

HW 3

In comparison to last week, these two readings seem to differ a bit more in the content they covered. In Bogost's work, there was far more focus on game engines and the mechanics of games. One quote from this reading that stuck out to me was "literature and art have always had a volatile relationship with permissibility—censorship and book burning are nothing new [...]. But by relying on a less ambiguous relationship, game engines relate cultural artifacts and the market in a fundamentally new way." Although game is not always considered an art in comparison to literature and traditional art, Bogost ultimately recognizes it as one in this quote. I see games as a form of art and the programmers as artists. Narrative games' popularity and the existence of this class both show how the intersection between games and art is becoming more prominent. In Sicart's reading, proceduralists are one of the topics that is talked about, "proceduralists claim that players, by reconstructing the meaning embedded in the rules, are persuaded by virtue of the games' procedural nature." Although players can make decisions in a game, the creator of the game still intentionally put those options, scenes, and endings within the game. I think this is more so giving you the illusion over control in the game. However, since you have the ability to change what *version* of the author's game you play, you could also argue against this. My work in Inky and the work I debugged both somewhat reflects this, as it is choice based with different endings that I or the person who made the other file created. The player gets to "choose" what ending they get to by making different choices, however these are all possibilities that I ultimately made.