

VIRTUAL HUMAN RIGHTS

30TH MAY, 2017

PROF. RICHARD A. **BARTLE**

UNIVERSITY OF **ESSEX**

INTRODUCTION

- THIS IS A TALK ABOUT **COMPUTER GAMES** AND **HUMAN RIGHTS**
- THESE ARE TWO SUBJECTS THAT ARE **RARELY** DISCUSSED TOGETHER
 - ALTHOUGH NOT ACTUALLY **NEVER**
 - I HAVE SPOKEN ABOUT IT AT MINISTERIAL-LEVEL **EU** AND **COUNCIL OF EUROPE** EVENTS
- THE RELATIONSHIP AND IMPLICATIONS ARE ONLY BEING EXPLORED **SLOWLY**
 - ITS AN AREA **WIDE OPEN** FOR RESEARCH!

BEAR KOMBAT

- HERE'S A PICTURE OF TWO **BEAR CUBS** FIGHTING



- **RAWR!**

FUNDAMENTALS

- WHEN IT COMES TO GAMES AND HUMAN RIGHTS, IT'S **IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER** THAT:
 - **EVERYONE** HAS HUMAN RIGHTS, WHETHER THEY **PLAY** GAMES OR **NOT**
 - THEY PROTECT **PEOPLE** FROM **GOVERNMENTS**
 - COMPUTER GAMES ARE PLAYED BY **PLAYERS**, WHO (BEING **HUMAN**) HAVE HUMAN RIGHTS
 - COMPUTER GAMES ARE DESIGNED BY **DESIGNERS**, WHO (BEING HUMAN) **ALSO** HAVE HUMAN RIGHTS
- MOST OF THE PROBLEMS WE'LL ENCOUNTER CONCERN **COMPETING** RIGHTS
 - NON-PLAYERS *VERSUS* PLAYERS *VERSUS* DESIGNERS

RIGHTS

- PEOPLE HAVE **MANY** RIGHTS, NOT ALL OF WHICH ARE **HUMAN** RIGHTS
 - CONSUMER RIGHTS, FOR EXAMPLE
- UNIQUELY, HUMAN RIGHTS ARE **INALIENABLE**
 - THEY **CAN'T** BE **TAKEN AWAY** FROM YOU
- THEY'RE **BACKED** BY THE UN'S 1948 *UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS*
 - WHICH **TOGETHER** WITH THE *INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS* **PLUS** *INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS* GIVES THE 1966 *INTERNATIONAL BILL OF HUMAN RIGHTS*

THE RIGHT TO PLAY

- NOW BEFORE I START **DISCUSSING** HUMAN RIGHTS, I'LL MENTION A "RIGHT" THAT **ISN'T**
 - THE **RIGHT TO PLAY**
- HUMAN BEINGS HAVE **NO** RIGHT TO PLAY
- THEY **DO** HAVE A RIGHT TO **SELF-EXPRESSION**, WHICH COULD BE **INTERPRETED** AS A RIGHT TO PLAY
- IT'S NOT **JUST** HUMANS THAT PLAY, THOUGH
 - THOSE **BEARS** I SHOWED YOU WERE **PLAYING**
 - THIS IS WHERE **SERIOUS GAMES** COME FROM

TRIGGER WARNING!

- HERE'S SOMEONE GETTING **KNOCKED OUT**



NON-PLAYER RIGHTS

- SO, THE FIRST THING TO NOTE IS THAT GAMES CAN AFFECT **NON-PLAYERS'** RIGHTS
- EXAMPLE GAME 1:
 - COMPUTER GENERATES ONE **SECRET** RANDOM WORD FOR YOU AND **ANOTHER** ONE FOR ME
 - THE **FIRST** ONE OF US TO GET THE OTHER TO **SAY** OUR WORD **WINS**
- EXAMPLE GAME 2:
 - AS EXAMPLE GAME 1 BUT WE TRY TO GET UNINVOLVED **NON-PLAYERS** TO SAY THE WORDS

EXTENDING

- THIS CAN **ANNOY** THE NON-PLAYERS BEING USED AS **PAWNS**, BUT IS IT BREACHING THEIR **HUMAN RIGHTS**?
- WELL, WHAT IF INSTEAD OF GETTING THEM TO **SAY WORDS** YOU **PUNCHED** THEM?
- "WE'RE JUST PLAYING A GAME" **CAN** WORK IF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED GIVE THEIR **CONSENT**
 - **BOXING** (A COMPETITIVE GAME)
- IT FAILS **WITHOUT** CONSENT
 - TO **EXIST**, GAMES **NEED** CONSENT

MAGIC CIRCLE

- THIS INTRODUCES A **CONCEPT** WHICH I ASSUME YOU KNOW: THE **MAGIC CIRCLE**
 - THE SPACE IN WHICH PLAYERS BOUND THEIR ACTIONS
- THE **CONTEXT** IT PROVIDES IS WHAT PSYCHOLOGISTS REFER TO AS A **FRAME**
- A FRAME INCLUDES A SET OF **PERMISSIONS** TO DO THINGS YOU NORMALLY **WOULDN'T**
 - *DARK ROOM SEX GAME*
- FRAMES PROTECT **MANY** ACTIVITIES
 - *EG. **ACTORS** BEING SEXIST/RACIST ON STAGE*

LIMITS

- *BOXING* IS INTERESTING BECAUSE BOXERS **ARE** TEMPORARILY **GIVING UP** A HUMAN RIGHT
 - ARTICLE 3 UDHR: **SECURITY OF PERSON**
- HUMAN RIGHTS LAWS WOULD **ANNUL** ANY **CONTRACT** THAT LET SOMEONE BEAT YOU UP
- IS IT THEREFORE A **GENERAL PRINCIPLE** THAT PEOPLE CAN OPT TO **WAIVE** THEIR HUMAN RIGHTS AS PART OF A **GAME**?
- SHOULDN'T NON-PLAYERS OR THE **STATE** BE ABLE TO **PROTECT** YOU FROM **YOURSELF**?
 - WHAT ABOUT **RUSSIAN ROULETTE**?

1ST MAY, 1945

- OKINAWA



- THERE'S A JAPANESE **SNIPER** IN THAT CHURCH

COLLATERAL DAMAGE

- WHAT IF **MY** GAME-PLAYING OFFENDS **YOU**?
- A 2005 BIG SELLER IN THE USA: *DEER HUNTER*



- THIS GAME NEVER MADE IT TO THE **UK**

WHY?

- GAMES DEPICTING THE KILLING OF **ANIMALS**

- **BAD TASTE**

- NON-PLAYERS
CAN GET

- VERY** UPSET



- GAMES DEPICTING THE KILLING OF **HUMANS**?

- THE UK'S NON-PLAYERS CARE **LESS** ABOUT THAT...!

INSENSITIVITY

- EVEN THOUGH NO **ACTUAL** DEER ARE HURT, IF I SHOOT **VIRTUAL** ONES SOME PEOPLE MIGHT **GENUINELY** BE DISTRESSED TO KNOW THAT
- DOES **MY** PLAY VIOLATE **THEIR** H. RIGHTS?
 - WHAT ABOUT GAMES WITH PLAYER CHARACTERS THAT CAN MOCK YOUR **RELIGION**, KICK **CHILDREN**, CONDUCT **RAPE**, DISPLAY **GORE**?
- **MOVIES** SHOW THESE (MODULO LOCAL LAWS)
- HOW MANY GAMES **DEPICT** ABUSES OF HUMAN RIGHTS **ANYWAY**?

THE SIMS

- HERE'S A SCENE FROM *THE SIMS*



- LATER, HUBBY SETS THE HOUSE **ON FIRE** AND WIFEY SURVIVES BY STANDING IN HIS **WEE**

THE TRIAL REPORT

- A 2009 REPORT BY FRIDA CASTILLO FOR **TRIAL** (“**TRACK IMPUNITY ALWAYS**”) LOOKED AT 20 **FPSS** COVERING CONTEMPORARY **COMBAT**
- SHE JUDGED GAME **CONTENT** AGAINST INT. HUMAN **RIGHTS** LAW AND INT. **HUMANITARIAN** LAW
 - IHRL IS MAINLY ABOUT WAR; IHL IS MAINLY ABOUT PEACE
- **SOME** GAMES SCORED WELL, BUT MANY **DIDN'T**
- THE COMMONEST **VIOLATIONS** DEPICTED WERE:
 - PRINCIPLES OF **DISTINCTION** AND PROPORTIONALITY
 - EG. DESTROYING CIVILIAN **PROPERTY**
 - TORTURE AND CRUEL/**INHUMAN**/DEGRADING BEHAVIOUR

AND YET...

- THE REPORT VIEWS DEPICTION OF IHL/IHRL ABUSES AS BEING UNIVERSALLY A **BAD THING**
- HOWEVER, THIS SHOWS A **LACK** OF UNDERSTANDING OF GAME DESIGN AS **ART**
- EXAMPLE: THE BAD GUYS MAY BE SHOWN USING **TORTURE** SO WE **KNOW** THEY'RE BAD GUYS
 - GOOD GUYS DON'T **DO** THAT!
- THE RIGHT TO SELF-EXPRESSION (“FREEDOM OF SPEECH”) **PROTECTS** THE DESIGNER HERE
 - YOU **CAN** SAY BAD THINGS EXCEPT IN CERTAIN CASES

CONTEXT

- THIS IS A **SCREENSHOT** FROM THE RELEASED-THIS-MONTH GAME *KILL THE FAGGOT*



- IS IT **INCITING** PEOPLE TO **KILL** GAYS?
- **CONTEXT MATTERS**

SINGLE-PLAYER GAMES

- **NON-PLAYER** INTEREST IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND GAMES **PRIMARYLY** CONCERNS:
 - THE USE OF NON-PLAYERS AS **GAME TOKENS**
 - PROTECTING PLAYERS FROM BEING COMPLICIT IN THEIR **OWN** RIGHTS' ABUSES
 - UPSETTING NON-PLAYERS, *EG.* BY GLORIFYING RAPE
 - PLANTING **SEEDS** IN THE MINDS OF PLAYERS THAT HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES CAN BE **ACCEPTABLE**
- THIS LAST POINT BRINGS US TO **SINGLE-PLAYER** COMPUTER GAMES
- HERE'S AN ORDERED **LIST** OF ABUSE DEPICTIONS

DEPICTIONS

- 1) THINGS YOU **SEE** HAPPEN BUT CAN'T **PREVENT**
 - EG. CUT SCENES OF TORTURE
- 2) THINGS YOU CAN **DO** BUT THAT THE GAME **PUNISHES** YOU FOR HAVING DONE
 - EG. MISSION FAIL FOR FIRING ON/SNIPING FROM A CHURCH
- 3) THINGS YOU CAN DO AND THE GAME **LETS** YOU
 - EG. **IMPRISONING SIMS**
- 4) THINGS THE GAME **REWARDS** YOU FOR DOING
 - EG. EXPERIENCE POINTS FOR KILLING PASSERS-BY
- 5) THINGS THE GAME **REQUIRES** YOU TO DO
 - EG. FEASTING ON BEGGARS AS A VAMPIRE IN *OBLIVION*

SOLO PLAY

- IN A SINGLE-PLAYER GAME, YOU CAN'T ABUSE ANYONE **ELSE'S** HUMAN RIGHTS **DIRECTLY** BECAUSE YOU'RE PLAYING BY **YOURSELF**
- ONLY POINT 5) ABOVE COULD BE AN ABUSE OF THE PLAYER'S **OWN** RIGHTS
 - IF I **PERSONALLY** DON'T WANT TO DO BAD THINGS, I SHOULDN'T **HAVE** TO
- THIS BRINGS US TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN **PLAYERS** AND **DESIGNERS**
 - BASICALLY, YOU **DON'T** HAVE TO DO BAD THINGS
 - YOU DON'T **HAVE** TO PLAY **AT ALL**

THE COVENANT

- PROBLEM: HOW DO YOU KNOW **BEFORE** YOU START THAT A GAME **WON'T** ASK YOU TO DO (WHAT YOU THINK ARE) BAD THINGS?
- WELL, DESIGNERS:
 - CREATE A SET OF **GENERAL** EXPECTATIONS AS TO WHERE THE MORAL, GENRE AND GAMEPLAY **BOUNDARIES** LIE
 - **COVENANT** WITH PLAYERS THAT, EVEN THOUGH THE PLAYERS DON'T **KNOW** WHAT'S COMING UP, IT **WILL** FALL **WITHIN** THOSE BOUNDARIES
- BREAKING THE COVENANT **MAY** BE A HR ABUSE

ADDICTION

- IF YOU'RE NOT PLAYING **FREELY**, YOU'RE NOT **PLAYING**
 - I MENTIONED THIS EARLIER AS A **CONSENT** ISSUE
- THERE ARE **OTHER** WAYS TO STOP PEOPLE FROM PLAYING **FREELY**, THOUGH
- YOU CAN USE **CHEAP PSYCHOLOGICAL TRICKS** TO MAKE A GAME **ADDICTIVE**
- ISN'T **THIS** A HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATION?
 - THE **GAMBLING** INDUSTRY AND **GAMIFICATION** SEEM TO GET AWAY WITH IT...

OFLAG IV-C

- THIS IS **COLDITZ CASTLE** IN SAXONY, A PRISONER OF WAR CAMP IN WWII
- 130 ESCAPES
- 36 ESCAPEES MADE IT BACK HOME



INDOCTRINATION

- GAME DESIGN IS AN **ART** FORM
- IT ALLOWS DESIGNERS TO PRESENT **POLITICAL** VIEWS THROUGH **GAMEPLAY** AND **FICTION**
- EXAMPLE: ALL **ELVES** ARE ALOOF, NATURE-LOVING **AESTHETES**; ALL **DWARFS** ARE GREGARIOUS, BEER-DRINKING **BOORS**
- THIS ENDORSES A VIEW THAT STEREOTYPING BY **RACE IS NATURAL** AND **JUSTIFIED**
- DISCRIMINATION BY DESIGNERS **CAN** BE MORE **OPEN**, OF COURSE...

OPEN

- EXAMPLE: THE TRADER **MALAKI** IN A TALE IN *THE DESERT* WOULD **ONLY** TRADE WITH **MALE** CHARACTERS AND WAS RUDE TO **FEMALE** ONES
- IS **THIS** AN ABUSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS?
 - WHICH PEOPLE **PLAY** AS FEMALE CHARACTERS?
- ACTUALLY, IT'S **NOT** AN ABUSE:
 - LOCAL **LAWS** DEAL WITH **INTERPERSONAL** DISCRIMINATION
 - THE **CONVENTIONS** CONCERN **GOVERNMENTAL** DISCRIMINATION OF **ACCESS** TO HUMAN RIGHTS

CHARACTERISTICS

- UDHR ARTICLE 12:
 - “NO ONE SHALL BE SUBJECTED TO ARBITRARY INTERFERENCE WITH HIS PRIVACY, FAMILY, HOME OR CORRESPONDENCE, NOR TO ATTACKS UPON HIS HONOUR AND REPUTATION. EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO THE PROTECTION OF THE LAW AGAINST SUCH INTERFERENCE OR ATTACKS.”
- MMORPGS: NEED I SAY **MORE?**
- HR CONVENTIONS PROTECT PEOPLE FROM GOVERNMENTS **VERY** WELL, BUT FROM EACH OTHER **LESS** WELL...

SCUNTHORPE

- **SCUNTHORPE** IS A STEEL-MAKING TOWN IN LINCOLNSHIRE, ENGLAND



RIGHTS OF THE AVATAR I

- RAPH KOSTER'S **THOUGHT EXPERIMENT**:
 - WHAT IF AVATARS (CHARACTERS) HAD **RIGHTS**?
- RAPH REDRAFTED U.S. **BILL OF RIGHTS** AND FRANCE'S **DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN** IN TERMS OF **AVATARS**
 - [HTTP://WWW.RAPHKOSTER.COM/GAMING/PLAYERRIGHTS.SHTML](http://www.raphkoster.com/gaming/playerrights.shtml)
- ACTUALLY, AVATARS HAVE **NO** RIGHTS
 - RAPH WAS USING THE THOUGHT EXPERIMENT TO SEE WHAT RIGHTS **PLAYERS** HAD
 - THIS IS AN **OFT-MISUNDERSTOOD** PAPER!

RIGHTS OF THE AVATAR 2

- THE ORIGINAL DRAFT OF THE PAPER **SANK** LIKE A **LEAD BALLOON**
- RAPH **RECOUCHED** IT AS "ADVICE TO ADMINS"
 - SOMEONE'S FINGER IS ON THE **POWER** BUTTON
 - WHAT THIS SOMEONE SAYS **GOES**
 - IF THIS SOMEONE DOESN'T PROVIDE A CODE OF CONDUCT, THEIR PLAYERS DESERVE **ALL THEY GET**
 - PLAYERS SHOULD BE **CONSULTED** OVER CHANGES TO THE CODE OF CONDUCT, BUT CAN BE **IGNORED**
 - CODES OF CONDUCT SHOULD BE **FAIR** AND SHOULD BE APPLIED **FAIRLY**

RIGHTS OF THE AVATAR 3

- SO WHAT DOES THIS MEAN IN TERMS OF THE ACTUAL **RIGHTS** OF PLAYERS?
 - PLAYERS HAVE RIGHTS IN THE **REAL** WORLD, OF WHICH THE MMORPG **IS** A PART
 - IN CONSIDERING RIGHTS, MMORPGS SHOULD **ONLY** BE THOUGHT OF IN THEIR REAL-WORLD CONTEXT
 - **PLAYERS**, NOT **CHARACTERS**
 - DEVELOPERS CAN **TAKE THEIR BALL HOME** IF THEY LIKE
 - PLAYERS DON'T **HAVE** TO PLAY BALL IF THEY **DON'T WANT TO**

VIOLATIONS GALORE

- PLAYER RIGHTS CAN THUS BE SUMMARISED AS “IF YOU DON’T **LIKE IT, LEAVE**”
- BUT VIRTUAL WORLD DEVELOPERS **ROUTINELY**:
 - **PUNISH** PLAYERS WITHOUT **TRIAL**
 - **EXILE** THEM
 - RESTRICT FREEDOM OF **EXPRESSION**
 - DESTROY **PROPERTY**
 - INFRINGE **PRIVACY**
- **ALL** OF THESE ARE HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, IF UNDERTAKEN BY GOVERNMENTS

OPERATORS

- MOST **ONLINE** GAMES ARE FACILITATED BY **OPERATING COMPANIES**
 - MICROSOFT, BLIZZARD, VALVE, SONY ETC..
- **ARE THESE EFFECTIVELY GOVERNMENTS** OR DO THEY JUST **LOOK** AS IF THEY ARE?
- WHY IS THIS **IMPORTANT**?
- IN 2010, BLIZZARD TIED **ACCOUNT** NAMES TO **REAL** NAMES
 - **PRIVACY** IS A HUMAN RIGHT (UDHR ARTICLE 12)
 - BLIZZARD BACKED OFF BECAUSE OF PLAYER **OUTCRY**

EXPRESSION

- WELL NO, MMO DEVELOPERS **AREN'T** GOVERNMENTS, THEY'RE **GODS**
- UNLIKE WITH **REALITY**, IT'S EASY TO **SWITCH** MMOS, OR INDEED NOT PLAY **ANY**
- DESIGNERS CAN CREATE AS **OPPRESSIVE** AND **UNFAIR** A WORLD AS THEY LIKE, BECAUSE PLAYERS **DON'T HAVE TO PLAY** IT
 - IF I WANT TO CREATE AN “ESCAPE FROM **COLDITZ**” GAME, I SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO **DO** SO, SURELY?
 - IT'S MY **FREEDOM** OF **EXPRESSION**

EXPRESSION+

- PLAYERS **TOO** HAVE THE RIGHT TO **SELF-EXPRESSION**, WHILE PLAYING
- SOMETIMES, THEY **WANT** TO DO THINGS THAT DESIGNERS WISH THEY **WOULDN'T** DO
 - GANKING NEWBIES, FOR EXAMPLE
- WHOSE RIGHTS OF SELF-EXPRESSION **WIN**?
- WELL, THE **DESIGNERS** WIN, UNDER THE “IT'S **MY** BALL” RULE
 - SO ... **1** DESIGNER TRUMPS **1,000,000** PLAYERS? DOES THAT MAKE **SENSE**?

REFERENCE POINT

- IT MAY SEEM **ODD** TO GIVE PRECEDENCE TO **DESIGNER-CREATED** CONTENT
- DOESN'T FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION MEAN PLAYERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PLAY HOWEVER THEY **LIKE**?
- IN THEORY, **YES**, BUT WHAT HAPPENS WHEN **YOUR** FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION STOPS **ME** FROM PLAYING HOW **I** LIKE?
- "THE PLAYERS" IS **NOT** A SINGLE GROUP!
- THE DESIGNER'S EXPRESSION IS WHAT **ALL** THE PLAYERS SIGNED UP TO **ACCEPT**

PROPERTY

- ANOTHER BIG ISSUE IS **PROPERTY** RIGHTS
 - A **HUGE** AREA IN MMO LAW RESEARCH, SO I'M ONLY GOING TO NOD IN ITS DIRECTION
- UDHR ARTICLE 17.2 SAYS **NO-ONE** SHOULD BE **ARBITRARILY** DEPRIVED OF THEIR PROPERTY
- 28 DEC 2014, AN *EVE ONLINE* SHIP WAS ATTACKED AND **DESTROYED** ALONG WITH ITS CARGO
 - 84 PILOT LICENCE EXTENSIONS WORTH **\$1,500**
- WAS THAT **ARBITRARY**? OR INDEED **PROPERTY**?
- IF THE GAME ALLOWS **STEALING**, IS THAT OK?

MORAL RIGHTS

- UDHR ARTICLE 27.2 TALKS ABOUT THE RIGHT TO PROTECTION OF THE **MORAL INTERESTS** IN YOUR ARTISTIC CREATIONS
 - BERNE CONVENTION: RIGHTS OF **ATTRIBUTION** AND **INTEGRITY**
- THIS MEANS THAT IF **YOU** PUBLISH A **SCREENSHOT** OF **MY** IN-GAME CREATION, I CAN **INSIST** ON ITS **REMOVAL**
- BUT THE VIRTUAL WORLD **ITSELF** PUBLISHES A STREAM OF SCREENSHOTS THE **WHOLE TIME..!**

- CAN **NON**-HUMANS HAVE HUMAN RIGHTS?
- SUPPOSE I CREATED AN MMORPG WITH NPCs SO **SOPHISTICATED** THAT YOU COULDN'T **DISTINGUISH** THEM FROM PEOPLE
- ARE THESE **NPCS** ENTITLED TO HUMAN RIGHTS?
 - THEY'RE **SAPIENT** BEINGS
- CAN YOU **KILL** THEM?
 - WHAT IF THE **ONLY** REASON THEY **EXIST** IS FOR PEOPLE TO **HURT** THEM?
 - IS **NEVER EXISTING** PREFERABLE TO **DEATH**?

WRAPPING UP

- I'VE COVERED **LOTS**, BUT **NONE** OF THESE HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES ARE **HEAVYWEIGHT**
 - NO-ONE IS ON DETENTION WITHOUT TRIAL HERE...
- HOWEVER, MANY **SMALL** RIGHTS ABUSES ARE HAPPENING DAILY TO MANY, **MANY** PEOPLE
- **YOU** GET TO DETERMINE WHAT **YOUR** STANCE IS ON THESE ISSUES – THEY'RE UNDECIDED
- EXAMPLE: IS **DEPICTING** HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS ITSELF A HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATION?
 - AND SHOULD SCUNTHORPE BE **RENAMED**?

CONCLUSION

- THERE ARE A FEW **GUIDING** PRINCIPLES TO BEAR IN MIND WHEN MAKING YOUR ANALYSIS
 - ALWAYS REMEMBER IT'S **PLAYERS** NOT **CHARACTERS** THAT HAVE THE RIGHTS
 - PLAYERS WHO CONSENT **TEMPORARILY** TO GIVING UP A RIGHT SO AS TO GAIN A **GREATER** BENEFIT WILL **NOT** LIKE DO-GOODERS INTERFERING
 - ASSERTING RIGHTS MIGHT BE **SELF-DEFEATING**
 - PREACHING IN GAMES COULD CLOSE THEM DOWN
 - **FRAMES** AND THE MAGIC CIRCLE ARE **CRUCIAL**
 - "IT'S ALL FUN AND GAMES UNTIL SOMEONE LOSES AN EYE"

CODA

- AN EARLY TEXT MMO CALLED **MIST** WAS RUN BY A **TYRANNICAL** ADMINISTRATOR WHO **ALL THE TIME** WOULD **DELETE** OR **IMPRISON** CHARACTERS, **DESTROY** PROPERTY, **BAN** PLAYERS, **INSULT** THEM
 - ALL **ARBITRARILY** AND **ON A WHIM**
- THE PLAYERS **LOVED** IT
 - IT WAS **PART OF THE GAME**
- SHOULD A GAME LIKE **MIST** BE **ALLOWED**?
- A THOUSAND TIMES **YES** IT SHOULD BE ALLOWED!