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The metaphor was the point I really took away from the chapter. He cites several classic block-buster games and claims that what made them such hits was the metaphor. The games simulated nothing in reality but the way they made you feel is the key. Tapping into the psyche of a generation is how to really make a hit. Was this metaphor intentional during game design?

I agree that the photorealistic games, for the most part, lack much emotion. A great deal of time and money have been thrown at graphics but after awhile it is just the same old.

I also like the point on safety. I agree that it is important for people to feel safe enough to take the risk and see what happens. One of the reasons I don’t care for most video games is because of the time investment required just to get past the initial stage of the game. Even the ability to save does not mean much to me. Few games have made me want to spend the time.

Games don’t have to be fun to provide entertainment, rewarding play, or just nice feelings. Condemning a game as “not fun” is about as useful as calling it “crummy”; it expresses an emotional reaction but offers absolutely nothing that you can get your hands on. Let’s banish this term from our serious game design discussions.