

CI 281 A Mitchell

First name: Aaron

Last name: Mitchell

Q1:

Improving the existing framework, the existing framework does a fine job of enforcing and applying classification, with the exception of an R18+ for video games to bring the classification into line with international standards. No system is ever going to be universally accepted but the current system has been effective for film and television for many years.

Q2:

To better inform Australians as to the content of media and entertainment. Not to restrict but to inform, the goal should be encouraging Australian individuals to make the best decision, not make a blanket decision for them.

Q3:

No, despite extensive studies by many different researchers in many different regions of the world the different mediums of entertainment do not impact the perceived reaction (heightened blood pressure, increased aggression, increased desensitisation). People who watch scary movies are as desensitised in the short term following as people who play scary games. While it's argued by some that the interactivity of games increases psychological involvement this is only a layman opinion and not born out by any current study.

Q4:

All content should be classified based on a set of agreed upon standards determined by public and industry consultation. Complaints can be heard, but the standards should be measured against the complaint, not individual items that people just happen to have taken issue with on a personal level.

Q5:

Standards should be enforced the same across all types of entertainment media, TV, film, radio, books, magazines, music and theatre should be subject to the same classification standards and regulations.

Q6:

No, although potential artistic merit could be taken into account on items with educational merit ie. Romeo and Juliet shouldn't be restricted despite depictions of underage sex, suicide and violence.

Q7:

For the purpose of consumer advice, classifications should be applied. I once attended a Festival of Perth play version of The Cars That Ate Paris that was advertised as a 'dazzling pyrotechnic display', then featured a rape scene between two men in the first 20 minutes, I saw several parents running for the door with children clutched on their shoulder at this point. An appropriate classification for this particular play would have been very beneficial.

Q8:

Yes, the existing classification would work well with music.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No, if the purpose is to inform as to the content, then no.

Q11:

Q12:

There is no effective method, the government is going to have to accept that the internet is the wild frontier to them and no action they can take will ever enable them to fully control or restrict content. The best action the government can take is a campaign parents to monitor their childrens access at all times. Similar to advertisements about drunk driving and other safe behaviours, a campaign encouraging parents to control internet access in their own homes would go a long way.

Q13:

As mentioned above, communicate to parents, advertise on TV's, promote free net nanny software, there's literally dozens of options available but many people don't even know there are such things as net nannies, encourage ISP's to advertise their optional filters to their customers and advertise simple ideas to people, like keeping computers in common areas of the home and not letting kids have computers in their bedrooms 24/7.

Q14:

Sell restricted content from behind the counter in stores.

Q15:

The simple classification content on the product and any promotional material is fine. You'd be hard pressed to find someone in Australia who doesn't understand the difference between R18+ and PG.

Q16:

There should be one, nation wide system of classification managed by the OFLC that applies the same rules to all content and media. The assessment process should be transparent and open for public scrutiny. The government should work for the people of Australia, as in all the people, not the vocal minority who write daily letters of outrage to their MP.

Q17:

Yes, absolutely. The people who create the content are obviously the most familiar with it and best placed to regulate themselves. This has been the stance of people working within the OFLC for some time.

Q18:

Both ends of the spectrum, obviously most education entertainment content could be classified as G or PG and all overtly sexual content could be classified as R18+

Q19:

Yes, in the case where an independent film has an expected profit below a certain threshold the cost of classification should be waived.

Q20:

Yes they are, there is, I believe a little confusion between M, MA and MA15+, due to the attempted adaptation of classification to be both informative or restrictive. It should focus on being informative with the only restrictive age group being R18+ as it used to be. I fail to understand the difference between the mental comprehension of a 15 year old and an 18 year old and why a distinction is so important.

Q21:

No, there is no need. What we have is fine, what we need is a more standardised application of the current classification, free of individual opinions interfering with the process.

Q22:

A written and agreed upon set of criteria determined in consultation with the industry and the general public (not just the damn ACL and ACCM who represent a special interest group and yet seem to have swayed government decision making on the issue to often in the past)

Q23:

Unsure

Q24:

The same kind of material in films that is generally refused classification in Australia.

Q25:

Not as it applies to games, due to the missing R18+ which creates a far too wide swiipe of material.

Q26:

Yes, a blanket classification system for Australia mandated by the federal government makes a lot more sense.

Q27:

It shouldn't be replaced, just reassessed.

Q28:

Yes, mandate it at a Federal level, mainly to prevent special interest groups from co opting the process.

Q29:

Follow the US model

Other comments:

I'm a father of three children and consider the responsibility to monitor their media input mine and mine alone and I feel extremely uncomfortable with the idea of the government playing a larger role than informing and educating parents. That's the purpose of a classification system. Currently we have a system whereby the government has fallen behind in the types of media available to Australians and handled the changes with reactionary behaviour based on the opinions of a small group of people who frequently cite poor or completely spurious arguments in favour of their view point. Groups such as the ACL and ACCM want to use the classification system to create walls between Australians and what they personally find distasteful or blasphemous. They do so by inciting moral panic almost identical to the same panic we have seen all through the 20th century over rock and roll music, swing dancing, comic books, heavy metal music, communism, homosexuality, immunisation, and too many other subjects to name. Classification, specifically the classification of video games, is only the latest in a long line of new ideas that are treated with immediate and unfounded derision.

The solution is a simple standardised set of rules that put certain depictions behind certain classifications that allow, all Australians, but particularly parents and guardians to make appropriate choices about what they experience.