

---

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH**

---

**SHOULD VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES BE BANNED IN INDIA?<sup>1</sup>****ABSTRACT**

With the recent spate of high-profile homicides, the argument between violence and video games has once again resurfaced. Playing violent video games, according to several individuals and organizations, is morally and ethically undesirable since it contributes to and promotes violence. In this paper, I'll look at the general complaints expressed by such stakeholders, as well as put these objections to the test using a variety of jurisprudential criteria. I'd be concentrating on the to understand these concerns, use a deontological and utilitarian perspective. Furthermore, I attempted to investigate the structure of modern-day video games in order to answer the issue of whether or not there is a relationship between violence and video games. The final point that has been raised is whether such video games should only be controlled or prohibited, and it would be a violation of free expression.

**Keywords:** Kant, Freedom of Speech, Utilitarianism, Video Games, Violence

**INTRODUCTION**

On December 14, 2012, Adam Lanza shot and killed 28 students and staff at his Connecticut elementary school before killing himself in one of the country's deadliest school shootings. This shooting reignited a discussion that has been simmering for some time. The debate over gun laws centres on whether ferocious video games are creation our culture more destructive as auna bridged should be outlawed This, in turn, is founded arranged the idea that here is a shortest relationship among the two. How our future generation is adjusting to violent video games and aggressive behaviors in society violence in video games. As a result, in this article, I'll attempt to appearance at it from a jurisprudential perspective to see how dissimilar theories of jurisprudence might approach as a discussion and problems.

**INITIAL QUERIES**

"Games played using computer power, where computer enforces the game's rules and the game is played on a visual display," according to the definition.<sup>3</sup> Video games have the ability to

---

<sup>1</sup> Bhagesh Gupta, Manipal University, Jaipur

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at [editorial@ijalr.in](mailto:editorial@ijalr.in)

essentially, they may be separated into two categories: one that is regarded 'harmless' since it does not necessitate the use of chemicals, and the other that requires the use of chemicals. One who engages in sports or solves problems and is unobjectionable in society, and another who engages in sports or solves puzzles and is unobjectionable in society set that is violent and requires the player to kill people, creatures, or conduct crimes in order to progress well as complete the game.

From humble beginnings in the 1970s with 'harmless games' like Pong, video games have progressed. As early as 1982, into games like Mystique, where the primary goal is to have fun sex with women who are bounder the 1976 death race. Today's video games also give a fun way to pass the time. a 'sandbox' structure in which the player must pick from a variety of pathways and make decisions if he wants to commit a crime or live a morally upright life. This adaptable framework that has been offered such a game offers the virtual paradigm's choice of selecting one's own life, and leaves it is up to the player to make the<sup>23</sup> decision. But how do we tell the difference among a good and a terrible disposed? Gamers will always<sup>45</sup> consider enjoyment worth of cinematic games, and will occasionally simply consider the degree of visuals and processing to determine what a good and terrible game is. However, when we consider this subject, From the standpoint of the state and politicians, such is characterized by the quantity of money invested. In these games, there is brutality and morality according to the current society's social view point. As a result, how can we assess the intrinsic morality or violence propagated by these videos? Is there a clear relationship between violent video games and real-life physical violence in the physical world?

To respond to such inquiries, we must first examine the virtual moral being and its relationship to physical non-virtual world violence. Would human people use their virtual experience to build or follow their own moral and ethical values? Jose P. Zagal assists us in providing a thorough understanding of the situation. Various moral issues that a player must confront when playing each game, with the opportunity to choose one of them. In every way, make moral and ethical decisions. A wide range of interactive features may be found in games like Grand Theft

---

1 <http://www.ct.gov/despp/cwp/view.asp?Q=517284> visited on 2 May 2013.

2 Miguel Sicart: Game, Player, Ethics: A Virtue Ethics Approach to Computer Games, International Review of Information Ethics Vol. 4, 2005, Pp 14.

4 Ben Pappas, From Pong to Kingpin, Forbes, May 31, 1999, Pp. 54.

5 William Cassidy, Top Ten Shameful Games, Gamespy, 2002,

<http://archive.gamespy.com/top10/december02/shame/index4.shtml> visited on 1 May 2013

Auto. The environment is set up in such a way that players may customize their virtual lives according to the frame work to gain money from the game. The gamer can get money by murdering random passersby or by getting a job in the game, and such actions are made by the player and have commensurate game effects stating that games simply serve as a foundation the player, on the other hand, is free to make his own decisions. As a result, video games with a sandbox format give the player with a lot of options. The player has access to a virtual environment that he or she may explore and control.

### JURISPRUDENTIAL APPROACH

There are several arguments for and against violent video games. The first complaint to violent video games is that they dehumanize and desensitize players toward other people; the second objection is that they objectify humans as things is a verb that implies "towards a goal." These judgments remain severe and well-originated, but can they be continued be maintained once just a sporadic connectivity has been established?

#### 2.1 OBJECTION 1

Eric Harris, the columbine massacre defendant, described his weapon as "straight out of Doom" 18 and was sentenced to life in prison before committing the act, largely influenced by the game, where DOOM is an RPG that includes the mindless goal of murdering creatures in order to progress to the next level of the game the very first is the argument contrary to such video games is that they dehumanize persons and desensitize gamers to other alive beings and ferocity, causing a gamers to grow resistant to such things. Their ethical conscience will be impacted, leading them to do specific activities.

In other medium, the only extension would be in terms of the interpretation of polysemic material, but in video games, the player is in charge of practically every stage of the game, as well as his course and direction and actions. The morality of such conduct is a question in and of itself separate question, but engaging with a different setting, such as your own character in a video game 'The SIMS' engrosses the player, transforming them from a passive audience member to an active participant directing the game itself .As a result, the issue with current games like 'GTA' or 'Manhunt' is not that they reflect brutality that has never been seen before in video games or the public media, but rather that the technical advancements under which they exist allow for a comprehensive realistic description of violence.

As a result, while the first objection is largely supported, the jurisprudential question of liberty and freedom remains unaddressed. The topic of whether such video games should be banned and imposed as a constraint on life and liberty is a difficult one to answer the utilitarian camp's

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at [editorial@ijalr.in](mailto:editorial@ijalr.in)

<https://www.ijalr.in/>

point of view.

## 2.2 OBJECTION II

The second most common argument is that such video games actualize human existences and portray them as simple things may remain walked ended by another human being in order to accomplish the final objective. Humans, on the other hand, are said to comprehend and be able to distinguish between the human and virtual realms. The creators of the 'magic circle' idea claim that all people are rational, aware, and comprehend that video games are separated from reality offer from a different set of norms than those that govern actual society. However, such a debate comes before anything else. Humans play interactive games like Grand Theft Auto, which excite the entire environment as a whole. Any human being's perspective of the actual world surroundings would be unaffected reality.

Returning to the original argument of objectification, Kant's categorical imperatives state that people should not be seen as means to an aim, but as ends in themselves. As a result, murdering people in a game should portray them as an item that serves as a means to an end. In opposition to Kantian thought However, there is a distinction to be made here: games differ in their levels of difficulty. It would be possible to play against other humans or the computer, but it would be difficult.

Only in the first circumstance, when one is in performance against another humanoid, is it difficult in games like Pawn-Strike, where one may argue that one is viewed as a means in and of itself. When a person is playing against the machine, it is all about murdering pixels that no human can see. An individual's state of being can be projected. However, the above-mentioned reasoning is shaky and would be unable to respond to Kant's objection to objectification effectively. As a result, this objection is effective, assuming that gamers would objectify people.<sup>6</sup>

Although this is a weak argument, it may be used to demonstrate that adults are reasonable human beings who can distinguish between the virtual and actual worlds. Some people believe

---

(1) Miguel Sicart: Game, Player, Ethics: A Virtue Ethics Approach to Computer Games, International Review of Information Ethics Vol. 4, 2005, Pp 15.

(2) Matt McCormick, Is it wrong to play violent video games?, Ethics and Information Technology, 2001, Volume 3, Issue 4, Pp 277.

(3) 14 Drabman, R.S. and Thomas, M.H. "Exposure to Filmed Violence and Children's Tolerance of Real-Life Aggression." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 1, 1974, Pp 198; "Does Media Violence Increase Children's

Tolerance of Real-Life Aggression?" Developmental Psychology 10, 1974, Pp 420.

(5) 15 Craig A. Anderson and Brad J. Bushman, Effects Of Violent Video Games On Aggressive Behavior, Aggressive

Cognition, Aggressive Affect, Physiological Arousal, And Prosocial Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Scientific Literature, Psychological Science, Vol. 12, No. 5, September 2001, Pp 355.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at [editorial@ijalr.in](mailto:editorial@ijalr.in)

that playing video games too much causes a person to bridge a gap or converge their interests combining virtual reality with real-life scenarios. However, this has yet to be verified. However, this argument is restricted to when we say that kids would grasp the situation as well as sensible adults, it falls hollow. I would be able to differentiate and make a sensible judgment. As a result, when we add minors in our calculations, A game's concept, game play, and objectives may teach people to feel that violence is acceptable. Acceptable in contemporary society As a result, the existing regulatory concept is well-established.

In addition, bad mouthing during violent video games might be presented as a counter-argument to the complaint of objectification. However, such a situation is once again a challenge all sports where tempers may flare and there is an inherent foul are subject to non-unique damage mouthing, but judging specific words as aggressive and unfriendly is contradictory as a notion. When particular sports or situations are utilised but not others, with the use of phrases like 'Conquer, kill,' and so forth. Furthermore, as observed in other sports such as boxing and others, the participants have a strong desire to win.

### CONCLUSION

It may be stated that, of all the objections raised, Kant's is the sharpest and crudest in terms of why violent video games should be outlawed; despite the fact that there is just a tangential relationship between ferocity and video games, they raid on a distinct ethical foundation. Although ,issues have originate up in a number of court cases. Regardless of where you are in the world, all courts will be open until the end of the year these laws and restrictions have since been overturned as unlawful because they infringe the fundamental rights of people. The notion of freedom of expression, while limited, should be regulated, and such games should be avoided should be offered to a certain demographic of people of a given age range, citing a change in lifestyle. From virtue to freedom and liberty: a jurisprudential perspective.