

CI 1072 C Proudmore

First name: Christopher

Last name: Proudmore

Q1:

Yes.

Q2:

To add a R18+ rating for video games in order to allow those who wish to play said games the choice to play them, rather than simply forcing them not to be even sold on the offchance that a bad parent buys a game marked for 18+ year olds for their 13 year old son.

Q3:

No. Everything should be classified based on itself.

Q4:

Yes, unless it is something in particular that obviously requires classification.

Q5:

The potential impact of content should not matter. If something is classified as R18+ and a parent buys said product for their young child anyway, that is their fault. Content designed for children should be the only things children receive. There is a reason we have an R18 rating for films and other media.

Q6:

Yes. If millions of people over the age of 25 are interested in purchasing a product suitable only for adults, the product should not be banned simply because of children.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

To be consistent, yes. However, logically this would not work. The prevalence of public radio stations and online music stores prevents this rating from being useful in any way.

Q9:

Yes. If millions of people over the age of 25 are interested in purchasing a product suitable only for adults, the product should not be banned simply because of children.

Q10:

No. If someone wishes to access content, they should have the right to do so. If a parent does not want their child exposed to said content, it is up to the parent to prevent the child from seeing it, not the government stopping everyone else.

Q11:

None. Everything should just be given a rating based on what age is appropriate for viewing said content. If the content is not inherently illegal there should be no reason why someone who wants to view it should be unable to.

Q12:

There should be an OPT-IN ONLY internet censor for Parents or others who wish to limit access to certain online content. The average adult should not have their access restricted without any choice.

Q13:

There should be an OPT-IN ONLY internet censor for Parents or others who wish to limit access to certain online content.

Q14:

Better parenting.

Q15:

Always. As long as the content is there for those willing to view, displaying warnings is fine. It will probably reduce the problem of children seeing content unsuitable for their age.

Q16:

They should simply classify something from G(All Ages) to R(18+) and then let people make up their own damn minds on whether they want to view the content.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Films. Video games. Television. Everything.

Q19:

Perhaps.

Q20:

All classifications are understood. The only ones that cause slight confusion are the differences between M and MA ratings, but even they are understood fully once explained.

Q21:

It's possible that M and MA should be merged (theres no real need for both of them). An R18+ rating should be added for any media type that does not currently have one. This is required for consistency and to not be stupid.

Q22:

Everything already is consistent. Except that video games do not have an R18+ rating, and to my knowledge is the only industry that doesn't. This makes no sense. At all.

Q23:

Perhaps. Though some adjustments would be required.

Q24:

Only that which is illegal (child pornography, graphic depictions of murder, etc.).

Q25:

No. It is far too broad.

Q26:

No.

Q27:

Something similar to America's scheme would work.

Q28:

They should refer to the Federal Government.

Q29:

R18+ rating for media that does not have it. How many times do I have to say it?

Other comments:

