

## CI 2364 J Deese

First name:

Jay

Last name:

Deese

Q1:

Improve the broken, outdated existing one, to include an R18+ classification, for consumers over the age of 18. There's quite a few of us.

Q2:

To have a rational system based on consumers wants/needs, and to stop pandering to the non consumers that just enjoy censorship for censorship's sake.

Q3:

Not at all. It should be a decision left to the end consumer.

Q4:

Depending on the validity of the complaint, yes.

Q5:

Content designed for children is not the issue. It's content (or lack thereof) designed for adults, being refused classification due to children existing.

Q6:

No, the content should affect the classification, not impact studies conducted by special interest groups.

Q7:

Artwork should never be censored. Offensive to one is beauty to another.

Q8:

Classification systems could be specialised to suit the platform/genre etc. However, if a rating such as R18+ exists for movies and film, video games should be allowed the same rating system, not limited to content designed for 15 year olds, for example.

Q9:

No, content is content, regardless of how many people see it.

Q10:

Content accessed in public, theoretically should be "public-safe". Nothing the average person would find particularly offensive etc.

Content accessed in the privacy of your own home should be censored by the one person it is affecting, namely the individual viewing the content.

Q11:

I don't think anyone is arguing for classification to be dropped completely, most people just want the current system to be improved. Australians are being denied content that is distributed globally every day, due to the governments inaction to bring our ratings system into the present.

Q12:

The internet belongs to the people, any government that attempts to block content that is freely available to all, is an oppressive one.

But to answer the question, ask Iran or China.

Q13:

Parental responsibility.

Q14:

Better sex education for children / teens, keep sexually explicit magazines behind the counter, heavy fines for selling it to minors, etc etc.

Although really, who still reads magazines?

Q15:

When its relevant. If something is deemed to be inappropriate for a particular group, such as children, then of course you would display classification markings. Personally I can't think of a reason why you wouldn't display the rating on the content.

Q16:

To listen to the actual consumers, and not noisy individuals that are on a personal mission to shape the world around them to suit their preferences. Governments and industry bodies should listen to the users.

Q17:

Well actually having people that have played a video game more than once in their life might be a good idea for the video game industry.

Anything would be more practical than current arrangements. How does one person refusing to come to the table break down the entire discussion? Because that's my understanding of the current system.

Q18:

Obvious and straightforward - the opposite of Q18's sentence structure.

Well if the "likely classification is obvious and straightforward", the decision should be pretty "obvious and straightforward".

In other words, yes.

Q19:

Q20:

The idea that the average age of video gamers is 15, and therefore the highest rating a game can be granted is MA15 is ridiculous.

The average age is closer to 30 and increasing each year. Give us a system that doesn't refuse classification for content designed for adults, by default.

Q21:

Yes, ratings that match across the board. If films are allowed an R18+ rating, so should video games.

Q22:

Have the same markings, criteria and guidelines across the board. Simple.

I find it strange that rape scenes are accepted in film classification, yet depicting sex between consenting adults in a video game can get it banned. Very strange indeed.

Q23:

Q24:

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: