

CI 191 S Gillespie

First name: Sam

Last name: Gillespie

Q1:

The ALRC should focus on developing a new framework for classification that considers both the needs of families and adults, such that those who rightly want access to adult content are capable of doing so, and that parents are able to make informed decisions as to the content that they wish for their children to view.

Q2:

A national classification scheme should focus primarily on providing information, such that adults may act in a logical and informed manner without prohibiting adults from accessing material that is not illegal.

Q3:

Based on the results of prior studies, it has been shown that violent video games impact on children in a similar way to violent movies and TV series. The technology in which adult themed material is distributed should not play as much of a role as the material itself.

Q4:

The film, TV and video game industries are capable of understanding their target audience, and should be allowed to classify their products according to a classification system. A review board should be set up only to deal with complaints that say the products are classified incorrectly.

Q5:

Q6:

No. Classification should be done purely on the content of the material.

Q7:

Traditional artworks, such as paintings and sculpture should never be classified, as there is no possible way that such things can harm children.

Q8:

Music and other sound recordings should be classified solely on the content of the material. If there is lots of coarse language or adult themes, then a classification should be designed to reflect this.

Q9:

No. Classification should be done purely on the content of the material.

Q10:

No. Classification should be done purely on the content of the material.

Q11:

Classification should be done purely on the content of the material.

Q12:

Controlling access to online content is like trying to stop the ocean with sugar cubes, it is a waste of time, effort and money. Due to the vast size of the internet, and the number of potentially illicit materials online, controlling access will inevitably infringe on a persons right to free speech. Due to the complexity of the internet, any system designed to control access can be easily circumvented with easy solutions such as proxy servers.

Instead, parents and adults should be teaching children safe internet practises, such that illicit material is not viewed at home. Optional filters on client-side computers are a more efficient way of controlling online access, without blocking any adults right to view what they wish to.

Q13:

Client-side filters are a preferred option to the ISP side filters. These can be controlled by parents to ensure that children are not accessing inappropriate material. Such filters are already in place in schools and similar institutions.

Q14:

The restriction of sale to minors is sufficient. No system will prevent all children from accessing such material, and to attempt to stop that will infringe on an adults right to view such material.

Q15:

Content should be required to display classification at the time of purchase. Therefore in the front cover of the material is sufficient. For online distribution, classification should appear at the main page of purchase for that product

Q16:

The film, TV and video game industry should be informed as to the resulting classification system, and be allowed to rate their material as they believe it should be rated. If there is a complaint with regard to this classification, an independent body should be established to ensure that the classification rating is correct. If it is deemed incorrect, then that particular institution should be put on watch, and have all future content monitored to ensure that they are correctly rating their material. Such reviews should be done at the expense of the company.

Q17:

A model where the industry is responsible for classifying content with a governmental body designed to deal with complaints and issues as they arise would be more efficient. This would reduce the cost to the taxpayers, while also still creating an informative system.

Q18:

The industry is capable of determining what material should be rated, and should be allowed to make

a judgement accordingly.

Q19:

If the Government were to make the industry classify their own content, then the Governments role would be reduced to that of a "watchdog". The industry should be forced to pay a fee if and only if the classification board has to review their rating.

Q20:

The classifications have too many grey areas. There is a distinct difference between M and MA, however there are films and other content where that line is not clear cut, and often cause confusion. Furthermore, ratings given out in the past are not consistent to the current day. An example of this is the difference between "Mad Max" and "Saw 1". In Mad Max a man is handcuffed to a car about to explode and given a saw, and told that the only way out is to saw his hand off. It is never known what happens to this man, and this film was given an R rating. However in the film Saw 1 a scene actually shows a man sawing his own leg off, in gory detail. This film is only given a MA15+ rating. Such inconsistencies are the biggest cause of confusion in the community.

Q21:

A new classification system should be made, and it should be the same across all forms of media. The G and PG ratings are good, as they inform parents of children up to the age of 15 what is appropriate. The M and MA system makes sense, although perhaps need to be defined a bit clearer, as there is often some confusion as to what warrents M as opposed to MA. The R and X rating are appropriate. AV is a redundant category, and should be merged with R. Each of these categories should be more clearly defined, and have these definitions remain consistent over time.

All media (including video games) should be allowed to be reviewed as one of these 6 categories.

Q22:

All media (including video games) should be allowed to be reviewed using the same classification system.

Q23:

Q24:

This question is leading. The prohibition of online material through a forced filter does not work, as the internet is vast with many different protocols for file transfer. Instead of focusing on prohibiting the average person from accessing material online, more effort should be done to stop illegal activities such as child pornography from happening in the first place. There are issues with foreign owned websites, and this is understandable, but the fact is that people who wish to view illegal material will do so, and will circumvent any filtering system. Therefore, a prohibition of online material will only stop the accidental viewing of material.

Q25:

RC should only be reserved for material that is illegal such as child pornography.

Q26:

Yes. A national classification system that is endorsed by all states and territories is essential.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments:

All media should be reviewed and classified equally, with a global classification system. The role of a classification system is to inform and educate, and should not restrict material that adults could reasonably wish to view. A draconian classification system that prohibits all adults from viewing what they wish will only cause otherwise upstanding citizens from resorting to illegal activities such as pirating. When video games are refused classification, piracy for that game increases dramatically in Australia, ripping funds from the industry. If we are to ever have a successful movie/TV/video game industry in Australia, we need to support them by making the transition between producer and consumer easier, without inadvertently influencing the youth of today.

The role of classification board should be that of an industry watchdog, not an Orwellian overlord.