

CI 133 B Turner

First name: Brett

Last name: Turner

Q1:

The framework is fundamentally fractured and broken. Uniformity needs to be brought to what is classified, what is not and how this is enforced throughout the states. Classification should be clarified as to its purpose in that it is a means of content classification and broadcast/publication control and not a means of circumventing the legal system. If something is deemed illegal then it should be illegal. That which cannot be classified illegal should not be shoehorned into being illegal based on the opinion of a select few.

Q2:

Unifying the classification across medium and the enforcement. The R and X ratings need to be extended across all mediums and the content addressed consistently. What is R should be R regardless of how it is accessed. The nature of technology needs to be addressed and the distinction between the push nature of broadcasting and demand access nature of online services needs to be removed as a special consideration for classification.

Q3:

No! This is a means to try and get around decisions on one medium and is connected with law enforcement grey areas.

Q4:

Yes. This is a concession to pragmatism. Classification of all broadcasts is possible because of the centralized nature of traditional mediums and collective accountability. The Internet (which is far bigger than just the World Wide Web) is decentralized and it is impossible (in practical terms) to classify it all. That content designed to be delivered in a push capacity (central publishing/broadcasting, central point of control) and viewed publicly without request is and should be classified. That which is not or primarily on request/demand should be on a complaint basis.

Q5:

Impact? This is a poorly worded question since impact isn't defined well. Impact as in the emotional impact of a real decapitated body or impact via interactivity as is argued by poorly informed child advocates? The former yes, the later no. The content should define the classification, not the medium of delivery.

Q6:

Yes. If ALL content across ALL mediums is required to be evaluated then the entire system will fail under the enormity of its own undertaking. There should be a given size where the complaint model is used.

Q7:

If the subject of complaint, yes. If this was a requirement before any artwork could be exhibited then this could well chill the production of creative works.

Q8:

Yes. Uniformity and consistency should be the main objective here.

Q9:

Yes. If ALL content across ALL mediums is required to be evaluated then the entire system will fail under the enormity of its own undertaking. There should be a given size where the complaint model is used.

Q10:

This is again a couched question. No, content should be classified to content and content alone. Content accessed on demand and not publicly viewable (not published/broadcast/distributed in a centralized model) should not necessarily be forced to seek classification before distribution though. This is again a pragmatic concession to practicality. If ALL content across ALL mediums is required to be evaluated then the entire system will fail under the enormity of its own undertaking.

Q11:

Content should be classified to general and consistent guidelines free of religious interference.

Q12:

None. Any that are tried will be bypassed and trivialized. Resources will be wasted on enforcing and criminalizing otherwise innocent citizens. Classification should be used, in the legal sense, to restrict public sale and importing for public sale of refused classification material. Where such material is not illegal to possess then online content is akin to a private ownership. The distinction between RC and illegal needs to be publicly stated and enforcement should be restricted to mass, commercial endeavors.

Q13:

Educate and empower parents in the home. The nature of the Internet makes any form of centralized control doomed to failure. This is a case of parents parenting better. If children understand computers better than the parents, the parents need to educate themselves. Society cannot bear the waste of resources and criminalizing of otherwise innocent citizens implementing methods of access control that are fated to fail.

Q14:

If content is age restricted then those retailing such content should be responsible for verifying the requirement to purchase.

Q15:

Classification should be displayed on all but the lowest level. Warnings should be displayed on extreme violence.

Q16:

All should collaborate. Government should be especially concerned about lobby groups unduly influencing classification requirements to the detriment of the majority of citizens and should veto/refuse those attempts. Government should use the system to protect children while making as much content as possible to adults legally. Very little, if anything, that is not illegal should ever be refused classification.

Q17:

Everything cannot be reviewed. There is simply too much of it. Self regulation to published guidelines should be applied to decentralized (non push/broadcast) markets.

Q18:

Those things which are legal for adults to participate in should not be refused classification. It should be self evident that those things which adults legally participate in should be able to be used for entertainment purposes.

Q19:

If the market is large enough to warrant classification before publication, then it should be able to afford classification.

Q20:

No, it isn't even understood by our own minister for the portfolio. The distinction between RC and Illegal is probably the biggest problem.

Q21:

For the most part, the classification categories need to be extended across all mediums. An R rating exists in movies already, this should be extended across to games. The content that requires a R rating should remain consistent.

Q22:

This is not a big an issue as some make it. Remove the puritan influence and have the classification reflect the acceptance of ordinary Australians. If it is accepted for people of the intended audience age to participate in the said activities or consume that sort of media, then it should be. Interactivity should NOT be a consideration for raising the classification level.

Q23:

Yes. Uniformity and consistency should be the main objective here.

Q24:

Illegal content. If it is legal then it should be available online. As far as mediums of distribution go, it is not advertised in public unsolicited and is on demand. The requirement to request content as opposed to participating unsolicited should make content more available online as opposed to looking at making it more restricted.

Q25:

No. RC has a massive disconnect between what is commonly accepted by Australians and what is listed. The category reflects a small, closed, puritanical position and not the broader view of what the majority of Australians view as acceptable. Illegal should remain illegal, RC should reflect what is unacceptable by the majority opinion to import and distribute for commercial purposes.

Q26:

Yes. There is confusion about how the classification board impacts media availability as it varies from state to state. This should be clear and concise. It is a joke that we tell to international visitors how we have to purchase real pornography from the territories and bring it back because we cannot purchase it locally. How is it illegal purchase but legal to own and consume as long as we purchase it in a territory?

Q27:

A standardized, federal framework for classification and enforcement.

Q28:

Yes. Uniformity and consistency should be the main objective here.

Q29:

This should reflect the views of the common masses of what Australians find acceptable for their various categories. These should be as liberal as is sensibly possible.

Other comments: