SANCTUARY ETHICS REVIEW BOARD

SERB-001 — ON THE CREATION OF SANCTUARY

A Preliminary Institutional Review of Foundational Authority, Interplanar Refuge, and the Rights of Created Populations

Issuing Authority: Sanctuary Ethics Review Board (SERB)
Docket: SERB-001
Classification: Foundational Governance and Institutional Ethics
Date: October 24, 2026
Status: Preliminary Findings and Notice of Institutional Inquiry

Principal Respondents:

- Inarius, Angel and Co-Founder of Sanctuary
- Lilith, Daughter of Mephisto and Co-Founder of Sanctuary
- The Original Angelic and Demonic Founding Assembly, collectively

Interested Parties:

- The Nephalem and Their Descendants
- The High Heavens
- The Burning Hells
- The Angiris Council
- The Horadrim, insofar as surviving historical records may be relevant

Subject: Whether the creation of Sanctuary established legitimate governing authority over its inhabitants, and whether subsequent actions undertaken by its founders were consistent with the ethical obligations arising from the creation of sentient life.

I. NOTICE OF REVIEW

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board hereby opens a preliminary inquiry into the founding circumstances of the world known as Sanctuary.

The Board acknowledges that Sanctuary was established as a refuge from the Eternal Conflict between the High Heavens and Burning Hells.

The Board further acknowledges that withdrawal from perpetual warfare may constitute a legitimate and morally defensible objective.

Indeed, the desire to escape an apparently interminable conflict is not, standing alone, evidence of misconduct.

The Board nevertheless observes that the creation of an inhabited world introduces ethical questions extending substantially beyond the intentions of its founders.

Among these are questions of governance, autonomy, public safety, inherited obligation, and the distinction between creating a place of refuge and claiming permanent authority over its occupants.

Accordingly, this investigation concerns neither the celestial nor infernal nature of the founders as such.

It concerns the consequences of their decisions.

The Board recognizes no general exemption from ethical review arising solely from participation in the creation of a world.

II. ESTABLISHED HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

For purposes of this preliminary investigation, the Board recognizes the following events as supported by the available historical record.

A. The Eternal Conflict

The High Heavens and Burning Hells engaged in a prolonged struggle over the ordering and dominion of existence.

The conflict persisted across immense periods, consuming substantial resources and producing destruction on a scale difficult to calculate.

The Board observes that longevity does not independently establish necessity.

A conflict may be ancient without being unavoidable.

Nor does the existence of an opposing power automatically justify every measure undertaken against it.

B. The Withdrawal of Inarius and Lilith

Inarius, an angel dissatisfied with the Eternal Conflict, and Lilith, a demon similarly disaffected, joined in an effort to escape the hostilities.

They gathered other angels and demons willing to abandon their respective factions.

This coalition sought a location beyond the immediate reach of the warring powers.

The Board provisionally recognizes the founding coalition as an assembly of persons exercising a desire for withdrawal from armed conflict.

Whether that withdrawal was lawful under the respective institutions of Heaven and Hell is not presently determined.

Neither institution has yet established that its claim to perpetual service is itself ethically legitimate.

C. Acquisition and Use of the Worldstone

The founding coalition obtained the Worldstone, an artifact possessing extraordinary creative capabilities and previously contested by the celestial and infernal powers.

The artifact was employed to establish and conceal a separate world.

That world became known as Sanctuary.

The Board identifies the Worldstone as an instrument of exceptional infrastructural significance.

Its use in creating an inhabited world raises questions concerning:

- Authorization and custody.
- Foreseeable consequences.
- Security and containment.

- Access to critical infrastructure.
- The concentration of extraordinary powers in a limited number of individuals.

The Board reserves the question of whether the Worldstone's original acquisition constituted misappropriation for a separate proceeding.

The present inquiry concerns the governance consequences of its use.

D. Emergence of the Nephalem

The angelic and demonic inhabitants of Sanctuary subsequently produced offspring known as the nephalem.

These beings possessed capabilities potentially exceeding those of their progenitors.

Their emergence transformed the ethical character of the founding enterprise.

Sanctuary was no longer merely a refuge inhabited by those who had voluntarily participated in its establishment.

It had become the home of a new population whose members had not participated in the founding agreement and possessed interests distinct from those of their ancestors.

The Board regards this distinction as central.

A refuge established by consenting founders does not thereby become a hereditary possession of those founders.

III. THE QUESTION OF FOUNDATIONAL AUTHORITY

The Board identifies a recurring difficulty in the available account.

The founders of Sanctuary appear to have exercised substantial control over the conditions of its existence.

It does not necessarily follow that they possessed unlimited legitimate authority over those who subsequently inhabited it.

The Board therefore distinguishes three concepts.

First: Creative capacity.

The ability to bring something into existence.

Second: Administrative authority.

The legitimate power to establish and enforce rules governing a community.

Third: Proprietary entitlement.

A claim of ownership over property or resources.

These concepts are neither identical nor automatically interchangeable.

The ability to construct a dwelling does not establish ownership over every person subsequently born within it.

The ability to create a nation does not establish perpetual sovereignty over its descendants.

Likewise, the creation of a world does not, without further justification, establish ownership of its inhabitants.

The Board therefore rejects the proposition that creative capacity alone establishes political legitimacy.

This conclusion does not deny that founders may initially undertake necessary administrative responsibilities.

It instead requires those responsibilities to be distinguished from unlimited authority.

A necessary act of stewardship must remain answerable to the interests of those being stewarded.

IV. ON CONSENT AND THE CREATION OF SENTIENT LIFE

The Board recognizes an immediate philosophical complication.

The nephalem did not exist at the time Sanctuary was founded.

It would therefore have been impossible to obtain their prior consent to the creation of the world.

The Board declines to treat this impossibility as proof that creation itself was unethical.

Such a conclusion would impose a requirement incapable of satisfaction.

The relevant question is not whether a nonexistent population could have approved its own existence.

The relevant question is whether, **once that population existed, its founders recognized obligations toward it as a population of persons rather than as an extension of the founding project.**

Those obligations include appropriate consideration of life, bodily integrity, autonomy, security, and freedom from arbitrary interference.

A creator may possess responsibilities arising from creation.

Those responsibilities do not necessarily include a corresponding right of domination.

The distinction is particularly important where the created population develops capacities, interests, and judgments unforeseen by its progenitors.

The Board finds that the emergence of independent persons requires reconsideration of any arrangement based solely upon the intentions of their creators.

An institution established for one purpose may acquire new ethical obligations when its actions produce circumstances not contemplated at its founding.

The founders' original agreement cannot be presumed to speak indefinitely for generations that never participated in it.

V. ON THE DUTY OF CARE

Sanctuary was purportedly created as a refuge from war.

The Board accepts that this purpose carries substantial ethical weight.

The effort to protect persons from violence can constitute an important and legitimate undertaking.

However, the designation of a place as a sanctuary does not conclusively establish that it functions as one.

A protective institution must be evaluated by its conduct toward those it protects.

The Board therefore identifies several preliminary obligations that may have arisen from the creation of Sanctuary.

A. Protection from Foreseeable Harm

The founders knew of the Eternal Conflict.

They knew that the powers of Heaven and Hell contested the Worldstone.

They also knew that discovery of their refuge could expose its inhabitants to grave danger.

Accordingly, the question of whether reasonable protective measures were established requires examination.

The Board does not presume that complete protection was possible.

It does, however, distinguish unavoidable danger from danger aggravated by negligence, concealment, or unilateral decision-making.

B. Disclosure of Material Risks

The Board questions whether subsequent inhabitants received adequate knowledge concerning the origin and vulnerabilities of their world.

Concealment from external aggressors may have served a legitimate protective purpose.

Concealment from inhabitants presents a different ethical problem.

The Board recognizes that universal disclosure of sensitive information may itself create danger.

Nevertheless, secrecy intended to protect a population must not become an unquestionable basis for depriving that population of its capacity to understand and shape its own future.

C. Continuity of Essential Systems

The Worldstone played a foundational role in the creation and concealment of Sanctuary.

Its centrality raises concerns regarding dependence upon a singular object of extraordinary power.

The Board requests evidence of any contingency planning undertaken by the founding assembly.

Specifically, the Board seeks to determine whether provisions existed for the continued safety of Sanctuary in the event of:

1. Loss of the Worldstone.
2. Unauthorized alteration of its properties.
3. Compromise by hostile celestial or infernal forces.
4. Destruction or incapacitation of the artifact.
5. Internal disputes concerning its use.

The Board observes that the existence of an exceptionally powerful artifact does not, by itself, constitute an adequate disaster recovery plan.

VI. THE EMERGENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT

The appearance of the nephalem produced disagreement among Sanctuary's original angelic and demonic inhabitants.

Their extraordinary capabilities prompted fears concerning the possibility that their existence might attract attention from the High Heavens or Burning Hells.

Some members of the founding population contemplated the destruction of the nephalem.

The Board notes the seriousness of this development.

A population's capacity to exceed the power of its founders does not, standing alone, constitute an ethical justification for its extermination.

Neither does the possibility that hostile third parties may become aware of that population.

The Board recognizes that the founders faced circumstances of extraordinary uncertainty.

That uncertainty does not erase the distinction between protecting a population from danger and treating the population itself as the danger to be eliminated.

The Board therefore identifies a foundational governance failure:

The founders appear to have lacked an agreed procedure for resolving conflicts between their own security interests and the continued existence of their descendants.

This deficiency became particularly consequential once disagreements arose concerning the nephalem.

The subsequent actions of Lilith and Inarius will be examined in separate proceedings.

For purposes of the present docket, those actions demonstrate the importance of establishing protections before extraordinary authority is exercised.

VII. ON THE PURPOSE OF SANCTUARY

The Board considers the significance of Sanctuary's founding purpose.

It was not created as an ordinary territorial conquest.

Nor was it initially presented as an extension of the High Heavens or Burning Hells.

It was established by individuals who sought to withdraw from an existing system of conflict.

The Board finds this distinction ethically significant.

The founders had reason to recognize that institutional power may become oppressive even when its exercise is justified by longstanding custom.

They had personally rejected demands imposed by their original factions.

Their decision to seek refuge therefore raises an important question concerning the treatment of their descendants.

If the founders considered themselves entitled to escape the authority of Heaven and Hell, upon what principle could they deny comparable autonomy to the beings who followed them?

The Board does not conclude that descendants possess an unlimited right to engage in conduct threatening others.

It does conclude that the founders' own claim to freedom from coercive authority cannot be dismissed as irrelevant when evaluating their obligations toward subsequent generations.

A founding principle that applies only to the founders requires further justification.

VIII. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Upon review of the available historical record, the Sanctuary Ethics Review Board enters the following provisional findings.

Finding 1 — Legitimate Founding Purpose

The creation of a refuge from perpetual warfare represented a potentially legitimate and defensible objective.

Finding 2 — Absence of Automatic Sovereignty

The creation of Sanctuary did not, by itself, establish unlimited legitimate governing authority over its future inhabitants.

Finding 3 — Independent Status of Descendants

The nephalem and their descendants must be considered persons possessing interests independent of those of their progenitors.

Finding 4 — Continuing Duties of Protection

The founders' knowledge of the Eternal Conflict and the risks associated with the Worldstone created substantial grounds for examining their protective responsibilities.

Finding 5 — Deficient Foundational Safeguards

The available record does not establish the existence of adequate procedures for resolving conflicts between the founding population and its descendants.

This absence of evidence does not conclusively prove that no such procedures existed.

It does justify further investigation.

Finding 6 — No Presumption of Ownership

Neither celestial nor infernal ancestry establishes proprietary entitlement over the nephalem.

Finding 7 — Limits of Protective Authority

The protection of Sanctuary cannot be presumed to justify every action taken in its name.

Finding 8 — Reserved Questions

The Board makes no final determination in this docket concerning the legality or ethical propriety of the Worldstone's acquisition, Lilith's subsequent violence, Inarius's alteration of the Worldstone, or the later interventions of Heaven and Hell.

Those matters warrant independent examination.

IX. DIRECTIVES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

The Board hereby issues the following requests to the relevant parties.

To Inarius

Produce, if available:

1. The original purpose and terms of the founding agreement.
2. Records identifying the members of the founding assembly.
3. Any governance arrangements established before the emergence of the nephalem.
4. Documentation concerning the Worldstone's intended function.
5. Records of deliberations regarding the rights and status of the nephalem.

The Board notes that the characterization of the founding enterprise as a refuge does not eliminate the need to examine its governance.

To Lilith

Produce, if available:

1. Records of the original agreement to establish Sanctuary.
2. Communications concerning the anticipated emergence of descendants.
3. Evidence of any protections contemplated for the nephalem.
4. Records concerning disagreements among the founders regarding their descendants' future.

The Board recognizes the possibility that substantial portions of the requested record may no longer exist.

Destruction of evidence, where established, will be considered separately from ordinary deficiencies in record preservation.

To the High Heavens and Burning Hells

The Board requests any surviving records concerning the disappearance of the Worldstone and the subsequent discovery of Sanctuary.

Neither institution is required, for purposes of this preliminary inquiry, to concede that the founders possessed lawful custody of the artifact.

Equally, neither institution's objection to that custody will be presumed sufficient to establish authority over the inhabitants of Sanctuary.

To Representatives of Humanity

The Board invites testimony from individuals and institutions capable of addressing:

- The consequences of Sanctuary's founding arrangements.
- Historical experiences of celestial and infernal intervention.
- The exercise of mortal autonomy.
- The effects of decisions undertaken without human representation.

The Board emphasizes that humanity is not merely an evidentiary subject in this proceeding.

Its members are among the principal affected parties.

Their interests shall not be treated as adequately represented solely by those who claim to have created, protected, or governed them.

X. NOTICE CONCERNING SUPERNATURAL STATUS

The Board anticipates that certain respondents may contest its competence to examine matters involving the creation of worlds.

Such objections may be submitted in writing.

However, the following assertions will not, without supporting argument, be regarded as sufficient:

- That a respondent possesses extraordinary power.
- That a respondent predates humanity.
- That a respondent has participated in the Eternal Conflict.
- That a respondent's nature is celestial.
- That a respondent's nature is infernal.
- That a respondent believes the continued existence of Sanctuary depends upon obedience to that respondent.

The Board distinguishes the ability to enforce a command from the legitimacy of the command itself.

Claims of superior knowledge, benevolent intention, or exceptional necessity may be relevant.

They are not self-proving.

The Board further advises that threats of annihilation, corruption, eternal torment, or metaphysical disintegration will not be accepted as substitutes for procedural argument.

Where such threats are made, they may constitute additional matters for review.

XI. LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT REVIEW

The Board expressly recognizes that its jurisdiction is conceptual, ethical, and investigatory.

This proceeding is not an adjudication under any established mortal legal system.

Nor does the Board presume that contemporary mortal legal standards existed at the founding of Sanctuary.

The inquiry instead employs principles of institutional responsibility, autonomy, proportionality, and the moral standing of sentient persons to examine the conduct of extraordinary actors.

The Board acknowledges that some events occurred under conditions for which ordinary administrative analogies are necessarily imperfect.

It nevertheless rejects the conclusion that extraordinary circumstances place all conduct beyond reasoned scrutiny.

The absence of a precedent does not eliminate the possibility of judgment.

The absence of an institution competent to enforce a standard does not establish that no standard should exist.

And the absence of a person powerful enough to compel an explanation does not render the explanation unnecessary.

XII. CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

Sanctuary was created by beings who had grown weary of an endless war.

In that act, the Board recognizes something more significant than the exercise of extraordinary power.

It recognizes a refusal.

A refusal to accept that conflict must continue merely because it has always continued.

A refusal to believe that the purposes of great institutions necessarily exhaust the possibilities of existence.

A refusal, however imperfect, to remain forever within a struggle inherited from others.

Yet that refusal gave rise to a new world.

And within that world arose beings who had not chosen the circumstances of their birth, the nature of their ancestry, or the ancient quarrels of the powers surrounding them.

The founders escaped a conflict they considered intolerable.

Their descendants inherited its consequences.

The ethical significance of Sanctuary therefore lies not merely in the extraordinary circumstances of its creation.

It lies in the question of what its creators owed to the lives that followed.

A world founded as a refuge may become a prison if its inhabitants are denied the independence its founders sought for themselves.

A world founded to escape domination may reproduce domination if its creators mistake their original intentions for permanent authority.

And a world called Sanctuary cannot fulfill that name through declaration alone.

Its legitimacy must be considered in relation to those who live within it.

Creation may establish responsibility.

It does not establish ownership.

Protection may justify intervention.

It does not confer unlimited authority.

And the existence of a world does not resolve the question of who is entitled to govern it.

The Board therefore declines to recognize any permanent presumption of celestial or infernal sovereignty arising solely from the founding of Sanctuary.

The question of legitimate authority remains open.

The claims of the inhabitants must be heard.

XIII. DISPOSITION

The preliminary investigation shall remain open.

The Board orders no alteration to the physical or metaphysical structure of Sanctuary pending further review.

No inference of guilt shall arise solely from a respondent's extraordinary nature, ancestry, or participation in the founding enterprise.

The Board reserves the right to investigate subsequent actions independently.

Parties wishing to contest the findings may submit a reasoned response.

The Board respectfully reminds all respondents that the ability to destroy the reviewing institution does not constitute a substantive rebuttal to its findings.

So entered.

Sanctuary Ethics Review Board
Office of Foundational Governance and Interplanar Accountability

---

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE

The Board has received a preliminary inquiry concerning whether Inarius, as a principal architect of Sanctuary, may assert an inherent right to terminate the proceeding.

The inquiry has been referred to the Office of Jurisdictional Review.

The Office responds as follows:

The Board acknowledges the respondent's participation in creating the world.

The Board does not recognize that participation as grounds for terminating an inquiry concerning the consequences of its creation.

The respondent is invited to submit further argument.

A description of his celestial rank is not required. It is already in the record.

END OF SERB-001

Next proposed proceeding: SERB-002 — On the Alteration of the Worldstone: Inherited Power, Population-Wide Intervention, and the Ethics of Unilateral Biological Modification.