

CI 63 R Riley

**Robyn Riley**

**Question 1.** In this Inquiry, should the ALRC focus on developing a new framework for classification, or improving key elements of the existing framework?

I believe the ALRC should develop a new framework for classification that protects our society/children from so much violent & sexually explicit material. Children are especially impacted by negative material and we are seeing more and more violence on the streets and in our schools and children are increasingly sexually active, because it is portrayed as 'the norm' and ok in media. The present system is failing society.

**Question 2.** What should be the primary objectives of a national classification scheme?

- Protect our children and youth from Sexually explicit media
- Make sure the classifications reflect societies standards.
- Make it illegal for material that contravenes societies standards, or is harmful to be distributed.
- Make sure parents and care-givers know exactly what is in the media material so they can make an informed decision as to whether they attend a screening or purchase a game or magazine
- Make it illegal for adult rated material to be advertised where children can see it. (If it is not suitable to watch, why do we advertise the same material for all to see.)

**Question 3.** Should the technology or platform used to access content affect whether content should be classified, and, if so, why?

No. Because there is no guarantee that content not classified would not fall into the hands of minors or those people that could be adversely effected by violent /sexual material

**Question 4.** Should some content only be required to be classified if the content has been the subject of a complaint?

ALL content should be classified. Why should we wait for a complaint to recognise what is dangerous and destructive to society.

**Question 5.** Should the potential impact of content affect whether it should be classified? Should content designed for children be classified across all media?

Yes. Why should we wait for a negative impact before we classify media. If it has potential to do harm, it should be classified in a way that everyone knows and understands the content. Yes we should classife all media when it comes to our children . Parents need to be given the right to protect their child from 'potential' harm. Once a child has seen violent or sexual media, the damage is already done because you cannot erase their memory.

**Question 6.** Should the size or market position of particular content producers and distributors, or the potential mass market reach of the material, affect whether content should be classified?

Yes. Just because a distributor or producer is well known and has a wide marketing reach, should not preclude them from coming under the standards society set.

**Question 7.** Should some artworks be required to be classified before exhibition for the purpose of restricting access or providing consumer advice?

Yes. All art forms that promote the abuse or exploitation of ethnic groups; women and children, physically, sexually or in a demeaning manner should be **refused classification - irrespective of any so called 'artistic merit'**.

**Question 8.** Should music and other sound recordings (such as audio books) be classified or regulated in the same way as other content?

Yes. Under the **Commonwealth Classification Act**, music that **PROMOTES- INSIGHTS OR INSTRUCTS in sexual abuse, physical abuse, drug abuse, bestiality, child abuse, incest or suicide, is not permitted by LAW** to be published in **written** form. If it was deemed that **dangerous** to be put in the CCA, then how much more dangerous is it to the **minds** of our very impressionable youth. We are seeing more and more violence and I believe seriously, that it stems from all the negative media around today. The self-relugating system is **NOT** working and needs to be changed.

**Question 9.** Should the potential size and composition of the audience affect whether content should be classified?

No. If any media is violent or negative and goes against societies standard; it should be classified to give the whole of society the right to make an informed decision, as to whether they would watch/read/play it.

**Question 10.** Should the fact that content is accessed in public or at home affect whether it should be classified?

No. Whether it is accessed in the home OR in public, does not negate the need to make an informed decision on a product. If it is for the home, parents still need the right to be informed before they spend money on a book/game/movie etc.Same for the public arena.

**Question 11.** In addition to the factors considered above, what other factors should influence whether content should be classified?

Advertising standards Boards need to take into account the **EVIDENCE** from psychologists;police and behavioural studies from different organisations, before they classify any form of media. They need to see if negative media does have an effect on society or not. (I have spoken to detectives who have clearly stated that they believe music & movies have a negative impact and contribute to crimes).

**How should access to content be controlled?**

**Question 12.** What are the most effective methods of controlling access to online content, access to which would be restricted under the National Classification Scheme?

Mandatory filtering of internet content at the ISP level.This would exclude all material that would be classified RC, X18+ or R18+. Access to R18+ could be provided with age verification if required.

**Question 13.** How can children's access to potentially inappropriate content be better controlled online?

I feel the best way, is to make it illegal for inappropriate material to be on-line. **Our children are smarter than we give credit and learn at an early age how to get around the 'Net Nanny'**. If media is bad for the mind of a child, it is also bad for the mind of an adult who has the capacity to carry out the violence he sees in media on-line.

**Question 14.** How can access to restricted offline content, such as sexually explicit magazines, be better controlled?

ALL sexually explicit magazines/videos/games etc should be sold ONLY in a closed off area to children. They should NEVER have access to this material. I have found it impossible to let my children come into a video store with me because the explicit material is now mixed in with the other DVDs and for all to see. It is still my belief that if it is dangerous to the mind of a child, it is equally dangerous to an adult.

**Question 15.** When should content be required to display classification markings, warnings or consumer advice?

As soon as it goes over and above the classification for a child.

#### **Who should classify and regulate content?**

**Question 16.** What should be the respective roles of government agencies, industry bodies and users in the regulation of content?

The government should be in control of governing the standards and regulations. It should NEVER be left to the people who sell the product. Self-regulation does NOT work. **This was proven when I took a very explicit and violent music cd, showing the disembowelling of a girl with a man's head between her legs to my MP. He was horrified.**

**Question 17.** Would co-regulatory models under which industry itself is responsible for classifying content, and government works with industry on a suitable code, be more effective and practical than current arrangements?

No! As I have said in Q 16, Self-regulation does NOT work. Government should take into consideration the standards set by society and then regulate accordingly.

**Question 18.** What content, if any, should industry classify because the likely classification is obvious and straightforward?

None. As per Q16-17

#### **Classification fees**

**Question 19.** In what circumstances should the Government subsidise the classification of content? For example, should the classification of small independent films be subsidised?

No. Tax payers are struggling to make ends meet. Why should they also have to fund a film/book/game that they would not necessarily watch/read/play. Film/book/game makers should be made pay for their own classification (based on societies standards) and then that fee should be passed on to the people watching the film; buying the book/games etc.

#### **Classification categories and criteria**

**Question 20.** Are the existing classification categories understood in the community? Which classification categories, if any, cause confusion?

I believe that all of the classification categories need an overhaul. I have taken a 3 year old to a movie that had in-appropriate content for her age. I have also taken my older children to a film with in-appropriate content for their age. I have also walked out of a film because of in-appropriate content that did not meet the 'classification' set. We need to make sure that the content of films do NOT contravene the 'classification' for that film.

**Question 21.** Is there a need for new classification categories and, if so, what are they? Should any existing classification categories be removed or merged?

- The existing classification categories should remain so long as the content does NOT contravene the 'Classification'. X18+ category for films should be cancelled. Films containing explicit sexual acts should be Refused Classification. These films exploit and demean women/children and other community groups. They have been implicated in the sexual abuse of, and the premature sexualisation of our impressionable, innocent children.

- No R18+ classification should be introduced for computer games because they cause violent thinking and behaviour in those who play them. I have spoke to detectives who believe that violent video games contribute to violent acts. How much worse will R18+ be to society.

**Question 22.** How can classification markings, criteria and guidelines be made more consistent across different types of content in order to recognise greater convergence between media formats?

Simply have the same rule for all, with the same Classification for all.

**Question 23.** Should the classification criteria in the *Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995* (Cth), National Classification Code, Guidelines for the Classification of Publications and Guidelines for the Classification of Films and Computer Games be consolidated?

Yes. Same for all based on community standards.

#### **Refused Classification (RC) category**

**Question 24.** Access to what content, if any, should be entirely prohibited online?

ALL R18+;

RC, X18+ or

ALL sexual material that denigrates women, children and people groups.

**Question 25.** Does the current scope of the Refused Classification (RC) category reflect the content that should be prohibited online?

No

#### **Reform of the cooperative scheme**

**Question 26.** Is consistency of state and territory classification laws important, and, if so, how should it be promoted?

Yes. It should be promoted by enforcing consistant classification rulings & through education of suppliers that it will be governed as LAW to be enforced.

**Question 27.** If the current Commonwealth, state and territory cooperative scheme for classification should be replaced, what legislative scheme should be introduced?

It should be introduced with ONE governing body to oversee and legislate all Commonwealth, state and Territory jurisdictions ENFORCABLE BY LAW.

**Question 28.** Should the states refer powers to the Commonwealth to enable the introduction of legislation establishing a new framework for the classification of media content in Australia?

Yes there should be only ONE governing body. This will reduce cost and make the system more efficient.

**Other issues**

**Question 29.** In what other ways might the framework for the classification of media content in Australia be improved?