Spoony wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 03:11Cabal8616 wrote on Sun, 20 April 2008 17:27I don't even think EA tests C&C3 ATALL. Seriously, if they did, they wouldn't need the ridiculous amounts of patches they had to put in it.
r4z0r wroteI agree with this, but only to an extent. Because EA doesn't have beta testers.
this is just plain ignorant... from C&C3 onward EA genuinely made the effort to get the balance+bugs situation right (yes, I'm aware more than anybody here that this wasn't true before C&C3), but there are bound to be some that don't get sorted... trust me on this. I'm guessing neither of you have made a game the size of C&C3 or a complete patch for it?
No, you misunderstood what I said.

I specifically said BETA testers. They have a Q&A department that tests for bugs every patch. Whenever a new bug or exploit is found in C&C3, everyone gets pissed off at them, not EA. Did YOU know that?

What I meant by Beta testers is that C&C3 didn't have a beta, it had a community summit and they chose a select few people who they thought were "pros" and let them answer all the big choices in the game. But as it turns out they were also people who enjoyed Generals and still played it. It is their fault that the radar in C&C3 is on the MCV and not the Command Post. EA said so themselves. Not to mention various other things that many of the fans don't like.