

CI 1018 T Higgison

First name: Tim

Last name: Higgison

Q1:

Improving the existing framework.

Q2:

In my opinion, it would be to bring classification of computer games in line with the existing classifications for movies.

Q3:

No it shouldn't. I don't believe there is any difference between watching violence or sex in a movie or TV series and watching violence in a computer game.

Q4:

I don't have all the information to give an opinion on this. If it is prohibitively expensive to get someone to assess every piece of content then yes, it should be done on a complaints basis. Otherwise I don't see a problem with classifying all content. Maybe we could leverage off the American rating system and only thoroughly assess content that receives a high age restriction (say MA15+ and over) in the US. It would be a waste of time to have someone play through an entire Barbie or Lego game when it's obvious that it won't contain any objectionable content.

Q5:

I think 'potential impact of content' is hard to define. It's a very grey area with studies backing both sides.

Q6:

If the burden of classification costs is on the content producer, then I think it would be unfair for a small independent movie or game producer to have to foot the bill when their market reach is limited.

Q7:

If you mean physical artwork such as you would see in a gallery then I think that is absurd. I didn't realise there were people in Australia who would willingly go to an exhibition of art they know nothing about, then have the gall to be shocked by and complain about the content.

Q8:

I think audio books should have the same restrictions as paper books, which I believe is none. Music should be either marked as having explicit lyrics or not, but I see no need to restrict it to only 15+ or only 18+. Parents should be the ones deciding whether certain music is appropriate for their children, not the government or music stores.

Q9:

No

Q10:

If this is suggesting a movie viewed at a theatre should be classified more or less harshly than the same movie viewed at home then no.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

As a software developer, I can say you would be fighting a losing battle trying to restrict access to content online. To anyone with the knowledge, it is absolutely trivial to get around any sort of block you might put in place, and this knowledge would only spread so you would have to start banning sites that discuss how to get around the restrictions. New sites can be made in seconds, so the effort really is futile.

Also, how long until the Labour Party decides that the Liberal Party's websites are contraband and put on their secret blacklist, hiding them from the layperson? It's a slippery slope and I'm disgusted that this form of censorship of ideas would even be suggested in Australia. Is everyone naive enough to not see the insidious side of it?

Q13:

Parents should be locking down computers using filtering software, making access to inappropriate material impossible. If required, the government should be supplying free CDs with the filtering software on it so that the lay-parent with no computer knowledge can put it in the drive and have it running in a couple of clicks.

This is a parenting problem, not a technology problem. At the end of the day, if parents are buying their children computers and smartphones and giving them unlimited access to them then they are at fault. If the parents don't want to have to learn about this new technology and how to lock it down, then they either shouldn't be buying it for their kids or they shouldn't be complaining about it when little Johnny gets caught watching Internet porn.

Q14:

As I assume it is now. ID the customer at purchase, and punish adults for supplying it to kids.

Q15:

On the box, case, packet or ticket.

Q16:

The government should set the rating levels and perform the classification. Industry bodies should gather the information pertinent to that industry and provide a centralised place for the industry to learn about the rating systems, legal requirements and punishments. For example the music industry body would publish what constitutes 'explicit lyrics', and what stickers are required when you publish music with explicit content.

So the rules would be set and enforced by the government, and clarified by specific industry groups based on consultation with the government and the relevant laws.

Q17:

I think government and industry would be constantly locking horns over this. Industry has a financial reason to under-classify their content (lower classification = larger potential audience) so it might cost more to be constantly fighting them than it would for the government to just rate everything in the first place.

Q18:

Porn.

Q19:

I'm wary of the cost of classification crushing small independent game or film studios but I don't have a suggestion on the metrics to be used to determine subsidy of the classification cost.

Q20:

I haven't cared about the rating systems since I turned 18 so I'm not eligible to answer on behalf of the community.

Q21:

We require an 18+ rating for computer games. Refusing classification for violent or sexual content in games is ridiculous as these games can be easily bought or pirated online by anyone. It seems the dinosaurs in the government think they can without an 18+ rating on games and that somehow stops us from getting them at all. Get with the program, or at least get competent technology advisers that aren't afraid to say that restricting content over the Internet is an impossible task.

Q22:

Have a single set of logos across all audio-visual media (games, movies, TV) so parents can understand. Having different rating for different media will confuse parents.

Q23:

I haven't read these documents so I don't know. I can see that computer games, movies and TV should be lumped together because they are all audio-visual media, but if there are different ratings for magazines/newspapers/music then I don't have a problem with that. Reading or hearing things is a lot less subversive than seeing them happen.

Q24:

Obviously access to things like child porn should be prohibited, but I think it's impossible. The people that deal in this vile material already have sophisticated tools to make sure they aren't caught. Proxies, TOR, darknet, TrueCrypt, these people know what they're doing is highly illegal and protect themselves accordingly.

The problem is that I abhor the idea of any sort of blacklist of sites that are inaccessible nationwide and even moreso if the list itself is kept secret. This is putting far too much power in the hands of a small number of people and this list will inevitably end up with legitimate sites on it and/or be used as a political tool.

When will the government realise that the Internet is not like traditional media and can't just be censored by making a few phone calls and passing a few laws?

Q25:

No. There are computer games that have been either banned in Australia, or toned down for Australian audiences and I think that's pathetic. I can go to a movie store and rent explicit X-rated porn or movies with explicit and gruesome torture scenes (think Saw, Hostel, Oldboy) but when much milder content is in a computer game (e.g. shooting zombies), it's somehow offensive to my delicate sensibilities and needs to be kept from my precious eyeballs? Get real. Censoring or refusing classifications of games just mean that would-be paying customers turn to piracy to get hold of the full, uncensored version. By censoring games, Australia is encouraging widespread game piracy.

Q26:

If it makes classification a one-time thing for publishers rather than having to re-do it each time for each state then yes the laws should be consistent nationwide. It should be promoted by taking each state Senator out for an expensive steak dinner where it is gently explained to them that consistent classification laws would help smaller movie/game/music studios break into the business which creates jobs and helps fuel the economy.

Australia as a country has a fairly consistent set of moral standards. It's not like America where one state is full of religious whackjobs and another is fully of pot-smoking hippies. I think we could all generally agree as a country what media 15-, 18- and perhaps 21-year-olds should be exposed to.

Q27:

No idea.

Q28:

No idea.

Q29:

Allow games to be rated 18+. I'm a fully grown man and I should be able to purchase a game depicting mild violence or sex. We are the laughing stock of the international community.

Other comments:

Allow games to be rated 18+. I'm a fully grown man and I should be able to purchase a game depicting mild violence or sex. We are the laughing stock of the international community. People who want these games are pirating them anyway, so not allowing them to be classified is just taking away our opportunity to purchase them legally, along with that sweet, sweet GST that's incurred.