

# WHY SHOULD I PLAY TO WIN IF I CAN PAY TO WIN?

---

*Economic inequality and its influence on the experience of non-digital games*

PATRICK MAISENHÖLDER

## INTRODUCTION

While pay-to-win models are very common in digital games, they are rarely connected to non-digital games. But especially trading card games – like *Magic: The Gathering (MTG)* – show that economic capital can have a huge impact on one's ability to participate successfully in non-digital games. At least, if the game allows you to buy extra content besides the basic game content. It is of course, in games like these, possible to buy the basic game only. But when it comes to competitive gaming in certain game modes, you quickly reach your limits with the content of basic game packs or the content of some booster packs only – even if you are not playing on a professional level but are rather a casual player. Therefore, one is forced to buy cards to stay competitive or has to find other ways in order to make the game enjoyable. For example, by participating in (more) casual playing styles.

In this text, non-digital games that allow you to buy contents that improve your chances to be successful in them, will be analysed from the perspective of Roger Callois' (2001) game concept. The focus will be on the non-digital trading card game *MTG*. Additionally, Bourdieu's (1997) forms of capital are used and extended to show how economic capital can be transformed into

different forms of ingame capital but also how ingame capitals can be transformed into each other. Both concepts are used to explain how and why paying to win can influence the game experience negatively.

Besides asking what the players can do against this problematic phenomenon, questions on the consequences for producers of non-digital games regarding their responsibility will be raised – always keeping in mind that “moral heroism” (moralischer Heroismus) (Kersting, 2008, 19) can not be the solution but rather an approach that tries to arbitrate between economic demands, (media) ethical values and a good gaming experience for ideally every player.

#### WHAT ARE GAMES AND WHY ARE THEY FUN TO PLAY?

According to classic definitions, play is a free action that takes place in a “magic circle” (Huizinga, 1980, 10), i.e. that is distinct from the real world. Play follows rules and it is not connected with material interest. That means, it has its end in itself. You play for the sake of playing. A game is the “place” where play can happen. For example, if you play chess, the game provides the space in which play takes place.

Roger Caillois' (2001) concept builds up on Huizinga's (1980) definition but extends it when it comes to the reasons why games and playing are fun and enjoyable. While Huizinga (1980) mostly focuses on competition, Caillois says that also other mechanisms can be the sources of fun and enjoyment. Besides competition (agon), he lists chance (alea), mimesis (mimicry) and the alteration of perception (ilinx) (cf. Caillois, 2001, 12).

Games that are mostly competitive are fun to play because one can compare one's game-related abilities to those of others (Caillois, 2001). Examples are football, chess or a game of the Call of Duty series. In football, for example, players compare

their rapidity and stamina, in chess, they compare their ability to anticipate and in a game of the Call of Duty series, they compare their quick-aiming abilities. Every competitive game has certain spheres in which the players compete. Thereby, an uncertain outcome is a key factor for the enjoyment of the game. If the result of a match is clear beforehand, it is not perceived as a competition and may therefore lack fun and enjoyment.

Another source of fun in games is chance or alea. This category includes “all games that are based on a decision independent of the player” (Caillois, 2001, 17). That means, games that have “an outcome over which he has no control, and in which winning is the result of fate rather than triumphing over an adversary. More properly, destiny is the sole artisan of victory, and where there is rivalry, what is meant is that the winner has been more favored by fortune than the loser” (Caillois, 2001, 17). In this type of games, the enjoyment is also caused by the uncertain outcome in combination with the possibility to win. In contrast to agon, players have less possibilities to influence the outcome. They can calculate the possibilities, for example in *Blackjack*, but they can not force the needed card(s) to appear by using your strength or other abilities. The role of fortune is bigger in these games.

The other two types – mimicry andilinx – are games which are not as restricted by rules as the other types are. Mimicry can shortly be described as playing a role. “One can [...] escape himself and become another. This is mimicry” (Caillois, 2001, 19). The other type –ilinx – also has to do with an altered perception of reality. But in contrast to mimicry it is not about being another person or taking another role. Games of this type are rather such activities which lead to an altered perception of reality by manipulating the body or the sense organs. This can be achieved by activities leading to “dizziness and disorder” (Caillois, 2001, 12). But also through other activities that change the constitution of the body, i.e. by causing adrenaline rushes, and by that the perception of the world. Callois’ (2001) examples

are “high speed on skis, motor cycles, or in driving sports cars” (p. 25).

### **What is *Magic: The Gathering* and why is it fun to play?**

*MTG* was chosen as an example because with its release in 1993 it is the oldest trading card game and can therefore be seen as a prototype of and for other trading card games. And with its approximately 20 million players around the world, it is also well-known and well played (Duffy, 2015). So its existence on the market, the influence on other trading card games and its popularity were reasons for choosing *MTG* as an example for the possibility to use real economic resources to improve one’s chances to participate successfully in non-digital games.

Since its release *MTG* underwent different alterations but the core principles stayed the same. One of these principles is that there are two or more players that play against each other. The aim of the game is to beat the opponent(s). Therefore, all players are equipped with an own deck that he or she can build himself or herself before the game. Theoretically players can use every card out of every edition (i.e. every card since 1993) to build their deck. So the pool from which players build their decks that have (normally) at least 60 cards in them is theoretically every card ever created for *MTG*. The only limit is that you can have only four identical cards in a deck (except for basic lands). But the pool from which players can choose cards can differ. It depends on the gaming situation which cards are allowed. Everything is possible from cards that are only from the new(er) edition(s) to every card that has ever been produced for *MTG*.



Figure 1, 2, 3. Cards from 1993, 2005, and 2017 different editions. One can see that the style of the cards changed over the years.

The cards have different colors. The core colours are red, blue, white, black and green. Each color has to offer specific abilities and offers a different playing style. While red cards often offer players the ability to damage creatures or players, white cards often have abilities that prevent damage or give back life points. Besides different colors the cards are of different types. There are creatures, sorceries, instants, enchantments, artifacts, lands and even other types. The different card types offer different possibilities but have also different restrictions. If a player wants to cast his or her cards in the game, he or she has to “pay” them with mana that is produced by lands.

Another aspect in which the cards differ is their commonness. There are four types of commonness: common, uncommon, rare or mythic rare (There are even more differentiations possible. But these specifications are not important for the purpose of this text.). In general, the abilities or the effects of the cards or the possibilities and combinations offered by them get better with the degree of their rareness.



*Figure 4. Colours indicating the rarity of a card: Common, Uncommon, Rare, Mythic rare.*

At the beginning of a match, each player draws seven cards from the deck. Each turn a player has to draw one card. The aim is then to play lands to generate mana to cast the different cards in one's hand and ultimately to defeat the opponent(s) with the cards one has at hand. This is either done by reducing the life points of the opponent(s) to zero or less or by reducing the deck of the other person(s) to zero cards because if a player can not draw a card anymore, he or she also loses the game.

The cards can be bought in boosters which contain 15 cards each. They (generally) contain one rare card while the other cards are common and uncommons. One can also buy deck packs which contain playable decks with 60 cards. Single cards can also be bought. There are different possibilities starting with [www.ebay.com](http://www.ebay.com) to trading card specific websites like [www.magiccardmarket.eu](http://www.magiccardmarket.eu). The prices differ according to their release date, their edition, their abilities and also according to their commonness.



Figure 5. How to play *Magic: The Gathering*.

Since *MTG* is played freely by most if not all players, since it has rules, since it takes place in a “magic circle” (Huizinga, 1980, 10) due to the fact that killing creatures or the opponent does not cause real harm and since it is (mostly) played for enjoyment and not for economic resources, it can be assumed to be a game. The sources of enjoyment can thereby be found in three of Caillois’ four categories. Namely *agon*, *alea* and to a certain degree *mimicry*. But while it may be the case that being a mighty wizard or *Planeswalker* is an enjoyable imagination for some people, it seems more likely that besides *mimicry* the factors *competition* and *chance* are the main sources of enjoyment in *MTG* (and also other trading card games like *Yu-Gi-Oh!* and the like).

The competitive part of *MTG* is given in the setting that two or more players try to defeat each other by using their game-related skills, abilities and resources. The ability to think of good combinations of cards, to know when to play which card or

to anticipate the opponents actions can be mentioned here. Therefore you need better cards and/or a better strategy than the other player(s). You also have to be able to react to the actions of your opponent properly, so that his or her play will not be effective or at least not be as effective as he or she would like it to be. So *MTG* has competitive elements on several levels. Since both players can choose from the same card pool, i.e. all *MTG* cards or the editions the players determined as the card pool, the initial position for deck construction are theoretically even and skills and abilities – besides chance – seem to be the only crucial factors for winning.

The other factor which makes *MTG* enjoyable is that it contains some elements of chance. Drawing the first seven cards is always exciting because it can be very crucial for your success in the game. The card that you can draw each turn can be equally important. Knowing that your opponent will defeat you next turn unless you draw that one card that you need for your last-minute victory is a thrilling experience that can occur in some game situations and is clearly a factor of great enjoyment. It can, of course, also be a factor of disappointment but the thrill you feel before drawing the card is an end in itself and this could only exist if it is possible to fail.



*Figure 6. The Pro Tour Ixalan Finals 2017 as an example of competitive gameplay of MTG. Forms of capital and their ingame forms*

When one has to describe games in which one can achieve better results if real capital is used to gain ingame advantages, one can use and transform Pierre Bourdieus (1997) forms of capital. Bourdieu states in his original concept that besides economic capital, it is also possible to accumulate social and cultural capital, whereby cultural capital can be differentiated into institutionalized cultural capital, objectified cultural capital and embodied cultural capital. Bourdieu also states that these forms of capital can be (more or less directly) converted into each other or support each other.

When it comes to games – digital and non-digital – one can use this concept to explain how forms of ingame capital can be converted into each other or support other. Ingame capital will here be described as everything that directly or indirectly improves your chances to win or be successful in a game. Like

the classic forms of cultural capital, cultural ingame capital can either be objectified cultural ingame capital, embodied cultural ingame capital or institutionalized cultural ingame capital. The first form of cultural ingame capital – the objectified cultural ingame capital – can be described as every ingame object that improves your avatar or your chances to win, like weapons, armor, equipment in general, character-bound skills, improved stamina or mana, certain units in strategy games or, when it comes to non-digital games, (specific) cards, certain combos or miniatures. Embodied cultural ingame capital can be described as your abilities and skills as a player. Skills and abilities that one needs for playing directly against other players but also skills that you need for choosing the best equipment and creating your deck, army list or combos and so on belong to this category. Institutionalized cultural ingame capital is everything that shows or is at least an hint for a player's rank and/or experience in the game. Examples are a high level or other qualities, attributes and items bound to your avatar that do not improve your chances to win but are only an aesthetic feature and an alteration of appearance. An example would be a golden weapon in *Call of Duty*. It shows that a player has a high rank but it does not improve the strength of his or her weapon.

Another form of capital that mostly occurs in digital games is economic ingame capital. This is the case because it is mostly only in digital games possible to buy ingame money with real money. This ingame money then allows you also to buy the cultural ingame capitals mentioned above – at least every cultural ingame capital except embodied cultural ingame capital. It can only support the latter. For example, by enabling players to buy helpful objects that improve their playing.

Lastly, there is social ingame capital which is the reputation that players have in a game or a gaming community. It allows them to activate people for the realization of your own goals, i.e. a raiding

another persons or teams base or becoming the member of a clan or gaming group.

Like in Bourdieu's concept, it is assumed here that these forms can also be (more or less directly) converted into each other and support each other. If you play well, i.e. use your skills, abilities but also equipment, you can earn objectified cultural ingame capital as well as institutionalized cultural ingame capital. In return, objectified cultural ingame capital can increase your embodied cultural ingame capital because it can have a positive effect on your playing which may increase your skills and abilities. The conversion of embodied cultural ingame capital into institutionalized cultural ingame capital is possible because if you play well, you can level up faster and/or unlock aesthetic features that do not improve your character but show your rank. Having certain equipment, rank or level then gives you respect in the gaming community because it is a symbol of skill and ability or endurance. That can give you advantages when it comes to finding partners for a raid or something similar that enables or at least helps you to get the other forms of ingame capital. Due to the shortness of this essay, every other possible conversions and transformations will not be explicated. It should only be pointed out that they can directly or indirectly be converted into each other.

Here, it needs to be said that one has to limit the model of forms of ingame capital and the possible transformations. Not every of these forms of ingame capital can be used for every digital or non-digital game. It depends on the mechanisms of the game which form of ingame capital you can use and to what extent. If one analyzes a game, one has to bear that in mind.

One also has to say that the phenomenon of conversing ingame capitals into each other is not problematic in itself. The problem is rather given when game-external capital allows players to increase their forms of ingame capital. For example, if a game

allows you to buy objectified cultural ingame capital with real economic resources. In this case, a game-external capital is used to influence game-internal capitals that give the players in question advantages on different levels as it is mentioned above.

#### PAY TO WIN IN DIGITAL AND NON-DIGITAL GAMES

By using Callois' (2001) categories, it can be shown why the usage of game-external capital to increase game-internal or ingame capital(s) can be a problem from the perspective of the players. As it was mentioned above, games are a "magic circle" (Huzinga, 1980, 10) in which play happens. Two great sources of fun and enjoyment in digital or non-digital games are competition or chance. The idea is that you have theoretically equal starting points and only your game-related skills and abilities or in general your game-internal capitals or your luck are or should be crucial for winning or losing. This is corrupted when players are able to increase their game-internal capitals by using game-external capital and thereby increase their chances to win or be successful tremendously.

Of course, the ideally equal starting points can also be shifted by other factors, like training, experience with and in the game and unlocking weapons and gear and the like. But these forms of improvement are included in the logic of the game and are internal to it – for example, if weapons and gear (objectified cultural ingame capital) are unlocked by using game-related skills and abilities (embodied cultural ingame capital). In other words: If the competition is based on the comparison of game-internal capitals that were increased or are supported by other game-internal capitals or training, there is no problem because this is how the game works. This is what is written down in its rules. How well players of games perform depends on how much time and effort they put in it. In this case, better gear and equipment, a higher level and other advantages are the fruit of one's own game-related labour. The inequality is therefore

dependent on game-internal factors which are part of the logic of the game. The circle is not left or perforated and the transformation of capitals only happens in one sphere of capitals, here: the sphere of ingame capitals.

When players are able to use real economic capital, i.e. game-external capital to influence the game-internal capitals, the magic circle becomes perforated which unbalances the relation between the resources players have at hand and game-related labour. And if this has a tremendous effect on the balance of the competition, a new sphere in which players have to compete comes into play: The sphere of game-external capital. Besides comparing their game-internal capitals, as it is the idea of the game, players now also have to compete in regard to their real economic capital. A subversion of the logic of the game is the consequence which creates a ludic unbalance or asymmetry in favor of the economically strong(er) players which is in the disfavor of economically weak(er) players.<sup>1</sup>

The same works for non-digital games, especially trading card games like the example used in this text: *MTG*. Here players are also able to buy objectified cultural ingame capital, i.e. cards. As it is mentioned above, cards differ in their price according to their abilities and/or commonness. Players with more economic capital are able to use it to buy powerful single cards. They are also able to buy more boosters or deck packs which increases their chances to get rare and/or powerful cards. This enables

1. It should be mentioned here that the ability to use real economic capital to increase one's ingame capitals does not make embodied cultural ingame capital, i.e. game-related skills and abilities useless. They are still important and can not be directly increased by real economic capital. What is meant here is what is said: Real economic capital can shift the chances of winning in favor of the economically strong(er) players because – taking *MTG* as an example – they are not only able to combine magic cards and construct decks but to own and build them in real life and not just theoretically. Skills and abilities still need to be given and can not fully be replaced by the usage of real economic capital that is used for game-internal capitals. But the influence of real economic capital on one's chances to be successful in *MTG* and therefore for a possible good game experience is not marginal which is what this text wants to make plausible.

them to build decks that are really strong and that are almost impossible to defeat when buying basic packs or some boosters only. This influences the competition in favor of the players with more real economic capital by subverting the sources of fun and enjoyment – competition on the basis of game-internal capitals and even chance by making it more possible to draw a card if it is more than one time in a deck – through factors that are external to the game.



Figure 7; 8. Price comparison of a common (\$0.01) and a mythic rare (\$14.40) card. Prices according to <https://shop.tcgplayer.com> (11/11/2017).

Like in other games, buying the basic game is a necessary investment if one wants to play MTG. And what is also quite normal to trading card games is that there are many developer-given possibilities to boost your deck(s), i.e. by buying extra decks or booster packs. So, one could argue that using real economic resources to increase one's objectified cultural ingame capital is part of the game and its rules and therefore no problem at all. A possible argument could be: If players who are not able or willing to spend real economic resources on MTG complain

about this, they do not seem to have understood the game. The negative game experience is a result of the player's wrong understanding of the game and not owed the game itself and its mechanisms.

And prima facie this argument seems to be right. MTG is a trading card game and therefore it is part of the logic of the game to buy, collect and trade cards. In other words: Using game-external capital to own and increase objectified cultural ingame capital is part of the game. But looking at it more closely, one can detect some problematic phenomena that come along with it. And they have to do with how the developers of *MTG – Wizards of the Coast (WotC)* – deal with this.

When one looks at the game-related media products in which *MTG* is presented or explained by *WotC*, a flaw can be detected. This is the case because they explicitly tell (potential) players – i.e. in advertisements – or especially implicitly give (potential) players the impression – i.e. through the rule texts, other game-related texts or videos that explain how to build decks or play *MTG* – that the main sources of fun and enjoyment of *MTG* are competition on the basis of ingame capitals and/or chance, in other words: that winning or losing are (mostly) dependent on game-specific skills and abilities and luck and that you only need a relatively small amount of cards (objectified cultural ingame capital) to play *MTG*.

On their website for example, *WotC* has a 16-page *Quick Start Guide* for *MTG* ([http://media.wizards.com/2014/docs/EN\\_M15\\_QckStrtBklt\\_LR\\_Crop.pdf](http://media.wizards.com/2014/docs/EN_M15_QckStrtBklt_LR_Crop.pdf)). In it, the impression is given that only game-related skills and abilities are crucial for winning or losing since *MTG* is depicted as a game in which you only need “deep strategy” (p. 2) for winning while you just need “some Magic cards” (p. 2) because they are “the tools you use to defeat your opponents” (p. 2). Of course, you need to buy the game, i.e. have to use real economic capital to buy objectified



media products. At least, if the possible influence of real economic resources on the game is theoretically justified and also empirically detectable – which should not be a problem to show in *MTG* or other trading card games. And if this influence is plausible, producers and promoters who do not provide information about the potentially problematic influence of real economic capital on the game experience violate the value truthfulness. This is the case because, as it is mentioned above, they implicitly or explicitly raise wrong expectations with their promotion and explanation of the game and its mechanisms and rules. The expectation is raised that players only need some objectified cultural ingame capital and mainly their game-related skills and abilities to participate successfully in the game. By this, the huge possible influence of game-external capitals – in this case: real economic capital – is unnamed and *truthfulness* therefore violated. In other words: While *WotC* gives the impression that players mostly compete on basis of their skills and abilities (which can be the main reason for buying the game in the first place), they conceal that the game can also include an unofficial sphere of comparison: The real economic capital. (New) Players therefore buy the game in a state of partial knowledge.



**Creature (25)**

- 4 Glint-Sleeve Siphoner
- 3 Hostage Taker
- 4 Longtusk Cub
- 2 Rishkar, Peema Renegade
- 4 Rogue Refiner
- 1 The Scarab God
- 3 Walking Ballista
- 4 Winding Constrictor

**Sorcery (4)**

- 4 Attune with Aether

**Instant (10)**

- 4 Blossoming Defense
- 4 Fatal Push
- 2 Vraska's Contempt

**Land (21)**

- 4 Aether Hub
- 4 Blooming Marsh
- 4 Botanical Sanctum
- 2 Fetid Pools
- 2 Swamp
- 1 Island
- 4 Forest

**60 Cards**

Figure 10; 11: Comparison of prices for the Planeswalker deck (Ca. 15 \$ | More than 300 \$ without sideboard) from the video How to Build Your First Magic Deck and Seth Manfield's Sultai Energy Pro Tour Ixalan deck that is listed in the category Winning decks on <https://magic.wizards.com/en/articles/winning-decks>. Prices according to <https://shop.tcgplayer.com> (11/11/2017).

PLAYERS POSSIBILITIES AND PRODUCERS RESPONSIBILITIES

If a game enables players to highly influence their chances to win

by using real economic capital and if this is generally done in a manner that forces players to also engage in such actions because otherwise it would influence their game experience negatively in a very extreme way as it is described above, it seems that players have three options: either pay the price, i.e. buy cards or play with reduced fun and enjoyment or quit playing. But, as experience shows, that does not have to be case.

Over the years, some forms of casual game modes have developed. In them, factors that make the game enjoyable can not be corrupted by real economic capital fueled objectified cultural ingame capital. In game modes like these, skills, abilities and luck are the crucial factors for winning or losing the game – like ideally in *agon* and *alea*. Examples are *pauper*, *peasant*, *booster draft* or *cube draft*. On their website, *WotC* have a list of these limited formats in which game-related skills and abilities and luck are more crucial for winning than real economic capital (<http://magic.wizards.com/en/game-info/gameplay/rules-and-formats/formats>). In *pauper* for example, you are only allowed to use common cards. Besides this limitation, there is also another limit represented by banned cards. *WotC* have lists on their website where you can see banned cards for *pauper* (<http://magic.wizards.com/en/game-info/gameplay/formats/pauper>). These modes are also included in their weekly event *Friday Night Magic* (<http://magic.wizards.com/en/events/event-types/friday-night-magic>) where players gather to play the game. Formats like these limit the influence of economic resources on the chances to win and make game-related or game-specific skills and abilities and also luck again more crucial for winning or losing. In these formats, economic capital can not have a tremendous negative effect on the gaming experience. They seem to provide a good gaming experience for ideally every and not only economically strong players.

So, besides their flaws in regard to truthfulness, *WotC* has to be mentioned as a positive example for promoting such game

modes. The only flaw that can be found is that the game modes that are not as costly as the *Standard* game mode are not promoted and supported in the same manner. *Pauper*, for example, or even *Modern* have no big tournaments like the Pro Tour (anymore) (<https://magic.wizards.com/en/events/coverage/ptsoi/where-modern-goes-from-here-2016-04-24>). This gives the impression that these modes are not the *real* or *actual* ones and do not provide the full *MTG* experience. The latter only seems to be provided by the game mode in which players have to buy new cards every three months (<https://magic.wizards.com/en/content/standard-formats-magic-gathering>). And also at *Friday Night Magic*, this last game mode – *Standard* – seems to be present the most. So, if the promotion of the – from the perspective of the players – (more) economical game modes and events would be combined with a truthful depiction of the game and the possible influence of real economic capital on the game and the game experience, *WotC* could serve as a good example for other producers of trading card games and also other non-digital games that allow you to improve your chances to win by using real economic resources, like *Warhammer 40.000*.

What does all of this mean for non-digital games that allow the usage of real economic resources to increase game-internal or ingame capitals? From a(n) (media) ethical perspective, one can not say that it is morally wrong to produce games which enable pay to win. It is not a problem in itself that in some games the influence of economic resources is tremendously. That means that it is not a problem if the main sources of enjoyment – competition and chance – are subverted by game-external factors to an extent that makes it almost or fully impossible to be successful in the game for non- or less-paying players. At least it is not a problem if this is transparent for the (potential) players because then it becomes an explicit part of the game's logic. If a game is promoted as a game that gives an advantage to

players who are able and willing to use real economic resources for ingame resources, it is not problematic at all if the game is played and the agents involved in production, distribution etc. gain profit from it. But it can become problematic if a game is intransparent with regard to this.

From the producers view, being truthful thereby does not have to be negative. Being transparent may be rewarded with a better relation to the community and customer loyalty. In other words: *Ethics pay off* (cf. Rath 2006, 126)! And it may also lead the producers to develop (new) game modes or promote those which are less corruptible by real economic capital which may then attract new players. It may also bring back players that quitted playing MTG (or other trading card games) for the same reason.

This, of course, raises the question what truthfulness implicates: What do producers of a game have to make transparent? Another question could be on the outreach of the responsibility of the producers of games: If there is a market for single cards that is not run by the producers, to which extent are the producers responsible for the influence of transactions on these markets on the game? And to what extent do producers have to explicate this in their depiction and description of the game? Questions like these can not be answered here. But the text can be seen as a starting point for reflecting on these topics and questions. Further research has to be done and could eventually – by implementing other and promoting the existing (more) economical game modes – be a factor for reducing the influence of game-external capitals on the game experience.

## REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *The Forms of Capital*. Translated by Richard Nice. In Halsey, A. H. / Lauder, H. / Brown, P. / Stuart Wells, A. (Eds.), *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*. Oxford University Press. 46 – 58.

Caillois, R. (2001). *Man, Play and Games*. Translated by Meyer Barash. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Duffy, O. (2015). How Magic the Gathering became a pop-culture hit – and where it goes next. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/jul/10/magic-the-gathering-pop-culture-hit-where-next>

Huizinga, J. (1980). *Homo Ludens. A Study of the play-element in culture*. Trowbridge and Esher: Redwood Burn Limited.

Kersting, W. (2008). Wirtschaftsethik? – Wirtschaftsethik!. In: Kersting, W. (Ed.), *Moral und Kapital. Grundfragen der Wirtschafts- und Unternehmensethik*. Paderborn: mentis Verlag. 9 – 24.

Rath, M. (2006). Wahrhaftigkeit des Journalismus: Moralanspruch oder Marktfaktor? In: Niesyto, H. / Rath, M. / Sowa, H. (Eds.), *Medienkritik heute*. München: Kopaed. 117 – 128.

Rath, M. (2014). *Ethik der mediatisierten Welt. Grundlagen und Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

### **Webpages**

<http://magic.wizards.com/en/events/event-types/friday-night-magic>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

<http://magic.wizards.com/en/game-info/gameplay/formats/pauper>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

<http://magic.wizards.com/en/game-info/gameplay/rules-and-formats/formats>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

<https://magic.wizards.com/en/content/standard-formats-magic-gathering>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

<https://magic.wizards.com/en/events/coverage/ptsoi/where-modern-goes-from-here-2016-04-24>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

<https://shop.tcgplayer.com> (Accessed 11/11/2017).

## Figures

Figure 1: Aladdin. URL: <http://gatherer.wizards.com/Pages/Card/Details.aspx?multiverseid=955>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 2: Akki Underling. URL: [http://gatherer.wizards.com/Pages/Card/Details.aspx?multiverseid=105214&part=Akki Underling](http://gatherer.wizards.com/Pages/Card/Details.aspx?multiverseid=105214&part=AkkiUnderling). Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 3: Bonded Horncrest. URL: <http://gatherer.wizards.com/Pages/Card/Details.aspx?multiverseid=435287>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 4: Colours indicating the commonness of a card. URL: <https://www.dicesaloon.com/articles/beginners-guide-to-valuing-magic-the-gathering-cards>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 5: How to play *Magic: The Gathering*. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RZyXU1L3JXk>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 6: The Pro Tour Ixalan Finals 2017 as an example of competitive gameplay of MTG. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HFR6Yq9i82k>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 7: Colossal Dreadmaw. <http://gatherer.wizards.com/Pages/Card/Details.aspx?multiverseid=435335>. URL: Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 8: Carnage Tyrant. URL: <http://gatherer.wizards.com/Pages/Card/Details.aspx?multiverseid=435334>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 9: How to Build Your First Magic Deck. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ncGvTC-Uun0>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 10: Aether Revolt – Planeswalker Deck. URL: <https://shop.tcgplayer.com/magic/aether-revolt/aether-revolt-planeswalker-deck-tezzeret>. Accessed 11/11/2017.

Figure 11: Seth Manfield’s Sultai Energy Pro Tour Ixalan. URL: <https://magic.wizards.com/en/articles/winning-decks>. Accessed 11/11/2017.