

CI 619 J Preston

First name: Josh

Last name: Preston

Q1:

The current framework is good, However i would like an R18+ rating for video games

Q2:

To introduce an R18+ rating for video games, and to allow people to make informed choices by providing ample information

Q3:

No, only parents are capable of monitoring what their child is exposed to

Q4:

it is most likely that people will raise an issue with hot button topics without any understanding of the topic, while real problems will go unnoticed.

Q5:

regarding video games, many people claim that the interactive nature of violence in video games makes them worse, however there is little scientific basis for this. Please better define "potential impact".

Q6:

Typically, big business will gun for a lower rating so that they can reach a wider potential audience, so they hardly ever create anything more than controversial.

Q7:

please refer to the recent Brown vs EMA case in the supreme court in america, as soon as you start restricting free speech, artists have less business motive to create content for adults, and creativity in the medium suffers.

Q8:

yes, standardization is a good idea, and exceptions should be backed up with scientific evidence that satisfies the Australian courts and general public.

Q9:

How would the potential size be determined. and how would size affect the classification. are you talking about ignoring niche markets because it would be too difficult to classify everything?

Q10:

again, parents should be responsible regardless. inappropriate adds and content exist both on public billboards, and on television adds, so it is accessible everywhere anyway.

Q11:

with the breadth of information and content out there, it would be hard to know where to draw the line. this is not a black and white answer, but i think you should focus not where the bad content is, but where people are most likely to take the classifications into consideration.

Q12:

you cannot, the government internet censorship was a colossal wast of money, and would have only covered content that people raised an issue with, not necessarily the worst of the worst. however as I

have said, parents are capable of monitoring their childrens activities online far better than any in-comprehensive joke of a rights infringing filter.

Q13:

see above

Q14:

hard to say, but that stuff has always been pretty visible in news agents.

Q15:

typically, public places like Malls, and prominent online retailers are the places I look for them.

Q16:

some level of censorship is inevitable, even an R18+ rating for video games would not open the floodgates for the worst of the worst. but i am very afraid of government censorship. As an adult that enjoys video games for adults that are not suitable for children for their tone (not necessarily sex or violence). I do not feel respected when the government steps in to make these decisions for me.

Q17:

industry self regulation works well in other countries, so i would be willing to accept it as an alternative to government regulation. industry cooperating with the Government sounds like the most reasonable solution.

Q18:

I am not sure, i cannot think of any content that would be simple to classify, but for the sake of avoiding overhead that having more content rated, then this sounds like a good idea.

Q19:

I believe there is a cost appreciated with having your content rated, if kickbacks allow independent creators to publish their work at a lower cost, then this could be a good thing.

Q20:

content descriptors are often confusing. and if you are, for example, reading a book, to evaluate it, then it cannot hurt to be more specific (see <http://www.whattheyplay.com/>). the logic behind general descriptors is fine, but the general nature of these descriptions leave too much to interpretation, and lead to confusion.

Q21:

An R18+ Rating for video games, it is starting to get a little ridiculous that we do not have one; every time Australia refuses classification for a game (because we do not have a rating for it), it makes us look like we hate this exiting and increasingly adult oriented medium. we are quickly being left with a bad, and undeserved, reputation that is cause not by a need to protect our people, but by a gap in our system.

Q22:

i do not thing consistent descriptors across multiple mediums is practical, it just means we will need more and more of them, at which point you may as will just list the things that people may be concerned about in black and white.

Q23:

perhaps reconsidered is a better approach, that would be a discussion on its own.

Q24:

see further up, you cannot block content on the internet. Even if I would like to have, for example, all video of rape blocked on the internet, you simply cannot. It is impractical and unnecessary if you place greater trust and information into the hands of parents.

Q25:

see above

Q26:

it should be promoted on line. a government website that outlines a national classification would avoid confusion, because local government could simply link to it in all instances.,

Q27:

at the moment, all of the attorneys general need to reach a consensus to change the rating system. this has only resulted in stalemates, and considering they only meet to discuss such issues every 6 months or so, the issue is never resolved, i would like to see a system capable of changing to stay relevant as audiences mature and as technology changes the needs of the calcification system.

Q28:

yes, but the scary part is not knowing what legislation they will introduce.

Q29:

see "Other comments"

Other comments:

The internet makes all of this more or less moot, classification is not about protection, because you cannot rate everything, so it should be about information; informing and educating people, particularly parents, is the best way to prevent adult content to get into the hands of minors.

please refer to <http://www.whattheyplay.com/> for a good example of how to use your resources best.