

CI 1165 W Brown

First name: William

Last name: Brown

Q1:

A new framework should be developed. Media and society changes quickly, and I and others as consumers feel that your system reflects values past. Many areas are lacking, such as the notion that individuals over the age of 20 play video games and thus should have access to otherwise (R) rated content.

In all ways, the notion of classification is needed not to censor, but to advise on the audience. Many games, movies and modern media are works of art, often involving intricate stories and plots, often exploring the darker aspects of human culture. To neglect these issues, and to censor what is an art form goes against what we as a culture believe in freedom of expression and speech.

In short - Our system needs to have content classifications that support people of a older and more mature age bracket to be able to allow artistic freedoms.

Q2:

To minimise rejection of content. Content should be rejected only in extreme circumstances. For example, introduction of R ratings for games, tightening of rules as to what constitutes MA and M, should also be considered. This way more "extreme" content is allowed to pass our classification system, but it is directed at the correct audience.

Q3:

This question is arbitrary. I will assume it relates to the differences between Movies and Games. I believe that they should be classed differently, as they are different experiences. It is one thing to watch an immersive story, and another to experience it and live it. If you have played immersive games, it is a far more thrilling experience than watching a similar movie. However, the differences between the two should not be vast, and should be minimal at most to highlight the difference between watching and experiencing.

Q4:

No. This form of classification would allow any member of the public who disagrees to have any content removed.

For example, an individual from a religious group could complain that a specific game is too violent and should be classified. This then affects all the other people who are mature enough to understand and experience that content, and detracts their experience at the whim of another. Conversely, I could argue that I find this individual's religion to be offensive and should be classified. Is it right of me to

quash the beliefs and ethics of another?

No, you should not do this. You should encourage people that if they object to content, to not view it or partake in it. At the end of the day, it was their choice to purchase and experience this content. If they dislike it that is their opinion and this should not be forced upon others.

Q5:

This is two questions, and I shall answer it as such.

The potential impact of content should not affect classification or restriction. All content should be treated equally, as though every individual who partakes freely and willingly chooses to partake in it. If one goes to a movie and watches it, they went of their own free will. If they watch at home they can change the channel. Each content item is by large, chosen to be viewed by individuals, and not forced upon people en-masse. Thus, each content item has the same impact - it impacts on individuals (Whether it be positive or negative impact is up to the person). Thus, all content should be treated equally, and as though each consumer is willing as a participant in it.

Content aimed at children is a tough question. It raises the context of "Think of the children", as a plight to shield and bubble wrap our young.

I believe the content should be targeted for that age group appropriately, and think that the specific nature of "children" in this case is over used. Every classification bracket should be targeted at the specific age gap inside of it. You should also understand that as children mature, they should be exposed to new and various items of content, as it develops more and more complex plots.

Q6:

No. All content should be treated equally. Else we begin to take the path of 1984.

Q7:

Are you not already classifying art but applying this to cinema and games?

I believe that discretion should be used when classifying any artwork. You should only classify / censor when appropriate. That means, when the subject would be out of reach of the understanding of the audience. Should a picture of a naked individual be classified? No, because it is just a person and that is who we are. Should a picture of two people having intercourse be classified? Yes, but only where appropriate as it demonstrates concepts that are more mature than is understood by younger age brackets.

Q8:

Only if they are so extreme in nature, that classification is warranted. We already have warnings for explicit lyrics in music. Books are sorted into age groups. Do we really need to go much further unless the content is so far beyond that it truly needs classification?

Q9:

No. As before, each individual is a willing participant to the content they view, and should take responsibility for this.

Q10:

No. Whether one views it at home or in public, they are still willing and it still has the same exposure to the individual.

Q11:

You need to understand the argument of "Think of the children".

This argument is flawed and used whenever anyone wants to "automatically" win their argument. Saying this is the ultimate trump card in classification and censoring.

In this day and age, parents are expecting the government and schools to shelter and raise their children. However it is not right. Parents need to take responsibility, and be involved with their children.

As I grew up, my mother was always careful about what I watched. I never was allowed toy guns. I couldn't watch things with swearing, and violence. She took great care of myself and my brother.

At the same time, I went to school (primary school this is, grade 3). Kids were discussing the latest south park. They were playing guns in the school yard. I had no idea about this content, or what it was.

It comes back to their family. Later on I learnt these children were essentially neglected by their parents, and were able to do what they like. It was not the child's fault they had a family that was not supportive or would give them direction. Even in those days south park was M rated. Yet the parents took no responsibility. My parents did. This is not the government's fault for lack of action, or lack of censoring. This is society's fault for believing the issue is "Not my problem" and blaming the government, such as yourselves.

At the end of the day, the government is too scared to tell parents "This is your responsibility. You need to take responsibility for your children and what they do." Now we have a government that rolls over when someone says "Think of the children". It's a self-destructive spiral into censorship and a world of 1984.

Q12:

Vendors such as Valve provide correct measures already, being they restrict content based on your age (when you sign up you provide this).

However, I don't believe the answer is more censorship. In this day and age, every child and young person can avoid netfilters like a second nature. Accessing online proxies is trivial. Google reveals

hundreds of results for how to achieve this. Even uncensored media, such as chat sites are wealths of information as experienced people will share this knowledge of avoidance with the younger folk.

Infact, censoring and restricting only increases the desire to obtain the item. And people will go to every length to achieve this.

Infact the best way to restrict content is not to restrict and ban it, but to make it available for those who are more mature. Often it is the adult market who loses when content is restricted for the good of the children. And it is the Adult market who are people that know how to violate the censoring systems and obtain what they want regardless.

Summary - The best restriction, is to restrict nothing, and to make it available to the appropriate audience.

Q13:

Parents need to take responsibility for their childrens actions. Parents should supervise online activity, the computer should be in a public location (No kid will search porn when their parents are in the room behind them for example).

As already explained, the use of government based censors and controls is trivial to bypass. Children have done this in the past, the the internet filter trials.

However, it is not the governments responsibility. Parents should take responsibility at home. You are not that childs parent, so why are you looking after them when their parents refuse to be responsible?

Q14:

Vendors should already be carrying out ID checks. If this is not happening, you should be going and talking to your "shonky vendors". And if you have kids who are getting someone else to buy them for them what can you really do? Parents should be more vigilant about what their children have access to.

And it also raises the point. Should we hide and mask sex from our children? Sex is a integral part of human nature. It is, primaly, something we aim to do. Our goals in life at its most basic are to survive, and to reproduce.

To hide sex from children means they won't understand it and may gain the wrong impression of it growing up when they are exposed to pornogrhpic material. This also shapes their ideas of how sex is carried out and what it is for. We already see this now, with many young people who have sex for pleasure in a promicous fashion, rather than as an act of romance between two people in an intimate relationship.

Children learn so much from their parents. If their parents explain their relationship, and what these

values are, then exposure to these pornographic items is Not as detrimental. Because kids will already understand it, and its context.

If you treat a child like a child, they will always be like that. If you treat a child like an adult, they will become an adult.

Q15:

Yes. You should be able to judge an item from its warnings.

Q16:

They should merely provide classification, and rules on access control (such as not selling M, MA or R to children etc).

Anything else is overstepping the boundaries. It is not the governments job to raise children, and to control what they see. That is the responsibility of parents.

Q17:

No. A self regulated industry means no central standards, making it hard to correlate the differences between two content items from two different vendors. As stated, the government should classify material, but on a fair scale, thus, people can make informed decisions on equal footing about content.

Q18:

None. Classification should allow all material to be published, but with correct warnings and ratings of what content is inside.

Q19:

Yes. Else it is infeasible for small artwork vendors to create their content.

Q20:

They are all understood. However, what is not understood is why you classify games and movies differently. R rated games *should* be available for adults, and they should be judged as you would a movie.

Q21:

Yes. R rated content in games. Adults *do* play video games, and want access to mature content. Other classifications such as M and MA seem to take no effect at all in movies, and children are allowed to view these without parental supervision. This however, is the fault of cinemas not the government.

Q22:

As already explained, they should use a universal system for games and movies. Thus you can accurately understand what content will be in each.

Q23:

Yes. You should have a serious reform to this act. Times have changed, adults do play games, and the system should be more inline with movies. Thus, we should have R ratings, and content should be classified as such.

Q24:

None. If a content item is illegal (Such as illegal sexual material), you should target the supplier.

The effect of censorship is you censor the content from people who don't look at it anyway, and the people who are viewing it, can avoid your censorship schemes regardless. Thus, you gain nothing from the effort.

Q25:

No. Anything that is RC, should be explicitly illegal to possess in Australia, such as illegal sexual material. All other content, should be classified according to the audience it is intended for.

Q26:

Yes. Else people will traverse state borders, obtain content, and come back. That simple.

Q27:

Q28:

By Commonwealth, I assume you mean the greater whole of Britain and Australia, and other countries.

The answer is No. The values we hold in Australia are different to that of other countries in the Commonwealth. Thus we need an Australian system to reflect that.

Q29:

More public feedback on processes. You should also not classify or censor material on the whim of an individual. You should not accept the responsibilities of parents, and you should give them proper, honest, advice about their duties.

Other comments: