

CI 1956 L James

First name: Lucas

Last name: James

Q1:

Given the multitude of different classification systems for print, FTA TV, Pay TV, Public broadcast TV, Computer games, the ALRC should focus on developing a new framework,

Q2:

To inform the public of the level of content they are about to purchase/watch/read

Q3:

No. However, due to the difficulty of classifying overseas content, the ALRC should consider "equivariant systems of classification" as a means of compliance.

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

No. Yes

Q6:

No. However this illuminates a blind spot in the review. Content producers and distributors on the internet can mean individual citizens. Content classification should NEVER be applied to content that is produced by individuals.

Q7:

No. However if an artwork would provoke a strong reaction, it should have a warning label.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

It should only be classified if produced for commercial gain.

Q12:

Education on what is appropriate to look at. This is the only means.

Q13:

Stern parents/caregivers.

Q14:

Stern parents/caregivers.

Q15:

All the time

Q16:

Govt, industry to agree on a standard code. Users can self regulate

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

All

Q19:

All circumstances. If the government wants a say in the classification of content, the government can pick up the tab.

Q20:

RC. RC is conflated with illegal content, which is incorrect.

Q21:

RC should be removed. a Non-Violent-Erotica should be introduced.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

None. If access to the "worst of the worst" was prohibited, these low-lives will not be reported and arrested.

Q25:

No. There is scope within RC that would not offend the average Australian. There is content that currently would attract an RC classification that would not be in a banned category in other western liberal democracies.

Q26:

Yes. Cut off funding to the states and territories until they comply.

Q27:

The 100% of state AG agreement should be replaced with a majority of states AGs

Q28:

Yes

Q29: