



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Colonial gamification: Maya representation in Civilization VI

Tsigoni, F.

Citation

Tsigoni, F. (2024). Colonial gamification: Maya representation in Civilization VI. *Inter-Section*, 5(1), 4-11. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4170407>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)


Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4170407>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



INTER-SECTION

Junior Archaeological Research Journal



INTER-SECTION
DECEMBER 2024
ISSUE V

COLONIAL GAMIFICATION

MAYA REPRESENTATION IN CIVILIZATION VI

FOTEINI TSIGONI

ABSTRACT:

This paper analyses the inclusion of Maya culture in historical strategy games, specifically *Civilization VI*. We investigate the game through the perspective of the Maya, marking this nation as important as other non-Western and Western civilizations in the game, to understand what is lacking in its representation. We find that the game depicts a limiting view of the Maya by ignoring important archaeological evidence. This is done by emphasizing Eurocentric notions of how a civilization should develop over time and by disregarding works of anthropologists on historical particularism. This paper emphasizes the representation of the 'Other' and how misunderstood this Other is in the media, such as video games; an industry that had been valued at more than 173 billion dollars in 2021. This shows lack of inclusivity of the Maya influences their cultural heritage and the Pan-Maya movement of the modern Maya peoples.

KEYWORDS:

Civilization VI; Maya peoples; Archaeogaming; Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw; Digital colonialism

Corresponding author email: fotinitsigoni@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The *Civilization* game has been the subject of academic debate over its focus on creating an anti-historical stance and historical alterities by using different 'Nations'. These debates often center around the structure of the game, called 4Xs, which leads to homogenization of nations through genocide and erasure (Chapman, 2013; Ford, 2016; Tharoor, 2016). Adding to that, Western and non-Western civilizations used by the game are seen as distilled versions of themselves and portrayed falsely by the developers (Ghys, 2012; Mol et al., 2017; Mol & Politopoulos, 2021; Politopoulos & Mol, 2021; Rassalle, 2021). This history of misrepresentation was seen recently with the lack of consultation from the Poundmaker Cree nation about the representation of their leader and culture (Carpenter, 2021, 40).

The goal of this paper is to analyze *Civilization VI* from a post-colonial perspective and by looking into the representation of Maya culture and its leader, Lady Six Sky.¹ This representation will be examined in terms of how digital heritage could influence the reception of the culture

and heritage of the Maya peoples. This paper was the outcome of several discussions on ancient and contemporary Maya, influenced by the VALUE (Videogames and Archaeology at Leiden University) foundation lectures. It should therefore be viewed as a thought experiment exploring how digital representations of ancient civilizations are now becoming part of their contextual heritage.

SID MEIER'S CIVILIZATION VI GAME

Sid Meier's Civilization VI is a popular strategy video games on most video game streaming platforms. The first launch of the *Civilization* game was in 1991 by Sid Meier and Bruce Shelley, who created a new game genre known as '4X games'. The four Xs stand for the ability of the player to interact with the world of the game: 'eXploration', 'eXpansion', 'eXploitation' and 'eXtermination' (Mol et al., 2017, 214; Ford, 2016, 4). The goal of the game is to choose a cultural civilization, ancient or modern, out of the 52 available options and to create a strong civilization 'that will stand the test of time' (<https://civilization.com>).² For each civilization to expand the player needs to unlock

¹ "Lady Six Sky" is the Westernised name of the "Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw". As this piece aims to a post-colonial view of the specific Maya representation in *Civilization VI*, all references on the main part of the article will henceforth change the Westernised names to the original Classic Maya names.

² This number is found [https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Leaders_\(Civ6\)](https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Leaders_(Civ6)), which is a list of all the leaders in the game, including the expansions 'Gathering Storm', 'Rise and Fall' and 'Frontier Pass'. The original game contains only 28 leaders.

certain features named 'technologies' and 'civics', which will unlock different 'governments'. To unlock new technologies, the player needs to select and unlock civics from the determined 'civic tree' which advances the civilization culturally. Civics unlock political ideologies from the 'government panel'. Technological development and cultural advancement can be performed faster by building specific structures called 'wonders', such as the Pyramids of Giza and the Eiffel tower (Mol et al., 2017, 214; Firaxis games 2016, 106-12).³ The game can be won through religious, technological, cultural or territorial victory (Firaxis games 2016, 146-50).

Each civilization has its own unique characteristics in the way of portrayal and playing, as well as specific perks and an agenda of ruling to be either more technologically or culturally focused.⁴ Furthermore, the game gives the ability to mix the 'technologies' and the 'civics', to create new scenarios each time the game is played. In a hypothetical situation within the game, the Egyptian civilization can take on technologies from 18th century England in combination with cultural innovations from the Italian Renaissance period. With these characteristics, any political ideologies of a civilization that are found in historical sources can be ignored to create an imaginary scenario that pushes the boundaries of historical reality.

UNDERSTANDING THE 'DIGITAL' MAYA: MAYA REPRESENTATION IN THE GAME

A new collection of leaders and civilizations was introduced, including the Maya civilization with a new Maya

leader introduced in the 'New Frontier Pass' expansion of the *Civilization VI* game, released on May 27th 2020. The choice of the leader, Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw, is different than in previous *Civilization* games, where the Maya were represented by male leaders Pacal II of Palenque ([https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Pacal_\(Civ5\)](https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Pacal_(Civ5)); Firaxis 2007, 29) and Chan Imix K'awiil ([https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Mayan_\(Civ3\)](https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Mayan_(Civ3))).⁵

The new leader is portrayed as a woman with an impressive headdress, holding what seems to be a jade spear and wearing elaborate decorations and dress (Figure 1). Jade is prominent on all the pieces of decoration, such as the jade central piece on the belt that depicts a Panthera. However, the rest of the dress seems simplistic, accompanied by extensive body paint on the face and arms. At first glance, the decoration of the leader seems more 'Maya-nesque' than Maya, and only vaguely recalls the original depiction of Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw on Naranjo stele 24 (Figure 2).

In the game, the most important feature of Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw is the '*Ix Mutal Ajaw*' which is the name of the queen of Tikal, a former Maya ruler depicted in a stela dating to 761 CE (Pillsbury et al., 2017). In the game, this civilization feature grants extra points to the player if they position secondary cities around the capital city. This creates a defense system for the player, as units receive more attack power within the network of non-capital cities around the capital.




Figure 1: Screen shot from loading screen to launch game.

³ The manual does not include any further information about the expansions of the game, 'Gathering Storm', 'Rise and Fall' and 'Frontier Pass'; just the original game with no added features.

⁴ Each leader has specific perks and subsequently, each civilization has its own 'agenda'. For example, Seondeok of the Korean civilization has the 'Cheomseongdae' where her civilization produces more science points to unlock new technologies faster. Jadwiga of the Polish civilization has the agenda of the 'Saint', where she produces religious points easier to spread her religion faster.

⁵ During *Civilization II* and *I* games, there was no representation of the Maya civilization and culture.



Figure 2: Naranjo stela 24, depiction of Lady Six Sky (marked as public domain by Wikimedia Commons).

I. Socio-Political understanding of the city-state network

It was considered for a long time, from the 18th and mid-20th centuries, that the Maya were a peaceful civilization of the New World. However, after a series of archaeological campaigns from the 1960s, this idea has changed (Webster, 2007). According to Smith and Montiel (2001), among the Mayas military engagement was one of the ways of dominating peripheral territory by larger centers. Through archaeological findings, we can trace a unique city-state network: 1) the main capital city, which was the political center; 2) a surrounding dominated territory, which connected through economic exchange the capital and the provinces; and lastly 3) the overall international context which influence of the capital was projected on (Smith & Montiel, 2001, 247; Flannery, 1998, 18).⁶ Societal complexity and craft specialties were characteristics

of the main capital cities, which included glorification of the hegemonic leader of the city-state network (Hyslop, 1990). The relation with the provinces provided economic exchange with this political center (Costin & Earle, 1989; Fox et al., 1996). The way of controlling the different provinces was employed mainly through military conquest, taxation, reorganizing settlements, and cooperation with local elites (Costin et al., 1989; Redmond, 1983; Smith & Heath-Smith, 1994; D'Altroy, 1992; Topic & Topic, 1993). Epigraphers and archaeologists may also include a final category used to indicate ties between cities-states that are not currently understood, as seen in figure 3 (Martin, 2020, 309).⁷

This model could be considered as part of the centralization versus decentralization debate for understanding the different Maya polities (Foias, 2013; Schortman & Urban, 2012). The former accounts for one large city-state, such as Tikal and Caracol, were the main powerful economic centers controlling a large territory, that included different sized city states, thus creating a political hierarchy between city-states that were controlled from one center (Foias, 2013, 61). The later can differentiate depending on the cultural political model adopted, however all are similar when accounting a weakly centralized model (Foias, 2013, 60), as seen in the three-party model mentioned in the previous paragraph. One important point mentioned by Foias (2013) when describing this discourse is that post-processual thought extended the discourse as it included variability of change on both models, meaning that proxies such as power or economic control could be lost. With processual thought in mind, he concluded that the dynamic model given by J. Marcus is significant in having a basic understanding of Maya polities.

The dynamic model is defined as a different perspective into the discourse by showing repetitive cycles of growth and decline within this organization/network system of city-states (Marcus, 1992). Thus, it is suggested that the forementioned three party pattern, in the earlier paragraph, actually changed whenever the main capital city declined and/or another city state gained more economic and political power (Marcus, 1998; Iannone, 2002). To provide evidence of this, a recent survey project conducted in Central Mexico proves that the hegemonic character of the Maya city-state network changed dynamics in circular movements because of political fragmentation (Smith et al. 2021, 380).⁸ This survey provided proof this through ceramic analysis of different periods in the Yauhtepec Valley, in Mexico, that the 'dynamic model', or that power structures were not static, were changing depending on

⁶ It is important to note that a core-periphery approach, as could be suggested in this generic simplification of the city-states' dynamics, has been disputed by later and even more recent studies on this subject (c.f. Schortman & Urban, 2012, 476-478; Smith et al., 2021, 378-382). However, this approach is good to have in mind due to the impact that it had in the conventionalization of network dynamics of Maya city states (c.f. Marcus, 1992, 1998; Iannone, 2002; Smith & Montiel, 2001, among others).

⁷ The figure was originally provided by Martin and Grube (2000) and in the second version, used in this paper, published in 2008. The schematic map of the Maya networks has been adjusted in the Martin (2020) publication due to newly found evidence.

⁸ The survey project results as seen in this publication provide an overview of the urbanization processes of the Yauhtepec Valley of central Mexico. This survey project strived to reconstruct socio-political understanding of the different population centers from the Formative (1100 BCE-100 BCE) until late Colonial period (1650-1820 CE).




Figure 3: Schematic interpretation of the connections included within a Maya city state network in the Classic period (Martin 2020, 308). Reproduced with permission of Cambridge University Press through PLSclear.

economic and political relations between the city states. Even if these descriptions provide an image into the political and economic system of the classic Maya, it must be noted that the complexity of the Mayan civilization has not been fully explored yet.

II. Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw

King of Tikal, B'alaj Chan K'awiil, the father of Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw, placed her as the founding leader of a new royal family at Naranjo. This decision was taken to create a strong alliance between Caracol and Naranjo in 682 CE, as seen in Naranjo Stela 31 (Sharer, 2006, 383; Closs, 1985, 72; Iwaniszewski, 2018, 191). Thus, Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw became sole ruler; something that happened only rarely in Maya royal culture as it was mostly patrilineal (Sharer, 2006, 387; Martin & Grube, 2008, 14). She was never inaugurated as a formal ruler of the city, but was considered as such. Even though she was not considered a 'holy lady', as seen on Naranjo Stela 24 (Closs, 1985, 74; Proskouria-koff, 1960, 466), she carried out the calendrical rituals and recorded them in different stelae, as any male Maya king would. However, Iwaniszewski (2018) suggests that the epigraphical interpretation of Stela 24 is that Lady Wak Chanil Ajaw could be considered as a 'Lunar Goddess'. It is still not clear whether this title is connected to her royal title (Iwaniszewski, 2018, 194; Helmke, 2017, 83). In 695 CE, she started a series of military campaigns to regain secondary centers for the alliance with Naranjo

and reassert authority over the region, as seen on Stela 1 of Naranjo (Sharer, 2006, 390; Martin & Grube, 2008, 75).

CRITICAL REFLECTION

I. How the Maya are represented

The most important aspect of the Maya civilization, which was ignored in its representation, was the politics of the Maya and their city-state networks. It is glaring, once considered the archaeological models presented above, that the game creates an oversimplified perspective of the ancient Maya city-state. For example, even though *Civilization IV* portrays the Mayan civilization as unified, archaeological sources and inscriptions give no indication that the Mayas were ever unified (Martin & Grube, 2008; Foias, 2013). On the contrary, as discussed above, the Mayan civilization followed a dynastic system and each network was often in opposition with the others for ideological, religious or political and economic reasons (Martin & Grube, 2008).

An aspect that could be considered close to the reality of the ancient Maya cities is that *Civ VI* has the function of creating districts with distinct specialities; these districts produce, among other things, various technologies, and serve religious and/or other cultural functions. The big centers of the Maya could be focused on ideological-ritualistic and political and administrative functions (Sanders & Webster, 1988). However, these specialized districts are available for every 'nation' in the game, not just the

cities built by the Maya, therefore suggesting that this is a matter of game structure rather than of historical and social representation.

II. How the game mechanics function and influence the representation

We see that every representation of a nation is influenced by the structure of the game. The game provides specific choices to the player with the technology tree, civic tree, and government panel; drastically reducing the portrayal of civilizations and cultures. By limiting the player with specific technological, cultural, and governmental options, the game oversimplifies the idea of a 'civilization progressing through time'; effectively promoting an anti-historical world (Chapman, 2013). These guided choices about culture and technology could be referred to as 'determinism'. Ghys (2012) argued that technological determinism in games creates a linear way of unlocking and progressing through the game, but at the same time gives us an idea of how people interpret history. He argued that this model is controversial as it represents a history of technology in a linear way, without noting its historic complexity. This deterministic understanding of history has been seen in other historical strategy games, such as *Civilization IV* (2005), *Rise of Nations* (2003), *Empire Earth* (2001) and *Age of Empires* (1997). This determinism could be understood as an oversimplified analysis of history within a Western understanding that serves to 'reduce' the 32 non-Western civilizations.

The 4Xs structure guides nations to have a predatory expansion over the map and encourages colonization over other civilizations. The world of *Civilization VI* is created to give an interactive perspective of storytelling and creates a complex relationship with a hypothetical time and space with protagonists being different civilizations. The game's 4Xs structure leads the player to a clear-cut 'Victorian England' type of colonization over this digital world (Ford, 2016). These last features push the game into a neo-Roman colonization game, as it focuses the player to just do these commands. Thus, diversion from gamification of colonialism is difficult, and the developers intended for the players to play the game in a homogeneous way (Poblocki, 2002; Pötzsch & Hammond, 2012).

On the other hand, we could argue that this 'playground' of history and nations might be appealing. The freedom allowed by the game has created hypothetical historical events. In *Europa Universalis II*, the players could switch the role of nations and "colonize the colonizer", therefore creating anti-historical events; for example, players created a strong enough Oman to take over Zanzibar (Apperley, 2006, 4). This was the original goal of the creator of the game who wanted to create an 'apolitical game', or as he specifically stated in an interview: 'one of our fundamental goals was not to project our own philosophy or politics into things. Playing out somebody else's political philosophy is not fun for the player' (Tharoor, 2016).

THE HERITAGE OF MODERN MAYA PEOPLES

Keeping the above case study in mind, it is important to notice how ancient heritage of minority peoples, such as the Maya, has been continuously misinterpreted and misused by media for profit. This is sadly a common phenomenon, as the misrepresentation and misappropriation of Maya culture has been long present in large-media products, such as movies, television shows, or clothing lines taking 'inspiration' from Mayan indigenous weavers. Even if in the past decades there has been an effort to reduce this phenomenon, it has not yet stopped (Webster, 2007; Arden, 2004). Maya groups have been battling these colonial frameworks from different countries, both their own and foreign. For example, the Pan-Maya movement (created in the 80s as a response to the marginalization of Maya groups by both politics and modern society) aims to address how the international media mistakenly portray the Maya peoples as a homogeneous group with a uniform identity (Vogt, 2015). It is important to realize, then, that the Maya identity is the dialectic that exists between the formation of modern Maya identity and the historical narratives about the Maya; two intertwined and mutually constitutive elements forming a heterogeneous whole.

The example of the *Civilization* series shows how the games' inclusion of minority peoples' heritage was not necessarily intended for the better promotion of marginalized groups, but rather for the social or economic benefit of providing that space. The game dynamics do not promote Mayan history, nor does the way the leaders are portrayed do justice to the way they have been carved on the stelae that archaeologists are still able to study today. Most importantly, there was no collaboration in *Civ IV* with Maya peoples on the subject of their heritage even though the representation of the Maya in *Civ VI* (or any other media) could *de facto* be considered as part of the Maya cultural heritage (Balela & Mundy, 2016; Eklund & Sjöblom, 2019). It follows that this flawed media representation of heritage should have been organized differently: its purpose should not have been to provide a partial (and distorted) image of the Mayan heritage, but also to educate people that lack any background information on the complexity of being part of the modern Maya. In this framework, the notion of collaborative (or community-based) archaeology, as recently promoted by several scholars (e.g., Cipolla, 2021), might provide a profitable framework for future endeavors in the region, promoting an approach that focus on partnerships with local communities both in archaeological research and in media portrayal.

CONCLUSION

Historical strategy video games can create an experience of understanding the uniqueness of each civilization. The fact that *Civilization VI* is showing this uniqueness of nations through colonial tactics is interesting to note. These tactics have not changed through the different versions of the game and made it even more popular, thus encouraging the colonial thinking over different nations

and homogenizing them with a neo-Roman approach. We should respect civilizations and their differences and not try to reduce them to imaginations of them, such as in a historical particularism debate. On the contrary, there is significant potential of engaging with different cultures and interacting with them through 'play'. In this way, historical video games, and other media, can show respect to these civilizations' that experience hardships and continuous marginalization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to dr Alexander Guerds and the editorial team of Inter-Section for their help throughout the process of editing this article, as well as Dr. Shawn Morton for his helpful review. I am grateful for the help of Alejandro J. Garay Herrera and dr Aris Politopoulos for aiding me. Lastly, I want thank Lennart Kruijer for motivating me to write this piece.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apperley, T. (2006). Virtual Unaustralia: Videogames and Australia's colonial history. In P. Magee (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Cultural Studies Association of Australasia Conference 2006*. University of Canberra.

Arden, T. (2004). Where are the Maya in ancient Maya archaeological tourism? Advertising and the appropriation of culture. In Y. Rowan and U. Baram (Eds.), *Marketing heritage: archaeology and the consumption of the past* (pp. 103-116). Lanham: Altamira press.

Balela, M. S., & Mundy, D. (2016). Exploring approaches to the generation and representation of heritage artefacts in video games contexts. *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 26(1), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1326365X16640347>

Carpenter, M. J. (2021). Replaying colonialism: indigenous national sovereignty and its limits in strategic videogames. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 45(1), 33-55. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2021.a776046>

Castaneda, Q. E. (2004). "We are not indigenous!": an introduction to the Maya identity of Yucatan. *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, 9(1), 36-63. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlca.2004.9.1.36>

Chapman, A. (2013). Is Sid Meier's civilization history? *Rethinking history: the journal of theory and practice*, 17(3), 312-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2013.774719>

Cipolla, C. N. (2021). Posthuman potentials: considering collaborative indigenous archaeology. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 31(3), 509-14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774321000202>

Closs, M. P. (1985). The Dynastic history of Naranjo: the middle period. In M. G. Robertson & V. M. Fields. (Eds.), *Fifth Palenque round table, 1983* (pp. 65-77). San Francisco: The Pre-Columbian art research institute.

Costin, C. L., & Earle, T. K. (1989). Status distinction and legitimation of power as reflected in changing patterns of consumption in late pre-Hispanic Peru. *American antiquity*, 54, 691-714. <https://doi.org/10.2307/280677>

Costin, C. L., Earle, T. K., Owen, B., & Russel, G. (1989). Impact of Inka conquest on local technology in upper Mantaro Valley, Peru. In S. E. van der Leeuw and R. Torrence (Eds.), *What's new* (pp. 107-139). London: Unwin Hyman.

D'Altroy, T. N. (1992). *Provincial power in the Inka empire*. Washington DC: Smithsonian institution press.

Eklund, L., & Sjöblom, B. (2019). Lost in translation: video games becoming cultural heritage? *Cultural Sociology*, 13(4), 444-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975519852501>

Firaxis games. (2016). *Sid Meier's Civilization VI Manual*. Myraland: Firaxis games.

Firaxis games. (2007). *Civilization IV: Beyond the sword - Manual*. Myraland: Firaxis games.

Flannery, K. V. (1998). The ground of archaic states. In G. M. Feinman & J. Marcus (Eds.), *Archaic States* (pp. 15-58). Santa Fe: School of American research press.

Foias, A. E. (2013). Reconstructing classic Maya polities. In Foias, A. E. (Ed.), *Ancient Maya political dynamics* (pp. 59-110). Gainesville: University press of Florida.

Ford, D. (2016). 'EXplore, eX pand, eXploit, eXterminate': affective writing of postcolonial history and education in Civilization V. *Game studies: the international journal of game research*, 16(2). <http://gamestudies.org/1602/articles/ford>

Fox, J. W., Cook, G. W., Chase, A. F., & Chase, D. Z. (1996). Questions of political and economic integration: segmentary versus centralized states among the ancient Maya. *Current Anthropology*, 37(5), 795-801. <https://doi.org/10.1086/204563>

Ghys, T. (2012). Technology trees: freedom and determinism in historical strategy games. *Game studies: the international journal of computer game research*. 12(1). http://www.gamestudies.org/1201/articles/tuur_ghys

Helmke, C. (2017). 'The hearth and the stomach of a king': a study of the regency of Lady Six Sky at Naranjo, Guatemala. *Contributions in New World Archaeology*, 11, 83-130.

<https://civilization.com>, accessed 28 July 2021.

https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/List_of_agendas_in_Civ6, accessed 28 July 2021.

[https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Mayan_\(Civ3\)](https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Mayan_(Civ3)), accessed 28 July 2021.

[https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Pacal_\(Civ5\)](https://civilization.fandom.com/wiki/Pacal_(Civ5)), accessed 28 July 2021.

<https://tujaal.org/open-letter-to-archaeologist-richard-d-hansen/>, accessed 19 September 2021.

Hyslop, J. (1990). *Inka settlement planning*. Austin: University of Texas press.

Iannone, G. (2002). Annales history and the ancient Maya state: some observations on the “dynamic model”. *American Anthropologist*, 104(1), 68-78. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/683762>

Iwaniszewski, S. (2018). The observations of the moon at Naranjo – New facts and interpretations. *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry*, 18(4), 191-198.

Marcus, J. (1992). Political fluctuations in Mesoamerica. *National Geographic Research and Exploration*, 8(4), 392-411.

Marcus, J. (1998). The peaks and valleys of ancient states: an extension of the dynamic model. In G. M. Feinman and J. Marcus (Eds.), *Archaic States* (pp. 59-94). Santa Fe: School of American research press.

Martin, S. (2020). Classic Maya networks. In S. Martin (Ed.), *Ancient Maya Politics: a political anthropology of the Classic period 150-900 CE* (pp. 303-319). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Martin, S., & Grube, N. (2008). Introduction & Tikal. In S. Martin and N. Grube (Eds.), *Chronicle of Maya Kings and Queens. Deciphering the Dynasties of the Ancient Maya* (pp. 14-53). London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Mol, A., Politopoulos, A., & Ariese-Vandemeulebroucke, C. E. (2017). “From the Stone age to the information age”: History and Heritage in Sid Meier’s Civilization VI. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 5(2), 214-219. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2017.9>

Mol, A., & Politopoulos, A. (2021). Persia’s victory: the mechanics of orientalism in Sid Meier’s civilization. *Near Eastern Archaeology*, 84(1), 44-51. <https://doi.org/10.1086/713527>

Pillsbury, J., Potts, T. F., & Richter, K. N. (2017). *Golden Kingdoms: Luxury Arts in the Ancient Americas*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Poblocki, K. (2002). Becoming-State: The Bio-Cultural Imperialism of Sid Meier’s Civilization. *Focaal – European Journal of Anthropology*, 39, 163-77.

Politopoulos, A., & Mol, A. (2021). Video games as concepts and experiences of the past. In E. M. Champion (Ed.), *Virtual Heritage: a guide* (pp. 81-92). London: Ubiquity press.

Pötzsch, H., & Hammond, P. (2012). War/game: studying relations between violent conflict, games, and play. *Game Studies: the international journal of computer game research*, 16(2). <http://gamestudies.org/1602/articles/potzschhammond>

Proskouriakoff, T. (1960). Historical implications of a pattern of dates at Piedras Negras, Guatemala. *American Antiquity*, 25(4), 454-75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/276633>

Rassalle, T. (2021). Archaeogaming: when archaeology and video games come together. *Near Eastern Archaeology*, 84(1), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.1086/712387>

Redmond, E. M. (1983). *A fuego y sangre: early Zapotec imperialism in the Culcatlan Canada, Oaxaca*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology.

Schortman, E., & Urban, P. (2011). Power, Memory, and Prehistory: Constructing and Erasing Political Landscapes in the Naco Valley, Northwestern Honduras. *American Anthropologist*, 113(1), 5-21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41407373>

Schortman, E., & Urban, P. (2012). Networks, Cores, and Peripheries: New frontiers in interaction studies. In D. L. Nichols & C. A. Pool (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Mesoamerica Archaeology* (pp. 471-481). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sharer, R. J. (2006). *The Ancient Maya*. Stanford: Stanford University press.

Sid Meier’s Civilization. (2020). *Civilization VI – First look: Maya | Civilization VI – New frontier pass*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IQVks3rQh0>

Smith, M. E., & Heath-Smith, C. (1994). Rural economy in late postclassic Morelos: an archaeological study. In M. G. Hodge and M. E. Smith (Eds.), *Economies and Policies in the Aztec realm* (pp. 349-376). New York: University of Texas press.

Smith, M. E., & Montiel, L. (2001). The archaeological study of empires and imperialism in pre-Hispanic central Mexico. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 20(3), 245-84. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jaar.2000.0372>

Tharoor, K. (2016). *Playing with History: what Sid Meier’s video game empire got right and wrong about*

'Civilization'. Electronic document. <https://longreads.com/2016/10/26/what-sid-meiers-video-game-empire-got-right-and-wrong-about-civilization/>, accessed 27 May 2021.

Topic, J. R., & Topic, T. L. (1993). A summary of the Inca occupation of Huamachuco. In M. A. Malpass (Ed.), *Provincial Inca: archaeological and ethnohistorical assessment of the impact of the Inca state* (pp. 17-43). Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Vogt, M. (2015). The disarticulated movement: barriers to maya mobilization in post-conflict Guatemala. *Latin American politics and society*, 57(1), 29-50. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24765954>

Webster, D. (2007). The uses and abuses of the ancient Maya. In J. Diamond and J. Robinson (Eds.), *The emergence of the modern world conference* (pp. 1-38). Otzenhausen, Germany.

L UDOGRAPHY

Sid Meier's Civilization

1991. PC. MicroProse. MicroProse: Hunt Valley.

Sid Meier's Civilization II

1996. PC. MicroProse. MicroProse: Hunt Valley.

Sid Meier's Civilization III

2001. PC. Firaxis Games. Infogrames: Lyon.

Sid Meier's Civilization IV

2005. PC. Firaxis Games. 2K Games: Novato.

Sid Meier's Civilization V

2010. PC. Firaxis Games. 2K Games: Novato.

Sid Meier's Civilization VI

2016. PC. Firaxis Games. 2K Games: Novato.

Europa Universalis II

2001. Paradox Development Studio. Strategy first: Montreal.

Age of Empires

1997. Ensemble Studios, Big Huge games, Robot entertainment, Relic Entertainment, Hidden path entertainment, Forgotten Empires, World's Edge and Tantalus Media. Xbox games studios: Redmond.

Empire Earth

2001. Stainless Steel studios and Mac Doc software. Sierra entertainment, Activision and Vivendi: Los Angeles.

Rise of Nations

2003. Big huge games and Westlake interactive. Microsoft game studios and MacSoft: Redmond.

INTER-SECTION

Junior Archaeological Research Journal

ISSUE V

DECEMBER 2024

ISSN PRINTED VERSION: 2452-266X (MAX. 200 COPIES)

ISSN ONLINE VERSION: 2452-2678



Universiteit
Leiden
Archaeology