

CI 893 A Leone

First name: Anthony

Last name: Leone

Q1:

preferably both, in the sense of creating an 'r' rating system that should already be there, plus seriously evaluating what constitutes a high rating game in itself, as current criteria for what makes a game unsellable in australia is nothing short of ridiculous and horribly outdated, not to mention redundant. However the system of labeling a piece of media g, pg, m or ma etc is effective and established, no change is needed on that part.

Q2:

To encourage foreign media companies to make a larger effort to export their product to australia by cutting out the red tape and silly political posturing.

Q3:

No, because technology is harmless in itself, its merely how its used and what is used on it that should be under any sort of scrutiny.

Q4:

No, it should not. All content should be legally classified, so there is no mistake when someone buys something. If someone complains that a R rated movie/game is violent/has adult themes, then they have no ground to stand on, as they knew what they were buying.

Q5:

No, if content designed for a child is produced, it should be classified for children so parents know what to expose to their child. Theres far too many lazy parents buying violent games/movies for kids too young to be playing them as it is, making it more obvious what a kid should be playing is the only way to combat this sensibly.

Q6:

How popular a peice of media may prove to be before its release and sale is nothing but speculation, to pick and choose what to classify would be silly, how would you really know how much it could sell? Better to analyse it all, or at least give it the same classification that america, britian or europe does so there can be no mistakes.

Q7:

Artworks, although another form of media, exist outside the capitalism-fueled economy of media. It exists for its own sake, and people shouldnt be barred from enjoying it at any age, nor should a peice of art be denied entry to australia because its too "risky".

Q8:

Not really, as a metal music fan, all an album with violent content needs is a small warning label like back in the 90s with "warning explicit content" on it, the artwork on cd/dvd covers alone is enough to tell what you will be listening to. Same with video games and movies to be honest, but not doing so opens the government up to lawsuits from people looking for a quick buck. With music its supposedly the musicians "fault" if people are hurt by its contents (see marilyn mansons court cases for an example).

Q9:

No. Speculation is not a sound way to decide what to rate.

Q10:

No, it makes no difference either way.

Q11:

possibly radio stations, but that is a dying form of media as is, pointless to do anything with it.

Q12:

There is no effective way of controlling access to online content, any security filter installed by a government is easily bypassable by anyone with sufficient computer knowledge, and merely harms the average citizens ability to access foreign content. There is also no reason to do so, as access to an unfiltered internet has become a basic human right, and should never be revoked, a parent looking to protect a young child from explicit content online can EASILY download for free a number of internet filters, i believe windows operation systems also come with its own method of restriction. This supposed national classification scheme is cruel government censorship on level with countries like iran and china, not something worth pursuing if a government wants to be seen as legitimate.

Q13:

Again, there are numerous programs one can download for free online that restrict a childs potential to find explicit content, this comes down to whether or not a parent has the drive to watch out for their kids wellbeing. A child growing up in a home where the parents simply dont care what they get exposed to has far bigger problems than finding innapropriate content online. This country should not be a nanny state, we as humans are all responsible for our own actions, or failure to act for those in our legal care.

Q14:

They are currently controlled just fine, although again, explicit magazines are a dying form of media, and the people who buy them are almost all fully grown adults who are perfectly able of making their own descisions. Additional control is NOT necessary, as it would only damage the ability for newsagencies to do buisness. This comes down to again, nanny state behaviour that is not needed.

Q15:

Just before and after release, so when a game/movie is released what you can expect to see/experience is clear and known from the start.

Q16:

Government agencies should basically be handed all media content yet to be released, classify it to a better thought out classification system, then authorise it for release. Industry bodies should be responsible for producing said content and giving it to the respective government agency at a suitable time before release, indicating what they think is a fair label for this content, so it can streamline the process somewhat.

Users do not need to have any role, except to purchase said content if they wish. Aslong as all media content is correctly ranked and labeled, they should not need to make complaints about an aspect of media they dissaprove of, as they knew what they were getting into to begin with.

Q17:

Very much so, although for certain large scale media forms like blockbuster movies and large videogame franchises (such as call of duty, battlefield or gears of war) the industry may attempt to give a game a lower rating than it should have, in order to try and secure a few more sales. This is up to the government to decide is risky or not, as again, any competent parent or individual can simply view an online video preview of said peice of media to judge for themselves if its suitable for them or their children.

Q18:

Only tv shows and series, Movies and video game are worth classifying. Music is arguably not, see my answer on question 8 for my opinion on that.

Q19:

It should be simple and cheap to classify content in itself, all you really need is a small team to review each peice of media and give it a rating, under the scrutiny of the CCC if there are any complaints concerning inaccurate ratings given to said media.

Q20:

Largely they are understood quite well by the community at large, however the difference between a 'pg' rated peice of media and an 'm' rated peice are often a source of concern as they can vary wildly in content due to poor rating practices. This can be fixed with a review and a clear indication of what constitutes a particular rating.

Q21:

For videogames there needs to be an R rating for high violence as its causing a serious issue with foreign game companies trying to sell games in australia, a cause of serious anger amongst the gaming community in australia, whose average age is over 30 according to studies ive read about years ago, and dont want to buy watered down versions of what is easily purchaseable in any other developed country.

Q22:

simply put, have a suitably sized department correctly instructed and trained to rate all related forms of media that require classification and markings. Make sure the current g/pg/m/ma system is the same across all forms of media and keep it streamlined.

Q23:

Very much so, alot of it covers the same ground, what constitutes a violent movie can easily be transferred to a violent computer game with similar levels of violence, this is just another example of government red tape going out of control, to the detriment of the community and media economy at large.

Q24:

Nothing should be prohibited or restricted online, there is no need to do so. Especially if someone is accessing terrorist related information or child porn, allowing somewhat easy access (as in letting the internet polic such stuff on its own, as its been doing fairly effectively for years) and simply monitoring it as the federal police have been doing for years. Doing so allows them to be caught with much greater ease.

For example, a muslim tries to access terrorist information online and tries to organise a violent attack, if he has no restrictions on the ability to do this, the federal police can easily monitor him, the

site/chat service he used and perform an arrest when the time comes. Heavy internet censorship simply makes said man use various means to make his activities online anonymous and untraceable, leaving the police blind and unable to monitor or act. It hinders public safety, rather than assists it.

Q25:

Absolutely not. The RC category should exist only for extremely offensive racial or terrorist related books and cds/dvds purchaseable on the street or online. No video game or movie needs to be labeled in such a manner.

Q26:

Not particular, unless the law dictates that each state must make its own decision on what a piece of media should be rated. This is an example of more red tape that isn't necessary.

Q27:

A straightforward national scheme, that regulates all forms of media yet to be released in the country. Efficiency and fair and balanced rating systems are a must, incorporating all levels of classification and differing types of media, allowing a piece of media of any level of explicit content to be sold in australia.

Q28:

They should defer to the rating that the national government issues towards any piece of media content. That is if its system for classification is correctly reviewed.

Q29:

Aslong as an 'r' rating system for violent video games is released, not much that any citizen would notice the difference, any large scale changes would likely cause annoyance amongst the general populace.

Other comments:

Essentially, the people of australia dont need the government banning movies and games that are "too violent" for them, we are capable of making our own decisions, especially so if the government has a clear and consise rating system for said games and movies. An internet blacklist is also a terrible idea as you've hinted at in this questionairre, we dont need censorship, we do not want to live in an authoritarian country. It does not protect the youth from explicit content online, it punishes those who seek unbiased information and discussion online, which is a good thing, despite what the major political parties would have you beleive.