

# A Quintessential Film Noir Video Game

FAR-GO-GREEN ZAREEF

Release: August 2010

Developer: 2K Czech

Platforms: Microsoft Windows, OS X, Xbox 360 and PlayStation 3

With the current hype surrounding the release of Mafia III, we thought it would be better to take a walk down memory lane to revisit its predecessor, the beautiful Mafia II.

During its release, Mafia II was already one of the most hyped games of the year. With the masterpiece that Mafia was, gamers were excited for it. And they were not disappointed. 2K's promises to fans were well-kept.

From the onset, Mafia II had features that made it stand out. The graphics for its time was amazing and has dated well with time. With the music in-game consisting of tracks from the 1940s till the early 50s and licensed cars from the era being used, the game manages to do justice to its timeline period. The gameplay mechanics make it insanely fun. The cover system is one such feature that can be utilised to perfection in situations. The pick-locking mini game is an interesting addition to the game which makes it possible for players to either break open a glass or pick lock it when stealing a car, for example.

But Mafia II's best feature is easily its story. The tale

REPLAY



of Vito Scaletta (who was also in Mafia III!) is a beautifully told story of vengeance and redemption. His journey with his best friend Joe Barbaro as they climb up the Italian Mob is scintillating and the climax itself is worthy enough to make gamers crave for a third outing in the series. Don't worry, we will not spoil the story because this is one such story that you need to play by yourself to unravel.

With Mafia III releasing pretty soon, it would be

nice if Mafia II gets re-mastered so that previous gamers can enjoy this classic and those who could not play it then, can enjoy it with updated graphics.

*Fardeen Zareef is sarcastic in spirit. In his free time, he quotes Chandler Bing, fights with carbohydrates and tries to understand Vape Nation. He is also a passionate Manchester United fan who loves to game. You can e-mail him at fzareef666@gmail.com*

## WHEN LESS IS DEEMED MORE AT \$60

TAMIM BIN ZAKIR

The time has come for another multiplayer-only game to state its case about why it costs \$60 & the game in question is none other than Blizzard's well-received shooter, Overwatch.

The stripping of campaigns from games has been a hot topic recently, though it seems like Overwatch never even intended to have one at all. Battlefield and Titanfall got relentlessly massacred for not having a single player campaign, although the latter got hurt more due to the flow of game matches that began to feel repetitive. Battleborn has all its different modes and did its utmost to shove together 'stuff' into the game ranging from campaign missions to MOBA-styled multiplayer, however still making us grind to unlock heroes and skills like it's a free-to-play game. Evolve has so many monsters, hunters & maps DLCs that it became a meme before it even launched. On the contrary, Unreal Tournament, CS:GO & Team Fortress 2 have all managed to pass by without a campaign over the years.

The argument fundamentally arising here is that Overwatch, despite providing a handful of multiplayer modes, 21 heros roster, 12 maps and nothing even resembling single-player or co-op campaign content, manages to bring more to the table without anything outside the core game.

Does a full priced shooter always require a single player campaign to justify its price of admission?

Often, we demand a story mode from a game out of a somewhat misguided desire for "value",

and because that's how it's generally been done since the beginning. Looking across the shooter landscape, though, it's actually kind of rare to find an FPS that does both single-player and multiplayer really well. Battlefield's single-player campaigns, for example, are notoriously poor. Call of Duty's single-player and multiplayer are both generally well-regarded, but plenty of fans prefer one or the other but not both. DOOM appears to be an exception, garnering plaudits for its excellent single-player while also featuring a conventional multiplayer mode.

So what's the difference between Overwatch and Battlefield exactly? How does one game get crucified for not having enough content, while another game with even less content vaults into Game of the Year competition?

Overwatch defies that conventional line of thinking with team-based multiplayer that's so well-tuned and fun to play that any thoughts of a single-player go flying out of your head. It's remarkably fresh whereas Battlefield, successful in capturing the look & essence of Star Wars universe, at the end is business as usual. Wolfenstein and Bioshock did their share on the opposite side of the divide with their excellent campaigns. Sometimes a really great core game is enough. Blizzard has publicly stated that all future heroes and maps will be free, meaning that the playerbase will never become fractured by cost. This scheme is where many of these games seem to have stumbled and it has brought Blizzard and Overwatch a lot of advance goodwill from fans. If players know they're not just buying the current game, but all future content at the \$60 price point, that's going to make them feel a bit more comfortable about their purchase.

*Tamim Bin Zakir aka Shwag\_Lord (PSN ID) is a 24/7 angry individual being who seldom thinks of being generous to others. Feel free to devour his tranquility at niloy.tbz@gmail.com*

