Scott Reed talking:

Some people in the community as the game has become more, um, more regarded . . . have raised the concerns about how we as graduate students have absorbed a lot of cost in producing the game and um . . . trust me, it concerns us too. We're not . . . we're not rolling in any money here.

There's a lot of real labor; there's a lot of real capital that goes into the game. And I think it's . . . it makes sense that people be concerned about how we are aware of that. We were lucky early on thanks to Doug Eyman to get some funding through Cengage; there wasn't a very formal process to it. We just asked if they were interested, and they helped us defray some of the costs. I think in any given year, we're looking at roughly $1,500 or so in terms of the cost of actually putting on the game. And our sponsor, and having Cengage sponsor us has been . . . has helped. Um, this year we're switching up how we approach funding, and we're hopefully going to be able to arrange for some sustainable, more officially recognized sorts of funding.

Um . . . but just despite that, I personally for myself and I . . . I think most of the other organizers would agree with me, that we never regarded the cost of the game as an onus. We looked at it as our way of trying to give a gift to the community. Um, Emi Bunner, one of our designers, really early on—early and often—articulated to us the importance of a gift economy, and we try to make that something that the game encourages, to encourage generosity between players. And it's something that we . . . encourage ourselves. By not complaining about the cost. Because yeah, it costs a little money. What's money, you know?