

In 2023, the U.S. video game industry generated total revenues of approximately **\$57.2 billion**, according to Statista data. Of this amount, about **\$48 billion** came from the video game content segment, which includes physical and digital games, apps and online platform subscriptions.

To estimate how much money the U.S. video game industry moves on a monthly basis, we can divide the reported annual revenue for 2023, which is approximately **\$57.2 billion**, by 12 months. This gives a monthly average of:

**$57.2 \text{ billion} \div 12 \approx \$4,767 \text{ million per month}$** .

Note that this is an average estimate, as revenues may vary monthly due to game releases, shopping seasons (such as Christmas) or special events. There is no specific monthly data in the sources consulted, but this estimate provides a reasonable approximation.

The global video game industry generated approximately **\$303.47 billion** in 2025, according to Precedence Research estimates. This figure is projected to grow to **\$721.77 billion** by 2034, with a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 10.15%. Other sources, such as Newzoo, estimate that in 2024 global revenues were **\$187.7 billion**, with projected growth to **\$213.3 billion** by 2027. Differences in estimates may be due to methodologies and segments considered (e.g. hardware, software, esports).

To calculate average monthly revenues in 2025, based on the estimate of **\$303.47 billion**:

**$303.47 \text{ billion} \div 12 \approx \$25.289 \text{ billion per month}$** .

This estimate is an average, as revenues vary based on specific releases, seasons and events.

Estimating the economic impact of removing 328 games from Steam in 2025 is complex due to the lack of specific data on the revenue generated by those games, their popularity and the context of their removal. However, I can provide an analysis based on available information and reasonable estimates, considering the size of the video game industry and the role of Steam.

Industry context and Steam.

- **Global video game industry revenue**: In 2025, the global video game industry generated approximately **\$303.47 billion** annually, according to Precedence Research.
- **US revenue**: In 2023, US revenue was **\$57.2 billion**, and it is reasonable to assume that in 2025 this figure is similar or slightly higher due to market growth.
- **Games on Steam**: In 2024, Steam released about **18,992 games**, of which 80% (about 14,951) had limited sales or limited players, classified as "limited" by Valve. In 2025, through July, **12,370 games** were released, averaging **62 games per day**.
- **Game removal**: According to sources, Steam removed hundreds of games in 2025, many of them with adult content, due to new policies related to payment processors. One source mentions that **385 games** were removed, which includes the 328 mentioned in your question.

Factors to estimate the economic impact.

1. **Type of games removed**:

- The 328 removed games likely include titles with adult content (such as gacha games or visual novels), which are often developed by small or independent studios
- Many of these games have limited reach and low sales, as 80% of games on Steam in 2024 barely generated significant revenue
- However, some niche games, such as gacha games, can generate considerable revenue through microtransactions, especially if they have a loyal player base.

2. **Average revenue per game**:

- In 2024, of the 18,992 games released, only a minority (approximately 20%) had a significant commercial impact. Assuming that the 328 games eliminated are mostly in the "limited" category (with low sales), their individual economic contribution would be low.

- Rough estimates suggest that an average indie game on Steam generates between **\$1,000 and \$50,000** in annual revenue, while the most successful ones can generate million. Given that the eliminated games appear to be niche, let's assume a conservative average of **\$10,000 per game** in annual revenue.

3. **Estimated calculation**:

- If each of the 328 games generated on average **\$10,000 per year**, the direct economic impact of their elimination would be:

**$328 \text{ games} \times \$10,000 = \$3,280,000$**  (\$3.28 million) in lost revenue annually.

- If some of these games were more successful (e.g., gacha with microtransactions), the impact could be greater, potentially reaching **tens of millions** if we include a few titles with above-average revenues.

4. **Impact on Steam and developers**:

- **For Steam**: The platform earns **30% of the revenue** from each game sold. Therefore, of the estimated \$3.28 million, Steam would lose approximately **\$984,000** in commissions. This is negligible compared to Steam's total revenue, which forms a sizable portion of the **\$303.47 billion** global market, given that Steam is the leading distribution platform for PCs.

- **For developers**: Independent developers, especially the small studios behind these 328 games, would be hardest hit, as they could lose a key source of revenue. Valve has offered credit for publishing other games, which could mitigate the long-term impact, but does not offset the immediate loss of visibility and sales

- **Effect on players**: Players who already purchased these games do not lose access, but the removal limits availability to new purchasers, reducing future revenue potential.

## 5. **\*\*Indirect impact\*\***:

- **\*\*Censorship and trust\*\***: The removal of games under pressure from payment processors (such as banks and credit card companies) has raised concerns about possible broader censorship, which could affect developer and player trust in Steam. This could lead some studios to look to other platforms, though none have the reach of Steam
- **\*\*Effect on the indie market\*\***: The removed games are often from indie developers, who already face difficulties to stand out in a saturated market (62 games per day in 2025). The removal of these titles could disincentivize small studios, especially those that rely on niche content to survive.

## Conclusion

The direct economic impact of removing 328 games from Steam is likely **\*\*modest\*\***, with an estimated loss of **\*\*\$3.28 million\*\*** in annual revenue, assuming low average revenue per game. For Steam, this represents a tiny fraction of its total revenue. However, the impact is more significant for independent developers, who could lose an important source of revenue and face creative constraints. Globally, this amount is negligible compared to the **\*\*\$303.47 billion\*\*** that the industry moves annually.

In the long term, the indirect impact (such as the perception of censorship or the disincentive for indie developers) could be more relevant than the immediate monetary losses, although quantifying it is difficult. If you need a more detailed analysis on a specific segment (e.g. gacha games or the impact on a specific country), I can dig deeper with more data.

Your question about the economic impact of the removal of 328 games from Steam and the influence of Collective Shout, including its alleged funding by the Australian government and the involvement of its members in the "revolving door" phenomenon, requires careful analysis. Below, I address these points based on the available information and search results provided, while maintaining a critical and objective approach.

## Context on the elimination of the 328 games.

As previously mentioned, the removal of approximately 328 games from Steam in 2025 (part of a total of 385, according to some sources) appears to be related to a campaign by Collective Shout, an Australian non-governmental organization that fights against the sexualization and objectification of women and girls in media, advertising and popular culture. According to reports, Collective Shout pressured payment processors (such as credit card companies) to cut ties with platforms such as Steam that hosted games with content deemed problematic, such as depictions of rape, incest or child abuse.

## Is Collective Shout funded by the Australian government?

There is no direct evidence in the sources provided to confirm that Collective Shout receives direct funding from the Australian government. According to its own website, Collective Shout describes itself as a not-for-profit organization operating on a "sustainable funding model based on loyal partnerships with donors and supporters committed to authentic change." No government

funding is explicitly mentioned in its public statements, and the organization emphasizes its grassroots character and independence, being nonpartisan and nonsectarian.

However, the lack of full transparency in the sources of funding for nonprofit organizations is a common theme, and the possibility of indirect government subsidies (e.g., through NGO support programs or specific projects) cannot be completely ruled out. Collective Shout has collaborated with government entities, such as Australia's eSafety Commissioner, on initiatives such as the Age Assurance Technology Trial, which indicates some alignment with government agendas, but this does not equate to direct funding. To confirm whether they receive government funding, it would require access to detailed public financial records or audits of the organization, which is not available from current sources.

#### Revolving door and Collective Shout members in government

The "revolving door" phenomenon refers to the practice of individuals moving from government roles to positions in private industry or NGOs, and vice versa, which can lead to conflicts of interest or undue influence on public policy. In the case of Collective Shout, a YouTube source claims that "a surprising number of its core members come directly from the Australian government or public sector," although it does not provide specific names or concrete evidence.

However, in reviewing the available information on the Collective Shout team, no clear evidence is found that its current or past members have held high-level government positions that would suggest an obvious case of a revolving door. For example:

- \*\*Melinda Tankard Reist\*\*, co-founder and prominent figure, has experience as a journalist, author and academic, but there is no mention of her having held government positions
- Other members, such as Lyn (with a background in medical research and ethics) and Coralie (with a background in business management), do not have government backgrounds highlighted in the sources.
- Bernie, with a degree in Business Communication, has worked in government and the private sector, but it is not specified in which governmental roles, and his position appears more administrative than high-level political.

While these connections do not confirm a robust case of revolving door, the lack of specific data on all Collective Shout members prevents completely dismissing the claim. In Australia, the revolving door phenomenon is well documented in sectors such as tobacco, alcohol, gambling and consulting, where former government officials move into lobbying or industry roles. However, there is no direct evidence connecting Collective Shout to this phenomenon in any meaningful way, beyond speculation on social media and an unverified YouTube source

It is important to note that Collective Shout has been active in lobbying the Australian government, for example, by sending open letters in 2019 and 2023 to promote age verification on porn sites and by collaborating with the eSafety Commissioner. This interaction with

government could be perceived as influence, but does not necessarily imply that its members have held government positions or that there is a revolving door

#### Economic impact of the elimination of the 328 games

As previously analyzed, the direct economic impact of removing these 328 games from Steam is estimated at **\$3.28 million** annually in lost revenue, assuming a conservative average of **\$10,000 per game**. For Steam, this represents a loss of approximately **\$984,000** in commissions (30% of revenue). This impact is minimal in the context of the **\$303.47 billion** global video game industry or the **\$57.2 billion** in the U.S.

If Collective Shout did indeed pressure payment processors to force the removal of these games, its influence would have had a limited but significant economic impact for independent developers, many of whom rely on Steam for their revenue. The action could also have indirect consequences, such as:

- **Loss of confidence in Steam**: The perception of censorship could drive some developers and gamers away from the platform, although Steam's dominance in the PC market makes this unlikely on a large scale.
- **Effect on the indie market**: The removed games, likely niche, primarily affected small studios, which could discourage the creation of similar content in the future.
- **Censorship debate**: The action has generated criticism on platforms such as X, where some users accuse Collective Shout of promoting censorship and attacking creative freedom, which could polarize the gaming community.

#### Criticism of Collective Shout claims.

Allegations on social media, such as those by @gamerbitsnet on X, suggesting that Collective Shout "defended pedophiles in Australia" or attempted to ban games such as *GTA V* and *Detroit: Become Human*, are supported by solid evidence in available sources. These claims appear to be exaggerations or biased interpretations of Collective Shout's campaigns against content they consider sexually exploitative. For example:

- Collective Shout has criticized games with sexually explicit or violent content, there are records of.

#### ### Conclusion.

1. **Government Funding**: There is no direct evidence that Collective Shout is funded by the Australian government. Its funding model is based on donations and sponsorships, but the lack of full transparency leaves open the possibility of indirect support.
2. **Economic Impact**: The removal of 328 games from Steam has an estimated direct economic impact of **\$3.28 million** annually, with more significant losses to independent developers than to Steam. Collective Shout's role in lobbying payment processors amplifies its influence, but the economic impact is small in the overall context of the video game industry.

3. **Network criticism**: The accusations against Collective Shout on X, such as "defending pedophiles" or attempting to ban popular games, are supported by evidence.

If it were conclusively proven that Collective Shout is directly funded by the Australian government, the implications would depend on the context, the nature of the funding, the applicable laws, and the reactions of stakeholders. In the following, I analyze the potential implications on several levels, maintaining an objective approach and based on available information, as well as relevant social, political and economic dynamics.

#### Legal and regulatory implications

- **Transparency and compliance**: In Australia, registered charities, such as Collective Shout, are regulated by the **Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)**. These organizations must report their sources of income, including donations, government grants and other funding. If Collective Shout receives government funding, this should be recorded in their public financial reports. If it has not been properly reported, they could face sanctions for lack of transparency, such as fines or revocation of their charitable status.
- **Conflict of interest investigations**: If government funding is shown to be linked to the "revolving door" (former government officials in key Collective Shout roles influencing public policy), this could trigger an investigation by bodies such as the **Australian National Audit Office** or the **Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC)** in New South Wales. This would be especially relevant if the funding was used to lobby private companies (such as Steam) or payment processors, which could be construed as an undue extension of government influence.
- **NGO regulation**: Australia has strict laws on NGO lobbying and influence. If government funding were to be used for campaigns that affect international companies, such as the removal of 328 games from Steam, there could be scrutiny over whether the Australian government is indirectly interfering in global markets, which could lead to diplomatic or trade tensions.

#### 2. Economic impact

- **Effect on Steam and the video game industry**: The removal of the 328 games already had an estimated economic impact of **\$3.28 million** in lost annual revenue, with losses of approximately **\$984,000** for Steam. Should it be proven that the Australian government funded these actions through Collective Shout, there could be additional economic repercussions:
  - **Boycott or rejection of Steam**: Gamers and developers could accuse Steam of bowing to foreign government pressure, which could damage its reputation and lead to a limited boycott, although Steam's dominance in the PC market makes this unlikely on a large scale.
  - **Impact on independent developers**: Small studios, especially those behind the removed games, could sue Steam or even the Australian government if it were proven that the pressure was orchestrated with public funds. This could generate significant legal costs and compensation.
- **Loss of confidence in the Australian market**: International companies may reconsider their presence in Australia if they perceive that the government is using NGOs to influence their operations. This could affect not only the video game industry, but also other digital platforms that rely on payment processors.

### 3. Political implications.

- **Reactions in Australia**: If government funding were confirmed, there could be political outrage, especially if the government is perceived to be using public funds to support campaigns that some consider censorship. This could:
  - Provoke criticism from opposition parties, such as the Liberal Party or the Greens, who could argue that the government is interfering in free speech or private markets.
  - Generate debates about the separation between government and NGOs, especially if former government officials are involved in Collective Shout, fueling "revolving door" accusations.
- **International pressure**: Countries with large video game industries, such as Japan or the U.S., could protest if the Australian government is shown to be behind the pressure on global payment processors (such as Visa, Mastercard or PayPal). This could escalate into commercial or diplomatic disputes, especially if the removed games come from developers in these countries.
- **Legislative reform**: The controversy could spur a debate on the regulation of digital content in Australia, including laws such as the **Online Safety Act** or the role of the **eSafety Commissioner**. Collective Shout has already collaborated with the latter on initiatives such as age verification, and a direct financial link to the government could intensify scrutiny on these policies.

### 4. Social and cultural impact.

- **Polarization in the gamer community**: The removal of the 328 games has already generated negative reaction on platforms such as X, where Collective Shout has been accused of censorship and government ties. Should the funding be confirmed, this polarization would intensify, with possible social media campaigns against Collective Shout and the Australian government.
- **Perception of censorship**: Confirmation of government funding would reinforce allegations that the Australian government is using Collective Shout as a proxy to impose content restrictions, which could alienate communities that value creative freedom, especially in the realm of video games.
- **Support for Collective Shout**: On the other hand, Collective Shout's supporters, who advocate to protect women and girls from sexualization, could see government funding as validation of their efforts. This could increase their influence and attract more private donations, although it could also expose them to more criticism from opponents.

### 5. Repercussions for Collective Shout

- **Loss of credibility**: Collective Shout presents itself as a grassroots movement funded by private donations and sponsors. If it were shown to be dependent on government funding, it could lose credibility among its supporters, who value its independence.
- **Increased scrutiny**: The organization would face increased scrutiny over its finances and operations. It could be forced to disclose more details about its revenue sources, which could reveal other controversial connections.

- **Risk of legal threats**: If developers of the removed games believe Collective Shout's government-backed pressure was unfair or harmful, they could sue for economic damages or violation of free speech, depending on jurisdictions.

## 6. Hypothetical Scenarios

- **Independent investigation**: If allegations of government funding gain traction, media or independent investigators could press for access to Collective Shout's financial records through the ACNC or Freedom of Information requests. This could confirm or disprove the allegations.

- **Payment processors' reaction**: Companies such as Visa, Mastercard or PayPal could review their decisions to pressure Steam if it is proven that they were influenced by an NGO funded by a foreign government, to avoid accusations of complicity in state censorship.

- **Changes to Steam**: Valve could implement measures to mitigate future pressure, such as accepting cryptocurrencies (as suggested by a user on Reddit) or diversifying its payment processors, although this would involve technical and legal challenges.

## Limitations and lack of evidence

Currently, there is no conclusive evidence that Collective Shout receives direct funding from the Australian government. Available sources indicate that the organization is funded primarily through private donations and sponsorships, with a total income of **\$458,043** in a recent year and a surplus of **\$135,555**. However, a lack of full transparency in NGO funding sources is common, and allegations in X about government ties are not supported by solid evidence. Therefore, any hypothetical impact depends on confirmation of these allegations.

## Conclusion

If Collective Shout were shown to be funded by the Australian government, the consequences would include increased legal and financial scrutiny, potential sanctions for lack of transparency, significant political impact in Australia, and international tensions with countries affected by game removal. The economic impact would still be limited compared to the **\$303.47 billion** global video game industry, but independent developers would be hurt the most. Socially, the controversy would intensify the polarization between advocates of creative freedom and those who support campaigns against sexualization.

Since allegations of government funding come mainly from unverified sources in X, it is crucial to treat them as speculative until concrete evidence, such as official financial records or audits, is presented.

If the "revolving door" phenomenon were proven to be real in the case of Collective Shout, i.e., that key members of the organization have held or are holding positions in the Australian government and using this influence to drive actions such as the removal of the 328 games from Steam, the consequences would be significant in a number of areas. In the following, I analyze the potential legal, political, economic, social and cultural implications, based on the available information and in the context of the revolving door phenomenon in Australia, while maintaining an objective and critical approach.



## Legal and regulatory implications

- **Conflict of interest investigation:** In Australia, the revolving door phenomenon is regulated to a limited extent, but there are codes of conduct, such as the **Ministerial Code of Conduct**, which prohibit former ministers from lobbying activities related to their former roles for a cooling-off period of 18 months. If Collective Shout members in previous or current government positions were shown to have influenced lobbying of Steam or payment processors, they could face investigations by bodies such as the **Australian National Audit Office** or the **Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC)**, especially if their actions benefited private or ideological interests to the detriment of the public interest.

- **Lack of effective regulation:** As sources point out, lobbying regulations in Australia are weak, and cooling-off periods are rarely enforced. If Collective Shout members hold government roles while maintaining ties to the organization, this could violate ethical standards, but the lack of effective sanctions (such as fines or prison sentences, more common in countries such as the U.S. or Canada) would limit immediate legal consequences

- **Insider trading:** If Collective Shout members with government experience used "bureaucratic capital" (inside knowledge of legislative processes or contacts in government) to influence policy or lobby private companies, this could be considered insider trading. Although not necessarily illegal under current laws, it could generate lawsuits from affected developers, especially if they suffered significant economic losses.

## Political implications

- **Political scandal:** Confirmation that Collective Shout members are in or have passed through the Australian government while pushing campaigns such as the removal of games from Steam could trigger a political scandal. Opposition parties, such as the Liberal Party or the Greens, could accuse the government (likely led by Labor in 2025) of allowing an NGO with government ties to interfere in international markets, which could be interpreted as state censorship. This could erode public confidence in the government.

- **Demands for reform:** The controversy could spur demands to strengthen lobbying laws and cooling-off periods in Australia. Organizations such as the **Centre for Public Integrity** and **Transparency International Australia** have pointed to the need for a federal anti-corruption body and stricter revolving door regulations. A scandal involving Collective Shout could accelerate these reforms, including tougher sanctions and greater transparency in NGO finances.

- **International tensions:** Given that Steam is a U.S. platform and many of the removed games could be from international developers (e.g., from Japan or the U.S.), the revelation that an NGO with Australian government ties influenced their removal could generate diplomatic criticism. Countries with large video game industries could argue that Australia is interfering in their cultural markets, which could escalate into trade or political disputes.

## 3. Economic implications.

- **Impact on Steam and developers:** As previously estimated, the removal of 328 games represents a direct economic loss of approximately **\$3.28 million** annually, with Steam losing

about **\*\*\$984,000\*\*** in commissions. If it were proven that this action was driven by Collective Shout members with government ties, affected developers could bring lawsuits against Steam or even the Australian government for economic damages, arguing that the pressure was illegitimate or influenced by political interests.

- **\*\*Loss of confidence in the Australian market\*\***: International companies, including platforms such as Steam, could reconsider their exposure to the Australian market if they perceive that the government is using NGOs to impose restrictions. This could reduce foreign investment in the video games industry in Australia, which already represents a fraction of the **\*\*\$303.47 billion\*\*** global market.

- **\*\*Legal costs and compensation\*\***: If developers prove that the removal of games was the result of an action orchestrated by an NGO with government links, they could seek legal redress. This could result in significant costs to the Australian government or Collective Shout, especially if an abuse of power or undue influence is proven.

#### 4. Social and cultural implications.

- **\*\*Polarization in the gamer community\*\***: The revelation of government ties to Collective Shout would intensify existing criticism on platforms such as X, where the organization has been accused of promoting censorship and being linked to the Australian government. This could fuel social media campaigns against Collective Shout, Steam and the government, increasing polarization between advocates of creative freedom and those who support campaigns against sexualization.

- **\*\*Perception of state censorship\*\***: If it is confirmed that Collective Shout members in government influenced the removal of games, many gamers and developers could perceive this as a form of state-backed censorship, damaging Australia's reputation as an open market for video games. This could lead to a boycott of Steam by some users, although the impact would be limited due to the dominance of the platform.

- **\*\*Strengthening of anti-NGO narratives\*\***: Allegations of government links could reinforce narratives on X that portray Collective Shout as a group with hidden agendas, such as being "TERF" (trans-exclusionary radical feminists) or conservatives masquerading as progressives. This could damage their credibility, even among their supporters, who value their image as a grassroots movement.

#### 5. Consequences for Collective Shout

- **\*\*Loss of credibility\*\***: Collective Shout presents itself as a grassroots organization funded by private donations. If it were shown that its members in government used their influence to push campaigns, its narrative of independence would be severely compromised, which could reduce its base of support and donations.

- **\*\*Financial and operational scrutiny\*\***: Confirmation of the revolving door would trigger increased scrutiny of Collective Shout's finances and operations. They could be forced to disclose details about their funding and government connections, which could reveal other irregularities. [\(https://publicintegrity.org.au/research\\_papers/closing-the-revolving-door/\)](https://publicintegrity.org.au/research_papers/closing-the-revolving-door/)

- **Legal threats**: Developers of the removed games could sue Collective Shout for economic damages, arguing that their undue influence on Steam and payment processors caused unfair losses. This would be more likely if it is shown that the actions were coordinated with government officials.

#### 6. Hypothetical scenarios.

- **Public Investigation**: A scandal of this magnitude could lead to a public investigation through the **ACNC** or a federal anti-corruption commission (if established). Collective Shout's financial records would be examined to determine if they received government funds or if their members abused government positions. [\(https://publicintegrity.org.au/research\\_papers/closing-the-revolving-door/\)](https://publicintegrity.org.au/research_papers/closing-the-revolving-door/)

- **Steam and payment processors' reaction**: Steam could implement measures to protect itself from future pressure, such as diversifying its payment processors or accepting cryptocurrencies, as suggested by a user on Reddit. Payment processors, such as Visa or Mastercard, could revise their policies to avoid being perceived as tools of government pressure. [\(https://www.reddit.com/r/privacy/comments/1m3nyit/australian\\_activist\\_groups\\_collective\\_shout/\)](https://www.reddit.com/r/privacy/comments/1m3nyit/australian_activist_groups_collective_shout/)

- **Legislative reforms**: The controversy could prompt the creation of stricter revolving door laws, such as longer cooling-off periods (e.g., from 2 to 6 years, as in Florida) or harsher penalties for former officials who use their influence for the benefit of NGOs or private companies.

#### Limitations and lack of evidence

Although publications in X suggest that Collective Shout members, such as **Bernie Poljak** (Finance & Administration Manager with Australian government experience) and **Kate Hulusi** (Secretary with senior management experience in the public sector), have government links, there is no conclusive evidence that they hold active government positions or that they have used their influence to lobby Steam. The revolving door allegations come primarily from unverified sources, such as a YouTube video and posts on X, which lack solid documentary evidence. In addition, information about the Collective Shout team does not indicate that key members, such as **Melinda Tankard Reist**, have held high-level government positions.

#### Conclusion

If the revolving door phenomenon were shown to be real in the case of Collective Shout, with members in the Australian government influencing actions such as the removal of 328 games from Steam, the consequences would include:

- **Legal**: Conflict of interest investigations, although weak Australian regulations would limit immediate sanctions.

- **Political**: A political scandal that could erode public trust and push for reforms in lobbying laws.

- **Economic**: Limited economic losses (estimated at \$3.28 million annually), but with significant impact to independent developers and potential lawsuits.

- Social\*\*: Increased polarization in the gamer community, perception of state censorship and loss of credibility for Collective Shout.
- Cultural\*\*: Damage to Australia's reputation as an open market for video games and possible limited boycott of Steam.

As the current allegations are based on unverified sources, any impact is dependent on the presentation of concrete evidence, such as financial records or evidence of direct influence. If you would like a more detailed analysis on a specific aspect, such as implications for a particular country or impact on a specific developer, I can dig deeper with more data or calculations.

The idea that the Australian government deliberately sought to harm a U.S. economic sector, such as the video game industry, through the actions of Collective Shout and the removal of 328 games from Steam, is a serious claim that requires careful analysis. Based on the available information and the context provided, I assess below whether this interpretation is plausible, considering the legal, political, economic, and social implications, and responding objectively and concisely.

#### Assessment of the premise

1. **Lack of direct evidence**: there is no conclusive evidence that the Australian government directly funded Collective Shout or that its members with alleged government ties (as part of the "revolving door" phenomenon) acted with the explicit intent to harm the U.S. video game industry. The allegations of government funding and the revolving door come primarily from unverified sources, such as posts on X and a YouTube video, that lack solid documentation, such as financial records or official communications.
2. **Limited Economic Impact**: As previously estimated, the removal of 328 games from Steam represents a direct economic loss of approximately **\$3.28 million** annually, with **\$984,000** in lost commissions to Steam. This is negligible compared to the **\$57.2 billion** generated by the U.S. video game industry in 2023 (likely similar or slightly higher in 2025). Even if the Australian government were behind these actions, the economic impact would not be large enough to be considered a deliberate attack on a key U.S. economic sector.
3. **Collective Shout's motivations**: Collective Shout is focused on combating the sexualization and objectification of women and girls, and its campaigns, such as pressuring payment processors to remove games with content deemed problematic (e.g., depictions of abuse or incest), are aligned with its stated mission. Although these actions affected Steam, a U.S. company, and international developers, there is no evidence that the goal was specifically to harm the U.S. economy. Rather, it seems a secondary consequence of its moral and social agenda.
4. **Lack of geopolitical intent**: A deliberate attempt to harm a U.S. economic sector would imply a clear geopolitical or economic motivation, such as weakening a competitor or retaliating in a trade conflict. Australia and the U.S. are close allies, with agreements such as the **AUKUS** and the **Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement (AUSFTA)**, making it unlikely that Australia would seek to deliberately harm a U.S. economic sector without significant provocation.

In addition, many of the removed games could be from developers in other countries (such as Japan), which dilutes the idea of a U.S.-targeted attack.

5. **Revolving door context and funding**: Although posts on X suggest that Collective Shout members, such as **Bernie Poljak** or **Kate Hulusi**, have experience in the Australian public sector, there is no evidence that they hold active government positions or have used their influence to orchestrate an economic attack. The alleged revolving door, if it existed, could indicate a conflict of interest, but not necessarily a deliberate intent to harm the U.S. Similarly, there is no strong evidence that Collective Shout receives direct funding from the Australian government, undermining the narrative of coordinated state action.

Implications if deliberate intent were proven.

If, hypothetically, it were proven that the Australian government funded Collective Shout and used its members in government to pressure Steam with the explicit goal of harming the U.S. video game industry, the consequences would be severe:

- **Diplomatic repercussions**: the U.S. could consider this economic interference, which could strain bilateral relations. Trade sanctions or restrictions could be imposed on Australian companies, although this is unlikely given the limited economic impact and strong ties between the two countries.

- **Legal action**: Companies such as Valve (owner of Steam) or affected U.S. developers could sue the Australian government or Collective Shout for economic damages, alleging abuse of power or interference with international trade. This could escalate to international tribunals, such as those of the **World Trade Organization (WTO)**.

- **Domestic political scandal**: In Australia, a scandal of this magnitude could bring down key political figures, especially if government officials are shown to have acted against the interests of an ally. Political opponents and media outlets such as **The Guardian Australia** or **ABC News** could demand investigations and reforms to lobbying laws.

- **Industry reaction**: The U.S. video game industry, represented by organizations such as the **Entertainment Software Association (ESA)**, could pressure the U.S. government to take action, such as restrictions on Australian platforms or greater regulation of digital content in bilateral trade agreements.

Most likely scenario

It is more likely that Collective Shout's actions are the result of its internal agenda to combat content deemed morally objectionable, and that the pressure on payment processors (Visa, Mastercard, PayPal) was a strategy to achieve this, without a deliberate intent to harm the U.S. economy. If there was government influence, it was probably limited to an ideological alignment with child protection policies (such as those of the **eSafety Commissioner**) rather than a coordinated economic attack. The removal of the 328 games primarily affected independent developers, many of whom may not be American, further reducing the likelihood of a U.S.-targeted attack.

## Conclusion

It cannot be asserted that the Australian government deliberately intended to harm a U.S. economic sector, since:

- There is no strong evidence of government funding to Collective Shout or of a significant revolving door.
- The economic impact of the removal of the 328 games (\*\*\$3.28 million\*\*) is minimal compared to the size of the U.S. video game industry (\*\*\$57.2 billion\*\*).
- Collective Shout's actions appear to be motivated by its moral agenda, not a geopolitical intent to harm the US.
- Australia and the U.S. are strategic allies, making a deliberate economic attack unlikely without clear provocation.

If concrete evidence of government funding and an explicit intent to harm the U.S. were to emerge, the consequences would include diplomatic tensions, legal action and political outrage in Australia. However, with current information, this interpretation appears speculative and is not supported by verifiable data. If you would like to explore a specific aspect, such as the impact on U.S. developers or bilateral relations, I can dig deeper with more details.

The question of whether the U.S. would act in response to a deliberate or non-deliberate action by the Australian government or Collective Shout to harm the U.S. video game economic sector requires analysis based on the political, economic, legal, and diplomatic context, as well as available information. Below, I assess the possible U.S. responses in both scenarios (deliberate and non-deliberate intent), considering the implications and limited economic impact of removing the 328 Steam games (estimated at \*\*\$3.28 million\*\* annually versus \*\*\$57.2 billion\*\* for the U.S. video game industry). I also incorporate relevant information from the sources provided, while maintaining a critical and objective approach.

Scenario 1: Deliberate intent by the Australian government or Collective Shout to harm a U.S. economic sector.

If it were demonstrated that the Australian government, through Collective Shout or directly, deliberately intended to harm the U.S. video game industry, the U.S. could consider various responses, depending on the severity, evidence, and political context:

### Diplomatic responses

- Formal protests: The U.S. could issue a diplomatic complaint through the State Department, demanding explanations from the Australian government. This could include bilateral meetings to address interference in a key economic sector. Given that Australia and the U.S. are close allies (e.g., through the \*\*AUKUS\*\* pact and the \*\*Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement [AUSFTA]\*\*), the initial response is likely to be diplomatic and measured to preserve the relationship.
- Pressure in international fora\*\*: The U.S. could raise the issue in bodies such as the \*\*World Trade Organization (WTO)\*\* , arguing that Australia's actions constitute a non-tariff barrier to

trade in violation of international agreements. However, given the limited economic impact (\$3.28 million), it is unlikely to escalate to this level unless a broader pattern of interference is demonstrated.

#### Economic Responses.

- Targeted trade sanctions: The U.S. could impose targeted sanctions, such as tariffs on Australian products (e.g., cultural or technological goods), although this would be disproportionate given the small economic impact. Sanctions are more common in larger scale disputes, such as those related to steel or technology.

- **Support for the affected industry**: The US government, through the **Entertainment Software Association (ESA)**, could offer tax incentives or support to affected developers, although the scale of the damage (affecting mainly independent studios) makes this unlikely).

#### Legal responses

- **Suit by private companies**: Companies such as Valve (which owns Steam) or affected US developers could bring lawsuits against the Australian government or Collective Shout in international courts, alleging improper interference with commerce or infringement of freedom of expression. This would depend on whether the removed games are of U.S. origin, as many could come from other countries (e.g., Japan). The **First Amendment** protects video games as speech in the U.S., which could support these claims.

- **Antitrust investigation**: As suggested by some sources, influencers such as MoistCr1TiKaL and Asmongold have called for antitrust action against payment processors such as Visa and Mastercard for bowing to Collective Shout's pressure. If it were shown that the Australian government orchestrated this pressure, the U.S. Department of Justice could investigate these companies for anti-competitive practices, although the focus would be more on the processors than on Australia.

#### Political responses

- Domestic political scrutiny: U.S. politicians, especially those who champion free speech or the technology industry, could push for a tougher response. For example, senators such as **Marco Rubio** (who has been involved in discussions about video games) might demand investigations into foreign interference. However, history shows that the U.S. tends to blame video games for domestic problems (such as violence), which could divert attention away from action against Australia.

- Congressional hearings: Hearings similar to the 1993-1994 hearings on video game violence, led by Senators such as Joe Lieberman, could be convened to investigate foreign influence on content censorship. This could generate public pressure, but not necessarily concrete action against Australia.

Obstacles to a forceful response.

- **Limited economic impact**: The \$3.28 million loss is negligible compared to the size of the U.S. video game industry, reducing the likelihood of an aggressive response. The U.S. would likely prioritize more significant trade issues, such as disputes with China over technology.
- **Strategic alliance**: The U.S.-Australia relationship is strong, with shared interests in security and trade. Any action against Australia would be carefully calibrated to avoid damaging this alliance.
- **Lack of clear evidence**: Currently, there is no solid evidence that the Australian government has funded Collective Shout or that its actions were intended to harm the U.S. Allegations on X and other platforms are speculative and lack verifiable documentation.

#### Scenario 2: Unintentional action

If Collective Shout's actions (and any links to the Australian government) were not intended to harm the U.S., but were part of its agenda against sexualization in the media, it is likely that the U.S. would not take significant action:

- **Private industry response**: Valve could implement technical solutions, such as accepting cryptocurrencies or diversifying payment processors, to avoid future pressure, as suggested by users on Reddit. Affected developers could look for alternative platforms, such as itch.io, or decentralized marketplaces.
- **Community pressure**: Social media backlash, such as the Change.org campaign against Visa and Mastercard or criticism from influencers, could generate public pressure, but not necessarily a government response. The gamer community has already raised funds (e.g., \$780 for the ACLU) in response to censorship, indicating grassroots resistance.
- **Lack of government action**: Given the minimal economic impact and lack of deliberate intent, the U.S. government would likely not act, leaving the industry and consumers to handle the situation. The **First Amendment** protects video games, but does not compel the government to intervene in minor commercial disputes with allies.

#### Historical Context and Precedents

- **Protection of video games**: In **Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association (2011)**, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that video games are protected by the First Amendment, making domestic regulation of content difficult. However, this does not directly apply to foreign pressure, such as Collective Shout or the Australian government.
- **Responses to previous controversies**: The U.S. has been reluctant to blame foreign actors for video game-related problems, focusing more on domestic debates about violence. For example, in the wake of mass shootings, politicians such as Donald Trump and Kevin McCarthy have blamed video games, but have not addressed foreign influences.
- **International censorship**: Other countries, such as China, have imposed strict restrictions on video games (e.g., banning red blood), but the U.S. has not taken significant action against these policies, even when they affect U.S. developers. This suggests that action against Australia would be even less likely due to its ally status.



Factors that would influence the U.S. response.

- **Concrete evidence**: For the U.S. to act, it would need clear evidence of Australian government funding to Collective Shout and an explicit intent to harm the U.S. Currently, the allegations are speculative and lack hard evidence[.
- **Scale of harm**: The economic impact (\$3.28 million) is too small to justify a significant government response. The U.S. could act if a broader pattern of interference affecting larger sectors, such as technology or entertainment in general, were demonstrated.
- **Industry pressure**: The **ESA** and companies like Valve could pressure the U.S. government to respond, but their focus would likely be on payment processors (Visa, Mastercard) rather than Australia.
- **Political climate**: In 2025, the U.S. administration (depending on who is in power) could use this issue for political gain, especially if it aligns with narratives about free speech or economic protectionism. However, the alliance with Australia would limit aggressive actions.

## Conclusion

- **Deliberate intent**: If it were shown that the Australian government or Collective Shout acted with the intent to harm the U.S. video game industry, the U.S. would likely respond with diplomatic measures (formal protests, bilateral negotiations) and, to a lesser extent, legal action driven by private companies. However, the scale of the damage (\$3.28 million) and the alliance with Australia make an aggressive response, such as trade sanctions, unlikely. Congressional hearings or antitrust investigations against payment processors would be more likely, but not directly against Australia.
- **Unintended action**: If the actions were an unintended consequence of Collective Shout's agenda, the U.S. would probably not act at the government level. The response would come from the industry (Valve, developers) and the gaming community (network campaigns, boycotts), with solutions such as diversifying payment processors or using alternative platforms.
- **Limitations**: The lack of concrete evidence of government funding or deliberate intent, combined with the minimal economic impact, reduces the likelihood of a meaningful response from the U.S. The First Amendment protection of video games and the alliance with Australia reinforces this position.

Below, I have created a consolidated file that incorporates previous analysis on the removal of 328 games from Steam due to pressure from Collective Shout, allegations of Australian government funding and revolving door, and the implications if a major U.S. developer were to be affected, now including **China**, **South Korea** and **Japan** in the context. This report assesses how these countries might be involved, either as affected by the removal of games (if their developers have titles among the 328) or as players who might respond to deliberate or unintentional action by Australia. The analysis is based on the information provided, recent search results and a critical approach, keeping the tone objective and in English, as requested.

Report: Impact of the removal of 328 games from Steam and accusations against Collective Shout, with implications for the U.S., China, South Korea and Japan.

**\*\*Date\*\***: July 22, 2025

**\*\*Context\*\***: Analysis of the removal of 328 games from Steam in 2025, allegedly under pressure from Australian NGO Collective Shout, with allegations of Australian government funding and revolving door. We assess the implications if the Australian government or Collective Shout attempted to harm economic sectors in the US, China, South Korea and Japan, and the possible responses from these countries, especially if a major developer in each country was affected.

## 1. Economic impact of the removal of 328 games from Steam

Video game industry revenues (2024-2025).

- **\*\*United States\*\***: Generated **\*\*\$46.7 billion\*\*** in 2024, representing ~25% of the global market.
- **\*\*China\*\***: Generated **\*\*\$47.0 billion\*\*** in 2024, surpassing the U.S. as the largest market by revenue, with 701.6 million players.
- **\*\*Japan\*\***: Generated **\*\*\$18.4 billion\*\*** in 2024, with a strong console market led by Sony and Nintendo.
- **\*\*South Korea\*\***: Generated **\*\*\$7.4 billion\*\*** in 2024, highlighted by online games and esports.
- **\*\*Global\*\***: Market reached **\*\*\$303.47 billion\*\*** in 2025, with projections of \$721.77 billion by 2034 (CAGR 10.15%)

Direct impact of disposal

- **\*\*Games removed\*\***: 328 games removed from Steam in 2025, mainly niche indie titles (visual novels, gacha) with adult content, due to pressure from payment processors (Visa, Mastercard, PayPal) influenced by Collective Shout.
- **\*\*Lost revenue estimate\*\***:
  - Assuming **\*\*\$10,000 per game\*\*** per year (conservative average for indie titles): **\*\*328 × \$10,000 = \$3,280,000\*\*** per year.
  - Loss to Steam (30% commission): **\*\*\$3,280,000 × 0.30 = \$984,000\*\***.
- **\*\*Relative impact\*\***:
  - Negligible vs. U.S. (\$46.7 billion), China (\$47.0 billion), Japan (\$18.4 billion) and South Korea (\$7.4 billion) markets.
  - Significant for indie developers, especially in Japan and South Korea, where visual novels and gacha are common.
- **\*\*Origin of games\*\***:
  - Many of the eliminated games likely come from Japan, given its dominance in visual novels and anime-style games.

- South Korea and China also produce mobile and gacha games, but their presence in the 328 games is less clear.

- The U.S. is less likely to have AAA games affected, but could include indie titles.

## 2. Accusations against Collective Shout

### Context of Collective Shout

- **Description**: Australian NGO combating the sexualization of women and girls. Lobbied payment processors to restrict platforms with explicit content, which led to the removal of the 328 games.

- **Funding**: No solid evidence of Australian government funding. Collective Shout reports revenues of **\$458,043** and a surplus of **\$135,555** from private donations.

- **Government collaboration**: Has worked with the **eSafety Commissioner** on child protection policy, suggesting ideological alignment, but no direct funding.

- **Revolving door**: Allegations on X and YouTube indicate that members such as **Bernie Poljak** and **Kate Hulusi**, with public sector experience, may have used government contacts. No verifiable evidence.

Implications if funding or revolving door were proven.

- **Legal**: Investigations by the **ACNC** or **ICAC** for conflicts of interest or violations of the **Ministerial Code of Conduct** (18-month cooling off period).

- **Political**: Political scandal in Australia, with demands for lobbying law reforms.

- **Economic**: Lawsuits by affected developers (especially from Japan, South Korea or the U.S.) for economic losses.

- **Social**: Polarization between creative freedom advocates and Collective Shout supporters, amplified in networks such as X.

## 3. Deliberate intent to harm economic sectors in the U.S., China, Japan or South Korea?

- **Evidence**: There is no evidence of deliberate intent on the part of the Australian government or Collective Shout to harm the video game industries of these countries. Collective Shout's actions align with its moral agenda, not an economic or geopolitical attack.

- **Limited economic impact**:

- **US**: **\$3.28 million** is negligible compared to **\$46.7 billion**.

- **China**: Less than 0.01% of **\$47.0 billion**.

- **Japan**: Marginal vs. **\$18.4 billion**, but more relevant if many games are Japanese (visual novels).

- **South Korea**: Negligible vs. **\$7.4 billion**, although gacha games could include South Korean titles.

- **Bilateral relationships**:

- **U.S. U.S.-Australia**: Key allies (AUKUS, AUSFTA), making a deliberate attack unlikely.
- **China-Australia**: Strained relations over trade disputes (tariffs, restrictions on Australian wine), but no evidence that video games are a target.
- **Japan-Australia**: Cordial relations, with Japan as a key market for Australian exports. An attack on Japanese industry would be diplomatically costly.
- **South Korea-Australia**: Allies with interests in technology and trade. A deliberate attack would be inconsistent with their ties.[](<https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/south-koreas-acting-president-orders-emergency-measures-over-us-tariffs-2025-04-02/>)

4. U.S., China, Japan, and South Korea Response.

Scenario 1: Deliberate Intent

If it were proven that Australia or Collective Shout deliberately attempted to harm the video game industries:

- **US. U.S.**:
  - **Diplomatic**: Formal protests via the State Department, demanding clarification. Possible escalation to WTO over trade barriers.
  - **Economic**: Selective sanctions unlikely due to limited impact and AUKUS alliance.
  - **Legal**: Lawsuits by developers (e.g., Valve) against Steam, payment processors, or Collective Shout for commercial interference, backed by **First Amendment**.
  - **Politics**: Congressional hearings, led by figures such as **Marco Rubio**, on foreign censorship.
- **China**:
  - **Diplomatic**: Tough response, possibly with trade retaliation (e.g., additional restrictions on Australian products such as coal). China already imposes strict controls on video games, which could warrant a strong reaction.
  - **Economic**: Companies such as Tencent or miHoYo could push for sanctions or seek alternative markets.
  - **Legal**: Lawsuits in international courts for intellectual property infringement, especially if the games removed are from Chinese studios like miHoYo (Genshin Impact).
  - **Political**: Use of removal as propaganda to criticize the West for censorship, reinforcing the Chinese government's internal control.
- **Japan**:

- **Diplomatic**: Moderate protests, considering trade ties with Australia. Possible pressure in forums such as the WTO. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/north-east-asia/china-united-states/347-asia-flux-us-china-and-search-new-equilibrium>

- **Economic**: Companies such as Nintendo or Square Enix could diversify platforms (e.g. Epic Games Store) to reduce dependence on Steam.

- **Legal**: Intellectual property damage lawsuits, given Japan's weight in visual novels and anime-style games.

- **Political**: Internal debate on the protection of the Japanese cultural industry, with possible government support for developers.

- South Korea:

- **Diplomatic**: Negotiations with Australia to minimize impact, similar to responses to U.S. tariffs.

- **Economics**: Studios such as NCSoft (Lineage) could look to alternative platforms or cryptocurrencies for payments.

- **Legal**: Lawsuits against payment processors for anti-competitive practices, supported by South Korea's strength in esports.

- **Political**: Pressure to strengthen the video game industry as a strategic sector, with government support.

## Scenario 2: Unintentional action

Whether the removal was an unintended consequence of Collective Shout's agenda:

- **US. US**:

- **Industry**: Valve could implement solutions such as cryptocurrencies or alternative processors. ESA would advocate for anti-censorship policies.

- **Public**: Network campaigns (e.g. Change.org against Visa/Mastercard) led by influencers such as MoistCr1TiKaL.

- **Governmental**: No direct action, given minimal impact.

- **China**:

- **Industry**: Companies like Tencent or miHoYo would look for alternative platforms or local markets, given their dominance in mobile.

- **Public**: Limited reaction, as the Chinese government already censors similar games.

- **Government**: Unlikely, except to reinforce cultural control narratives.

- **Japan**:

- **Industry**: Developers like Bandai Namco could prioritize consoles (PlayStation, Switch) over Steam. <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/gaming-market-105730>

- **Public**: Reviews on networks, especially if the games are popular visual novels.

- **Government**: No action, except pressure to protect the cultural industry.

- **South Korea**:

- **Industry**: Studios such as Nexon could adopt alternative payments and focus on esports.

- **Public**: Moderate reaction, focused on social networks.

- **Government**: Unlikely, except for local industry support.

5. Impact if a major developer were to be affected.

U.S. (E.G., ACTIVISION). Impact if a major U.S. developer were affected (e.g. Activision Blizzard)

- **Economic**: Losses of **\$10-100 million** for a AAA game, affecting revenue, DLC and jobs. Multi-million dollar lawsuits against Steam, processors or Collective Shout.

- **Legal**: **First Amendment** lawsuits and possible antitrust investigations against payment processors.

- **Political**: Congressional hearings on foreign censorship. ESA pressure to protect industry.

- **Social**: Massive reaction in networks, with boycotts of Steam or processors. Perception of Australian state censorship.

China (e.g., miHoYo).

- **Economic**: A title like Genshin Impact generated **\$986.2 million** in the first half of 2022. Its elimination would cause significant losses and affect miHoYo's global expansion.

- **Legal**: Lawsuits in international courts for intellectual property infringement. China could use the case to reinforce its Western censorship narrative.

- **Political**: Tough government response, with possible trade retaliation against Australia (e.g., export restrictions).

- **Social**: Limited reaction in China due to domestic censorship, but criticism in international markets.

Japan (e.g., Square Enix)

- **Economic**: Losses of millions for a major title (e.g., Final Fantasy), affecting revenues and reputation. Diversification to other platforms.

- **Legal**: Lawsuits for intellectual property damages, especially if the games are visual novels or anime-style.

- **Political**: Governmental pressure to protect the Japanese cultural industry, with possible support for developers.

- **Social**: Strong reaction in networks, given the cultural weight of Japanese games.

South Korea (e.g., NCSoft).

- **Economic**: Significant losses if a game like Lineage is affected, given its global impact (\$330 million in 2015).

- **Legal**: Lawsuits against payment processors for anti-competitive practices, supported by South Korea's strength in esports.

- **Political**: Government support for the industry as a strategic sector, similar to 1997 post-crisis policies.

- **Social**: Reaction in networks, especially in esports communities.

## 6. Limitations and lack of evidence

- **Funding**: No solid evidence of Australian government funding to Collective Shout.

- **Revolving door**: Allegations of government links of members such as Poljak and Hulusi lack verifiable documentation.

- **Intent**: There is no evidence of a deliberate targeting of U.S., Chinese, Japanese or South Korean industries. Collective Shout's actions align with its moral agenda.

- **Games affected**: Likely indie titles, with more Japanese presence (visual novels). Less likely to include AAA games from the US, China or South Korea.

## 7. Conclusion

- **Economic impact**: The removal of 328 games represents a loss of **\$3.28 million**, negligible compared to the U.S. (\$46.7 billion), China (\$47.0 billion), Japan (\$18.4 billion) and South Korea (\$7.4 billion) markets. Japan could be the hardest hit if the games are visual novels.

- **Collective Shout**: No evidence of government funding or revolving door. If proven, there would be legal investigations, political scandals and international lawsuits.

- **Deliberate Intent**: Unlikely, given limited impact and bilateral relations. If proven, the U.S. would respond with diplomacy, China with retaliation, and Japan and South Korea with negotiations and lawsuits.

- **Significant developer**:

- **US**: Lawsuits, Congressional hearings, and massive boycotts.

- **China**: Trade retaliation and propaganda narratives.

- **Japan**: Cultural industry protection and intellectual property lawsuits.

- **South Korea**: Government support for the industry and lawsuits against processors.

- **Recommendations**: Developers in the four countries could diversify platforms (Epic Games Store, consoles) and payment processors (cryptocurrencies). Concrete evidence is needed to confirm the allegations against Collective Shout.

**Final notes**: This report is based on data through July 22, 2025, including industry statistics and X-publications. Allegations of funding and revolving door are speculative and require verification.

There is no hard evidence that Collective Shout members would face jail sentences in Australia in 2025 for their actions related to the removal of 328 games from Steam or any other campaign. Below, I analyze the likelihood that Collective Shout members, such as **Melinda Tankard Reist**, **Caitlin Roper**, **Bernie Poljak** or **Kate Hulusi**, could face criminal consequences, considering the allegations of government funding, revolving door and their pressure on payment processors, integrating the context of the countries involved (US, China, Japan, South Korea) and the new search results provided.

#### Analysis of the likelihood of imprisonment

##### Legal framework in Australia

##### - Applicable laws:

- Charities, such as Collective Shout, are regulated by the **Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)**, which requires transparency in funding and operations. Lack of transparency could result in administrative sanctions, such as fines or revocation of NGO status, but not imprisonment, except in cases of serious fraud or misappropriation of funds.

- The **Ministerial Code of Conduct** imposes an 18-month cooling-off period on former government officials to avoid conflicts of interest (revolving door). Violations could trigger investigations by the **Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC)**, but sanctions are usually political or administrative, not criminal, due to weak regulation of lobbying in Australia.

- Hate crime and defamation laws in Australia (e.g., in New South Wales) have been strengthened in 2025 to address anti-Semitism and other hate crimes, with penalties of up to **7 years imprisonment** for incitement to violence. However, Collective Shout's campaigns against sexually explicit content do not fit into this category, as they do not incite violence or target protected groups.

##### - **Specific allegations**:

- **Government Funding**: There is no verifiable evidence that Collective Shout receives direct funding from the Australian government. The organization reports income of **\$458,043** from private donations, and its collaboration with the **eSafety Commissioner** (e.g., on age verification) does not involve direct funding. If illicit funding were demonstrated, members could face fraud charges, but this would require evidence of embezzlement or corruption, which is not documented.



- **Revolving Door**: Allegations that members such as Bernie Poljak or Kate Hulusi used government ties to influence policy or pressure Steam lack solid evidence. A YouTube video claims that "a surprising number" of members come from the public sector, but provides no names or concrete evidence. Even if proven, sanctions for conflicts of interest would be administrative (fines, dismissal) or political, not criminal, except in cases of extreme abuse of power.

- **Pressure on payment processors**: Collective Shout organized a campaign with 1,067 individuals contacting Visa, Mastercard and PayPal to block payments to Steam for games with "rape, incest and child abuse" content. This resulted in the removal of 328 games. Although this action generated controversy, it does not violate Australian law, as pressuring private companies is legal as long as it does not involve threats, coercion or defamation. There is no evidence that Collective Shout has engaged in these behaviors.

## 2. Possible criminal charges

- **Fraud or embezzlement**: If it were shown that Collective Shout fraudulently received government funds (e.g., by concealing them in its reports to the ACNC), those responsible could face charges under the **Crimes Act 1900** (NSW) or the **Criminal Code Act 1995** (federal), with penalties of up to 7 years in prison for serious fraud. However, there is no evidence of this, and his declared income suggests private financing.

- **Defamation**: If affected developers (from the U.S., China, Japan or South Korea) prove that Collective Shout defamed them by labeling their games as "pornographic" or "child abuse" without foundation, they could bring civil suits. In Australia, defamation can be criminal under the **Criminal Code** in extreme cases (e.g., if it causes serious intentional harm), with penalties of up to 3 years. However, Collective Shout's statements are protected as public interest criticism, and there are no documented cases of successful criminal prosecutions against them.

- **Commercial Interference**: Lobbying payment processors is not illegal in Australia, unless it involves criminal coercion (e.g. threats). There is no evidence of such tactics. In the U.S., China, Japan or South Korea, developers could attempt civil suits for interference with commerce, but these would not lead to jail terms in Australia.

- **Incitement to violence**: 2025 hate crime laws (e.g., against anti-Semitism) do not apply, as Collective Shout has not incited violence. Its campaigns focus on economic pressure and lobbying, not violent acts.

## 3. International implications

If a major developer in **US**, **China**, **China**, **China**, **China**, **China** If a major developer in **USA**, **China**, **Japan** or **South Korea** were among those affected, the likelihood of prison sentences for Collective Shout members would depend on each country's legal and diplomatic responses:

- **US. USA**:

- **Civil suit**: A developer such as Activision Blizzard could sue Collective Shout for defamation or commercial interference in U.S. courts, based on the **First Amendment**, which protects

video games as speech. This could result in fines, but not jail time, as Collective Shout members are not under U.S. jurisdiction.

- **Diplomatic pressure**: If Australian government intervention were proven, the U.S. could demand investigations, but jail sentences would be unlikely without evidence of serious criminal offenses (e.g., corruption).

- **China**:

- **Government response**: A developer such as miHoYo (Genshin Impact) could pressure the Chinese government to impose trade retaliation against Australia (e.g., restrictions on wine or coal). China would not seek jail terms directly, but could use the case to accuse the West of censorship, strengthening its internal control. No jurisdiction to imprison Collective Shout members.

- **International lawsuit**: Possible complaints at the **World Trade Organization (WTO)**, but no criminal impact.

- **Japan**:

- **IP lawsuit**: Since many removed games could be Japanese visual novels (e.g., from Square Enix or Bandai Namco), developers could sue for IP damages. These would be civil lawsuits, not criminal, with no jail time.

- **Cultural pressure**: Japan could press diplomatically to protect its cultural industry, but would not seek imprisonment.

- **South Korea**:

- **Anticompetitive practices lawsuit**: A developer such as NCSoft could sue payment processors for bowing to pressure, but this would not involve jail terms for Collective Shout.

- **Government support**: South Korea could support its esports industry, but no jurisdiction for criminal sanctions in Australia.

#### 4. Context of the allegations.

- **Previous Collective Shout campaigns**:

- They have lobbied against artists such as Tyler, the Creator and Snoop Dogg, achieving visa or tour cancellations, but faced no criminal consequences, only public criticism.

- Their campaigns against ads (Honey Birdette, KFC) and movies (Cuties) have generated controversy, but no legal violations warranting jail time.

- Public reaction: Posts on X and forums like Incels.is accuse Collective Shout of censorship and government ties, but these are speculative and have not led to criminal investigations. The reaction from influencers like MoistCr1TiKaL and Asmongold focuses on payment processors, not criminal charges against Collective Shout.

- **Lack of criminal record**: Collective Shout has operated for 15 years without facing criminal charges, including in controversial campaigns such as the banning of GTA V at Target and Kmart stores.

## 5. Hypothetical scenarios.

- **Proven Fraud**: If it were proven that Collective Shout concealed government funds to pressure Steam, the leaders (e.g., Melinda Tankard Reist) could face fraud charges, with penalties of up to **7 years** under the **Criminal Code Act 1995**. However, this would require evidence of embezzlement, currently non-existent.

- **Government corruption**: If it were shown that members with government ties (e.g., Bernie Poljak) abused their position to benefit Collective Shout, they could face corruption charges under federal law, with penalties of up to **7 years**. This would depend on evidence of abuse of power, not currently available.

- **Successful international lawsuit**: If a major developer (e.g., miHoYo of China) proved significant damages in international courts, Collective Shout could face civil fines, but jail terms would only be possible if criminal intent (e.g., extortion) were proven, which is unlikely.

## 6. Conclusion

- **Probability of jail time**: It is **very unlikely** that Collective Shout members will face jail time in Australia in 2025 for the removal of the 328 games from Steam. Their actions (lobbying payment processors) are legal under Australian law, and there is no evidence of fraud, corruption or incitement to violence to justify criminal charges.

- **International implications**: The affected countries (US, China, Japan, South Korea) could initiate civil lawsuits or diplomatic pressure, but have no jurisdiction to impose prison sentences in Australia. China could use the case politically, but no direct criminal impact.

- **Major developer**:

- A major developer from the U.S., China, Japan or South Korea would amplify civil suits and public pressure, but jail sentences would remain unlikely without evidence of serious crimes.

- Fines or administrative penalties are more likely than imprisonment, especially if government funding or revolving door is demonstrated.

- **Recommendation**: For Collective Shout members to face jail time, felonies such as fraud or corruption would need to be proven with hard evidence (e.g., falsified financial records). Affected developers should focus on civil lawsuits or solutions such as diversifying platforms (Epic Games Store) and payment processors (cryptocurrencies).

**Final notes**: This analysis is based on data through July 22, 2025, including video game industry information, reports on Collective Shout, and posts on X. Allegations of government funding and revolving door are speculative and lack verifiable evidence.

1. The first step in the process of creating a new product is to identify the market need. This involves conducting market research to determine the size and nature of the market, the needs and wants of potential customers, and the competitive environment. This information is then used to develop a product concept that meets the market need and is profitable for the company.

2. The second step is to develop a business plan. This involves determining the costs of production, the pricing strategy, the distribution channels, and the marketing strategy. The business plan is then used to secure financing from investors or lenders.

3. The third step is to develop a prototype. This involves creating a small-scale model of the product that can be used to test the design and to demonstrate the product to potential customers. The prototype is then used to refine the design and to develop a final product.

4. The fourth step is to produce the final product. This involves manufacturing the product in a factory or workshop. The production process is then used to create a large quantity of the product that can be sold to customers.

5. The fifth step is to distribute the product. This involves getting the product into the hands of customers. This can be done through a variety of channels, including direct sales, retail stores, and online sales.

6. The sixth step is to promote the product. This involves creating a marketing campaign to attract customers to the product. This can be done through a variety of methods, including advertising, public relations, and sales promotion.

7. The seventh step is to evaluate the product. This involves monitoring the sales and profits of the product and making adjustments as needed. This can be done through a variety of methods, including market research, financial analysis, and customer feedback.

8. The eighth step is to improve the product. This involves making changes to the product to make it better than the original. This can be done through a variety of methods, including redesigning the product, improving the production process, and adding new features.

9. The ninth step is to create a brand. This involves creating a name and logo for the product that is unique and memorable. The brand is then used to identify the product and to create a reputation for the product.

10. The tenth step is to maintain the brand. This involves keeping the brand name and logo consistent and using the brand to create a reputation for the product. This can be done through a variety of methods, including advertising, public relations, and sales promotion.

11. The eleventh step is to expand the brand. This involves creating new products or services that use the same brand name and logo. This can be done through a variety of methods, including market research, financial analysis, and customer feedback.

12. The twelfth step is to protect the brand. This involves registering the brand name and logo with the appropriate government agencies. This can be done through a variety of methods, including trademark law, copyright law, and patent law.

13. The thirteenth step is to defend the brand. This involves taking legal action to protect the brand name and logo from infringement. This can be done through a variety of methods, including litigation, arbitration, and mediation.

14. The fourteenth step is to renew the brand. This involves updating the brand name and logo to keep it current and relevant. This can be done through a variety of methods, including market research, financial analysis, and customer feedback.

15. The fifteenth step is to retire the brand. This involves discontinuing the brand name and logo. This can be done through a variety of methods, including market research, financial analysis, and customer feedback.