

CI 1774 C Konior

First name: Cody

Last name: Konior

Q1:

A new framework.

Q2:

To allow each person to decide what games they want to play, legally, without the opinions of the government or society in general impinging on what is essentially not their business.

Q3:

Yes, because each technology has a different majority audience and development community; it goes against Australia's fair-go ethic to "tax" developers disproportionately... an independent iPhone developer who sells a game for \$1 cannot afford the same rating system as a multi-national Xbox 360 developer whose games retail for \$110 AUD. Nor are the target markets the same.

Q4:

Yes. It should not be mandatory to classify content. And even then, I do not support the restriction of content for adults.

Q5:

No. I believe in the actual impact of content, not the potential impact. I don't support classification of content specifically because it is targeted at children. If anything, the marketing is what needs to be regulated in that circumstance.

Q6:

Yes. Independent developers selling games for \$1 across multiple countries cannot afford multi-hundred dollar classification fees.

Q7:

No, because classifying these works implies a scale wherein at the top end there is a restriction against even adults accessing the material. I do not support this.

Q8:

No, because classifying these works implies a scale wherein at the top end there is a restriction against even adults accessing the material. I do not support this.

Q9:

No. This makes classification too complicated.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

None, in that there are no effective methods. Furthermore it is immoral to restrict the access of adults to information and entertainment in a (relatively) democratic society.

Q13:

By parental discussion and oversight.

Q14:

By parental discussion and oversight.

Q15:

Never.

Q16:

The government should not regulate the access of people to things. It's role is to serve the people in providing public utilities and such and to pay for defence.

Q17:

I don't know.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

No, because this kind of content should not require classification.

Q20:

Yes, I think the G/PG/M/MA/R/X categories are understood... why R and X are often missing, is not so understood, because it is ethically and morally wrong for these to be inaccessible in a modern society.

Q21:

Yes. Unclassified, as a category, should not be illegal.

Q22:

I don't know.

Q23:

No.

Q24:

None.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

It is important, on the other hand, federal classification is so restrictive that it is best if state governments can override those decisions with more sane ones.

Q27:

I don't care, I just want access to any content I see fit.

Q28:

Only if that legislate is less restrictive than the current legislation.

Q29:

My removing it; or by making unclassified content legally accessible.

Other comments:

I am an adult, citizen, human being. I do not agree with the government deciding what is fit for me to view, or not to view. I don't care what you do with ratings in regards to children, and the rights of children did not spark the move to have the classification system overhauled.

The classification system overhaul is about removing stodgy laws and giving increased legal rights to adults to access what we see fit, including video games, in the privacy of our own homes without

government intervention and oversight. It is not for the government to say what is right and wrong, or to pander to the masses in forcing their own biased, unscientific, and uneducated opinions on the rest of us, even if it makes you or your children feel safer at night.

A country, which restricts what people can imagine or create in an imaginary medium, is not safe in any definition of the word.