

No meeples for "Scramble for Africa". Online debates on playing historical trauma

Natàlia Lozano-Monterrubio, Juan Luis Gonzalo-Iglesia, Núria Araüna-Baró

(University Rovira i Virgili)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9848-0257>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5682-1102>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1997-2833>

Abstract

In 2019, the publisher GMT Games announced the withdrawal of the game *Scramble for Africa*, in prototype development phase, after receiving fierce criticism on specialized online forums. The game was accused of representing simplistically a colonial past linked to genocide and slavery and rewarding players' for recreating the European powers' exploitation of the colonies. This chapter delves into online controversies in game specialized forums to observe the emergence of new positionalities (the "postcolonial subject" and "anticolonial allies") with regards to the colonial past. By applying thematic analysis methodology (Braun & Clarke, 2006), the research examines the discussions that emerged in the biggest and most updated source of information on board gaming, BoardGameGeek, during the first semester of 2019. Results allow us to distinguish between four different types of players in relation to their views on the relationship between board games and colonial history: "ethical", "critical", "ludic" and "guilty-pleasure" players. Overall, these debates illuminate the players' agency and engagement with the historical accounts of the past. The *Scramble for Africa* case study, beyond contributing to this public debate, has generated discussion in the games industry and has led to a process of reflection about how the sector should be accountable to the past.

Keywords

Historical game studies, postcolonial theory, digital communities, board games, active players

Introduction

In 2019, after receiving fierce criticism on social networks and specialist online communities such as BoardGameGeek, the publisher GMT Games announced the withdrawal of the game *Scramble for Africa*, still in a prototype phase, from their platform. The game was accused of representing simplistically a colonial past linked to genocide and slavery and rewarding players' for recreating the European powers' exploitation of the colonies. For the announcement, GMT's spokesperson alleged that: "It's clear to me that the game is out of step with what most Eurogame players want from us, in terms of both topic and treatment" and highlighted that players' comments had led them to reconsider its publication (GMT Games, 2019). The aim of this paper is to analyze the online controversies about colonialism (in the past and in its 'neo' form) to observe the emergence in analogic gamer culture of what Spivak (1999) termed the "postcolonial subject." At our research, we sustain that this "postcolonial subject" has become a participant in public discussion through a savvy use of social media, and that is managing to broaden a traditionally white and masculine geek gamer culture (Trammell, 2022). Thus, this research focuses on how the discussion around colonial legacies, playable representations and the gaming industry shows different strategies through which individuals position themselves in front of collective trauma by engaging in spaces and tools of the geek gamer culture.

Colonial debates in contemporary cultures of playability

Postcolonial studies tackle the socioeconomic, legal, and cultural remains of the imperial regimes that sustained "institutional colonialism" and the subsequent power relationships generated by or surviving after their collapses (Gikandi, 1996). Unequal relationships informed by the recent past are pervasive in economic and sociocultural relationships, and the descendants of the people who have been oppressed by colonialism still carry its material marks in their bodies and histories (Trammell, 2022). These unbalanced positions are routinely legitimized in cultural representations in books, popular music, films, TV series or games. In this regard, taking a postcolonial stance allows us to point at the biases that reproduce neocolonial understandings of the past and the present, and to reflect on how we could build a decolonial future (Albrecht, 2019). This does not deny that the Postcolonial approach is in itself subject to debates about its "post" (structuralist) ways of reproducing the old binaries between the Europeans and "others" (Chibber, 2013). Drawing from the Marxist

anticolonial thinkers of the 1950s and 1960s (Brennan, 2006), Postcolonial theorists have developed a complex, sometimes polyphonic framework to tackle cultural values and representations associated with colonial prejudice.

Controversies under the topic of colonialism are common in many cultural products, and since recently also in historical board and video games, that precisely use the historical imaginary of the past to translate into playable items (Borit et al., 2018). These representations of the past are based on recurring topics, often trivialized, which are recognizable by players, and that can lead to action processes such as war, conquest, industrial development, and other items based on Westernized (and colonial) ideas of progress (Said, 1978; Norcia, 2019). Murray suggests that primarily games have been looked at through the lenses of technology and playability, and highlights that a postcolonial perspective might be of critical worth if it is able to work "against the grain of profit-and innovation-driven discourses in games" (2018:4). In this light, even relatively abstract games such as the popular *Minecraft* can be read as fully normalizing capitalist extractivism and expansionism (Dooghan, 2019). The recent wave of popularization of board games has raised academic interest (Booth, 2021) for some of the abovementioned debates, previously held on videogames, that have now shifted to board games. At the same time, the board games market has been expanding its titles, the list of topics covered, and the gaming structures. Specifically, within historical games, there has been a trend toward hybridizing complex historical game designs and more playable Eurogame forms (Woods, 2012) that have tended to make a more abstract use of history.

A deeper critique of game design as carrying the "perspective of the colonizer" (Borit, et al., 2018) aligns with Spivak's claim (1988) for the impossibility of the subaltern to speak (for us "to play, or be played"), and thus the impossibility of telling History on its own terms. Put in another way, Mukherjee (2018:13) reflects that, also in games, the images of the Orient are always being manufactured and only represent that which colonial imperialism wishes to show and see. Norcia (2019) showed how in the 18th century, British board games targeted to children were consciously designed as imperial management training tools. However, Robinson (2014), asserts that even the conflict-avoidance structure of an Eurogame such as *Catan* (KOSMOS, 1995) may result in the invisibilization of the violence of colonization and produce a vision of colonization without conflict, with no native populations or ethnocide -a frame aligned to national-imperialistic views of conquest and expansion. There have been of course some board games looking for alternate perspectives on

colonialism and the history of nations, such as the case of *This Guilty Land* (Hollandspiele, 2018), based on the political conflicts regarding slavery before the American Civil War. Yet, for the case of videogames –and we could say the same about analogue games–, Mukherjee (2018) has contended that even when intending to offer alternative versions of History they end up "replacing one elite with another, effectively tying into the logic that they seek to overturn" (p. 14).

Postcolonial players' debates online

Beyond recognising that building a playable structure of history and assigning a specific position to players might erode some of the problematic aspects of the past (e.g., the extreme violence that implied massive deaths in slave transportation), or legitimize historical exploitation, we want to focus on how more concerned understandings of history emerge in players' conversations around games. Particularly, to do it through the analysis of the changes in the ethical dimension of the public resonance of games, the interpretations of players, and of the game industry itself. Even if Höglund (2008) asserted that game players and specialized reviewers are more interested in the dynamics and narrative of games than on their politics, our case study shows the emerging centrality of political debates. Since one of the concerns of Postcolonial Studies is "the constant repetition of White European and American values and tropes (...) linked to the seductive and pleasurable aspects of global capitalism" (Trammell, 2022), we aim at observing what tensions arise between the experience of these pleasures and ethical approaches to play, and how these tensions are expressed online. Authors such as Jayanth (2021) and Trammell (2022) have stated how the European colonizer thought ingrained in the same mechanics of play, promotes empathy for the colonizers through incarnating their mechanics, rewarding and making pleasurable the practices of exploitation and subjugation. But, is this one the sole possibility?

In this regard, specialized online forums offer new opportunities for an expanded dialogue between players of diverse backgrounds, game designers, and publishing companies. This way, we can better understand the possibilities of history-telling ingrained in board games, and the critical responses to it that arise from the collision between a cultural artifact (the game, in this case, the prototype *Scramble for Africa*) and its context. As we will see, Höglund's assumption (2008) that board game players are less aware than other cultural consumers of the political discourses embedded in historical representations is forcefully challenged when confronted with online discussion. The popularization of social

networks has opened up a space for discussion where the postcolonial diasporas can express their views (Franklin, 2001) and disseminate public concerns for fairer views of the past, plus the acknowledgment of the need for reparation. The "postcolonial subject" (Spivak, 1999), as multiple as it is, is here a subject of enunciation, successful in building alliances to decenter board game worldviews: "the most profound way any of us can resist the colonial tropes embedded in play theory is to read, learn, and understand what the legacy of colonialism means for those who have lived through it and their descendants" (Trammell, 2022).

We follow Trammell's engagement with a people-centered approach to games and, mainly, play (2022) shifting towards interpretation and debate. As Mukherjee (2018) observes, players' do not necessarily share the cultural values represented in a game and, depending on their position and ideology, might "actualize" what we can understand as the postcolonial experience. The interactive structure of games guides players' construction of meaning and their understanding of historical momentum (Kapell & Elliot, 2013). Despite this, this guidance does not foreclose interpretative freedom and the ability to ultimately transgress games' narratives. In this sense, the decisions that players take while playing a game are diverse (represent a role, take strategic decisions, test what is not permitted in the real world, etc.). Holl, Bernard & Melzer (2020) consider that a game can be read as a continuous iteration of decisions, some of which with a moral load. We sustain that this requirement of continuous decision-taking promotes processes of reflection which expand in-game conversation (Gonzalo & Araña, 2018). Through verbal or performance expressions during the game, players suspend the tale offered by the game and may counteract it through their own knowledge and ideological position (Mukherjee, 2018). The game can thus be understood as an interactive experience with History, but also as a space of dialogue and reflection either during the game or beyond. This is especially relevant in a context in which digital media has expanded the public conversation on the readings of history. Online forums, social networking sites, and online video servers are platforms where players may share games' proposed interpretation or may participate in the version of games' oppositional interpretive frameworks. As Sedelmeier & Baum (2022) highlight, the numerous online debates about colonialism generated among the board game community indicate that "there is an interest in critical questions about the action framework of games not only among Lugologists and Cultural Scientists, but also among the players themselves." (p.97). Moreover, players may contend online about how they feel affected by the relationship of the simulation experience with their personal experience and genealogy.

The flight of Scramble for Africa

On 20 February 2019, GMT Games, mostly known for being a wargame publisher, announced the launch of the prototype of the board game *Scramble for Africa* in their P500 pre-order system. The information released at that moment was minimal, just an outline of the setting of the game: the exploration and colonization of Africa during the 19th century. The game achieved 300 cut orders during its first month, even before the designer included more information. Even if the data was scarce, it seemed that the game format would be close to a Eurogame, in which playability is a priority.

Despite its promising appearance, in April the prototype started to receive fierce criticism on social media, especially on BoardGameGeek (BGG), a digital database and one of the main forums of board games that enriches its content periodically with the participation of more than their 2 million registered users (BGG 2021a). This webpage is considered the main and most significant updated source of information on gaming, and besides reviews and play-aids, it contains a forum section. These forums are moderated in order to warrant an inclusive conversation, free of racist, homophobic, misogynistic, and transphobic comments (BGG, 2021b). In April, GMT editors announced the withdrawal of *Scramble for Africa*, even if previous board games on colonialism such as *Source of Nile* (Avalon Hill, 1979), *Heart of Africa* (Phalanx Games, 2004), *Colonialism* (Spielworxxx, 2013) or *Mombasa* (eggertpiele, 2015) were released without public controversy.

Our research examines the discourses that emerged in the forums of BoardGameGeek (BGG) within this period, the first quarter of 2019. In those days, users generated five different forums of *Scramble for Africa* which overall contained 1002 posts (table 1.1). However, the moderator deleted 316 posts (which equals 31.5 per cent of the total) because these infringed BGG community rules that try to respect different opinions and preserve gender, racial and sexual diversity (BGG, 2021b). Therefore, the total number of available public posts is 686.

Forum title	Number of posts per forum	Number of deleted posts by the moderator
Scramble for Africa	120 posts	0 posts
The Designer did nothing wrong!	202 posts	68 posts
I thought we were past this	457 posts	190 posts
Further game description from the GMT blog – webcache	75 posts	6 posts
How about a new and better Publisher?	148 posts	52 posts
Total number	1002 posts	316 posts

Table 1.1. Number of posts (total and deleted) within the selected forums

We analyzed these conversations during August 2021 by following Braun & Clarke's (2006) guide for thematic analysis methodology. The analysis examined 350 posts (51 per cent of the data corpus) corresponding to users that had intervened 3 or more times in the forums. The posts correspond to 90 different users (with 3 or 4 posts each). In the first stage, we transferred all 350 selected contributions from the forums into a text document and familiarized ourselves with the data. Then, each researcher analyzed the first 80 posts manually using the line-by-line technique which helped to identify theory-driven codes and build a preliminary coding framework. Once codes were agreed upon and naturalized by all researchers, the coding framework was applied to the remaining forum contributions but was constantly revised (in a constant-comparison approach) that merged similar codes and created new ones when it was thought appropriate. In the analysis, we asked in particular how participants position themselves in front of colonialism as a game narrative, how they debate between morality and freedom to play any game, and, what they expect from the game industry. Finally, codes were grouped into the following three main themes: postcolonial players' positions; users' agency and game industry.

Can we play colonialism? Perspectives and players

Playing colonialism is one of the main topics debated in the forums, beyond how the specific discourses, maps or representations of this historical process are made. Results show different user perspectives concerning the suitability of playing *Scramble for Africa* but colonialism and History itself. We have identified four types of players that range from those who state being against playing traumatic episodes of history to those who express enthusiasm about these themes and the re-enactment of power inequalities. In the middle of these antagonist positions, there is a group who considers that colonialism and post-colonialism consequences should be represented with conditions as the topic generates public thoughtful debate. We have categorized their positions as: ethical players, critical players, ludic players, and guilty-pleasure players. As all categorizations, ours have an abstract condition and there are individuals who might have traits of more than one, but they serve us as frames into which to systematize the debates.

The first group, ethical players, broadly condemns board games based on colonial processes under the assumption that historical trauma should not be something playable or enjoyable. This position would adhere with Trammell's notion (2022) that commercial board games are necessarily embedded in colonial thought patterns. Under this regard, some users passionately agree with the idea of the cancellation of *Scramble for Africa*:

I'm someone who thinks there are very few topics that should not be games. This is very close to that line [...] I don't wish to be hyperbolic, but what I see here is barely a step above a train game about the Holocaust in terms of tastelessness (user 23).

Ethical players tend to blame the rest of the users as insensitive for their inability to empathize with those who suffer or are descendants of the oppressed. The debate could be summarized in this post:

User x states: Everyone affected is long dead.

User y replies: A billion Africans might have a different view (user 13).

Even if gamers recognize that consuming representations of exploitation does not turn people into colonial advocates, they advise of the dangers of normalizing biased views of History: "White supremacism is a thing, and while it looks pretty trivial, I could argue that a badly designed game about colonialism could reinforce ideas that white exploitation of Africa was harmless or even beneficial" (user 19). In consequence, ethical players

consider that we have reached a moment where the industry should avoid the publication of more colonialist games. For them, changing the setting of *Scramble for Africa* would solve the problem. This reveals the importance that ethical players give to "themes":

Seriously. Set it on Mars or with exploding Caticorns and this game works just fine without leaning into slavery and prompting players to grog nards over who can optimize colonialist and genocidal strategies the best (user 54).

The second group, critical players, admits the uneasiness and danger of colonial representations of the past. However, they consider that these games enhance a public debate and the development of social consciousness of an oppressive and unfair past. They understand players as reflexive actors with the capacity to interpret and transgress the represented world. Some even consider these games pedagogical as they raise discussion and thoughtful thinking about colonialism and other practices of oppression from today's perspectives, creating a possibility for empathy (Spivak, 2012).

Any cultural product is not necessarily interpreted in the way the designer/sender wishes. [...] Take Tintin in the Congo for instance. That can be used in many ways. [...] In some places, it's banned because it's racist and in other places, it's used to educate on how racist society was not too long ago (user 26).

To me this is shaky ground on which to situate an argument for why a game shouldn't exist; I'd almost go so far as to argue that it's an argument for such a game. [...] Games permit one form of structured inquiry into such questions (user 29).

The will of critical players is to talk about traumatic topics in a conscious way. However, oftentimes their arguments end up being accused by ethical players of whitewashing history. On occasions, critical players must reaffirm their positions on their comments:

Colonialism as a theme for board games should be discussed. Critically [...]. If a game has a colonialist setting, even if players are supposed to represent colonial powers, it does not mean that anyone involved in creating, publishing, or playing the game sees colonialism as harmless or glosses over it (user 58).

Ludic players, the third group identified, consists of those users that believe that a game should not be compared to real-life standards and defend that simulation and playability must be free from ethical constraints. Some of them uphold the idea that games should be dissociated from history. Despite this, it does not imply that the entertainment of the game makes them insensitive to colonialism itself.

IT IS A GAME. [...] And from what I gather the theme is offensive to some. But how many games do we all play that have TERRIBLE themes if you think about? [...] Does playing a game justify murder? No. Does playing a game with a theme like war, slavery or pillaging justify those acts in history? No! (user 17).

This group of players defends the idea that everyone is free to choose what they want to play, despite its topic and ideological position, and disagrees with what they see as "impositions" that try to repair faults from the past. On occasions, the tensions between ethical players and ludic ones are evident as the latter group seems to perceive they are imposed on what could be played or not:

We need to ban *Puerto Rico* and *Mombasa* while we are at it, I guess? Also, my version of *Five Tribes* has the original slave cards, should I throw that away as well? (user 11).

Lastly, if some board games simulating historical oppression and violence have succeeded is due to the fourth category of (silent) players, that we have termed guilty-pleasure ones. This figure recognizes the unethical pleasure of "playing" cruel dynamics of history by perpetrating "politically incorrect" atrocities like slaving and slaughtering people. There is a strong sense of irony in the discourses of these players, and –common with ludic players– a clear separation between the pleasures of playing and the workings of real life. We see this category, even more reluctant to discourse regulation than ludic players, as potentially aligned with the resurgence of an imperial nostalgia that labels every call for colonial consciousness as "woke" (Mitchell, 2021). However, this fourth category appears timidly in just one of the posts. Researchers suspect that some of their comments may have appeared among the 316 posts deleted by the moderator for attempting BGG's community rules that are intended to preserve gender, racial and sexual diversity (BGG, 2021b). The post that supports the designer and uses black humor to defend the game includes references to the pop-culture novel *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad:

I hope the designer sees it, [...] don't give up hope, you did nothing wrong! [...] I totally would have bought this game and played it

wearing a pith helmet drinking gin and tonics until the quinine made my ears ring. Hope it sees the light of day so we can journey into the heart of darkness! The horror, the horror! (user 10).

Context matters: Other sides of the debate

Apart from the intrinsic ethical constraints of players about whether colonialism should be playable or not, or under which conditions, the debate shows underlying tensions related to the economic dimension of games as a cultural product.

In hobby board games, there are several genres (i.e., thematic games, abstracts, euros, or wargames). Most of the specialized participants of BGG are aware of these differences, and some use them as an explanation for how the representation of history should be understood according to genre specificity. While wargames focus on the historical simulation of an event or period and are supposed to deepen into complex topics, Eurogames instead use the historical moment as a catchy setting for its narrative and rely on playability and ludic mechanics. They aim at two market niches: wargames are addressed to knowledgeable audiences, whose interests lie in learning about historical momentum, whereas Eurogames are targeted to family publics who look for entertaining leisure. The difference between these genres has a direct effect on the treatment of colonialism in terms of depth and reality, and some users justify that *Scramble for Africa* barely addresses the underlying history based on its category/genre:

This wasn't going to be a simulation wargame that sought to show what happened or how it could have happened differently. This was a Euro, where your goal is generally to optimize an engine to efficiently generate points (user 49).

Besides, some users raised the fact that they cannot give their judgments about the game, which had not even been released, with the scarce published information. They give the benefit of goodwill to the game, as even in those cases where the games are published and information is fully available, it is not until the moment of playing when the mechanics and dynamics complete the gaming experience:

I myself felt offended by *Labyrinth: The War on Terror, 2001* -? for many years, and it was not until I played the game that I discovered the true intention of the designer – that being the use of a game to

explain historical motivations and interactions between two very different groups. So, maybe this game will be terrible, or maybe it will be great. It's too soon to judge in my opinion (user 22).

Apart from this, some users expressed that their deception about *Scramble for Africa* is not the game itself but the publisher. GMT Games is specialized in wargames, it is its hallmark. The fact that this brand decided to create a Eurogame with a plain narrative has offended its loyal customers who see their favorite publisher sold to commercial decisions.

Board games are a serious medium, and they deserve serious literary discussion, especially GMT which has a record of doing an incredibly good job with their settings and presenting historical research. This game is a fiasco for them (user 28).

GMT have publicly stated that the Euro games are the fastest-growing section of their catalogue. [...] The point is GMT's core audience may not be wargamers in the near future (user 51).

This last point leads us to another debate related to users' agency and freedom. Since the emergence of social media, the market is not only regulated by the law of supply and demand but also by the opinions and images shared by customers on their social media accounts as they have the power to create and shape enterprises' reputations (Scott 2009). Seeing this, the debate focuses on whether the cancellation of *Scramble for Africa* was an act of censorship or a free market. On the one hand, many users feel annoyed that the opinions of a minority led to the withdrawal of the board game, and they claim the self-regulation of the free market: "In the end, I believe no game is too taboo that it can't be published; one man's trash may be another's cup of tea. [...] People who are sensitive [to these topics] could speak with their wallets" (user 2). Some members go further and blame these actions as part of today's cancel culture: "People try to force their opinions about what's right or wrong on others by running campaigns that aim to prevent products from being made and to ruin the companies that are trying to make them. It's vigilantism, public enforced censorship" (user 57). Members also express their concern about these online campaigns as these occur with increasing frequency and put pressure on designer and publisher decisions: "This is happening with increasing regularity in the book world, [...] perhaps I shouldn't be surprised that it's happening in the game world too" (user 60). To fight against GMT's final resolution, some users encourage others to boycott the publisher and ask the designer to self-publish the board game: "I urge Joe Chacon to Kickstart and self-publish this game. Even at a higher price for

a smaller print run. You will find many people willing to back as a protest against censorship” (user 39).

On the other hand, other members defend that the cancellation of the game was part of the free market as it answered GMT’s business resolutions after reading users’ opinions: “A business chose to listen to some feedback from the intended audience and chose not to publish something, which is always their prerogative” (user 35). These users also complain that it seems that colonialism and other topics related with historical traumas seem to be taboo even in the forums as they are easily labeled as “censorship” and mock over other users for using that term easily:

A funny thing about BGG is that we can complain about a game’s mechanics, components, play length, player count, game weight, box size, [...], but the moment anyone objects to a theme for its evocation of historical atrocities or for any other personal ethical reasons, it’s suddenly considered “censorship” and “snowflake pandering” and “oversensitive Social Justice Warrior” bullshit (user 3).

Call it censorship if you want, though know that it absolutely isn't. You probably have an easy life if the closest thing to actual censorship that you've ever experienced is a board game company choosing not to publish a board game (user 48).

Conclusions

This chapter has focused on a representative case of how collective debates and reflections over postcoloniality have entered the gaming community and have transformed the way in which games and play are approached. Overall, these debates illuminate how part of the white masculine gaming culture is being cracked by “postcolonial subjects” (Spivak, 2012) and anticolonial allies. If white men and Eurocentric publishers had been hegemonic in (global) game design and play, the diversification of players and workers in the industries is leading to a more complex positionality in the play of history. This research has stressed the role of the player and the interpreter of the games more generally as an active agent who interacts with known and unknown peers through social networks. At the same time, results have challenged former studies that pointed to the unawareness of players regarding the political dimension of gaming (Höglund, 2018). Nowadays, debates on the reproduction of neocolonial frames on board and videogames are affluent at least on social media.

Besides, these online forums might be sites to forge consciousness and intervene in public opinion and market decisions. These debates are not isolated but situated within a context of a dispute over the decolonization of history and memories, that have had meaningful expressions like throwing down statues of slave traders (Mitchell, 2021). With regards to games, we have observed how “ethical” players consider that it is not possible to play about a traumatic past event without reproducing colonial views. On their side, “critical” players would strive for more accurate and fair game design on these historical processes. “Guilty-pleasure” players and some “ludic” players would instead prefer freedom and so defend that the responsibility of injustice is not to be charged upon games. In a context in which players demand for progressive and inclusive politics through social networks, conservative groups seem to be appropriating “freedom of expression” discourses and blame critical voices for being repressive and leading to a woke cancel culture.

The *Scramble for Africa* case study, beyond contributing to this public debate, has generated discussion in the games industry and has led to a process of reflection about how the sector should be accountable to the past. The conversation conveyed designers and users agree that board games have not traditionally portrayed the perspectives of the oppressed accurately but also recognized that the industry is timidly changing. Thus, in general terms, we can see that the controversy has made people aware of the need for more games on colonialism that give voice and agency to marginalized communities and their perspectives. Participants even suggested specific ideas addressed to publishers about how players would like to game with historical traumatic events like giving a more prominent role to subaltern groups in the game design, or building an overtly critical perspective on the past, as well as quoting counterexamples of games that have made an explicit anti-colonial discourse, such as *Spirit Island* (Arrakis Games, 2017). The emergence of initiatives such as the Zenobia Awards, which seek to promote the inclusiveness of designers of underrepresented groups in the industry and encourages their visions, or also projects under production such as *Free at Last* (The Dietz Foundation) and *Borikén: The Taíno Resistance* (GMT Games) which deal with traumatic and complex topics from the perspectives of the oppressed, are a step that shows the progressive consciousness of the sector or, at least, its reactivity to the public critique.

Reference list

Albrecht, M. 2019. *Postcolonialism Cross-Examined. Multidirectional Perspectives on Imperial and Colonial Pasts and the Neocolonial Present*, Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Ambrosio, T. and Ross, J. 2021. "Performing the Cold War through the "The Best Board Game on the Planet": The Ludic Geopolitics of Twilight Struggle." *Geopolitics* (July): 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2021.1951251>.

BGG. 2021a. "Welcome to BoardGameGeek." Last modified September 5, 2022. https://boardgamegeek.com/wiki/page/Welcome_to_BoardGameGeek.

BGG 2021b. "BoardGameGeek Community Rules." Last modified September 5, 2022. https://boardgamegeek.com/community_rules#tocl.

Borit, C., Borit, M. and Olsen, P. 2018. "Representations of Colonialism in Three Popular, Modern Board Games: Puerto Rico, Struggle of Empires and Archipelago." *Open Library of Humanities* 4(1): 17, 1-40. <https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.211>.

Booth, P. 2021. *Board Games as Media*, London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. 2006. "Using thematic analysis in psychology". *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2): 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.

Brennan, T. 2006. From development to globalization: postcolonial studies and globalization theory. In N. Lazarus (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chibber, V. 2013. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*, London: Verso Books.

Doohan, D. 2019. "Digital Conquerors: Minecraft and the Apologetics of Neoliberalism." *Games and Culture* 14(1): 67-86, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1555412016655678>.

Franklin, M. I. 2001. "Inside Out: Postcolonial Subjectivities and Everyday Life Online", *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 3:3, 387-422, DOI: [10.1080/14616740110078194](https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740110078194)

Gikandi, S. 1996. *Maps of Englishness : writing identity in the culture of colonialism*. New York : Columbia University Press.

GMT Games. 2019. "P500 Update: Removing Scramble for Africa." Accessed 5 September 2022. <https://mailchi.mp/a9c2643ed89c/p500-update-removing-scramble-for-africa>.

Gonzalo, J. y Araüna, N. (2018). "Digitalizando la experiencia analógica de juego: el caso de los juegos (post)coloniales", en Aranda, D.; Sánchez-Navarro, J. y Planells, A.J. *Game & Play: La Cultura del Juego Digital*, Egregius Ediciones, pp. 87-105.

Höglund, J. 2008. "Electronic Empire: Orientalism Revisited in the Military Shooter." *Games Studies* 8(1). <http://gamestudies.org/0801/articles/hoeglund>.

Holl, E., Bernard, S., and Melzer, A. 2020. "Moral decision-making in video games: A focus group study on player perceptions." *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies* 2(3): 278–287. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.189>.

Jayanth, M. 2021. "White Protagonism and Imperial Pleasures in Game Design #DIGRA21". *Medium* <https://medium.com/@betterthemask/white-protagonism-and-imperial-pleasures-in-game-design-digra21-a4bdb3f5583c>

Kapell, M.W. and Elliott, A.B. (Eds.) 2013. *Playing with the past: Digital games and the simulation of history*, Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Mitchell, P. 2021. "Sovereign bodies". In: *Imperial nostalgia*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526159168.00008>

Mukherjee, S. 2018. "Playing subaltern: Video games and postcolonialism." *Games and Culture* 13(5): 504-520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1555412015627258>.

Murray, S., 2018. "The Work of Postcolonial Game Studies in the Play of Culture." *Open Library of Humanities* 4(1): 13. <https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.285>.

Norcia, M.A. 2019. *Gaming Empire in Children's British Board Games, 1836-1860* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429264238>

Robinson, W. 2014. "Orientalism and abstraction in Eurogames." *Analog Game Studies* 1(5). <https://analoggamestudies.org/2014/12/orientalism-and-abstraction-in-eurogames/>

Said, E.W. 1978. *Orientalism*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Scott, D.M. 2009. *The new rules of Marketing and PR. How to use news releases, blogs, podcasting, viral marketing & online media to reach buyers directly*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Sedelmeier, T.; Baum, L. (2022). The Controversy About Colonialism in Board Games—Illustrated by the Example of Santa Maria. In: Edler, D., Kühne, O., Jenal, C. (eds) *The Social Construction of Landscapes in Games*. RaumFragen: Stadt – Region – Landschaft. Springer VS, Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-35403-9_6

Spivak, G. C. 2012. "Spivak on an Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization", YouTube video, 4:48. 20 January 2012 <https://youtu.be/YBzCwzvudv0> [Last accessed 2 November 2022].

Spivak, G. C. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, G. C. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?". In: Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Eds.). *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Trammell, A. (2022). "Decolonizing play", *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 39:3, 239-246, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2022.2080844>

Woods, S. (2012). *Eurogames. The Design, Culture and Play of Modern European Board Games*, Jefferson.: McFarland.