

Approach to the Inquiry

Question 1. In this Inquiry, should the ALRC focus on developing a new framework for classification, or improving key elements of the existing framework? The present framework if applied correctly should work but appears to fail on because it is focused on individual right instead of community good.

Why classify and regulate content?

Question 2. What should be the primary objectives of a national classification scheme? It should give accurate information about the content so people can make informed decisions about what they wish to watch/read or expose their children to. Some material is potentially very harmful to our community and I believe the good of the community is more important than an individual's "right" to experience harmful content.

What content should be classified and regulated?

Question 3. Should the technology or platform used to access content affect whether content should be classified, and, if so, why? It should not affect classification. All types of technology are accessible to people in our communities. It is not only children who are affected by harmful content. Adults are also affected and then affect their families and/or communities.

Question 4. Should some content only be required to be classified if the content has been the subject of a complaint? No, all content should be classified and classified accurately.

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 and yes.

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? Absolutely not!

Question 7. Should some artworks be required to be classified before exhibition for the purpose of restricting access or providing consumer advice? Some paedophiles hide their pornographic material behind the label of art. Any artwork or advertisements that show men, women or children or animals in a way that is offensive or exploits them should be refused classification whatever their so-called artistic merit may be.

Question 8. Should music and other sound recordings (such as audio books) be classified or regulated in the same way as other content? Yes. Lyrics of songs can be as damaging as visual material. Why would decent people want to fill their minds with demeaning, violent or nasty material. The community needs to protect itself from encouraging depraved people in their depravity.

Question 9. Should the potential size and composition of the audience affect whether content should be classified? No. One person can be affected by violent and/or exploitative sexual content and then run amok affecting many in the community.

Question 10. Should the fact that content is accessed in public or at home affect whether it should be classified? No, for the same reasons as above.

Question 11. In addition to the factors considered above, what other factors should influence whether content should be classified? Community good should be considered. What is the purpose of the material? Do we want a violent, sexually violent and exploitative society or do we want a society in which people are peaceful and respectful of one another. Many in the above industries are exploiting young people and psychologically vulnerable people for their own gain with no thought for the effect on the person and ultimately on the community.

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? Compulsory blocking by the ISP.

Question 13. How can children's access to potentially inappropriate content be better controlled online? By compulsory blocking by ISP and ability for parents/schools to easily block at the computer level as well.

Question 14. How can access to restricted offline content, such as sexually explicit magazines, be better controlled? Such publications as are not offensive, violent or exploitative in their content, could be sold only in an area not accessible to children, and entry only to those with proof of age.

Question 15. When should content be required to display classification markings, warnings or consumer advice? Always, so informed choices can be made.

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? People with a vested interest in making money out of the sale of the material should not have input.

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.

Question 18. What content, if any, should industry classify because the likely classification is obvious and straightforward? None. The industry cannot be trusted to self-regulate.

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?
Yes

Classification categories and criteria

Question 20. Are the existing classification categories understood in the community? Which classification categories, if any, cause confusion? The classification categories appear to be straightforward but the application of the categories has sometimes been misleading. What people who do not live with violence consider to be moderate violence is very different from those people who live with violence. In a world in which many people are hoping and working for peace, it seems extraordinary that so much gratuitous violence both physical and sexual is depicted rather than alternatives and solutions.

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? X18+ should be abolished for films and R18+ not introduced for computer games.

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?

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?

Refused Classification (RC) category

Question 24. Access to what content, if any, should be entirely prohibited online? Material of the type that would be classified as RC, X18+, R18+

Question 25. Does the current scope of the Refused Classification (RC) category reflect the content that should be prohibited online? No, our community does not need RC, X18+, R18+.

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 is important so RC, X18+, R18+ do not enter by the backdoor

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

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 if that is the only way we can achieve Australia wide classification.

Other issues

Question 29. In what other ways might the framework for the classification of media content in Australia be improved? The application of the classification needs to more accurately

reflect the content. It seems as if the people involved in the classification process do not always represent the views of many people within the community. Sometimes it is a minority who get most media attention and decisions appear to be based on how much fuss was made rather than the merits or demerits of the material in question.