

CI 1947 S Cook

First name: Stuart

Last name: Cook

Q1:

Q2:

To inform consumers (especially parents) about the content of creative materials, without impeding the creation and distribution of those materials.

The classification system must be a system for empowering choices, not restricting or removing them. It is vital that it not be corrupted into a tool of censorship.

Q3:

A successful classification scheme should take into account the realities of each medium, but attempt to keep classification consistent between media where it is practical and sensible to do so.

Q4:

Yes, absolutely. Mandatory classification for all content is a tremendous burden on the types of content that can otherwise be created and distributed very cheaply. However, a complaints mechanism should not serve as an effective means of harassment or denial-of-service.

Q5:

If content is obviously low-impact, it should not be burdened with pointless bureaucracy. Conversely, if content is obviously high-impact (and therefore unsuitable for minors), it should also enjoy a lesser amount of scrutiny, because that scrutiny is not serving the purpose of informing parents.

Q6:

The classification scheme must be sensitive to the impact it has on the creation and distribution of content, and attempt to minimize that impact as much as possible. To this end, it should be sensitive to the market position and reach of the materials it is classifying, so that niche and low-margin creative works are not stifled.

Q7:

The classification scheme must never cause a work to be completely or practically available to the adult public. Subject to that constraint it might be possible to restrict certain works in narrow ways, but such restrictions must be considered grave and should err on the side of availability.

Q8:

To the extent that such materials are classified, harmony between classification systems would be helpful. However, expanding the scope of classification, regulation or censorship of these materials is unacceptable.

Q9:

If an audience is already known to consist entirely of adults, there is very little reason for the classification scheme to be involved at all.

Q10:

Q11:

The primary consideration should be the impact of classification on the availability of materials to the adult public. Any aspect of the classification scheme that makes it substantially more difficult for adults to access content of any kind is entirely inappropriate.

In addition, it must be very easy for content of any kind to "opt out" of the classification scheme in a reasonable way. As long as adult customers are reasonably informed that content is unclassified, access to that content (by adults) should not be restricted.

Q12:

The classification scheme should not attempt to control access to online content. Any attempt would be impractical and expensive, and serve only to inconvenience adult consumers.

Q13:

Any system for restricting access must be entirely voluntary, for both creators and viewers.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

The government-run scheme has utterly failed to respond to modern needs and attitudes, so it is hard to imagine how industry involvement could make things worse.

However, any cooperative scheme must not be used as a vehicle for incumbent industry players to impose higher barriers to entry on newer players.

Q18:

Q19:

If Government needs to subsidise the classification of materials, then the classification scheme has already failed the authors and audiences of those materials.

Q20:

The existing classifications are reasonably-well understood. Any attempt to change them radically would likely result in more confusion, not less.

Q21:

The "Refused Classification" category has no place in an informative classification scheme, and serves only to oppress. If necessary, it should be replaced with a category that indicates that materials have not been classified. This classification MUST NOT restrict the reasonable availability of such materials to the adult public.

The lack of an R18+ classification for video games is a disgrace, and must be rectified. Adult-age gamers have been asking for this classification for over a decade, and the government's response has been to extend its middle finger and treat these adults as children. There is simply no excuse for an R18+ classification to be denied to video games.

Q22:

Q23:

It makes no sense for video games to be held to an arbitrarily higher standard than film. Consolidation therefore makes sense, as long as neither category ends up more restricted.

Q24:

Access to online content should not be prohibited.

This cannot be stressed enough. It is simply indefensible for the government to even attempt to dictate to adult Australians what they can or cannot access online.

Q25:

No. The current scope of the Refused Classification category is utterly divorced from reality, and serves only to allow overzealous religious groups to oppress the rest of the adult public.

Q26:

Consistency is important, where possible. However, consistency must NEVER be used as an excuse for one state or territory to veto changes in other states or territories, as has occurred under the current scheme.

Q27:

Any new scheme must NOT allow special interests to restrict others.

Q28:

The current classification scheme has already suffered enough from being a political football. The structure of any new framework must allow for maximum flexibility, so that oppressive interests in one state or territory cannot impose their will upon the rest of the country.

Q29:

The most important and fundamental change needed is that the classification scheme must shift away from censorship and bans, and move towards a more informative system that does not restrict the choices of adult Australians.

Other comments:

It is shameful that this review has been conducted in near-silence, with very little opportunity for interested members of the public to become involved. It is extremely likely that this mishandling will skew the results of this consultation, leading to many more years of religious oppression of the adult public.

I also object to the incredibly leading and biased format of this consultation, greatly weakening its ability to accurately reflect public sentiment.