CI 245 S Farrelly

First name: Stephen

Last name: Farrelly

Q1: Focus on recrafting the framework for classification as it is currently outdated in relation to media and technology

Q2: Above all else, to inform. Education is the key to a greater understanding of media, regardless of content. Adults reserve the right to view or participate in mature forms of content in this country, but we need a comprehensive classification system that also informs consumers, parents and retailers to better control what levels of access everyone has. Knowledge is power, and dangerous material can be kept out of the hands of children through a grater emphasis on accurate information through correct classification.

Q3: No. The platform is redundant in this capacity as it is only a tool through which content is accessed. Classification needs to applied directly to the content source.

Q4: No. All content should be subjected to a classification review process.

Q5: Yes. There is still a review process even for children, and some content is designed for children of different ages, hence the likes of G and PG as current ratings, which still inform very well.

Q6: No. All content should be subjected to a classification review process, regardless of market penetration, potential or size.

Q7: Yes. Providing consumer advice on specific artworks or exhibitions falls more directly in line with the ideology of informing people of potentially risque material. Banning art is not conducive to the artistic merits of Australia or its artists, however, informing the public of the art's content will go a long way to ensuring people can make an informed decision to view it, or partake in exhibitions featuring it.

Q8: Yes.

Q9: No.

Q10: No.

Q11: None, the above is sufficient.

Q12: A greater emphasis on parental control and information for parents is needed, but a blanket filter for online content would restrict content to adults, therefore we should invest in education on parents controlling access for their children, and not apply a single 'stop-gap' fix for all online, which the internet filter would be.

Q13: Through eduction for parents to better inform them on how to control what their children can access through their own direct means.

Q14: Appropriate classification.

Q15: When it is clearly aimed at a mature audience.

Q16: Government should help regulate classification standards and uphold law enforcement upon infringement of the classification system. For example, if a store owner sells an underage person a maturely rated product.

Q17: Yes. In the case of videogames, for example, the government should work hand in hand with the videogames industry to appropriately classify material coming into the country and regulate it.

Q18: Any adult material such as R18+ or X18+ that is clearly intended for mature consumers, such as pornography.

Q19: No. All material should be treated with equal interest.

Q20: M15+ and MA15+ are often confused or cause confusion. Abolish MA15+ and replace with R18+. X18+ could also be shifted to X21+ as an indication of its adult-specific nature.

Q21: See above. But also, we need to remove Refused Classification through a more comprehensive classification system

Q22: Categories need to be inclusive of the product. Videogames, for example, should be marked as such with the appropriate age rating and information regarding its content. For example: "R18+ Contains Graphic Violence, Coarse Language and Nudity"

Q23: No, because each are different mediums. They need to be drawn in line with one another, but new criteria for each to reflect modern-day, online and technology should be drafted to bring us in line with the rest of the world. the ESRB in the United States is a good example of a body specifically catering to videogames, that is also actively in line with film and television, while maintaining relevance to its category.

Q24: None.

Q25: No.

Q26: Yes, consistency Australia-wide is absolutely necessary. Any inconsistencies lead to confusion among people less informed.

Q27:

Q28: Yes

Q29: Through active involvement from the various bodies involved with specific media. the Film and Television industry should be involved in creating a better framework for their category, working alongside the government. The same can be equally said of videogames, literature, music, art and beyond. The most comprehensive way to actively install a working frame-work that is both consistent and well-informed, is to include individuals and business from each category.

Other comments:

Moral objection to content needs to quickly become a tool of the past. We live in a multi-cultural, multi-religious society that proclaims democracy, yet the sheer act of Refusing Classification, often based on moral objection to content is ridiculous (as is the case currently in the debate regarding the introduction of an R18+ rating for videogames). We need a comprehensive classification system that

is uniformly consistent with each and every category it regulates. Any outside lobbyists should steer clear of changing any classifications through moral objection. Not everyone in this country is Christian, for example, yet the ACL manages to actively protest many governmental decisions or initiatives. The separation of Church and State needs to be upheld in Australia to better cater to the larger, more diverse community we are.