
Subject: Thanks Arnold

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 04:45:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://forums.trielite.net/index.php?topic=215.0>

The hole keeps getting deeper.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 12:37:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So, what's the problem? It's just banning the sale of violent video games (which is intended to be and will be interpreted as M+ rated games) to children, which already can't buy M rated games at most retail/game stores, so it's really not changing that much. This isn't banning the use of M rated games by children, or ordering the developers to censor themselves, this is only forcing parents to buy the M rated games for their children instead of allowing the children to come in and get it themselves.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 15:55:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's the idea behind it that is problematic, not the practice. Parents are already supposed to be the key of the ratings system. This sort of legislation does four things:

1. It fingers videogames as a cause of violence in children, which is a claim that we already know holds no water.
2. It removes responsibility from the parents, it does not give them more. This bill says, in no uncertain terms, that parents can't be trusted to watch what their kids are into, so the government should play watchdog instead. That is dangerous ground to tread on.
3. As a result of #2, parents get the message that they don't HAVE to watch what their kids are doing anymore, BECAUSE the government will do it for them. Another shaky assumption, which leads to parents that are less and less responsible (and more and more apathetic) about their childrens' behavior and upbringing.
4. Paves the way for lawsuits against the entertainment industry. While the parents are paying less attention tot heir kids, and the government is only pretending to care, the kids go out and do their thing anyway, having not learned differently from anybody. The parents, shocked and appalled, are quick to shift blame from themselves to what they see as the source of their childrens' behavior. And what more obvious scapegoat than the violent videogames that the government was supposed to be regulating?

In short, this won't do shit except for making things worse. If little 8-year-old Timmy goes out and buys Doom 3, it's supposed to be Mommy and Daddy's job to catch him playing it, give him a lecture, and make him return it. That's parenting. That's how people learn what is and is not appropriate- by trial and error. Remove the possibility of making an error, and you're never going to earn a lesson from it, are you?

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 18:30:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Responsible parents are supposed to let their children buy anything and then take away the innapropriate stuff after they've used them? That doesn't sound like responsible to me, responsible parents would have been at the store with their children in the first place to decide what their children can or can't get. The law only makes it so the child can't get it himself without the parent's knowledge (or some adult), it doesn't take responsibility away from the parent.

Besides setting a precedent for lawsuits and/or whatever, it has no real effect since most retail and game stores already don't sell M rated games to those under 17.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 23:42:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is rdiculus, its only a matter of time before were all abck to playing pong.
(figuratively speaking)

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold
Posted by [deerwalk](#) on Sat, 15 Oct 2005 20:10:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So what if your to young get your mom to buy it for you.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold
Posted by [Dishman](#) on Sat, 15 Oct 2005 21:07:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

grow some balls and find a place that doesn't check id's or care.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Sat, 15 Oct 2005 23:00:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

deerwalk wrote on Sat, 15 October 2005 16:10 So what if your to young get your mom to buy it for you.

Not all people are too young ass.

I mean the people who ARE too young are going to sufer the most of this, its the retards that take games too seriously and act in real life to them that are causing this bullshit.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold

Posted by [runewood](#) on Tue, 18 Oct 2005 00:38:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Someone has to be blamed, what is he gunna say "Your children are violent killers because you are morons who arnt good parents!"?

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 18 Oct 2005 07:19:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:what is he gunna say "Your children are violent killers because you are morons who arnt good parents!"?

FUCK YES.

Subject: Re: Thanks Arnold

Posted by [SuperMidget](#) on Tue, 18 Oct 2005 17:58:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 12 October 2005 11:55 It's the idea behind it that is problematic, not the practice. Parents are already supposed to be the key of the ratings system. This sort of legislation does four things:

1. It fingers videogames as a cause of violence in children, which is a claim that we already know holds no water.
2. It removes responsibility from the parents, it does not give them more. This bill says, in no uncertain terms, that parents can't be trusted to watch what their kids are into, so the government should play watchdog instead. That is dangerous ground to tread on.
3. As a result of #2, parents get the message that they don't HAVE to watch what their kids are doing anymore, BECAUSE the government will do it for them. Another shaky assumption, which leads to parents that are less and less responsible (and more and more apathetic) about their childrens' behavior and upbringing.

4. Paves the way for lawsuits against the entertainment industry. While the parents are paying less attention to their kids, and the government is only pretending to care, the kids go out and do their thing anyway, having not learned differently from anybody. The parents, shocked and appalled, are quick to shift blame from themselves to what they see as the source of their children's behavior. And what more obvious scapegoat than the violent videogames that the government was supposed to be regulating?

In short, this won't do shit except for making things worse. If little 8-year-old Timmy goes out and buys Doom 3, it's supposed to be Mommy and Daddy's job to catch him playing it, give him a lecture, and make him return it. That's parenting. That's how people learn what is and is not appropriate- by trial and error. Remove the possibility of making an error, and you're never going to earn a lesson from it, are you?

Nukeit, you raise some extremely idealistically valid points, but they are viewed (by you) to be way off center.

For the number 2 AND 3 suggestion, it does NOT remove the responsibility from the parents, little 8 year old Timmy should not be ALLOWED to buy that Doom 3 game. It's like why the strip joints keep out people 18 and under out of their stores. Law states this to be done. Don't you think it is even REMOTELY possible, that the government should also pass legislature (that's idea, by the way, was brought up by and voted for by the public of your country) that disallows citizens that are not of a agreed mature age to purchase these items? Be honest with yourself and you'll soon see that I got a point.

As to number 4, in no way will this pave a way for easy lawsuit against the entertainment industry. The parents elected a board (called the ESRB) to govern the restrictions and label contents of games' material and content. Why would they throw a lawsuit at simply jacking ratings? Now I'm not saying that the WHOLE public is together with one standard opinion, but if anything they're would be a lawsuit against them for their ratings to be not strict enough (This is in regards to the GTA 3: San Andreas upgrade that recently occurred).

Parents now a days are too busy to be there 100% for their children (especially the gaming age 10-15). A vast population suffer from poverty (NOT homelessness), single parenting, or depression. As for the working class, they often have sitters or let the kids stay home alone for most of the rest of the day. They don't have TIME to govern and punish their children's deviant actions. The government is merely trying to HELP you by funding ESRB and letting them practice.

Get off your government's back, they're trying pretty hard. That's not to say that there's NO corruption or false practice, but for the main part, it works, so let it be. (Not applicable to Americans, I disagree with almost every action that Bush has done.)

As to close, I just wish to tell you that you are a very talented arguer, and this is just for friendly competition, nothing personal
