus that is 20 times the size of leading PC-based graphics accelerators. The Graphics Synthesizer architecture can execute recursive multi-pass rendering processing and filter operations at a very fast speed without the assistance of the main CPU or main bus access. In the past, this level of real-time performance was only achieved when using very expensive, high performance, dedicated graphics workstations. There is a 48-Gigabyte/sec memory access bandwidth achieved via the integration of the pixel logic and the video memory on a single high performance chip. The quality of the resulting screen image is comparable to high quality pre-rendered 3D graphics. (that is once the game developers have learned how to use it properly) There has also been a misunderstanding about the VideoRAM on the PS2. The VRAM is included in the 32MB of main RAM on the CPU (the developer chooses how much of it he wants to dedicate to VRAM). Everyone thought the 4MB of memory on the GS was the VRAM while that is just a buffer in which all the rendering is done so no external bandwidth is needed (only for texture streaming). Another rumor that's been spread by several gaming sites is that the Xbox is capable of texture compression and full scene anti-aliasing while the PS2 isn't. This is simply not true. The PS2 can compress/ decompress textures and do full scene anti-aliasing without causing as much slow-down as on the Xbox. And although the Xbox GPU can do a lot of effects that are not 'built-in' in the PS2 GS, the PS2 can do all these effects and more in software mode (but at least at the same quality) through the Emotion Engine.

Now let's take a look at how Microsoft got the idea that their graphics chip can do 125 million polygons...

The PS2's Graphics Synthesizer has the highest pixel fill rate of the next generation of consoles. Most remember the 4.0 GPixels on Microsoft's spec comparence sheet. Well, Microsoft was nice to include a "(anti-aliased)" next to it. What does "4.0 GPixels (anti-aliased)", mean? It's misleading. The Xbox has hardwired 4x FSAA, when this is turned on the actual total of 1.0 GPixels is re-rendered 4 times to remove aliasing. Another possible reason for Microsoft to say Xbox's fill-rate is 4 GPixels per second. Is that the 1 GPixels is with 2 texture layers, if it is NOT used

Xbox would not gain any performance and if it is used Xbox wouldn't lose any performance. It remains 1.0 GPixels w/ 2 textures, so what MS possibly did was it doubled the fill rate twice. Trying to compare it to PS2's fill rate w/ no texture. What MS did was it came up with misleading numbers. The Xbox can't go higher than 1 GPixels per second.

The NV2a in the Xbox has 4 pixel units running at 250 MHz, that's 1 billion pixels/second. While the GS in the PS2 has 16 pixel units running at 150 MHz, which is 2.4 billion pixels every second.

Now let's talk about polygons. Right here I'm talking about polygon rendering and not polygon transformations. To calculate polygon rendering performance, you take the pixel fill rate, and write it in millions. So PS2's pixel fill rate is 2400 Million. When Sony says polygons, it is referring to 32 pixel polygons. Divide 2400 Million by 32. You get 75 Million (32-pixel) polygons per second. That is raw and doesn't include textures, they use up pixels also. Now let's take Microsoft's alleged pixel fill rate of 4000 Million, which MS has on it's spec sheet and divide it by 32, you get, yes you guessed it, 125 Million (32 pixel) polygons per second. Here's the problem, the NV2a doesn't have a 4000 M fill rate but a 1000 M fill rate. So it's 31 Million (32 pixel) polygons per second. This isn't raw, since there's also 2 texture units for each pixel unit. So that's 31 million with 2 texture layers, the PS2 is around 38 Million with 1 texture layer and 20 million with 2 texture layers. The Xbox maxes out at 31 MPolygons per second, if textures aren't placed on those polygons- Xbox will not gain a polygon rendering increase in performance. The PS2's Graphic Synthesizer could render 75 MPolygons per second with no texture. The NV2a in the Xbox can't render higher than 31 MPolygons per second at all.

Okay now take that all into account and then check out the following...

"Is the XBox graphics chip the same as a GeForce 3 card? Not quite. The NV2A chip that powers the XBox is quite similar to the GeForce 3, but isn't quite a GeForce 3. The GeForce 3 is a 64mb card with 350mhz RAMDAC. The XBox's NV2A is a card that SHARES it's memory with the XBox's system RAM and has a 250mhz RAMDAC. The NV2A compensates for this by having a Second Vertex Shader, as opposed by the GeForce 3's single vertex shader. However, Microsoft claims that this second vertex shader instantly bumps the XBox's theoretical max poly count from the 31 million that Nvidia lists for the GeForce 3, all the way up to 125 million pps. According to most experts, the area that will actually see the most improvement from this will actually be in Bump Mapping. Microsoft has yet to explain how the second vertex shader yields an additional 94 million polygons per second."

I don't know enough to go more in detail about this but this is definitely an interesting point, and either way you turn it, it doesn't seem like the XBox has the advantage here.

I can understand that this is all a bit confusing if you're not a real tech-freak. It comes down to this: when developers have learned how to use the power of the PS2 GS properly they'll get a lot more out of it than XBox developers will get out of the XBox GPU. The PS2 GS combined with the EE can do a lot more advanced visual effects than the XBox GPU combined with its CPU.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [JeepRubi](#) on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 23:36:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No way im gunna waste my time reading all of that.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Renx](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 00:46:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Who cares, they both have terrible graphics.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Lijitsu](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 00:49:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jeep Rubi wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 18:36No way im gunna waste my time reading all of that.

Alright, read the last paragraph, the like three line.

...Still say the XBox is better.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 00:51:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

XBox1 pwnz PS*
Why?

1. XBox1 is extremely moddable
 2. XBMC (Xbox Media Center) - Best media center there is, blows Winblows XP media center away
-

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 01:12:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think consoles suck.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 01:21:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:51XBox1 pwnz PS*
Why?

EDIT

Whoops, I did not completely read your post. You are right, those are 2 of the few advantages that Xbox has

On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 02:08:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

icedog90 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:12I think consoles suck.

Ummm yeah, PS2s tend to break down A LOT more than an Xbox. Which is of course why the Xbox is better.

Actually, Nintendo makes consoles that survive nuclear wars. My friend told me about this one site that they tested all 3 consoles, dropping them off a building or whatnot and hitting them with a sledgehammer, the Gamecube survived the longest, PS2 died instantly.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 02:20:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 18:21On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.

Actually it's all because of the money. Halo was originally planned for the PC, but then Microsoft stepped in and flashed the dudes at Bungie some green and then the rest is history.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [remek](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 02:39:33 GMT

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

uh oh wonder when will people learn that consoles are about game titles and not the specifications. you simply wont buy a console that doesnt have any interesting games. also its a matter of opinion, as someone mentioned why they didnt make halo for ps2, well imo beacuse halo sucks and its not worthy ps2, but hey, thats just my opinion and thats the deciding factor when you are buying a console

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [Renardin6](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 02:51:59 GMT

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

icedog90 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:12I think consoles suck.

I think that too.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 03:05:47 GMT

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

I used to be big with game consoles before i started using the computer(Quite awhile ago). But after getting into computers and modding. Games on consoles got boring fast.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 03:11:39 GMT

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

icedog90 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:12I think consoles suck.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 04:14:16 GMT

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

Yet, the Xbox is still better than the PS2. Almost all PS2 games I've seen have shitty graphics compared to the Xbox.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 04:20:17 GMT

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

bigejoe14 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 18:20 Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 18:21 On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is. Actually it's all because of the money. Halo was originally planned for the PC, but then Microshaft stepped in and flashed the dudes at Bungie some green and then the rest is history.

Actually, the Mac AND PC.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 05:53:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Those round monitors scare me. Awhile ago I dropped one and it started rolling. By the time it stopped i thought FEW!! well i soon regreted that when I plugged it in and i could faintly hear sparks. Than i could smell smoke, than i notice the moniter wont turn on. Who knows what the hell that had to do with the adapter though

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [emperorz0](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 05:59:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Consoles sucks like the have always did.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 10:02:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

icedog90 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 20:12 I think consoles suck.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 10:32:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Even if you dont like consoles and would never play a console game, I would still highly recommend getting a used xbox, mod it, and install XBMC and enjoy having a first rate media center Or heck just install linux on it

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 14:35:42 GMT

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

icedog90 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 20:12 I think consoles suck.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 14:54:23 GMT

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

rm5248 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 21:08 PS2s tend to break down A LOT more than an Xbox. Which is of course why the Xbox is better.

Actually, Nintendo makes consoles that survive nuclear wars. My friend told me about this one site that they tested all 3 consoles, dropping them off a building or whatnot and hitting them with a sledgehammer, the Gamecube survived the longest, PS2 died instantly.

I know about that, but you forgot to mention the part where 1. Gamecube Survived Longest, 2. PS2 survived second longest, and 3. Xbox was last

Anyway, if consoles suck so much, then why were all the GTA(3, Vice City, San Andreas) made for PS2 first? Or why do you think Microsoft made Halo for Xbox?

I know that consoles have limited capabilities, and if I had more money, I would probably buy a "Gaming computer", because games for PC are usually much cheaper than for consoles. But consoles still have some advantages like for example two or up to four people can play on one console, but only one person can use PC at a time.

I can't really think of any other advantages, but I am sure there are some.

The only purpose of this thread was to show how is PS2 better than Xbox, and not how are consoles better than PC, which they clearly are not.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 15:21:30 GMT

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

On a PC you could also play with 2 easily up to 4 players. You just need enough entrances for gamepads.

I know lots of race games that you can play with 2 (wacky wheels for example, that game was t3h 1337, who remembers it?) on one comp. My bro and I used to play it: one gamepad, other keyboard or even both on keyboard ^^.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 15:53:39 GMT

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

Yes, but how many FPS games for PC have split screen? The only FPS game that I have seen for PC and that had split screen was Serious Sam first&second encounter.

And how many FPS games for consoles have Split Screen? Much more. To name few:

Splinter Cell: Chaos theory,
Killzone,
all of the Ranbow Six,
Ghost recon 1&Jungle Storm,
Time Splitters 2&3,
Darkwatch,
Area 51,
Brothers in Arms (both),
Half Life,
Medal Of Honor.
Serious Sam,
XIII,

How many of these games for PC have Split screen? Except Serious Sam, NONE.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [SCOTT9](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:38:34 GMT

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

Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:21Blazer wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:51XBox1 pwnz PS*
Why?

Read my post please

On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.

respect ^^ 1)xbox is made by bill gates whos a shithead

2)ps2s controls are easier

3)ps2s graphics pwn even the xbox360!

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:41:50 GMT

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

meh, doesn't really matter what system is better.

PS2 has the larger RPG library, so I went with that.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 16:50:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SCOTT9 wrote on Wed, 25 January 2006 16:38 Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:21 Blazer wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:51 XBox1 pwnz PS*
Why?

Read my post please

On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.
respect ^ 1)xbox is made by bill gates whos a shithead
2)ps2s controls are easier
3)ps2s graphics pwn even the xbox360!

Please for crying out loud, go away and don't come back. Ugh, I've met decomposing dog carcasses that are less offensive to the senses than you are.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [tooncy](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 22:03:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

All the current-gen consoles look pretty damn dated to me, but that doesn't make the games for them suck. Look at the DS and the PSP. The DS is fugly compared to the PSP, but 90 percent of the PSP games on the market suck. Even though it is technologically inferior, the DS is outselling the PSP right now.

And consoles usually suck. The only ones that didn't were the Genesis, SNES, NES and a few other 2D based systems. While a few newer ones like the DS are pretty good, the rest of the bunch seems mediocre. When consoles made the jump to 3D, they really started to decline in quality. The only thing that consoles will ever have over PCs is cost. The PC has them beat in every other aspect.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 22:09:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tooncy wrote on Wed, 25 January 2006 17:03 The only thing that consoles will ever have over PCs is cost. The PC has them beat in every other aspect.

I am going to have to agree to that. By cost you mean cost of the system right? Because when comparing cost of the games, PC games are lot cheaper than console games. Example: When Vice City for PS2 had cost 30 CAN, it was only 20 CAN for PC.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Wed, 25 Jan 2006 22:34:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I bet consoles are extremely appealing to people who are intimidated by computers or not willing to spend so much money to keep their computers so up-to-date. Any new games that come out on consoles are guaranteed to work on that machine, and interesting games are always coming out on console.

However, I find console wars just silly.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 00:07:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

one thing that consoles win over PCs is game quality. I don't mean which game is better, but just the hardware/software quality. Games for PCs have to account for every single type of hardware/software combination known to man. This makes the existance of bugs etc. more likely. However, with consoles, everyone has the same combination of hardware/software, so game programers can concentrate solely on opimizaion for that specific set of hardware/sofware.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 00:07:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SCOTT9 wrote on Wed, 25 January 2006 11:38Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:21Blazer wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:51XBox1 pwnz PS*
Why?

Read my post please

On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.
respect ^^ 1)xbox is made by bill gates whos a shithead
2)ps2s controls are easier
3)ps2s graphics pwn even the xbox360!

How the fucking hell is the richest man in the world currently a "shithead?"

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 00:38:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I believe that the richest person in the world is the King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia. I'm pretty sure

that Bill Gates is not the richest person.

Oh, and why does everybody hate Bill Gates for making Windows? He doesn't have much power anymore--I'd be suprised if he even codes anything anymore.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 01:41:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The fact that consoles suck is my opinion. That can't be altered by the fact that GTA was on PS2 first. I hate split screen too. I have plenty of friends who come over every once and a while for a LAN using their PCs. And trust me, they're fun. I've been to a few Halo LANs and all they do is get me pissed off, since Halo 2 is so friggin annoying. I also have an Xbox but I never play it, but I should put Linux on it, hehe.

Consoles suck.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [hunteroo2](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 02:22:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

what difference does it make now that the 360 is out and ps3 is coming out...though i dont know when...?

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 02:58:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why does everyone hate Bill Gates? Because his success outmatches anything they will ever achieve? You act as if he is satan-incarnate and out to destroy all that is harmoneous with current technology and economics. I have a news flash for all of you Bill Gates haters out there. He is a fore-father for all that is modern technology. Just because someone is worth more in figures than you are does not mean you should hate them. So SCOTT, go to hell.

Getting back to the main topic- I chose the Playstation 2 not for its incredible graphics, but for the titles under their wing. This would include my favorites: Grand Theft Auto(They come out first for the PS2), and the Final Fantasy series. Although, Final Fantasy 10-2 sucked.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 03:26:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Microsoft is evil.
Bill Gates is the founder of Microsoft.
Therefore, Bill Gates is evil.

It's simple logic...

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 05:41:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SCOTT9 wrote on Wed, 25 January 2006 11:38respect ^^ 1)xbox is made by bill gates whos a shithead

Yeah, but consoles made by a company that installs trojans on consumers' PCs are okay.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [hunteroo2](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 20:51:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i, for one, dont hate bill gates..sure i envy the hell out of him(well..more his money..), but i dont hate him

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 21:53:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 20:21Blazer wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:51XBox1 pwnz PS*
Why?

EDIT

Whoops, I did not completely read your post. You are right, those are 2 of the few advantages that Xbox has

On a side note, if PS2 is better than XBox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.

Gee... I donno... MAYBE BECUASE IT IS A MICROSOFT GAME... dumbass.

Subject: Re: PS2 pwns Xbox 1

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Fri, 27 Jan 2006 00:06:04 GMT

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

DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 26 January 2006 16:53 Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 20:21 Blazer wrote on Tue, 24 January 2006 19:51 Xbox1 pwnc PS*

Why?

EDIT

Whoops, I did not completely read your post. You are right, those are 2 of the few advantages that Xbox has

On a side note, if PS2 is better than Xbox, I don't understand why they did not make Halo for it. (They probably got lazy and did not want to exploit PS2 more than it already is.

Gee... I donno... MAYBE BECUASE IT IS A MICROSOFT GAME... dumbass.

I remember reading an article a month back saying that Bungie is going to release Halo 2.5 (Or whatever the hell they're calling it) on the PS3 aswell as the Xbox 360.
