

CI 122 J Paisley

First name: James

Last name: Paisley

Q1: Developing a new framework.

Q2: The classification scheme should ensure that adults have access to adult material - it's as simple as that. Gratuitous violence, sexual acts or drug-use (the all too often cited reason for current RC ratings) are not reasons for disallowing adults to make adult decisions. Viewing these acts, or playing games with these acts, have never been shown to cause an increase of these acts being carried out in real life. Subsequently, there appears to be no logic behind imposing such restrictions, beyond imposing puritanical moral values of the few who object to such content. Simply, if you object to the content, you don't have to be subject to it; do not watch it, do not buy it, do not play it.

Q3: No.

Q4: I'm unsure what this question is referring to (perhaps it's related to Q3). Gaming and movies should be classified on release to the public to ensure that people are aware of the content within those mediums. This allows consumers to make informed choices, leaves nothing to surprise, but still doesn't limit the access that adults have to adult material.

Q5: No. "Potential" is the key word here. Until such a time that empirical evidence is brought forward to suggest that, for example, playing video games with gratuitous violence has a causative relationship with acts of violence carried out in real life, there is no need to consider mere "potential". The ambiguity of this mythical potential is what I object to.

Q6: No.

Q7: No.

Q8: Audio books need to be classified in line with the manner in which books are classified. CDs or other digital forms of music can maintain similar standards of classification to that of a DVD audio file.

Q9: No. Each piece of content should be weighed on its own merits alone.

Q10: No.

Q11:

Q12: There are no **effective** methods of controlling access to online content.

Q13: This has nothing to do with any government regulatory body. The government has (in the way of NetAlert) developed voluntary filters in the past that lacked interest, which resulted in funding being pulled. I'm unsure why it's such a consistent theme to try and control the flow of content that is - by and large - the responsibility of parents.

What the government **can** do is inform the older generations of relevant filters that are worth installing for their children if they choose to do so. The responsibility of carrying out the installation, however, is that of the parents - and the parents alone.

Q14: These are already controlled sufficiently. Sexually explicit magazines require identification at the point of sale. Sexually explicit images should not be allowed to display nudity on their front or rear covers.

Q15: All DVDs, games (and CDs) with a non-G rating should be required to display the classification

of the content and a brief overview as to the reason for this classification (i.e. as the system currently stands).

Q16: The government needs to *classify* content; it does not need to heavily regulate it. While I understand the urge for people with a particular moral code to try and impose this onto others, it is important for adults to be able to indulge in adult entertainment. If this is watching sexually explicit videos or using drugs in video games, this is an adult decision that is of absolutely no detriment to the person partaking the activity and - most important - it does not impact anyone else in the slightest.

Lets just step back and let parents do parenting. If parents want an internet filter, that is their responsibility, and not the government's. If parents don't want their 16 year old daughter to watch a video with violence of nudity (rated R18), then again, that's their responsibility to enforce this.

The bottom line here is the classifications board stepping back a little, removing the overly restrictive limitations on content at the moment and let adults do what they do best: make adult decisions.

Q17: Yes. This would result in a practical solution in which all consumers are able to have access to the content they desire, and industry can release content aimed at a particular demographic with this in mind.

Q18: CDs, books, audiobooks. Potentially DVDs and gaming provided that a rigid set of guidelines is created.

Q19: No.

Q20: No.

Q21: Yes. The main problem with current content is removing adult content (e.g. the R rating on games) for no particular reason, other than somebody doesn't wish to play/watch it.

Q22: Uniform colourations and coding scheme. The current system works well in this regard.

Q23: Yes. There needs to be a single point of reference to whichever entity is involved in the classification and regulation of content.

Q24: Child pornography. Allow law enforcement to monitor and charge persons known to be return visitors (rather than accidental visitors) of child porn sites. Under no circumstances should filtering be applied.

Q25: No. There are some depraved sexual acts (e.g. golden showering) which - while they're not exactly my cup of tea either - should not be prohibited. Such content is between two consenting adults and watched by consenting adults. As I said, while it's not something I'd be ever interested in personally watching, I can appreciate two consenting adults partaking in any activity they please provided it's not to the detriment of others.

Q26: Yes. Nation wide classifications. This makes it far easier for consumers who are increasingly shopping online, and for industry who won't have to jump through bureaucratic hoops in each prospective state of sale in order to be classified.

Q27: A federal scheme.

Q28: Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: