

CI 119 C Booker

First name: Chris

Last name: Booker

Q1: The ALRC should focus on developing a new framework, similar to those found in other democratic societies.

Q2: The primary objective should be to allow adults to view and engage with whatever content they feel is suitable for themselves and their children, while also informing them of the age group the content is likely suitable for, and where necessary restricting children's access to content that may not be suitable for them.

Q3: I do not believe that the medium should affect classification. I will start by saying I feel there should be very few things that should be refused classification. The classification system should serve as a guide to people as to what to expect from a piece of media. To this end, I feel a classification should read something similar to "This is a video game, which contains violence" rather than "This is a video game, which contains violence, therefore has a higher/lower impact than other mediums". That is the responsibility of an individual or parent to decide, and it should be the classification systems responsibility to inform them as best as it is able.

Q4: There are very few things these days that are not the subject of complaint, so I believe it would be simpler to provide classification on all content.

Q5: "Potential impact" is subjective. I believe that classifications role should not be to determine if something should be allowed to be viewed or interacted with, but to inform people of what to expect from the content and help guide their individual decision. I feel it is unnecessary to classify content designed for children across all media, just the media by which it is originally designed to be accessed.

Q6: I take this question to mean should things be classified based on how likely people are to hear about it and desire to engage with the content. The size or market position should be irrelevant.

Q7: In regards to classifying artworks, providing advice is fine, restricting access is not. Having said that, I feel artwork should have some avenue by which to appeal a classification should they feel it is incorrect, and given a chance to explain their position.

Q8: As mentioned earlier, the classification should serve to inform the populace of how the media is accessed, and the content, and let them decide for themselves the likely impact.

Q9: Bearing in mind that classification should only serve as a guide, not as a set of restrictions, the size and composition of the audience should be irrelevant.

Q10: I feel the location the medium is viewed should be a factor. For example, if a professor were to give a lecture on the effect of alcohol on society in a venue that is restricted to adults, it would not be necessary to classify that as only adults would be able to view it, and if they find it uncomfortable they are free to leave.

Q11: I feel that entities should be able to pre-emptively apply for a rating that restricts access of their media to adults only, or children in the company of an adult. This would save everyone involved time and effort.

Q12: This question is similar to asking "How do we control what people think and talk about?". The

internet is merely a tool by which people use to communicate with each other. The issue is not the internet, just like the issue isn't a mouth and a pair of ears. The most effective method is to identify individuals who desire to harm others, which is achieved by a robust social work system, which is a discussion in of itself.

Q13: I feel the better question would be "How can the relationship between parent and child be better fostered", which I believe also answers this question.

Q14: In a democratic society, people should be free to access whatever content they choose, though there should be limits as to what is regarded as appropriate, for example, when it comes to children. It would be better controlled by trying to control it less.

Q15: All forms of media should display classification.

Q16: The government should only seek to advise the populace as to the content of the media, and only block content which features excessively deplorable moral activities. The industry should see to inform a potential buyer of what it's product contains, and who it is likely to be suitable for. It is a users role to decide for themselves what is and isn't appropriate, and take responsibility for what they view, and what they let their children view.

Q17: Absolutely. I don't believe the industry wishes to deceive anyone, and appreciates the need for classification. In any case, laws could be established that punish an industry body seeking to abuse the system.

Q18: The industry should be able to voluntarily have their content, on a case by case basis, either restricted to adults, or children in the company of an adult.

Q19: The government should provide subsidy in exchange for a small percentage of the profits. This will dissuade people from seeking a subsidy on a product purely for the purposes of profit, while for smaller productions, who may make little or no profit, the benefit of the subsidy will greatly outweigh the small percentage of their small profits.

Q20: Games classification instantly springs to mind. Many games over the years have had to have their content changed so they can be effectively shoe - horned into the M15 category. Many parents are surprised to learn about the games their children play, especially when those games are proclaimed suitable for a 15 year old, as that is the maximum effective age for which a game can be classified.

Q21: In regards to games, an adult classification is desperately needed. To the best of my knowledge, Australia is the only western society that does not have the capacity to classify some games as only being suitable for adults, which means 15 year old children are able to access media that their parents may not be comfortable with. The classification system needs to recognise some games, just like movies, are only suitable for adults.

Q22: Difficulty arises when trying to judge the different impact content has based on the medium by which it is accessed. It would be far simpler to classify the content, rather than the medium.

Q23: Simply put, yes. Technology is advancing, as does the way we interact with content. The lines between them are getting blurrier, and will only continue to do so.

Q24: As I mentioned earlier, I think the real question should be if such a thing is even possible.

Personally, I find the harming of children to be utterly deplorable and inexcusable, but I cannot stop people from talking about it. The best I can do is make sure that the young people in my life are safe and educated, and that those would prey on them get the help they need.

Q25: I do not feel it does, but I feel my answer in the previous question reflects my stance.

Q26: It would make classification much simpler, and easier for everyone involved, if the laws were uniform. I hope the reminder that the purpose of classification is to inform it's audience, not decide what is and isn't appropriate. Everyone has their personal beliefs, the classification is simply a guide, not a moral stance or objective.

Q27: If I'm perfectly honest, this is beyond the scope of my expertise, but I feel a scheme that balances the right of an adult with the need to protect children would be a good foundation.

Q28: Yes, it would be simple and effective.

Q29: I have no issue with clasification, as I see it as a quick and easy guide in regards to the nature of content. I feel individuals that have strong feelings about particular content have every right not to view it, but should accept the responsibility for investigating and deciding for themselves if a particular piece of content is suitable for themselves or their children. That's the core of the issue, responsibility, and the classification scheme should seek to guide people, not take responsibility for them, or from them.

Other comments: