Stop Killing Games

An Exposé on the Industry's Anti-Consumer Practices

Exposing the Gaming Industry's Coordinated Campaign Against Consumer Rights

The gaming industry's opposition to the Stop Killing Games initiative reveals a coordinated campaign of misinformation built on demonstrable hypocrisy. While executives publicly champion "player-first" values, their trade organization, Video Games Europe, fights to maintain the right to destroy games that customers have purchased.

The Stop Killing Games Movement

Having reached over 1 million signatures, the initiative asks for simple, reasonable guarantees: when publishers end support for online games, players should retain access to products they purchased. This means providing **offline modes**, **server binaries**, or other preservation methods—not forcing publishers to maintain servers indefinitely.

A Web of Industry Control & Hypocrisy

Video Games Europe's Opposition

VGE, representing giants like EA, Ubisoft, and Microsoft, claims preservation is "prohibitively expensive" and a "security risk." Their most revealing contradiction? Arguing they can't support preservation because it would violate the "PEGI Code of Conduct"—a system they founded and control.

Executive Hypocrisy: "Player-First" vs. Reality

EA's Andrew Wilson: The "Player-First" Deception

"Is this good for the player?"

While claiming a "player-first" philosophy, EA declared live services the "foundation of our business," shut down 13 games in 2025 alone, and continues to sell broken Titanfall games. Their own user agreement clarifies players only license games, contradicting ownership marketing.

Ubisoft's Leadership: Openly Anti-Consumer

"Gamers need to get comfortable not owning their games." - Philippe Tremblay

After shutting down The Crew, Ubisoft revoked users' licenses entirely, deleting the game from libraries. In court, they argued players "never actually owned" the game, a direct contradiction to their marketing and CEO's promotion of "actual ownership" via blockchain.

Activision's Bobby Kotick: Acknowledging Passion, Destroying Games

Gamers would "revolt" if Call of Duty were removed.

Despite acknowledging player attachment, Activision shuts down games without refunds and aggressively issues cease-and-desist notices against community preservation projects, stifling any fan-led efforts.

Microsoft's Phil Spencer: Preservation Advocate Turned Opponent

Advocated for "industry-wide game preservation."

Despite public support for preservation and legal emulation, Spencer oversaw massive studio closures and layoffs. As a member of VGE, Microsoft Gaming officially opposes the Stop Killing Games initiative.

The Security Argument Collapses Under Scrutiny

VGE claims shutdowns protect player security. The evidence shows their own active, profitable games suffer worse security problems than community-preserved titles.

Active Games with Severe Unpatched Vulnerabilities

- **Titanfall Series:** Unplayable since 2018 due to DDoS/RCE exploits, yet still sold by EA.
- **Apex Legends:** Major tournament disrupted in 2024 by an RCE exploit injecting cheats.
- **GTA Online:** RCE vulnerabilities allowed hackers to delete accounts and modify stats.
- Call of Duty: A persistent, never-ending cheating epidemic.

Community Solutions Outperform Publisher Security

- World of Warcraft (Nostalrius): Zero major security incidents, inspired Blizzard to create WoW Classic.
- **GTA V (FiveM):** More secure than official online, acquired by Rockstar.
- **City of Heroes:** Community-run servers now officially licensed, better maintained than the original.
- **Skyrim Unofficial Patches:** Fixed thousands of bugs and exploits left unpatched by the publisher.

The Real Motivation: Revenue, Not Safety

Publishers' true concerns become clear in their own statements. Video Games Europe worries about "competition from community-supported versions of games" and that preserved games would "jeopardize the financial investments of the video game companies." This is about forcing consumers to buy remasters instead of playing preserved original games.

The Pattern of Planned Obsolescence

There is an acceleration of game shutdowns, with EA leading the destruction. In 2025 alone, EA shut down 13 games, including titles with dedicated player bases. This pattern represents deliberate planned obsolescence designed to force players toward newer titles and recurring revenue streams.

Successful Examples Disprove Opposition Claims

Despite VGE's claims that preservation is impossible, several publishers have successfully released server code and preserved games:

- **EA's Command & Conquer:** Released source code for multiple titles under GPL license, enabling community preservation at minimal cost.
- **Ubisoft's World in Conflict:** Released server source code after shutdown, allowing community-hosted servers.
- NCSoft's City of Heroes Licensing: Granted official licensing to community servers, keeping the game alive at virtually no cost.

VGE's Member Companies: United in Hypocrisy

The following companies, through VGE membership, officially oppose Stop Killing Games while their executives make contradictory public statements:

Nintendo	Microsoft	Sony
EA	Ubisoft	Activision Blizzard

Sega

What Stop Killing Games Actually Requires

The movement's demands are reasonable and achievable, focusing on basic consumer rights:

- 1. **End-of-life planning:** Require companies to consider preservation during development.
- 2. **Functional offline modes:** Ensure games can function without constant server connections.
- 3. **Server binaries:** Provide tools for communities to host servers when official support ends.
- 4. **Legal clarity:** Establish that purchased games cannot be completely destroyed.

Do Your Part.

Support the cause and demand accountability from an industry that sells products designed to be destroyed.

Sign the EU Citizens' Initiative

Learn More at stopkillinggames.com

UK citizens can search for the "Prohibit publishers irrevocably disabling video games" petition on the Parliament website.



Conclusion: The Mask Has Slipped

The Stop Killing Games controversy has exposed the gaming industry's true priorities. When faced with legislation that would actually benefit players, these companies revealed their real stance: profits over preservation, control over consumer rights, and corporate interests over community needs.

Their arguments about security are undermined by their own poor track record. Their claims about costs are laughable. The real concern is revenue protection, not player security. This movement represents our chance to demand accountability.

Sources and Documentation

Official Documents

- Stop Killing Games official website
- EU Citizens' Initiative petition
- Video Games Europe opposition PDF
- Video Games Europe statement

Executive Statements

- Ubisoft's "Don't Own Games" stance
- Ubisoft legal defense of The Crew shutdown
- EA's "Player-First" vs Live Service reality
- Phil Spencer on game preservation (2021)
- Phil Spencer layoff memo
- Bobby Kotick "revolt" testimony

Security Failures & Exploits

- Save Titanfall campaign documentation
- Titanfall 2 RCE vulnerability (EA forum)
- Titanfall 2 security issues (Ars Technica)
- PC Gamer on Titanfall server security
- Apex Legends tournament hack
- GTA Online RCE exploit
- CVE-2023-24059 (GTA Online)

Community Preservation

- Nostalrius WoW server
- City of Heroes community preservation
- City of Heroes official license
- Skyrim Unofficial Patch
- Ubisoft World in Conflict source release

Game Shutdowns & Industry Opposition

- PC Gamer analysis of industry response
- The Crew shutdown and license revocation
- Eurogamer on The Crew license revocation
- The Crew delisting announcement
- EA's 2025 game shutdowns list (Gamerant)
- FIFA 23 shutdown
- Madden NFL shutdowns
- EA games shutting down 2025 (Indy100)
- Marvel Heroes shutdown (Historical)
- SimCity server issues (Historical)

This document is a beautified web version of the "Stop Killing Games" PDF. All information and links are preserved from the original source.

© 2025 - Information compiled by advocates for consumer rights in gaming.