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Digital Games as History
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1 Introduction

Mr. Everyman is stronger than we are, and sooner or later we must adapt our knowledge to his necessities. Otherwise he will leave us to our own devices, leave us it may be to cultivate a species of dry professional arrogance growing out of the thin soil of antiquarian research. Such research, valuable not in itself but for some ulterior purpose, will be of little import except in so far as it is transmuted into common knowledge. The history that lies inert in unread books does no work in the world.

—Becker (1931, para. 22)

I am told it is June the 6th 1944, 6.35am, just off the coast of Normandy. The sky is grey, the water a little choppy. The other soldiers huddling in the landing craft all look scared. Ahead, one of them nervously taps his rifle against the floor. A commanding voice shouts ‘Clear the ramp, thirty seconds!’ Suddenly, I hear the whistling of distant artillery shells answered nearby by crumps of impact and jets of water. Soldiers flinch with each explosion. The occupants of another close-by landing craft all fall injured or dead, strafed by a swooping enemy fighter-plane. We speed past. With a bang our transport stops. The ramp lowers to the sound of artillery and ricocheting machine-gun fire. Suddenly we are underwater. There are soldiers, some dead, some struggling with wounds and the water is filled with blood and whizzing bullets that leaving spiralling patterns in their wake. Breaking the surface I run forward onto the beach. There are bodies everywhere and in the distance huge concrete bunkers spew machine gun fire. The sounds of explosions, gunfire and men screaming are intense and confusing. I can feel the vibrations of these explosions and each impact is met with a geyser of sand. My objective is only to survive. I run towards a crater occupied by one of my compatriots. With a loud bang the air is filled with fire. I pause for a second, startled. Now the crater is empty, its sole occupant vaporised. Just as I am about to reach the comparative safety of the depression, machine-gun fire stitches the sand in front of me. The beach turns black as my perspective falls to the floor, side-on. There is a distant call for a medic, but it is too late. Abruptly I am confronted by two words: ‘continue’ or ‘exit’.

I put down the controller and sat back almost feeling breathless, turning to my friend who had shown me the game and was waiting eagerly to hear
my reaction. We sat for a few minutes, inspired at least partly by the sense of disempowerment we were unused to games instilling in us and excitedly discussed how terrible and violent D-Day must have been and what a massive undertaking it was. This was not normally how games made us feel, this was not normally what games made us think. Put succinctly, this experience had stimulated our interest not only in the game itself but also the past that it represented. When I try and think of the first time I had the palpable sense, however basic, that maybe videogames could be history, it is this first encounter as a seventeen year old with Medal of Honor: Frontline (a WWII first-person shooter – ‘FPS’) that springs to mind. Look back at the game through the lens of today’s games and its limitations are so noticeable as to be almost laughable. But for us it was meaningful. It had offered us something we couldn’t express, but it was something different to the ways we normally engaged the past. We hadn’t read history or seen history. Instead, we had played it. Our role was not subsumed. It was in fact the exciting point.

Looking back now, I realise that although this experience stuck in my mind, it wasn’t actually the first time that I had engaged history through games. Four years earlier, in 1998, I started playing Age of Empires (see Figure 1.1), a historical real-time strategy (RTS) game that focused on the period spanning from the Stone Age to the Iron Age. My mother, glad to see me playing a game with what she perceived to be a little more in the way of substance, was happy to chat about it. We discussed the difference between

Figure 1.1 Screenshot of Age of Empires.
hunter-gatherer societies and agricultural societies, the changes that the Bronze and Iron Ages had brought about and the importance of technology in history, me drawing on my experiences in the game to do so. Again, we were asserting through our actions, if not our conscious recognition, that games could engage history.

These formative experiences perhaps account for why I have always been so interested in historical games, those games that in some way represent or relate to the past. For me, playing those games obviously felt fun, but I also felt that I gleaned something else from playing them, perhaps some kind of insight, perhaps just a stimulated interest in the past. I imagine that at least some other players (and probably some of the readers of this book) have had a similar sense at some point. *Digital Games as History* is at least partly generated by curiosity about this sensation. More specifically, this book seeks to examine digital games as a historical form by pursuing answers to three questions: How can we approach these historical games as scholars interested in them? How do they represent the past? What opportunities do they offer players in terms of actively engaging with history and historical practice?

**Popular History**

History, it is often claimed, is something in decline. The same anxieties seem to be repeatedly revisited. We worry about the state of history education, that too few study too little history and that the general public are disinterested and have too little knowledge of the past. Though these arguments undoubtedly sometimes have validity, generally they rest on the notion that “history” is a thing definable as only synonymous with official, educational, institutionalised and professional knowledge, forms and practices. This means that both the significance of the popular histories found in mainstream media and the nature of history as an active process of remembering performed by the public as well as professional historians, is often missed. Such perspectives generally ignore the role of the everyday, the local, the unofficial, the familial, the popular. Some scholars, journalists and political commentators, for example, are often highly critical and dismissive of popular history (see, for instance, the reactions of some historians to television history in Hunt 2006). These dismissals are often grounded in two common fears concerning popular engagements with history. First, that the public aren’t actually interested in history and that second, the ways in which the public receive history when they actually do so aren’t the ‘right’ ways. It is worth taking some time to examine both of these concerns.

First, it does not seem that the public and popular culture can really be accused of a lack of interest in the past. For example, Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998) discovered, in their seminal study of popular understanding and uses of the past, that (contrary to these perspectives) history was indeed important to ordinary Americans and a part of their everyday lives. This was
not necessarily, however, the history found in textbooks. Instead, this was a history weaved with hobbies, collections, local and family history, museum visits and drawn from both multiple cultures (other than the typically rather monolithic national history) and cultural resources. Of course, what those who decry popular engagements with the past actually generally mean when they say that the public are not interested in history, is that the public don’t engage with what they have determined to be the ‘right’ history (whether in terms of accuracy or historical topic). This kind of perspective even infiltrates popular perceptions. An anecdotal example: a friend of mine a few years ago said, rather shamefacedly, that he sadly knew nothing about history. I pointed out that, on the contrary, he actually knew an enormous amount about music history, particularly the history of bands such as The Beatles, The Beach Boys and The Dead Kennedys, their members, performances, music and the genres they emerged from and influenced. Hundreds of hours of research (e.g. reading websites, books, magazines, eyewitness accounts, watching performances and interviews and listening to music – including of course rarer or less well-known demos or recordings) had gone into this knowledge and yet he did not consider this to be history because it didn’t match up with ‘proper history’ – the kind of history we would typically find in textbooks. And yet his dedication, practice and knowledge seemed to show many of the hallmarks of the kind of engagement that this ‘proper’ history is supposed to encourage. This example is hardly an isolated case, many of us know a great deal about the history of whatever we are passionate about, whether sports, cars, music or films, for example, yet many of us would probably similarly position ourselves as knowing little about the past.

It also seems rather strange to point to public disinterest in the past when history seems to be more popular than ever. Historical films such as 12 Years a Slave, Selma and The King’s Speech fill cinemas internationally. Historical novels such as Wolf Hall and The Other Boleyn Girl are bestsellers and have sparked a proliferation of similar novels, as well as being adapted for film or television (TV). Indeed, many of the most popular TV dramas, are also historical, series such as Mad Men, Boardwalk Empire and Downton Abbey. And these series can be found alongside huge numbers of historical documentaries and historical reality TV programmes. When in 2006 Cannadine pointed in History and Media to how in the late 1990s and early 2000s “more history was being produced and consumed than ever before” (1), he also noted that in retrospect these years might end up seeming to be “more like a blip than a boom” (2). However, ten years later, this unprecedented interest in history seems to be showing no signs of abatement.

**History Beyond the Academic Word**

This brings us back to the second common objection to popular history. The reason that there are still concerns about popular disinterest, despite this
proliferation of popular interest in the past, is that these examples (although sometimes engaging the ‘right’ histories) are often dismissed because they occur in forms that emerge from popular culture. More specifically they are not the academic history book that is all too often seen as the only appropriate way to represent and engage the past and therefore as synonymous with history itself. This perspective rests on two problematic assumptions “first, that the current practice of written history is the only possible way of understanding the relationship of past to present; and second, that written history mirrors ‘reality’” (Rosenstone 1995, 49). As Schama notes, this first assumption that “real history is essentially coterminal with the printed book … that only printed text is capable of carrying serious argument” (Schama 2006, 23) is a mistake, because western written history both emerges from oral history and is weaved with a number of continuing performative traditions of engagement with the past. But also because perspectives based on the primacy of the word underestimate the power and capabilities of images (often a part of these popular forms), ignoring work in fields such as iconography and iconology. This ignorance, Schama continues to explain, leads to an understanding of images as only expressive of culture (e.g. politics, economics and religion) rather than also possessing the power to constitute it. Furthermore, “If it is true that the word can do many things that images cannot, what about the reverse – don’t images carry ideas and information that cannot be handled by the word?” (Rosenstone 1995, 5). This is an important idea that will be returned to throughout, that perhaps comparisons between historical forms should therefore not be focused on judgements about what is ‘better’ or ‘worse’ but what is different and what types of engagement with the past this allows. After all, even “language itself is only a convention for doing history – one that privileges certain elements: facts, analysis, linearity. The clear implication: history need not be done on the page” (Rosenstone 1995, 11).

Although this means that the chosen form is an important part of how history is constituted (as this book argues), the changes that other forms introduce are not to the extent, epistemically speaking, often imagined by critics. As Munslow explains, “in turning the content of the past into a form like film we are actually not doing much that is very different in narrative-making terms than historians do when they write (2007a, 568)”. For example, historical filmmakers, just like historians, “use preferred arguments, sift the past ideologically, emplot, select the sources to be offered ‘in evidence’, focalise, contract and extend time, make decisions about the relative merits of structure over agency, use rhetoric, acknowledge the role of the reader/viewer, employ inference, and so on” (Munslow 2007a, 569). The same can be said of historical TV drama makers, authors of historical novels, and as I will argue, digital game developers. All these producers of history, regardless of form, make meaning out of the past, they both engage and produce the larger historical discourse and their produced histories are referential – that is to say they are constructed in relation to other narratives about, and
Introduction
evidence of, the past. Problems with identifying these other popular forms as capable of being history only arise when first, as Schama argues in relation to historical television, we judge them “by the degree to which the preoccupations of print historians are faithfully translated and reproduced” (2006, 24). Comparisons of this kind, across not only forms but also differing arenas of historical practice (i.e. the professional and popular), are unfair and comparing the content of popular history in its multitude of forms to professional printed history tells us nothing about the possibilities of these forms.

As these arguments hint at, the rejection of popular history is often not only based on the idea of the primacy of the written word but also the sole primacy of the academic word. However, this ignores that even the claims of academic history as to its mirroring of past realities, capturing the complete truth, have become more uncertain. As Rosenstone puts it, “historians tend to use written works of history to critique visual history as if that written history were itself something solid and unproblematic” (1995, 49). However, the linguistic turn and various postmodernist perspectives have questioned the supposedly unimpeachable authority of written academic history over the past few decades. This is not the place to rehash these debates and the legacy of postmodernism is still arguably undecided. However, it is probably not too much to say that it is more difficult to find a historian in the contemporary landscape of the discipline that does not harbor at least some doubts about the capability of even academic history to truly and entirely capture and reflect the past. Most historians probably (hopefully) have a sense, for example, that history is always constituted under moral and ideological assumptions or decisions, that “all history is situated, positioned and for something or someone” (Munslow 2007b, 41). That history as a narrative pursuit, even on the page, is partly subjective and therefore “has never simply reflected or captured the meaning of the past, but has always created meaning for the past” (Rosenstone 2007, 594). And that history is therefore a fictive construction, neither entirely factual nor (still being based on evidence) entirely fictional.

Although this position has been expanded and convincingly argued in recent decades (by theorists such as Frank Ankersmit, Keith Jenkins, Hayden White, Elizabeth Ermarth and of course Robert Rosenstone and Alun Munslow), many of these later arguments can be traced back to earlier questioning of history’s supposedly objective scientific capabilities. Carr’s What is History? (1961), for example, famously questioned this notion by pointing to the subjectivities of historical writing and research, as did Carl Becker in his 1931 address to the American Historical Association, in which he argued that history is a “story that employs all the devices of literary art (statement and generalization, narration and description, comparison and comment and analogy)” (1931, para. 18). Such ideas do not deny the usefulness of, or need for, history. As Becker puts it, “Neither the value nor the dignity of history need suffer by regarding it as a foreshortened and incomplete representation of the reality that once was, an unstable pattern of
remembered things redesigned and newly colored to suit the convenience of those who make use of it” (1931, para. 23). Nor do such arguments (except in their most extreme of incarnations) deny the existence of facts. We can be certain, for example, that the Battle of Waterloo happened in 1815. Instead the argument is that these facts cannot speak for themselves and they are therefore “necessary (but not sufficient), for our understanding of the past” (Rosenstone 2007, 592). Dates, times and the existence of events contain little inherent meaning and, as such, history is necessarily about selecting particular facts and arranging them in particular ways into narratives and, in doing so, creating and deciding upon meaning.

These ideas have allowed a pluralisation of the past by questioning dominant narratives and, in doing so, allowing hitherto unheard voices and perspectives to speak. However, most relevantly to our current concerns, they have also pluralised because these conclusions about the subjective nature of history apply to all history. Differences between popular and academic history might then be a matter of degree (and purpose), but not kind. We cannot say that one is pure fiction while the other is the pure truth. As Munslow puts it, “there are always elements of the fictive/fictionality in all historying. It is simply unavoidable given that, ontologically, history is a narrative form” (2013, 287). This is not to say that there are no differences between popular and professional history and forms, and historians of the latter type are certainly experts of a particular kind. However, pointing to the subjective nature of all history, regardless of form, does mean that we cannot therefore intrinsically dismiss popular history as incapable of capturing the past without also therefore dismissing at least some aspects of professional history, because “The history written by historians, like the history informally fashioned by Mr. Everyman, is thus a convenient blend of truth and fancy, of what we commonly distinguish as ‘fact’ and ‘interpretation’” (Becker 1931, para. 18).

Part of the problem here is that ‘history’ is a confusing word with a double meaning, “It is the past, but it is also the study and description of the past, storytelling of a particular kind” (Lukacs 2011, 1). Thus, “the past and history are different things” (Jenkins 1991, 7). Whilst the past once existed, it is now gone and the only way we have to engage it is through the subjective narrative representations we call history. It is this distinction, and this notion of the inherent subjectivities of history, that enables us to be able to talk about historical media (that is those media that in some way represent, relate to or use the past) without needing to anchor this solely in their perceived accuracy, i.e. their ability to capture ‘history’ in the sense of its first meaning, through the practice of its second. We can of course make the argument that popular history sometimes gets even the basic facts wrong or misses something out. However, popular history can often, even simultaneously, get many of the facts right and as White puts it, “Every mimetic text can be shown to have left something out of the description of its object or to have put something into it that is inessential to what some reader, with more or less authority, will regard as an adequate description” (1978, 3).
In addition, simply arranging facts is not the only way to make meaning about the past and metaphor and metonymy are also an important part of this, even for professional historians (Munslow 2007b; White 1973). History is always narrative, but this narrative doesn’t necessarily have to detail the exact sequence of events that is understood to have taken place in the past in order to be historical. It is quite common, for example, to use one historical setting to say something about another and indeed professional historians often do this by making comparisons through time. So too, historical narratives (both popular and academic) often summarise, generalise, symbolise and conceptualise. Acknowledging this hints at the possibility that, for example, historical fictions (i.e. those works of history such as films, novels and games that utilise historical settings and yet in which key events or characters might be fictionalised) might also be used to say something meaningful about the past in which they are set. Rosenstone (2001, 61), for example, argues that history on the screen must be at least partly fictional (condensing or compressing events for example) in order to be true, as it cannot possibly be an exact replica of what actually happened. Thus, although still based on what literally happened, the recounting itself can never be literal. We can even propose that fantastical settings and narratives (such as fantasy and science fiction) could still be used metaphorically to argue about the past, offering particular notions of causality or exploring key ideas or concerns by mixing fantastical elements with those that are more conventionally historical. Foucault eloquently adds to these ideas about the complex relationship between fiction and truth when he states:

It seems to me that the possibility exists for fiction to function in truth, for a fictional discourse to induce effects of truth, and for bringing it about that a true discourse engenders or ‘manufactures’ something that does not as yet exist, that is, ‘fictions’ it. One ‘fictions’ history on the basis of a political reality that makes it true, one ‘fictions’ a politics not yet in existence on the basis of a historical truth. (1980, 193)

Fiction therefore, even while being devoid of some of the facts that we might consider to be pertinent, might still be used to say something we consider meaningful, important or even true. Put simply, what all these arguments ultimately mean is that we clearly need a definition of history, or at least the historical, that rests on more than only judgements of perceived accuracy or truth. Whereas facts and evidence are important, history is also more than this in both its popular and professional forms. Even academic histories may sometimes assert something we disagree with or perceive to be wrong, but this does not generally stop us (except in the most extreme of cases) referring to these texts as ‘history’ – being still written in reference to the past. Furthermore, simply criticising the content of individual popular histories on the more conventional basis of accuracy says nothing about the capabilities of the forms through which they are constructed and received and how
these might add to our shared understandings of the past in different ways. Given this and the aforementioned similarities between popular and more conventional histories, it seems more productive to operate through a definition of history based on more than only judgements of including the ‘correct’ facts and which moves beyond the idea of history as only ‘properly’ communicable through the academic book. A definition that doesn’t simplistically place popular engagements with the past and the forms through which they occur as too fictional and/or too formally incapable to be history.

Here we can draw on the work of Rosenstone, who argues that, in order to be historical, a film must only “engage, directly or obliquely, the issues, ideas, data and arguments of the ongoing discourse of history ... the ongoing (multimedia) debate over the importance of events and the meaning of the past” (2001, 62). Rather than separating popular and professional practices and forms, such a definition allows for an exploration of their relationship. This allows us to take a different perspective on popular forms such as historical film, “to suggest that such works have already been doing history, if by the phrase ‘doing history’ we mean, rather than engaging in that traditional discourse (which films clearly cannot do), seriously attempting to make meaning of the past” (Rosenstone 2006, 37). Whereas we can debate what ‘serious’ might mean to different parties (particularly complex a notion in relation to games), the gist of Rosenstone’s perspective seems to be fruitful and one perfectly applicable to forms, of what we can therefore term ‘history’, other than film. Including, digital games.

Popular Perceptions of the Past and Popular History

This moves our definition of history beyond only the ‘official’ history found in academic books and/or as that which sufficiently (by whatever criteria we may use) captures the past. Instead, the historical becomes simply that which attempts to make meaning out of the past, that which uses historical themes, theories, evidence and/or arguments, that which refers to or represents the past or seeks to make a point relevant to how we perceive it (even if it is not a description of that past itself). This allows us to look seriously at the multitude of ways in which the past is actually engaged. For example, work by scholars such as De Groot (2009), Jordanova (2000), Rosenstone (2006) and Samuel (1994) has not only similarly taken popular engagements with, and forms of, history seriously but also, in doing so, has pointed to both the frequent complexity of these engagements and the myriad of ways that they can occur. Underpinning such work is the similar sense that questions focusing only on accuracy or on delineating what can’t be considered history aren’t particularly useful or indeed are even rather irrelevant. After all, these popular forms haven’t waited for the outcomes of these debates and are already working as history out in the world because they are treated as history by audiences who use them as a resource for establishing
an understanding of the past. These histories are therefore one of the many influences on our perception of the past, our historical consciousness, our collective or cultural memory.

This is unsurprising, after all, disciplines such as media, film and literary studies are founded on the notion that media can communicate information and arguments to us and have an affect on our values and how we view the world. So too, history, at least as most of us know it, is not only constructed by historians but also by those involved in the production of multiple different cultural products and engaged in a variety of historical practices, as well as the local discourses with which they connect. Popular forms of history in fact have the potential to be particularly powerful precisely because they are often accessible, engaging and widely experienced. This is easy to demonstrate with a simple thought experiment. Think of the Normandy landings on D-Day. What springs to mind? Is it facts, maps, primary sources and arguments that we might find in a textbook in a history lesson? More likely, at least for those of us who aren’t World War II (WWII) historians, we probably think of images drawn from popular media. Films such as Saving Private Ryan and The Longest Day and for those of us who are gamers, perhaps that opening level of Medal of Honor: Frontline. It is relatively uncontroversial to argue that for most of us imagery and understandings drawn from popular media probably construct the past as much, if not more, than the books of professional historians (on which these popular media are often nonetheless based). After all, it is through popular media that most of us will primarily experience history after school.

The idea that popular media have a role in the construction of our cultural or collective memory is well established in memory studies. Landsberg argues, for example, that it is through contact with experiential popular histories that “a person sutures him or herself into a larger historical narrative” (2009, 222). Similarly, Wertsch (2002) demonstrates that collective memory is at least partially constituted from, and sustained in relation to, textual resources such as images and narratives, which function as cultural tools to aid in the individual appropriation and discussion of shared understandings of the past. Media such as films, documentaries, theatre, novels, cartoons, comics, advertisements and now digital games, are important because they are a widespread and shared source of these images and narratives. Underlying examination of these popular forms is also the idea that these kinds of history are important because, by playing a role in constructing our perceptions of the past, they are also part of forming our identities, our understandings of culture, society and even humanity. They might, as Landsberg puts it, “shape an individual’s subjectivity and politics” (2009, 223).

However, examining popular histories and practices is not only important because they influence our perception of the past but also because they reflect it. For example, Jeffrey Richards writes, in his Visions of Yesterday, that myths are often more important than reality because they shape attitudes and movements (again lending weight to the notion that studying popular
forms and engagements must be done on the basis of more than judgements of accuracy). However, he also adds, “The popular arts have a great deal to tell us about people and their beliefs, their assumptions and their attitudes, their hopes and fears and dreams” (1973, xv). When we approach the past, we frame it through the lenses of the present, for most of us it is relevant only as we see it speaks in some way to this present. And these present day beliefs and ideals can often become startlingly apparent in the denaturalisation that setting them against the backdrop of the past can entail. As such, popular forms and engagements with history are important because they influence the way we see the past and thus have a role in constructing our present day identities, beliefs and ideals. However, they also in turn reflect these present day values and beliefs and demonstrate and affect why and how we turn to the past. It is these kinds of complex cultural cycles of exchange that makes studying how we represent and engage the past important.

In this light, many of the objections we might have to popular forms and practices and their engagements with the past seem to become rather irrelevant. In a sense, whether something is history relies only on an understanding by the audience that the words of the book, actions of the reenactment, images of the film or even the rules of the game relate to something not contained within the text but of the world in which they live and yet in the past. “Often it seems that historians wish to mark history out, to control and boundarise it” (De Groot 2009, 250). However, as Samuel (1994, 8) argues, to understand what history actually is, as a socially constituted idea and practice, we must look at the multitude of different and often popular ways in which it is constructed and received. Even for historians occupying a more conservative viewpoint, seeking “to protect the historical consciousness of the public, they must first understand how that group is informed and resourced” (De Groot 2009, 5). These popular historical forms are how most people engage the past whether we, as scholars, prefer these kinds of engagements or not. We are therefore better placed to seek to understand these engagements and the forms, such as digital games, in which they take place, if we are truly to comprehend the work that history actually does in the world.

Why Study Digital Historical Games?

What this all means is that “It is not professional history that will shape historical consciousness in the future but the yet-to-be-defined relationship between its own highly specialised representational strategies and the unconstrained profusion of popular histories that are being thrown up by various indigenous cultures around the world” (Harlan 2007, 108). In part, this book is an attempt to start to define this relationship with the form of digital historical games. But why look at games in particular? Well, many of the arguments throughout this book will support this focus, but there are three particular reasons that serve as a suitable starting point.
First, digital historical games (i.e. those digital games that make meaning out of the past) are immensely popular. They are a significant part, however inadvertently, of the boom in popular interest in the historical. For example, at the time of writing, the Assassin’s Creed series has sold 93 million copies (Ubisoft Registration Document and Annual Report 2015), the Brothers in Arms series 6 million copies (Ubisoft Annual report 2008) and Sid Meier’s Civilization series 24 million copies (Take-Two Annual Report 2014). Similarly even single historical games can sell in these kinds of numbers. Red Dead Redemption, for example, sold 14 million copies (Karmali 2015) and Call of Duty: World at War, a part of an enormously popular series, sold 11 million copies (McWhertor 2009), even without considering the other historical entries into the series. Recently, upon the release of Total War: Attila, Sega announced that there were now over one million unique players of the series every month (Calvin 2015). Digital games now regularly rival Hollywood and hold many of the biggest entertainment sales records. Many of these games are historical. They might not be bought as histories, purchased instead because they offer good gameplay or are part of a familiar franchise, but in a sense this doesn’t really matter. Players are exposed to the offers of engagement with history and historical representations that these games entail and contain nonetheless. The kinds of sales numbers listed above make some digital historical games amongst the most successful histories of recent years and one of the most popular forms through which the past is engaged. Few history books or series (with perhaps the notable exception of the playful Horrible Histories series) manage sales even approaching these numbers and certainly even fewer academic history books.

It seems quite clear then that games have increasingly taken their place alongside the bricolage of different kinds of forms (e.g. novels, documentaries, films, websites, history books) that make up what we can call popular history. People explored history through games before this, tabletop wargames depicting historical conflicts, for example, have a history of use in military teaching and training, since at least the 19th century (Deterding 2010; Von Hilgers 2012). And indeed the historical development of digital games is also somewhat entwined with popular wargaming (Deterding 2010; Kostlbauer 2013; 2014). However, it is in the turn to the digital game (by which I mean, in a definition which is admittedly reductionist but adequate for our purposes, those games played on a screen) that we see the true proliferation of people engaging the past through games. This popularity means that digital historical games may well already hold a significant degree of power over popular understandings of the past. As such, understanding how the form of digital games works to represent and offer engagements with the past seems to be a worthy topic of investigation.

Second, digital historical games are worthy of our attention because of all of the arguments already made herein for popular history, but in particular the idea that forms other than print can constitute history. More specifically, I have argued previously (Chapman 2013a) for the legitimacy
of digital games as a historical form by pointing to how supposed flaws in
the form are actually epistemic flaws common to the practice of all history
and also to the similarities in the creative construction of game-based his-
tory to our other more traditional forms of history. Similarly, Kapell and
Elliott’s (2013) excellent introduction to their edited volume Playing with
the Past, puts forward a very cogent case that also argues (amongst other
things) that developers’ attempts to represent the past through games have
similarities to the historian’s process. Indeed, this notion that games can
be history underpins most of the existing work on digital historical games
in some way or other, even if not always explicitly acknowledged. It there-
fore seems appropriate to somewhat accept and move beyond this idea. As
such, although the notion that games can be history is certainly important
and will be reinforced by many of the arguments presented within this
book, it will also be at least partly assumed as a point to work from, with
the aim here instead being focused on explaining how they work as his-
tory and what they offer by doing so. This assumption of the potential of
digital games to be history means that I will also assume to use the term
developer-historian, because, as Rosenstone writes in relation to film, “to
accept film makers as historians … is to accept a new sort of history”
(2006, 159). This is not to claim that there are no differences between
the developer-historian and professional historian (who clearly often have
different aims, interests, professional standards and duties), instead by this
term I simply mean to refer to those that make meaning about the past
through the form of digital games. Though this notion may at first seem
outlandish, I hope that why I use this term will become more apparent as
the book progresses.

The third initial reason that the study of digital games as history must
be attended to, is that their enormous popularity is somewhat inversely
matched by how relatively understudied they are. Indeed, the same can be
said of many popular forms of history. As De Groot notes, “such cultural
product widens access to historical appreciation, and it therefore is notable
that the pedagogy, epistemology and methodology of such activities have
not been particularly analysed by historians” (2006, 392), adding that to
ignore popular media suggests “a shirking of a wider public duty” (2006,
411). This duty seems particularly pertinent with visual media as “for every
person who reads a book on a historical topic … many millions of people
are likely to encounter that same past on the screen” (Rosenstone 2006, 12).
In the case of digital historical games specifically, the relative lack of atten-
tion is no doubt partly due to the recency of their ascendance, but also
to the fact that games have only recently begun to be taken seriously as
a form of media in any regard. However, it does seem that “Rather than
dismissing such works … it seems more judicious to admit that we live in
a world shaped, even in its historical consciousness, by the visual media,
and to investigate exactly how … [they] work to create a historical world”
(Rosenstone 2006, 12).
Introduction

Historical Game Studies

Some scholars have begun to do precisely this and it does seem that, what I prefer to term, ‘historical game studies’ (i.e. the study of those games that in some way represent the past or relate to discourses about it), has started to cohere into a small but distinct field of interest. For example, at the University of Gothenburg in 2014, as part of our DSES (Doctoral School in Educational Sciences) initiative, we were able to run a course on historical representation in games that drew 19 PhD students interested in the topic from various parts of Europe and the USA. It is also becoming more common to see papers about historical games presented at a variety of digital humanities, games, heritage and history conferences. For example, the 2014 Challenge the Past conference, also in Gothenburg, had a track (thanks to a kind invitation to add this from organisers Jonathan Westin and Anna Foka) dedicated to digital historical games that eventually saw around 35 papers on the topic presented. Both this and the DSES course provided the critical mass to set up the ‘Historical Game Studies Network,’ a group that currently has over 150 members, who discuss ideas and collaborations and share information and publications relating to historical games. This follows in the footsteps of websites such as PlaythePast.org, which has featured posts on the intersections of history and heritage with games since 2010. As such, although historical games are still relatively understudied, there is increasingly a shared discourse and focus beginning to form, an interest gradually cohering into a field.

In terms of literature, there are a number of journal articles on the topic of historical games (at least 80 individual articles), many of which are referenced herein, as well as a number of individual chapters on the topic in various edited volumes. These publications vary in their disciplinary perspectives (e.g. educational science, media studies, narratology, games design, game studies, cultural studies and of course history, heritage, archaeology and historiography) and engage a broad variety of different themes. However, a few particular strands of interest do seem to have started to coalesce. These are apparent if we turn to the few edited volumes and longer works on the topic of historical games. The aforementioned edited volume, Playing with the Past (Kapell and Elliott 2013), reflects this variety of interests and, in doing so, provides an excellent introduction to thinking about historical games. However, other edited volumes, monographs and theses have focused on more particular issues. These include the use of historical games in conflict simulation (Sabin 2007; 2012), education (Kee 2014; McCall 2011; Squire 2004) and heritage (Champion 2011). Yet other texts have concentrated on the representation of particular historical periods (content) in historical games. Kline’s (2014) edited volume, for example, looks at the representation of the Middle Ages, whilst Winnerling and Kerschbaumer’s (2014a; 2014b) concentrate on representations of Early Modernity. Similarly, Kempshall’s (2015) excellent book gives an in-depth examination of the portrayal of the First World War in digital games. These particular
concerns (conflict simulation, education, heritage and the representation of particular historical content) also crop up regularly in the aforementioned variety of journal articles and individual chapters, alongside some other recurring topics (representations of colonialism in strategy games, or representations of WWII in FPS games, for example).

Just as historical game studies has a variety of disciplinary perspectives and themes, so too there is variety in the games themselves. Digital historical games represent a number of different historical themes and periods and also include enormous variation in terms of their gameplay. For instance, examples of digital historical games might include: WWII FPS games; strategy games focused on particular periods, such as the Roman Empire (or even the whole of human history) sports games where we can reenact famous matches or races from sports history; simulator games where we can drive historical tanks, cars or planes; first-person multiplayer melee games focused on the combat of the Middle Ages; role-playing games inspired by the Chinese wuxia genre and myth; RTS games that allow for alternate histories of the Cold War; open-world action-adventure games in which we explore Renaissance Italian city states or New York in the 1950s; adventure games with contemporary settings that present us with recreations of the material culture of, and information about, the Aztec Empire; puzzle adventure games that explore different perspectives of WWI, as well as any number of other genres, themes and hybrids. Simply put, the variation in what we can call historical games is staggering, both in terms of content and in terms of form.

A Formalist Approach to Historical Games

As such, what approach is needed to allow us to say something about historical games as a whole? What kind of analytical framework can speak to, and across, the areas of interest in historical game studies, and be potentially useful to each, and yet also speak simultaneously to the huge variety of what we can term historical games? The answer seems to lie in looking at the structures of the form itself, both in terms of its universal properties and characteristics and in terms of its variations, in order to examine the implications that it has for both historical representation and players’ engagement with history. In short, this is an approach grounded first and foremost in formal analysis, in order to explain the intersection between games and history. The start of such an approach can be found in the piece that I suspect many scholars (myself included) would posit as the beginnings of the formation of historical game studies. Uricchio’s (2005) seminal chapter, “Simulation, History and Computer Games,” looked beyond the content of individual games to begin to explore the formal relationship between games and history, considering the possibilities of the form and looking at how its structures and possibilities related to contemporary debates in historiography.

It seems that it might be fruitful to both expand and deepen such an approach, given that ultimately every avenue of investigation in relation to
historical games (education, heritage, historical content etc.) will eventually rely on some kind of broader understanding of digital games as a \textit{historical form} (even while often contributing to this understanding). This kind of formalist approach can produce transferable and broadly relevant results. It tells us about the process of historical narration and the opportunities for audiences this creates, as well as about the content that is narrated. It is in essence a search for the core structures and properties of historical games, their language of representation, their ludic aesthetics of historical description, their implications for history and the opportunities that these create. Such an approach therefore aims to map out the form of digital historical games, its variations, possibilities, predispositions and limitations and is also a search for an analytical metalanguage to describe these aspects. It is this kind of formal analysis, using the depth and cohesion of voice that a monograph allows, that \textit{Digital Games as History} aims to at least begin to provide.

As such, this book aims to take a broad viewpoint focused on the digital historical game form itself rather than the interpretation of individual games, the representation of particular historical content, or the uses of games outside of their current role in popular culture (although in doing so it aims to speak to each of these concerns). In a sense then, the book, although still making use of much of the excellent work done in historical game studies, draws most heavily in its approach from texts such as Robert Rosenstone’s \textit{History on Film/Film on History}, Hayden White’s \textit{Metahistory} and Alun Munslow’s \textit{Narrative and History}. Each of these texts similarly attempts to make broader claims about historical form by focusing on particular structures (and subcategories of variation). The approach offered here then aims to examine not only \textit{what} is said in digital historical games but also \textit{how} it is said, by searching for the formal structures that constrain and allow content, the stuff of history, to speak in different ways. And also aims to examine what these formal structures might offer audiences in terms of engaging with history.

As historians, we are generally rather good at interpreting and analysing content, after all this is a core part of our craft. We have perhaps though often been less attentive in our examinations of form. Instead, as Harlan (2007, 110) argues, there is a tendency to examine history produced in other forms with the same approach that we often take to academic history, focusing on accuracy and being concerned only with the analytic ends rather than formal means. In part, this relative inattention is because the relationship between form and content is easy to misalign. As Munslow notes, it seems to often be commonly assumed that “history presupposes the authority of content over form” (2010, 168). However, form always has a role in determining content, influencing what is selected, how this is arranged and ultimately what this therefore says. This is a concept of course eloquently encompassed in McLuhan’s famous phrase “the medium is the message” (1964, 7), by which he meant that the characteristics of the medium have a