Monopoly as a game utilizes the real-world social constructs of money, property, and ownership to create what is supposed to be an abstraction of modern capitalist economics. The players in *Monopoly* aim to buy properties that they can use to collect rent from other players, the final object being to bankrupt other players and remain the last player with money. The moral and ethical implications of the game come from two of its most basic mechanics: *choice* and *chance*. Each player chooses to buy property and upgrade them, but random dice rolls determine where they land, who they have to pay, and whether they go to jail, *directly* to jail. As a result, negative outcomes can be easily attributed to chance: one goes bankrupt because they owe whoever the dice takes them to. However, positive outcomes can be easily attributed to one's own choices: one gains money because of their choice to buy that property.

The ethical implications of *Monopoly* are that the "winners" of the capitalist system—the one created in the game and, by extension, the one in real life—get to the top through their personal skill, their choices, while the "losers" get there by chance. This, however, is not how the world often works. The extremes of economic inequality seen (and required) in *Monopoly* have analogs in the real world not because of random forces but instead due to social injustice and inequality in opportunities. If one were to use *Monopoly* as a model for ethical thinking, they would come to the same tired "bootstraps" cliche the capitalists are always talking about.