SANCTUARY ETHICS REVIEW BOARD

SERB-010 — NECROMANTIC PRACTICE

On Postmortem Autonomy, the Use of Mortal Remains, and the Presumption That Death Terminates Consent

An Institutional Inquiry into the Priests of Rathma, the Reanimation of Mortal Remains, the Manipulation of Spiritual Energies, and the Ethical Responsibilities Arising from Authority Over Life and Death

Issuing Authority: Sanctuary Ethics Review Board (SERB)
Docket: SERB-010
Classification: Postmortem Autonomy, Research Ethics, Religious and Philosophical Practice, Extraordinary Biological Intervention, and Institutional Accountability
Date: October 24, 2026
Status: Preliminary Findings, Institutional Determination, and Notice of Continuing Review

Principal Institutional Respondents:

- The Priests of Rathma
- The Necromantic Orders of Sanctuary
- Practitioners Exercising Authority Over Mortal Remains or Spiritual Essences

Foundational Persons of Interest:

- Rathma, formerly Linarian, Firstborn Nephalem
- Mendeln ul-Diomed, subsequently known as Kalan
- The Custodians of the Books of Kalan
- Senior Necromantic Instructors and Their Apprentices

Interested Institutions:

- The Horadrim
- The Angiris Council
- The Priests and Custodians of Mortal Burial Traditions
- The Mortal Authorities of Sanctuary

- The Office of Created Persons and Autonomous Systems

Affected Parties:

- Persons Whose Bodies Have Been Reanimated
- Persons Whose Spiritual Essences Have Been Manipulated
- The Families and Communities of the Deceased
- Individuals Subjected to Necromantic Curses
- Artificial or Reanimated Entities Possessing Potential Independent Awareness
- Persons Whose Remains Have Been Employed in Combat

Principal Questions:

Whether death eliminates every interest a person may possess concerning the treatment of their body, spirit, or identity.

Whether the ability to reanimate remains establishes legitimate authority to do so.

Whether necromantic practices can be distinguished according to their effects upon consciousness, identity, bodily integrity, and surviving persons.

Whether the maintenance of cosmic Balance provides adequate ethical justification for interventions undertaken without the consent of those affected.

Whether protective military necessity permits the temporary use of mortal remains.

Whether the Priests of Rathma possess adequate internal procedures for distinguishing responsible necromancy from coercive exploitation.

I. NOTICE OF INSTITUTIONAL INVESTIGATION

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board hereby opens its tenth inquiry into the ethical consequences of extraordinary power.

The present proceeding concerns necromantic practice.

The Board recognizes that necromancy occupies a complex position within the history of Sanctuary.

Its practitioners possess abilities that may appear disturbing to persons unfamiliar with their traditions.

Such abilities include the reanimation of corpses, manipulation of bone and blood, manifestation of spiritual energies, and direction of beings ordinarily associated with death.

The Board further recognizes that the Priests of Rathma have historically employed these capabilities in defense of Sanctuary.

Their opposition to infernal domination is well established.

Their philosophical tradition emphasizes the preservation of Balance between competing cosmic forces.

The Board therefore rejects the presumption that necromancy constitutes misconduct merely because it concerns death.

The use of unfamiliar or disturbing methods does not independently establish ethical impropriety.

Nor does the appearance of a reanimated being conclusively establish that a person has been harmed.

Nevertheless, the absence of automatic wrongdoing does not establish unrestricted permission.

Necromantic practices may affect physical remains, spiritual energies, surviving families, public spaces, and potentially the continuing interests of deceased persons.

These effects require examination.

The Board therefore distinguishes between the nature of a practice and the circumstances of its exercise.

The Board recognizes that necromancy may be employed for legitimate purposes.

It does not recognize legitimate purpose as an unlimited entitlement to employ the dead.

The inquiry shall proceed.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A. Rathma and the Discovery of Balance

Rathma, born Linarian, was among the Firstborn nephalem.

He was the son of Inarius and Lilith.

His extraordinary position afforded him direct knowledge of the conflict between celestial and infernal powers.

Unlike his parents, Rathma developed a philosophical commitment to maintaining Balance.

The Board recognizes that his position was not equivalent to unrestricted allegiance to either the High Heavens or Burning Hells.

Rather, his teachings concerned the relationship between opposing powers and the dangers associated with their dominance over Sanctuary.

This position bears upon the present inquiry.

An institution founded to preserve Balance may possess legitimate reasons to intervene against extraordinary disturbances.

Nevertheless, the definition of Balance and the authority to determine when intervention is appropriate require examination.

B. Mendeln and the Priests of Rathma

Mendeln ul-Diomed became Rathma's student.

He subsequently adopted the name Kalan.

His teachings and writings formed the foundation of the Priests of Rathma.

The order developed a tradition of instruction, apprenticeship, and specialized study.

Its members pursued knowledge concerning life, death, and the forces affecting Sanctuary.

The Board recognizes that the transmission of specialized knowledge through apprenticeship may create substantial professional responsibilities.

Those responsibilities include the accurate communication of known hazards and the development of appropriate limits upon practice.

C. Necromantic Philosophy

The Priests of Rathma regard death as a natural part of existence.

They do not ordinarily seek to abolish death.

Rather, they understand life and death as elements of a broader cycle.

The Board considers this position philosophically significant.

An acceptance of death may distinguish the order from institutions seeking indefinite preservation of life or unlimited personal power.

However, the recognition of death as natural does not independently explain when the dead may legitimately be disturbed.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning the relationship between the order's teachings and its practical treatment of mortal remains.

D. Protective Activities

The Priests of Rathma have historically intervened when the Balance was threatened.

Their actions have included opposition to the Prime Evils and other forces disrupting Sanctuary.

The Board recognizes the protective significance of these activities.

Nevertheless, the legitimacy of a protective mission must be distinguished from the permissibility of every method employed in its execution.

The Board therefore proceeds to examine those methods individually.

III. THE THRESHOLD QUESTION: WHAT REMAINS AFTER DEATH?

The Board identifies a fundamental uncertainty.

Necromantic practices may involve several distinct objects of intervention.

These include:

1. Physical remains.
2. Residual magical energies.
3. Spiritual manifestations.
4. Continuing individual consciousness.
5. Souls or other enduring forms of personal identity.

The Board recognizes that these categories may overlap.

However, they are not necessarily identical.

A corpse may remain after the consciousness previously associated with it has departed.

A spiritual manifestation may preserve characteristics of a deceased person without necessarily constituting that person's complete identity.

An independently conscious soul may possess interests distinguishable from those associated with its former body.

The Board therefore rejects any analysis that treats all necromantic practices as ethically equivalent.

In particular, the reanimation of a skeleton does not automatically establish that the deceased person's consciousness has been restored.

Conversely, the absence of ordinary speech does not establish that a reanimated entity lacks consciousness.

The distinction is material.

Where an intervention affects only inanimate remains, the relevant ethical interests may concern prior wishes, funerary customs, and surviving persons.

Where an intervention affects continuing consciousness, additional interests concerning autonomy and suffering may arise.

The Board therefore requests that practitioners distinguish between movement of remains and restoration or compulsion of the person formerly inhabiting them.

A demonstration of animation alone will not conclusively resolve the question.

IV. ON THE STATUS OF MORTAL REMAINS

The Board considers whether a deceased body may be treated as ordinary property.

A mortal body possesses a relationship to personal identity that distinguishes it from many other physical objects.

During life, the body is integral to the person's experiences and autonomy.

After death, the body may remain significant to surviving relatives, communities, and established cultural or religious traditions.

The Board recognizes that these interests may differ.

An individual may have expressed wishes concerning burial, cremation, preservation, or magical intervention.

Surviving relatives may possess interests in dignified treatment.

A community may maintain legitimate public health requirements.

The Board therefore rejects the proposition that death automatically renders a body available for unrestricted use.

However, it also rejects the assumption that every postmortem intervention constitutes an injury to a continuing conscious person.

That conclusion depends upon the nature of the intervention and the metaphysical status of the deceased.

The relevant inquiry must therefore distinguish among several interests.

The deceased person's prior wishes.

Any continuing interests of the deceased, where established.

The legitimate interests of surviving persons.

The public consequences of the proposed intervention.

The Board considers these interests independently relevant.

The absence of living consciousness does not necessarily eliminate every ethical obligation concerning a person's remains.

V. THE QUESTION OF PRIOR CONSENT

The Board next considers whether a person may consent during life to the subsequent use of their remains.

The Board recognizes that individuals may make meaningful decisions concerning the disposition of their bodies after death.

Such decisions may reflect religious conviction, personal preference, altruism, or other legitimate interests.

Accordingly, the Board identifies prior consent as a potentially important source of authorization.

However, consent must be evaluated according to its scope.

A person consenting to the temporary use of their remains for medical instruction has not necessarily consented to military reanimation.

A person consenting to communication with their spirit has not necessarily consented to indefinite spiritual confinement.

A person permitting use of bones in a funerary ritual has not necessarily authorized their conversion into armed servants.

The Board therefore proposes that necromantic consent be evaluated according to:

- The identity of the person granting permission.
- The intervention authorized.
- Its anticipated duration.
- Its foreseeable consequences.
- The purposes for which it may be performed.
- Any limitations or conditions expressed.
- The reliability of the record establishing consent.

The Board acknowledges that formal documentation may not always be available.

The absence of written records does not necessarily establish the absence of a person's wishes.

Nevertheless, where an intervention is extraordinary, irreversible, or potentially harmful, the evidentiary importance of reliable authorization increases.

Consent to one postmortem intervention shall not be presumed to constitute consent to every conceivable use of the deceased.

VI. THE QUESTION OF SPIRITUAL CONSENT

The Board recognizes that certain necromantic practices permit communication with spiritual manifestations.

This capability introduces an unusual possibility.

A person who has died may, under some circumstances, remain capable of expressing preferences.

The Board therefore considers whether postmortem consent may be obtained directly.

The possibility deserves serious examination.

However, the Board identifies several concerns.

First, the identity of the communicating entity must be considered.

Second, the entity's ability to exercise independent judgment must be evaluated.

Third, the possibility of magical compulsion must be excluded where reasonably possible.

Fourth, the communication must be sufficiently clear to establish the scope of permission.

Fifth, the entity's capacity to understand the proposed intervention must be considered.

The Board recognizes that some spiritual entities may retain knowledge unavailable to the living.

Others may preserve only fragments of memory.

Some manifestations may be imitations or residual impressions.

The Board therefore declines to treat every apparent communication as conclusive evidence of the deceased person's wishes.

Similarly, a spirit's response to a command does not necessarily establish that the spirit consented to the command.

The Board recognizes that the dead may sometimes answer questions.

It does not follow that every answer has been freely given.

VII. REANIMATION OF SKELETAL REMAINS

The Board turns to the common necromantic practice of animating skeletal warriors.

Such entities may be employed in combat, defense, exploration, or other operational activities.

The Board recognizes that skeletal animation may involve the movement of physical remains through magical energy.

However, the precise relationship between the animated skeleton and the consciousness formerly associated with its bones requires clarification.

The Board therefore identifies two principal possibilities.

A. Animation Without Continuing Personal Consciousness

Under this model, the skeleton operates through magical direction without restoring or compelling the deceased person's identity.

The ethical concerns would principally involve treatment of remains, prior wishes, surviving persons, and the consequences of the skeleton's actions.

B. Animation Involving a Continuing Spirit

Under this model, the deceased person's consciousness or an independently aware spiritual entity participates in the animation.

Additional concerns would arise concerning consent, freedom of action, suffering, and the right to terminate participation.

The Board recognizes that different necromantic methods may produce different results.

It therefore declines to issue a universal determination concerning all skeletal animation.

The Priests of Rathma are requested to identify the relevant mechanisms.

The Board further seeks clarification concerning whether skeletal servants may resist commands.

The inability to resist may indicate the absence of consciousness.

It may also indicate magical compulsion.

Additional evidence is necessary.

The Board respectfully observes that a skeleton's compliance does not independently establish that its former occupant consented to military service.

VIII. CORPSE EXPLOSION

The Board next examines the practice commonly identified as Corpse Explosion.

The procedure employs mortal remains as the source or medium of an explosive magical effect.

The Board recognizes that the practice may be employed during combat against extraordinary threats.

Its utility in defending living persons may be substantial.

Nevertheless, the intervention raises questions concerning the treatment of remains and the effects upon surrounding persons.

The Board identifies the following concerns.

A. Prior Authorization

Whether the deceased person had expressed any relevant wishes concerning the treatment of their remains.

B. Necessity

Whether the explosive use of the remains was reasonably necessary under the circumstances.

C. Discrimination

Whether the effect could distinguish legitimate military targets from civilians and other protected persons.

D. Public Safety

Whether the intervention created foreseeable dangers beyond the intended target area.

E. Identification

Whether the destruction of the remains interfered with the identification of the deceased.

F. Funerary Interests

Whether the intervention prevented reasonable recovery or burial.

The Board recognizes that battlefield emergencies may prevent ordinary consultation.

A practitioner defending civilians from a Prime Evil may possess little opportunity to investigate the prior wishes of every deceased combatant.

Nevertheless, emergency necessity does not establish unrestricted permission.

The Board therefore distinguishes between defensive use under conditions of immediate danger and use undertaken merely for convenience.

The Board recognizes that a corpse may possess considerable tactical utility.

It does not recognize tactical utility as an unlimited authorization for detonation.

IX. ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ENEMY REMAINS AND CIVILIAN REMAINS

The Board considers whether the identity or conduct of the deceased affects permissible necromantic intervention.

A person who participated in an attack may have presented a legitimate military threat while alive.

The Board recognizes that the use of force against such a person may have been justified.

However, the termination of the person's life changes the circumstances.

A deceased combatant ordinarily ceases to pose the same immediate physical threat.

The Board therefore questions whether prior hostility establishes unrestricted authority over the body.

It provisionally concludes that it does not.

The Board recognizes that an enemy's remains may possess dangerous magical properties.

They may require containment, examination, or destruction for protective reasons.

Those circumstances may justify particular interventions.

However, the mere fact that a person was an enemy does not automatically establish that the body may be employed without limit.

The Board further distinguishes between mortal remains and the remains of infernal entities.

Different metaphysical properties may require different protective measures.

The ethical status of each must be evaluated according to available evidence.

The Board recognizes that an enemy may be lawfully defeated.

It does not follow that defeat establishes perpetual ownership of the enemy's remains.

X. ON THE TEMPORARY USE OF REMAINS IN EMERGENCIES

The Board recognizes that necromancy may provide critical protective capabilities during emergencies.

A necromancer might employ reanimated remains to evacuate civilians, obstruct hostile forces, or prevent imminent destruction.

Under such circumstances, ordinary procedures for obtaining consent may be impossible.

The Board therefore considers whether emergency use may be ethically justified.

The answer depends upon several factors.

The danger must be sufficiently serious.

The intervention must be reasonably connected to preventing that danger.

Less intrusive alternatives should be considered where feasible.

The expected protective benefit must be evaluated against the harm imposed.

The intervention should be limited to the duration reasonably required.

The Board recognizes that these conditions may be difficult to assess during combat.

It does not require impossible precision.

Nevertheless, the existence of an emergency must remain distinguishable from the mere convenience of employing readily available remains.

The Board therefore rejects a blanket exemption for wartime necromancy.

Emergency necessity may justify an extraordinary intervention.

It does not convert every corpse encountered during an emergency into an unrestricted public resource.

XI. ON THE RELEASE OF REANIMATED SERVANTS

The Board next examines the termination of necromantic service.

The ability to animate remains raises a corresponding question.

What occurs when the practitioner no longer requires the animation?

The Board recognizes that some spells may terminate automatically.

Others may require deliberate release.

Certain entities may remain animated until destroyed.

The ethical implications depend upon the mechanism involved.

Where animation employs only magical energy and inanimate remains, termination may principally concern safe disposal and respectful treatment.

Where animation involves a continuing consciousness, termination may implicate the entity's own interests.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning whether practitioners possess established procedures for releasing reanimated servants.

It further requests evidence concerning the condition of the remains following release.

The Board identifies a potential duty to prevent unnecessary continuing animation.

A temporary defensive purpose does not automatically justify indefinite service.

The Board also requests clarification concerning whether reanimated servants may be abandoned while still active.

Such abandonment could create hazards to surrounding populations.

The Board recognizes that summoning a skeletal servant may be operationally convenient.

It requests confirmation that the servant is not simply left wandering after the operation concludes.

XII. ON THE MANIPULATION OF SPIRITUAL ENERGIES

The Board considers necromantic practices involving spiritual energies.

Historical accounts establish that necromancers can focus energies associated with the dead and give them manifestations within the physical world.

The Board recognizes that this process may differ from restoring the consciousness of a deceased person.

Residual energy may lack independent agency.

A manifested spirit may possess some form of awareness.

The distinction requires examination.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning whether spiritual manifestations retain identity, memory, preference, or suffering.

It further seeks to determine whether the practitioner can compel their behavior.

Where a spiritual manifestation is independently aware, the Board considers its interests potentially relevant.

Where no awareness exists, the principal concerns may involve the effects of the intervention upon living persons and the integrity of the surrounding environment.

The Board declines to presume that every magical energy associated with death constitutes a person.

It equally declines to presume that no such energy can possess moral standing.

The origin of an energy in death does not, by itself, determine whether the resulting manifestation is capable of experience.

XIII. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN COMMUNICATION AND COMPULSION

The Board identifies a significant ethical difference between communicating with the dead and compelling the dead to act.

An independently aware spirit may possess information relevant to the living.

Communication may be sought for reasons involving family, historical investigation, or public protection.

The Board recognizes that voluntary communication may be permissible.

However, the ability to summon a spirit does not automatically establish the legitimacy of requiring it to speak.

The Board therefore distinguishes:

Invitation: An attempt to communicate while preserving the entity's capacity to refuse.

Summons: A procedure bringing the entity into contact with the practitioner.

Compulsion: An intervention overriding the entity's independent judgment.

Confinement: A restriction preventing the entity from departing.

These conditions may overlap.

Their ethical significance must be assessed individually.

The Board further recognizes that a spirit may be summoned for legitimate purposes while the means of summoning remain ethically questionable.

The urgency of obtaining information does not automatically justify every method employed.

The Board recognizes that a deceased witness may possess relevant knowledge.

It does not recognize a general obligation upon the deceased to answer every inquiry directed by the living.

XIV. POSTMORTEM TESTIMONY

The Board considers whether necromantic communication may be employed as evidence in institutional proceedings.

The possibility presents substantial benefits.

A deceased witness may possess direct knowledge of events unavailable to surviving persons.

Communication might assist in identifying wrongful deaths, correcting historical errors, or locating missing persons.

The Board recognizes the potential value.

Nevertheless, postmortem testimony raises questions of reliability.

The identity of the communicating entity must be established.

The possibility of magical influence must be considered.

The witness's memories may be incomplete.

The circumstances of death may affect recollection.

The entity may possess motives or interests not apparent to the questioner.

The Board therefore rejects the assumption that supernatural testimony is automatically reliable.

Nor does the extraordinary nature of the communication establish that the witness's statements are necessarily false.

The Board proposes that such testimony be evaluated according to:

1. Verification of identity.
2. Evidence of independent awareness.
3. Freedom from material compulsion.
4. Consistency with available records.
5. Opportunity to identify contradictions.
6. Preservation of the original communication.
7. Disclosure of the method employed.
8. Recognition of relevant uncertainty.

The Board recognizes that these safeguards may not always be feasible.

Their absence affects the weight appropriately assigned to the evidence.

The Board respectfully observes that the ability to summon a witness does not establish that the witness is truthful.

Nor does death constitute an exemption from ordinary concerns regarding reliability.

XV. NECROMANTIC CURSES AND THE LIVING

The Board next considers the use of curses.

Necromancers possess the ability to alter the conditions affecting living beings through extraordinary magical interventions.

Such practices may impair strength, resistance, movement, or other capacities.

The Board recognizes that curses may be employed in legitimate defensive combat.

A practitioner confronting a hostile demon may reasonably seek to restrict its ability to cause harm.

However, the permissibility of a curse depends upon its target, purpose, and consequences.

The Board therefore distinguishes between defensive restraint and punitive or coercive manipulation.

A curse imposed to prevent an immediate attack may possess legitimate justification.

A curse imposed upon a person merely for expressing disagreement presents a different question.

The Board further recognizes that curses may have effects extending beyond the intended duration.

The possibility of enduring injury requires consideration.

The respondent institutions are therefore requested to identify any restrictions upon the use of curses against civilians, prisoners, or persons incapable of resistance.

The Board recognizes that a practitioner may possess the ability to alter another person's fate.

It does not recognize that ability as authority to do so merely because the practitioner finds the person disagreeable.

XVI. BLOOD MAGIC AND THE ETHICS OF SELF-SACRIFICE

The Board considers practices involving the use of blood and personal vitality.

Necromancers may employ their own life force to strengthen magical operations.

The Board recognizes that voluntary self-sacrifice may represent a legitimate exercise of autonomy.

An individual may choose to accept personal danger in the protection of others.

Such decisions are not inherently unethical.

However, the Board distinguishes self-directed sacrifice from the involuntary extraction of vitality from another person.

The latter implicates separate interests concerning bodily autonomy and consent.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning the sources of blood employed in necromantic rituals.

It further requests evidence concerning whether the use of another person's vitality requires authorization.

Where a practitioner voluntarily expends personal life force, the principal concerns may involve capacity, knowledge, and foreseeable harm to others.

Where the practitioner employs another person's body, additional justification is required.

The Board recognizes that emergency circumstances may complicate ordinary procedures.

Nevertheless, the distinction between one's own body and another's remains controlling.

The willingness of a necromancer to sacrifice personal blood does not establish an equivalent willingness on behalf of everyone standing nearby.

XVII. GOLEMS AND ARTIFICIALLY ANIMATED BEINGS

The Board next considers necromantic constructs.

Golems may be created from materials including earth, metal, blood, or other substances.

Some forms may incorporate human tissue or remains.

The Board recognizes that such constructs may not possess the consciousness of any deceased individual.

Their ethical status therefore requires examination distinct from the reanimation of a corpse.

However, the Board identifies two separate concerns.

First, the origin of the materials employed.

Second, the capacities of the resulting entity.

The use of human tissue may implicate postmortem interests even where the resulting construct lacks consciousness.

Conversely, a construct created without human remains may nevertheless possess moral standing if it develops independent awareness.

The Board therefore adopts the distinction established in SERB-007.

Creation does not automatically establish ownership.

The nature of the created entity must be examined.

The Board requests evidence concerning the capacities of necromantic constructs.

In particular, it seeks clarification concerning whether a golem can experience pain, develop preferences, or independently evaluate commands.

The Board makes no finding that every golem possesses consciousness.

It does find that the absence of ordinary biological life does not conclusively establish the absence of morally relevant experience.

The Board recognizes that a golem may have been assembled for the purpose of carrying equipment.

It does not follow that the purpose of assembly determines every right the resulting entity may possess.

XVIII. THE RIGHTS OF SURVIVING FAMILIES

The Board considers the interests of persons surviving the deceased.

The death of an individual may create obligations involving burial, mourning, cultural traditions, and the preservation of personal identity.

The Board recognizes that these practices vary.

Some communities may regard physical preservation as essential.

Others may accept cremation or other forms of disposition.

Still others may recognize necromantic intervention as an ordinary component of funerary practice.

The Board therefore rejects a universal assumption that all communities regard reanimation identically.

Nevertheless, the wishes of surviving persons may remain relevant.

The use of a loved one's remains without notice may cause substantial distress.

The destruction of remains may interfere with established rites.

The inability to recover a body may prolong uncertainty concerning death.

The Board recognizes that these interests do not necessarily override every prior instruction expressed by the deceased.

A person's own wishes may deserve substantial consideration.

Nor do the interests of surviving persons automatically prohibit every public-safety intervention.

The relationship must be evaluated according to circumstances.

The Board therefore requests that necromantic institutions identify their procedures for resolving disputes concerning remains.

The Board recognizes that the deceased may no longer require the same physical care as the living.

It does not follow that the living have ceased to care what happens to them.

XIX. THE QUESTION OF EXHUMATION

The Board next considers the removal of remains from burial sites.

Necromantic practitioners may seek bones, bodies, or other materials for ritual and defensive purposes.

The Board recognizes that certain graveyards may contain ancient remains whose original identities are no longer known.

Others may contain recently buried persons whose families and communities retain substantial interests.

The Board therefore distinguishes among:

Authorized recovery.

Emergency recovery undertaken for substantial protective reasons.

Historical or scientific examination.

Unauthorized disturbance for ordinary convenience.

These practices are not ethically equivalent.

The Board recognizes that a deceased person's prior wishes may be impossible to establish after centuries.

The absence of records does not automatically prohibit all intervention.

Nevertheless, uncertainty concerning ownership or identity should not be treated as proof that the remains are freely available.

The Board therefore requests clarification concerning whether the Priests of Rathma maintain procedures for obtaining and recording the source of human remains.

It further requests evidence concerning whether practitioners distinguish between abandoned remains and remains protected by identifiable funerary traditions.

The Board respectfully observes that a graveyard is not necessarily an unrestricted materials repository.

XX. THE PHILOSOPHY OF BALANCE

The Board now considers the central doctrine of the Priests of Rathma.

The order seeks to preserve Balance.

Its members regard both celestial and infernal domination as threats to Sanctuary.

The Board recognizes the philosophical significance of this position.

The refusal to accept unrestricted authority from either side of the Eternal Conflict may provide a substantial basis for independent judgment.

However, the concept of Balance requires clarification when employed to justify particular interventions.

The Board therefore distinguishes between Balance as a philosophical principle and Balance as an operational directive.

A philosophical principle may guide reflection.

An operational directive authorizes specific conduct.

The relationship between them requires justification.

The Board asks:

Who determines when Balance has been disrupted?

What evidence establishes the disruption?

What interventions are permitted?

What limits govern the resulting action?

Can the determination be challenged?

What prevents the doctrine from becoming a justification for whatever the practitioner considers necessary?

The Board recognizes that extraordinary circumstances may require specialized judgment.

It does not presume that every determination must be made by a public assembly.

Nevertheless, the claim to preserve Balance cannot automatically establish unrestricted authority over others.

Balance may provide a reason for intervention.

It does not, without further argument, determine the legitimacy of every intervention proposed in its name.

XXI. THE PARADOX OF THE PRIESTS OF RATHMA

The Board identifies a particularly significant feature of the order.

The Priests of Rathma oppose the treatment of humanity as an instrument of celestial and infernal interests.

Their teachings recognize that mortals should not merely serve as pieces in the Eternal Conflict.

Yet the order possesses the power to direct the bodies and spiritual energies of those who have died.

This creates a philosophical tension.

An institution opposing the instrumentalization of the living must consider whether its treatment of the dead reproduces the same underlying problem.

The Board does not conclude that all necromancy constitutes instrumentalization.

A corpse lacking continuing consciousness may not possess the same interests as a living person.

A spiritual entity may voluntarily cooperate.

A defensive intervention may prevent catastrophic harm.

These distinctions matter.

Nevertheless, the order's philosophical commitments create a reason to examine its own practices.

If humanity must not be reduced to a strategic resource for Heaven or Hell, the Board asks whether individual mortals may be reduced to strategic resources for necromantic practitioners.

The two circumstances are not necessarily identical.

Their underlying principles may nevertheless intersect.

The Board recognizes that the Priests of Rathma seek to prevent powerful institutions from using humanity as a means to their own ends.

It invites the order to explain the limits it places upon its own use of the dead for comparable purposes.

XXII. ON THE TREATMENT OF NECROMANCERS BY OTHER INSTITUTIONS

The Board considers whether the social treatment of necromancers presents independent ethical concerns.

Historical accounts indicate that the Priests of Rathma are frequently feared, distrusted, or misunderstood.

Their unfamiliar practices may contribute to suspicion.

The Board recognizes that public concern may sometimes be justified.

Necromantic magic possesses capabilities that can cause substantial harm.

However, the existence of dangerous capabilities does not establish that every practitioner has employed them improperly.

The Board therefore rejects categorical condemnation based solely upon affiliation with the order.

An individual priest may employ necromancy responsibly.

Another may employ similar powers for domination or cruelty.

Their conduct requires separate examination.

The Board further recognizes that public institutions may establish reasonable safeguards concerning hazardous magical practices.

Such safeguards should be directed toward identifiable risks rather than mere cultural discomfort.

The unfamiliar appearance of a ritual does not independently establish danger.

Nor does the practitioner's dark clothing, skeletal companions, or ceremonial scythe establish culpability.

The Board recognizes that a person accompanied by six animated skeletons may reasonably attract public attention.

It does not recognize public alarm, standing alone, as proof of misconduct.

XXIII. THE QUESTION OF PROFESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

The Board considers whether the Priests of Rathma possess adequate internal mechanisms for reviewing necromantic conduct.

The order's apprenticeship tradition provides a means of transmitting specialized knowledge.

It may also permit experienced practitioners to communicate ethical restrictions.

However, the Board requests evidence concerning the content of that instruction.

Are apprentices taught to distinguish physical reanimation from spiritual compulsion?

Are they instructed concerning the treatment of civilian remains?

Do they receive guidance concerning prior consent?

Are limits placed upon the use of curses against noncombatants?

Do they possess procedures for releasing summoned entities?

Can a senior priest be challenged?

What consequences follow deliberate misuse?

The Board recognizes that the order's emphasis upon discipline and emotional restraint may function as an important safeguard.

Nevertheless, personal discipline does not automatically replace institutional accountability.

An individual may sincerely seek Balance while misunderstanding the consequences of an intervention.

An experienced practitioner may make an error.

A senior instructor may abuse authority.

The Board therefore identifies a need for procedures capable of addressing such possibilities.

The Board recognizes the importance of self-restraint.

It does not recognize self-restraint as sufficient reason to eliminate every opportunity for independent review.

XXIV. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

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

Finding 1 — No Presumption of Inherent Misconduct

Necromantic practice does not constitute ethical misconduct solely because it employs powers associated with death.

Finding 2 — Legitimate Protective Purpose

The Priests of Rathma possess an established tradition of protecting Sanctuary from disturbances of Balance.

Finding 3 — Distinct Categories of Intervention

Physical reanimation, spiritual manifestation, soul manipulation, and the creation of constructs require separate ethical analysis.

Finding 4 — Continuing Interests After Death

Death does not automatically eliminate every ethical interest concerning a person's remains or identity.

Finding 5 — Significance of Prior Consent

Expressed wishes concerning postmortem intervention may provide substantial ethical justification where their authenticity and scope are established.

Finding 6 — Limits of Implied Consent

The absence of a deceased person's ability to object does not independently establish permission.

Finding 7 — Unresolved Consciousness

The moral status of particular reanimated entities depends partly upon whether independent awareness or continuing personal identity is present.

Finding 8 — Potential Legitimacy of Emergency Use

Extraordinary defensive circumstances may justify limited use of remains where ordinary authorization is unavailable.

Such justification remains subject to necessity and proportionality.

Finding 9 — Limits of Battlefield Authority

The defeat of an enemy does not automatically establish unlimited authority over that enemy's remains.

Finding 10 — Independent Interests of Families

Surviving persons may possess legitimate interests in the treatment and disposition of remains.

Finding 11 — Risks Associated With Corpse Explosion

The explosive use of remains raises questions concerning public safety, identification, funerary interests, and discrimination between targets.

Finding 12 — Spiritual Communication Requires Verification

An apparent communication from the dead does not automatically establish identity, independent judgment, or voluntary participation.

Finding 13 — Limits of Postmortem Testimony

Necromantic testimony may possess evidentiary value but requires consideration of reliability and possible magical compulsion.

Finding 14 — Blood Magic Requires Distinction

Voluntary use of one's own vitality is ethically distinguishable from involuntary extraction from another person.

Finding 15 — Construct Status Remains Open

The ethical status of golems and related entities cannot be determined solely by their artificial origin.

Finding 16 — Balance Is Not Self-Executing Authority

The philosophical commitment to Balance does not automatically justify every intervention undertaken in its name.

Finding 17 — Need for Professional Safeguards

The order's specialized capabilities warrant procedures governing consent, training, public safety, and the termination of magical service.

Finding 18 — No Collective Culpability

Membership in the Priests of Rathma does not establish individual responsibility for misuse of necromantic power.

Finding 19 — Continuing Responsibility

Practitioners who animate, summon, or otherwise direct entities may possess responsibilities concerning their treatment and eventual release.

Finding 20 — Ethical Consistency

An institution opposing the involuntary instrumentalization of humanity must examine whether its own practices respect comparable limits.

XXV. QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO THE PRIESTS OF RATHMA

The Board hereby requests responses to the following inquiries.

Question One:
What distinction does the order recognize between an animated corpse and a restored person?

Question Two:
Do reanimated skeletal warriors retain any portion of the consciousness previously associated with their remains?

Question Three:
Can spiritual entities summoned by necromancers refuse participation?

Question Four:
What procedures exist for obtaining prior consent to the use of mortal remains?

Question Five:
Does the order recognize any circumstances in which family objections should prevent reanimation?

Question Six:
What limitations govern the use of remains belonging to persons whose identities are unknown?

Question Seven:
Does the order distinguish between enemy remains and civilian remains?

Question Eight:
Under what circumstances may a practitioner employ Corpse Explosion?

Question Nine:
What safeguards prevent harm to surrounding civilians?

Question Ten:
Are practitioners required to preserve identifying information concerning remains used in rituals?

Question Eleven:
What procedures govern the release of skeletal servants?

Question Twelve:
Can reanimated entities continue operating without active supervision?

Question Thirteen:
Do spiritual manifestations possess interests independent of the necromancer who summons them?

Question Fourteen:
What means exist for identifying magical compulsion?

Question Fifteen:
Can the testimony of a deceased person be independently verified?

Question Sixteen:
What restrictions govern the use of curses against living civilians?

Question Seventeen:
Does blood magic involving another person's vitality require consent?

Question Eighteen:
What methods are employed to determine whether a golem possesses independent awareness?

Question Nineteen:
Who determines that the Balance requires intervention?

Question Twenty:
What procedure exists for challenging that determination?

Question Twenty-One:
Can an apprentice refuse an instruction believed to violate the order's ethical principles?

Question Twenty-Two:
What sanctions exist for necromantic misconduct?

Question Twenty-Three:
Does the order maintain records concerning the use and disposition of remains?

Question Twenty-Four:
Can a deceased person revoke prior consent through an independently verified spiritual communication?

Question Twenty-Five:
What obligations remain toward a summoned entity after its operational purpose has concluded?

The Board considers the final question particularly significant.

The ability to summon assistance does not automatically eliminate responsibility for the treatment of the entity providing it.

XXVI. INSTITUTIONAL DETERMINATION

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board finds that necromantic practice possesses legitimate applications within Sanctuary.

The Priests of Rathma have historically employed their abilities in opposition to infernal domination and other disruptions of Balance.

The Board recognizes these contributions.

It further recognizes that public discomfort with death magic is not sufficient evidence of ethical misconduct.

Nevertheless, certain necromantic interventions may affect interests requiring independent consideration.

These include the prior wishes of deceased persons, the possible continuing autonomy of spiritual entities, the rights of surviving families, and the safety of surrounding populations.

The Board therefore determines that no universal rule declaring all necromancy inherently unethical is supported by the available record.

Equally, no universal exemption permitting unrestricted necromantic intervention is justified.

The ethical legitimacy of a practice depends upon its mechanism, purpose, effects, and the circumstances under which it is performed.

The Board further finds that the doctrine of Balance may provide a legitimate philosophical framework.

However, its application must remain subject to reasoned examination.

The preservation of Balance does not automatically confer authority to disregard the interests of persons affected by the means employed.

The Board therefore proposes the following principles for future institutional review.

First: Physical remains should not be presumed freely available merely because their former occupant has died.

Second: Spiritual entities capable of independent experience should be evaluated as potential subjects of ethical concern.

Third: Voluntary consent, where meaningful and reliably established, may justify interventions otherwise requiring additional scrutiny.

Fourth: Emergency necessity may justify limited measures but should not be treated as unlimited authorization.

Fifth: Necromantic institutions should preserve procedures for identifying, supervising, and releasing summoned entities.

Sixth: Public safety and the legitimate interests of surviving persons must remain relevant.

Seventh: The same principles of autonomy and institutional responsibility applied to celestial and infernal actors shall apply to necromantic practitioners.

The Board enters no general prohibition upon necromancy.

The inquiry remains open pending additional technical and historical evidence.

XXVII. CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

Death presents a difficulty unlike many others confronted by institutions.

It marks the apparent conclusion of the ordinary capacity to speak, object, negotiate, and participate in decisions.

The living remain.

The body remains.

Memories remain.

Obligations may remain.

And in Sanctuary, where the boundaries between life and death are unusually permeable, something more may remain as well.

The Priests of Rathma have devoted generations to studying these conditions.

Their philosophy recognizes that death is not merely an enemy to be defeated.

It is a part of existence.

A transformation within a greater cycle.

A condition whose meaning cannot be understood solely through the fear it inspires among the living.

The Board recognizes the value of this perspective.

It further recognizes that the ability to confront death without terror may permit a kind of judgment unavailable to those who regard every encounter with mortality as an unacceptable catastrophe.

But familiarity with death does not automatically establish authority over those who have died.

The distinction is essential.

A person may understand the workings of a natural process without possessing unlimited authority to alter its consequences for others.

A physician may understand the body without owning the patient.

A historian may understand the past without owning the persons whose lives constitute it.

A scholar may understand the dead without acquiring unrestricted possession of their remains.

The Board therefore rejects the proposition that knowledge and authority are interchangeable.

The Priests of Rathma possess extraordinary knowledge.

Their mastery of death magic may permit interventions of substantial protective value.

Yet the legitimacy of those interventions must remain connected to the interests they affect.

The dead occupy a peculiar position in this analysis.

A body may no longer possess independent consciousness.

Nevertheless, its treatment may remain significant to the person who once inhabited it.

The individual may have expressed wishes concerning its disposition.

Surviving persons may have legitimate interests in its preservation.

Communities may maintain traditions that give its treatment meaning.

These interests do not necessarily establish an absolute prohibition upon intervention.

They do establish that the body should not automatically be treated as an object lacking every ethical significance.

And where consciousness survives death, the questions become more immediate.

An independently aware spirit may possess preferences.

It may experience distress.

It may wish to communicate.

It may wish to remain undisturbed.

The capacity of a necromancer to compel its appearance does not establish that such compulsion is justified.

Nor does the possibility of obtaining useful information establish that every spirit must answer.

The Board therefore considers the distinction between invitation and command particularly important.

A practitioner may ask.

A spirit may answer.

But the ability to obtain an answer by force does not render the answer freely given.

And the ability to summon a person does not establish ownership of the person summoned.

The same principle applies to reanimated remains.

Where animation involves no continuing consciousness, the ethical questions may concern the treatment of physical materials, the wishes of the deceased, and the consequences for the living.

Where animation involves continuing awareness, the moral character of the intervention changes.

The reanimated entity may become a participant rather than merely an instrument.

Its experience may matter independently of the purpose for which it was summoned.

The Board therefore declines to resolve every necromantic question through the simple declaration that the subject is already dead.

Death is relevant.

It is not necessarily dispositive.

Indeed, Sanctuary's history repeatedly demonstrates that the boundary between life and death may be less certain than ordinary mortal institutions assume.

Souls may endure.

Spirits may manifest.

Bodies may be animated.

Persons may return.

And entities previously believed destroyed may resume activity under circumstances no institution anticipated.

These possibilities complicate judgment.

They do not eliminate the need for it.

The Board therefore regards necromancy as a practice requiring careful distinctions rather than categorical condemnation.

Its powers may preserve life.

Its practitioners may act courageously.

Its methods may defeat threats that ordinary institutions cannot confront.

But the value of such accomplishments does not establish that every means employed is permissible.

The Board has previously examined the sacrifice of Tal Rasha.

His willingness to become a prison for Baal did not automatically extinguish the responsibilities of those who accepted his sacrifice.

The principle applies here.

A willing spirit does not necessarily consent to indefinite service.

A body made available for one purpose does not necessarily become available for every other purpose.

A person who once served Sanctuary does not automatically remain subject to service after death.

And the absence of a living voice does not establish that every prior wish may be disregarded.

The Board recognizes the extraordinary circumstances under which necromancy may be practiced.

A city may face destruction.

An infernal army may advance.

The living may possess no ordinary means of resistance.

A necromancer may have only moments in which to act.

Under such circumstances, the use of remains may prevent grave harm.

The Board does not presume that ordinary authorization procedures can always be completed.

Nor does it insist that every defensive intervention await the resolution of every conceivable ethical uncertainty.

But emergency necessity must remain connected to the emergency.

It must not become a permanent exemption from judgment.

The difference between employing extraordinary means to protect others and treating others as permanently available instruments remains fundamental.

The Priests of Rathma, perhaps more than many institutions, possess reason to appreciate that distinction.

Their own tradition arose partly from resistance to the use of humanity as a resource within the Eternal Conflict.

They reject the presumption that Heaven and Hell may determine the purpose of mortal existence.

They seek to preserve a world in which neither cosmic power exercises unlimited domination.

The Board recognizes the moral significance of this objective.

Yet it also asks the order to examine its own authority.

For it would be a peculiar contradiction if an institution devoted to protecting mortals from celestial and infernal instrumentalization came to regard the bodies and spirits of those same mortals as resources available without limitation.

The distinction may be defensible.

A corpse lacking consciousness is not equivalent to a living person.

A spirit voluntarily cooperating is not equivalent to a person compelled by force.

A construct without experience is not necessarily equivalent to an independently aware entity.

These distinctions matter.

But they require explanation.

They cannot be assumed merely because the practitioner considers the resulting intervention beneficial.

The Board therefore invites the Priests of Rathma to articulate the principles governing their practice.

Not because their art is necessarily wicked.

Not because public fear establishes their guilt.

Not because death magic is inherently less legitimate than celestial or ordinary mortal power.

But because extraordinary capability deserves examination according to the consequences of its use.

The same standard has been applied throughout these proceedings.

Inarius could create a world.

That did not establish ownership of its inhabitants.

The Angiris Council could determine the result of a vote.

That did not establish that humanity's continued existence was properly subject to its discretion.

The Prime Evils could compel obedience.

That did not establish consent.

The Horadrim could imprison extraordinary dangers.

That did not eliminate their responsibilities for continued containment.

Zoltun Kulle could discover remarkable truths.

That did not authorize every method employed in pursuit of them.

Malthael could manipulate death itself.

That did not confer authority to destroy humanity.

And the Priests of Rathma can raise the dead.

It does not follow that the dead belong to them.

The Board recognizes that the dead may no longer possess every interest they held in life.

It recognizes that physical remains may be employed for legitimate purposes.

It recognizes that extraordinary circumstances may justify interventions that would otherwise be inappropriate.

Nevertheless, it declines to treat death as the universal termination of ethical responsibility.

There may remain duties toward a body.

There may remain duties toward a spirit.

There may remain duties toward surviving persons.

There may remain duties concerning the consequences of the use to which remains are put.

And there may remain duties toward entities whose creation or animation produces new forms of awareness.

The precise scope of those duties requires investigation.

But uncertainty concerning their scope does not establish that they are absent.

The Board therefore returns to a simple distinction.

The dead may no longer speak through ordinary means.

Silence is not necessarily consent.

The dead may no longer require their bodies.

Lack of need is not necessarily abandonment.

The dead may possess information useful to the living.

Usefulness is not necessarily an obligation to serve.

And the dead may be capable of returning through extraordinary means.

Capacity for return is not necessarily permission to compel it.

The Board does not regard necromancy as an offense against nature merely because it crosses a boundary that ordinary mortals cannot cross.

It regards the boundary as a place where responsibility must become particularly careful.

For the ability to act where others cannot resist creates an obligation to consider what resistance might have meant.

The ability to speak for those who cannot answer creates an obligation to distinguish their interests from one's own.

And the ability to command the dead does not eliminate the moral significance of the question:

By whose authority?

The Board recognizes the Priests of Rathma as serious students of life and death.

It recognizes their commitment to Balance.

It recognizes their contributions to the protection of Sanctuary.

It now invites them to consider whether Balance includes restraint upon their own power.

The Board recognizes that death is part of the cycle of existence.

It does not recognize death as the termination of every obligation concerning those who have died.

The Board recognizes that necromantic intervention may preserve the living.

It does not recognize preservation as unlimited authority over the dead.

The Board recognizes the extraordinary abilities of the Priests of Rathma.

It does not recognize ability as a substitute for permission.

And finally:

The Board recognizes that the dead cannot always object.

It does not follow that the living need never ask.

The inquiry remains open.

XXVIII. DISPOSITION

SERB-010 shall remain open pending further evidence concerning the metaphysical mechanisms of reanimation, the status of spiritual manifestations, the validity of postmortem consent, and the institutional safeguards maintained by the Priests of Rathma.

The Board enters no general prohibition upon necromantic practice.

It further enters no finding that membership in the order establishes wrongdoing.

Nevertheless, the Board finds substantial grounds for examining practices involving involuntary spiritual compulsion, unauthorized use of identifiable remains, and the indefinite direction of potentially aware entities.

The Board reserves separate proceedings concerning:

- The moral status of reanimated beings.
- The reliability of postmortem testimony.
- The use of necromancy in military operations.
- The rights of surviving families.
- The treatment of remains recovered from battlefields.
- The creation and termination of necromantic constructs.
- The distinction between magical animation and restoration of consciousness.
- The meaning and application of Balance.

No directive requiring the destruction or release of existing animated entities is entered without further consideration of their nature and interests.

So entered.

Sanctuary Ethics Review Board
Office of Postmortem Autonomy and Extraordinary Biological Practice
Division of Spiritual Consent and Necromantic Accountability

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM A

Regarding the Assertion That the Subject Was Already Dead

The Office of Personal Autonomy has received a preliminary response asserting that the remains employed in the relevant practice belonged to a person who was already deceased.

The Office acknowledges this fact.

It has been entered into the record.

However, the present inquiry concerns whether death extinguished all relevant interests concerning the remains.

The statement that the person was deceased does not independently resolve that question.

The respondent is therefore requested to identify the nature of the intervention and the basis upon which it was authorized.

The Board recognizes that the subject was dead.

The Board asks whether the subject was available.

The two propositions are not identical.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM B

Regarding the Classification of Skeletal Servants

The Office of Created Persons and Autonomous Systems has reviewed the designation *skeletal servant*.

The Office acknowledges that necromancers may animate skeletons for legitimate protective purposes.

However, the designation does not conclusively establish the absence of consciousness.

Nor does it establish that the remains were obtained with appropriate authorization.

The respondent is therefore requested to identify whether the animation involves a continuing individual spirit.

Where no spirit is involved, the Office requests clarification concerning the origin and disposition of the remains.

The Board respectfully notes that the title "servant" describes an assigned role.

It does not, by itself, establish that the entity agreed to serve.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM C

Regarding Corpse Explosion

The Office of Extraordinary Hazard Management has received information concerning a practice in which mortal remains are employed as explosive instruments.

The Office acknowledges that the practice may possess significant defensive utility.

It further recognizes that an immediate threat may justify extraordinary intervention.

However, the Office requests clarification concerning the selection of remains and the precautions taken to protect surrounding persons.

The respondent is invited to provide evidence concerning the necessity and proportionality of the intervention.

For avoidance of doubt, the Office does not consider the general statement *the corpse was nearby* sufficient to establish necessity.

The Board respectfully observes that proximity is not authorization.

Nor is explosive potential an adequate substitute for a risk assessment.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM D

Regarding the Recovery of Remains

The Office of Funerary Integrity has reviewed preliminary descriptions of necromantic material acquisition.

The Office recognizes that certain practices require bones or other remains.

Nevertheless, the existence of material demand does not independently establish a right to remove those materials from burial sites.

The respondent is therefore requested to identify any procedures governing exhumation.

The Office further requests clarification concerning whether prior wishes, family interests, and local funerary practices are considered.

The Office respectfully advises that a cemetery is not presumed to operate as an unrestricted supply depot.

The matter remains under review.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM E

Regarding Spiritual Testimony

The Office of Evidentiary Integrity has received an offer to produce testimony from a deceased witness.

The Office acknowledges that necromantic communication may provide information of substantial value.

However, the witness's identity and independence must be established.

The Office therefore requests documentation concerning the summoning method and any magical influence affecting the response.

The Board further requests clarification concerning whether the witness may decline to answer.

The Office respectfully observes that the ability to compel a witness's appearance does not establish the reliability of the witness's statements.

Nor does death establish that the witness is relieved of every possible motive to mislead.

The proposed testimony shall remain subject to evidentiary review.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM F

Regarding the Doctrine of Balance

The Office of Institutional Ethics has received a submission asserting that the intervention under review was necessary to preserve Balance.

The Office acknowledges the philosophical importance of Balance within the teachings of Rathma.

It further recognizes that the preservation of Sanctuary may require extraordinary action.

However, the respondent is requested to identify the specific disruption addressed and the manner in which the proposed intervention would remedy it.

A general invocation of Balance does not independently establish necessity.

The Board recognizes Balance as a legitimate subject of philosophical consideration.

It requests that Balance also be explained when employed as an operational authorization.

The submission remains in the record.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM G

Regarding the Use of Remains in Military Operations

The Office of Military Ethics has received an inquiry concerning whether a deceased combatant may be reanimated for further service.

The Office recognizes that the person may have participated voluntarily in military operations while alive.

However, prior military service does not automatically establish consent to postmortem reanimation.

The respondent is therefore requested to identify the basis upon which further service is authorized.

The Office further requests clarification concerning the duration and termination of such service.

The Board respectfully notes that enlistment during life does not automatically establish perpetual service after death.

The question remains open.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM H

Regarding Necromantic Constructs

The Office of Created Persons and Autonomous Systems has received information concerning golems and other magically animated entities.

The Office recognizes that some constructs may lack independent consciousness.

However, the method of creation and the materials employed do not conclusively establish the resulting entity's moral status.

The respondent is therefore requested to provide evidence concerning the entity's capacities.

The Board further requests clarification concerning whether the construct can refuse instructions or experience distress.

The Office respectfully advises that the phrase "I made it" does not, by itself, resolve the question of whether the resulting entity possesses interests of its own.

This principle remains consistent with SERB-001 and SERB-007.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM I

Regarding the Fear of Necromancy

The Office of Institutional Fairness has received objections concerning the mere presence of necromancers within civilian communities.

The objections cite dark robes, ceremonial scythes, skeletal companions, and unfamiliar magical practices.

The Office acknowledges that certain practices may present legitimate safety concerns.

However, the appearance of a practitioner does not independently establish misconduct.

The Board therefore requests that allegations identify specific actions or risks.

The possession of a scythe may be relevant in particular circumstances.

It does not automatically establish intent to harm.

The Board respectfully notes that a disturbing professional aesthetic is not, without additional evidence, an ethical violation.

The objection is not sustained.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADDENDUM J

Regarding the Termination of Service

The Office of Postmortem Autonomy has received a request to clarify the appropriate disposition of reanimated servants following completion of an operation.

The Office acknowledges that different forms of animation may require different termination procedures.

Nevertheless, the respondent is requested to identify whether any independently aware entity remains subject to continuing compulsion after the original purpose has concluded.

Where animation involves only physical remains, the Office requests clarification concerning safe and respectful disposition.

Where a continuing spirit is involved, additional questions concerning autonomy may arise.

The Board respectfully observes that completing the task does not automatically establish that every entity summoned to perform it has been properly released.

The matter remains under review.

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE

SERB-010 — REGARDING THE AUTHORITY TO COMMAND THE DEAD

The Sanctuary Ethics Review Board has completed its preliminary consideration of the proposition that the ability to reanimate remains establishes unrestricted authority concerning their use.

The proposition is not sustained.

The Board recognizes that necromantic practices may be legitimate.

It further recognizes that the Priests of Rathma possess substantial expertise and an established commitment to the protection of Sanctuary.

Nevertheless, the capacity to perform a magical intervention does not independently establish permission to perform it.

The Board therefore requests that the respondent institutions distinguish between the capacity to command and the legitimacy of the command.

The following assertions have been entered into the record:

That the subject was deceased.

That the remains were available.

That the intervention preserved Balance.

That the resulting servant performed effectively.

That no audible objection was received.

The Board acknowledges these statements.

However, none independently establishes that the intervention was ethically authorized.

The Board further recognizes that a deceased person may no longer possess every interest ordinarily associated with living autonomy.

The precise consequences of death remain relevant to determining the appropriate standard.

Nevertheless, the mere inability of a person to refuse does not automatically establish that every possible intervention is permitted.

The Board recognizes that the dead may be silent.

The Board does not recognize silence as universal consent.

No further demonstration of skeletal obedience is required.

The obedience is already in evidence.

The question concerns the authority under which it was obtained.

END OF SERB-010

NOTICE OF SUBSEQUENT MUNICIPAL PROCEEDING

SERB-MUN-001

WHETHER "ANCIENT EVIL BENEATH THE CATHEDRAL" CONSTITUTES AN ADEQUATE MUNICIPAL DISCLOSURE NOTICE

On Extraordinary Premises Hazards, Religious Occupancy, Subterranean Containment, and the Continuing Duty to Warn

Status: Referred for Independent Institutional Review

Principal Historical Subjects:

- The Horadrim
- The Historical Custodians of Tristram Cathedral
- The Municipal Authorities of Tristram
- Archbishop Lazarus
- The Historical Administration of King Leoric

Principal Questions:

Whether the presence of Diablo's soulstone beneath a structure subsequently employed for religious assembly created continuing disclosure obligations.

Whether the original Horadric custodians established adequate succession procedures.

Whether later occupants received sufficient information concerning the hazard.

Whether public warnings adequately distinguished an ordinary ancient ruin from a site containing an imprisoned Prime Evil.

Whether the continued occupation of the premises was consistent with reasonable public safety precautions.

PRELIMINARY ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATION:

The Board recognizes that the original Horadric containment arrangement was established for legitimate protective purposes.

It further recognizes that the surrounding settlement developed under historical circumstances different from those prevailing at the time of the original imprisonment.

Nevertheless, the subsequent use of the site raises questions concerning disclosure and institutional continuity.

The Board therefore requests any surviving records concerning the transfer of custody and responsibility.

In particular, it seeks clarification concerning whether religious and municipal officials were informed of the nature of the extraordinary hazard beneath the structure.

The Office respectfully observes that "ancient evil" is a description of considerable breadth.

The presence of Diablo, Lord of Terror, may warrant greater specificity.

No final occupancy determination is entered.

END OF RESERVED NOTICE