

Daniel Little

1/25/19

This article gives the reader a basic understanding of what it is like to build a game from the idea to the very end. Mainly what I've gathered from this article is that the author prefers the "rock" part of game building to the talk. The author values the synesthetic audiovisual nature of Super Mario Bros. and Legend of Zelda. However, I disagree with his point of view towards "talk" in videogames, specifically how he says that "middle managers and random stakeholders choke these videogames with needless, often incoherent, and always disruptive talk". Quite frankly, the inclusion of talk in games, for me at least, has always served as a benefit for videogames. Without talk, a game can end up feeling hollow and dry of real content. It's as if the author of this article doesn't like the fact that games aren't pure action anymore and can't come to truly appreciate the talk in games.

As an example, take the original Super Mario Bros and Super Mario Galaxy. The original Super Mario Bros is mainly comprised of constant action until you beat the level. There isn't much to it and the only speaking lines you get are when you find out the Peach is in another castle or when you actually find her and save Peach. Now if you were to take that simple direction and apply that to Super Mario Galaxy, I guarantee that people would be genuinely confused with the sudden galaxy hopping, new and different enemies races, and the lack of context of the star entity that has possessed you and gives you magical star related powers. What I'm trying to say is that talk is very necessary in games nowadays. You can't just have a game where you just do things without reason unless you are a child that doesn't need explanations for anything. If not, rather than enjoying the game, you be stuck at the first level wondering why you're doing this.