

CI 1058 C Mules

First name: CJ

Last name: Mules

Q1:

New framework

Q2:

To allow adults to make informed decisions about the media content they wish to view and/or share with others, including children.

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Yes and yes

Q6:

No

Q7:

Yes, but never for restricting access, especially to art. Consumer advice is what a classification is for and should never exceed that role.

Q8:

Yes, but never restricted.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

If people are going to consume media in any form they should have the ability to access information about classification in order to decide for themselves if the content is appropriate for themselves or someone they are sharing it with.

Q12:

Controlling access is not the job the government or the classification scheme. Classifications exist as advisory information to be used in addition to common sense and personal research, not as a way for one person or people to decide what media another should be allowed to consume.

Q13:

By informing parents better and placing the onus on the parent or guardian to be responsible for monitoring their child's usage and education the child on the use of the internet. You could always require a digital license to access the internet, but I don't think the world is quite to take that step just yet and it would inevitably be abused anyway so in the end it will always be the responsibility of the parent and nobody else.

Q14:

People still read explicit magazines? Seriously?

Q15:

Consumer advice is the key here, content should be required to display consumer advice on packaging and online (such as website for films, etc) and in advertising. Once a product is purchased no further advice is necessary as the content is now owned and the owner is responsible for it thereafter. The current system appears to work fine however it is far too intrusive.

Q16:

Government should stay well away from regulation of content, it is not their place to decide what is suitable for me. Industry bodies should take it upon themselves to understand their content and to responsibly advertise and market their content. Users should have the most responsibility and should make choices about the content they purchase by informing themselves about it and understanding what it is.

Q17:

Yes, most likely.

Q18:

Films are an obvious answer, if there is violence, drug use or explicit language, it is clearly not for small children. (Sex is intentionally left off that list because it is strange for us to include something natural that everyone does in a list of things that are offensive, dangerous and socially frowned upon). This can also apply to music and interactive digital entertainment.

Q19:

Why does classification need to be subsidised? It should be free in the first place, provided as a public service.

Q20:

Yes, generally, however in my experience (Having previously worked in retail media sales) people are extremely unclear about why video games lack an R rating in this country while our close neighbours New Zealand have one. It is particularly strange in the age of global commerce because if I should choose to buy an R game, I should be able to do so within Australia rather than buying from overseas, despite the fact that I can and that it's very easy to do so. (which circumvents the lack of a classification in the first place)

Q21:

Games need to have the same categories as all other media, if the current system is kept then they should be given an R category, if I need to explain why then you need to do more research. As a side note, I've always thought that PG and M could be merged into one because honestly until a person turns 18 they are mostly likely still with their parents and the parents should be guiding their choices anyway, it seems silly that turning 15 means your parents should suddenly stop caring what films or music you are listening to. In fact, really, Parental Guidance is more of a lifelong responsibility, surely, so it should be implied in all rating rather than having a specific category which seems to say 'We think this film/cd/game is ok for people under 15, but we're not entirely sure you would agree with us, so we want you to watch it/listen to it/play it, with your child in order to make sure.' Isn't that kind of the entire point of classifications providing consumer advice?

Q22:

The pretty colours and simply markings were a good idea until they became huge and rectangular and ended up taking up a good chunk of the cover art of whatever of they were classifying. Keep it small, keep it simple and keep it obvious.

Q23:

If this question refers to applying an R category for computer games, then yes.

Q24:

I would love to give the easy answer and say 'Child porn' but if you think you're going to be able to 'prohibit' anything online you are mistaken. The kinds of people who traffic in things so obviously illegal are hardly going to do so on an easy to access network like the internet. As such, nothing inherently needs prohibiting online, it is however important that people in general become more educated about how to navigate the internet in a safe and responsible way.

Q25:

The Refused Classification category is a complete and utter waste of energy and should be scrapped. It's like saying 'Well we didn't have a classification for something so horrible/offensive, so we just decided not to classify it' It doesn't do anyone a service to simply say 'we don't know what to say about this...' and instead there should perhaps be a category called 'Eye Bleach (EB)' for things which are so far beyond the bounds of normal classification categories that the only people likely to be looking for them surely already know what they will find and anyone who stumbles across it accidentally will likely bleach their eyes as soon as possible anyway.

Q26:

Yes, it should be promoted by a brief advertising campaign designed to educate people about the changes happening followed by easily accessible information about the classifications. There is no need to shove it down everybody's throats.

Q27:

Well I'm certainly not going to write it for you, if I did I would simply have a single page with a single sentence saying 'Classification scheme starting 2012 - Figure it out for yourself' and the idea would be that people had to use their brains to decide if something was appropriate. This would fail of course because people aren't generally smart enough to know if something is appropriate for themselves let alone others.

Q28:

Sure, why not?

Q29:

Well you could always scrap the whole thing and leave people to make their own choices without the extra information but just wait until the vocal minority start clamouring for this or that particular film, cd, book, game etc to be banned because it has a penis on the front cover. Gods forbid anyone should witness such horror without having anyone tell them if they really want to or not.

Other comments: