

CI 1543 M Cooke

First name: Mathew

Last name: Cooke

Q1:

A new framework. The existing framework (I believe) attempts to classify games via a panel evaluation which is both difficult and prone to abuse. Some examples are the positive use of drugs (in the sense it benefits your character) was censored in Fallout 3,

Q2:

Allowing game manufactures to self classify and allow for objections to classification by the public, to be evaluated by the ALRC. I believe its more important for people to know the content of games more so than be protected from them, so as long as a game is up front about its contents (much like movies are) then I see no issue with people being able to make their own decisions

Q3:

No, because I believe its infeasible. Game content can be accessed in game, via download from game sites, or developed by other members of the public, independent of the game developer, rendering this a very difficult and effectively pointless exercise

Q4:

Possibly. As stated, self regulation by the gaming industry and then evaluation by the ALRC on objection from the public would handle this

Q5:

No, as I see this as being subjective, or at least more subjective than just stating the game content.

Q6:

no

Q7:

No. Art, or at least good art is supposed to challenge. As long as no illegal acts that have harmed people have been done in the act of creating that art, I see no need for government intervention. However, if an exhibition is disturbing, I see nothing wrong with the gallery choosing to warn people of the disturbing nature of the art before they enter the exhibition.

Q8:

No. This doesn't occur with books (to the best of my knowledge), so why start on audio books

Q9:

no

Q10:

no

Q11:

If there is an education element to the content, I believe more lenience should be given.. ie, content on the Nazi concentration camps would be disturbing, and it should be. We cannot afford to gloss over the mistakes of the past out of fear of offending someone

Q12:

At best, you could attempt to control online access to content via direct negotiation with the game manufactures. Anything else is a waste of time.

Q13:

Education and parental supervision

Q14:

It can't. The cat is out of the bag on that one.

Q15:

Dialog box before download

Q16:

Government review on complaint, possibly after not being able to settle with industry bodies

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Violence

Q19:

Not under self regulation.. Possibly for small aussie companies, otherwise.

Q20:

All understood

Q21:

R (restricted) for games for 18+ (same as movies)

Q22:

Conform to movie classification standards & symbols

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

I don't believe in censorship, so none

Q25:

No

Q26:

Yes. Consistency makes it simple for everyone.

Q27:

Q28:

yes

Q29:

Provide more concrete guidelines for classification. Current enforcement of classification in gaming suggests that there is significant scope for interpretation on the nature of content in games, and generally on the more conservative side that allows games to be banned.

Other comments: