

CI 1077 M Postle

First name: Matt

Last name: Postle

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework. I think the framework as a whole is good, it's just that key parts of it are out of sync with the rest of the worlds classifications or illogical (I.e. no R18+ rating for games)

Q2:

The primary objective for a national classification scheme should be to provide consumers with logical and coherent ratings to help them make informed decisions about the media they view.

Q3:

Yes. All forms of media available to the public CAN be classified, but doing so might not make sense. There is a difference between the classifications of physical products that can be bought off a store shelf, and trying to classify a communication medium like the internet.

Trying to impose classifications on the internet misses the mark simply because the internet is a form of communication (like a mail service) rather than a repository of static pieces of information (like a library). For cases where internet sites contain illegal material (child pornography, terrorist material) our laws should decide whether an internet site should be removed (i.e. Illegal content removed and the offenders arrested).

Q4:

Yes and no. Complaints are a good way to highlight cases when time and resources can't possibly cope with the volume of products to be classified. Unfortunately they are not a good tool to IDENTIFY harmful material. Treating complaints as an indication that a product should be withdrawn gives unfair power to the complaint where (in most cases) tens of thousands of people not complaining get ignored.

Q5:

All media should be reviewed on it's content. Trying to assign some items to a "designed for children" bucket causes confusion and ends up with completely illogical ratings.

The most poignant example of this is the computer game classifications. Laymans (in most cases) consider computer games to be "for children" where as in reality the average age of people who play computer games is 30. So computer games are more akin to movies, where adults can watch movies designed and rated for adults and children can view movies designed and rated for children.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Yes.

Q11:

Q12:

Legal action taken against purveyors of illegal online content (e.g. child pornography). Otherwise, trying to control what someone can or cannot see online doesn't make sense.

Q13:

Parental supervision and filter programs installed on a computer that a child may use.

Q14:

Why bother? What benefit would be gained from this? People who want to view sexually explicit mags should be able to

Q15:

Before purchase or viewing. I.e. If it's a physical or digital product the rating should be clearly displayed as part of the products description. If it's a TV show, the rating should come up before the show starts (just like it does now).

Q16:

The government (classification board) should classify media, the industry bodies should work with the classification board (displaying classifications etc) and users should be the ones deciding if they want to buy / look at something based on their personal choices while taking the classification on board as a piece of information for consideration.

Q17:

Probably. The industry should be able to regulate itself based on classifications made while working with the government. This could also potentially free up government resources

Q18:

Games, Movies, Books, Tv Shows.

Q19:

Yes I think subsidising small independent films promotes the arts and is a valuable cultural initiative.

Q20:

Most classifications are understood, however the classification of computer games is misleading and confusing. This is simply due to their being a hole in the classification of games (No R18+ classification). This has lead to a significant number of games being "shoe horned" into the unrestricted MA15+ classification where there rest of the world considers those games adult only material.

Just like movies, games have target audiences. Without an R18+ classification for computer games, it means games targeted for adults are inappropriately being classified for children.

Q21:

No.

Q22:

I think the classification markings are fairly congruent as it is.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Child pornography, inciting violence, hate material.

Q25:

No. As I understand it the classification of pornography into the RC category under the current classification scheme is like being told how to have sex by your grandmother. The classifications for sexually explicit material (online or anywhere else) needs to accept that people have a wide range of tastes and so long as these tastes involve consenting adults there is nothing "wrong" with what kind of sexually explicit material people wish to view.

Q26:

Yes, if possible the states should adopt a nation wide classification scheme.

Q27:

n/a

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

The classification of media in Australia needs more involvement of people educated in contemporary topics. Laymans making up classification rules just ends up with broken and out of date rules.

Other comments: