

CI 1277 S Bennett

First name: Shaine

Last name: Bennett

Q1:

Yes, I as well as the vast majority of the population believe the ALRC should focus on developing a new framework as well as publicised classification guidelines to work hand in hand in helping to make a more open, less complicated and more helpful classification system.

Q2:

The primary objectives of a national classification scheme should be to bring our classification standards in line with other leading countries of the 21st century. To achieve this, I believe that a classification for R18+ material across all forms of consumed media is required, including video games, television, radio, cable networks etc.

Q3:

The platform which content is delivered should affect the decision on classification. With the government launching it's voluntary 'clean feed' filter for ISP's, not considering the platform in which content is delivered could have a accidental implications of thousands and thousands of online websites being black listed. This would not only put a strain on the system but would tie up resources unnecessarily. Technology and platform should also be considered when looking at how to enforce the classification on something in a digital space where accessibility is wide spread and unmitigated. If something is available to, and used by large sections of our population and is classified, then a) how would the classification be enforced if the distribution network is digital, and b) refusing it's classification or classifying to highly would be a mistake due to its already accepted nature by the community at large.

Q4:

I do not believe so. Under the frame work, all forms of consumable media mention should be subject to the same classification guidelines and rules. Why should one thing be given a free pass while others are scrutinized over? All forms of consumable media should be considered equal in terms of submission to classification.

Q5:

The potential impact of material should be considered during classification, yes. Mature images and themes, subject matter that provokes in depth discussion, or even children's cartoons, the impact that these forms of content have on the wider community at large should be considered during classification, if it's not, then what is the point of the classification framework at all.

Q6:

I don't think the size of producers/distributors should have an affect on whether content should be classified. All content should be treated equal no matter the scope or reach of its impact. No treating all matter equally would lead to bias and favouritism in the classification framework and would be unjust.

Q7:

Artwork is a form of expression. It is the one of the oldest forms of expression one self that we have available to us, and is there for a difficult issue. I think the best practice for this is that an exhibition should be classified for the work it contains within, not each piece of art being classified individually.

Q8:

Yes, I believe that music and other sound recordings should be classified just as television and video games should be/are. If you're developing a framework to classify all consumable media, leaving one source out would be a drastic mistake.

Q9:

No, potential size and composition of the audience should not influence whether content should or should not be classified. All content should be considered equal under the classification framework. If it's not, this would only develop bias and favouritism to certain forms of content, even if the idea behind the decision was not meant to do so.

Q10:

No, I do not believe so. Content should be classified on the basis of its socially acceptable standards. If the classification framework is designed to promote consumption of subject content at home, then it's helping to develop a level of double standards in society which would not be beneficial to the people.

Q11:

Content should be classified based on the themes it contains, not by the level of its reach and not by the quality of its work. It's the ideas and subject matter that is being classified to ensure young minds are not exposed to content that they can't handle. As adults, we accept that during our lives will come across ideas that conflict with our own, but we understand how to deal with these ideas, to accept and move on or to grow and encompass these ideas in our world view, but this is not the case with children who are developing their own identities. If classification should at all be a government body, then it should be one without bias. If all consumable works and art forms are to be classified then it should be done so without bias, and only on the merit of each piece. That is to say that all works should be classified based on subject matter and themes, and their appropriateness in the given situation.

Q12:

The most effective method of controlling access to online content would be to disable access to being online. By design, accessibility to one part of the internet grants access to another, it's this interconnectivity that made the internet such a pivotal changing force in the way we live our lives. You would be foolish to believe you could control access to Refused Classification content via online distribution. It is not possible to filter online access, only to control whether access is given or not.

Q13:

Control is different from classification. This question shines a greater light onto the purpose behind the classification scheme. A child's access to the internet is controlled by its parents. The parents allow to the child to consume media appropriately classified by the government to help parents in their decisions. The government, does not and should not, control its people. It is a guiding hand, to help provide parents with the tools for better judgement.

Q14:

The refusing of classification should be a last resort measure by the classification framework. If that form of content is being submitted, then obviously it appeals to some form of the population. However, should content be refused classification, then it's sale should be prohibited. Controlling of this would be a police matter.

Q15:

Warnings, Consumer advice and other markings should be on display when the consumer is making the decision to purchase or consume the item. On boxes, magazine covers, cd covers etc.

Q16:

Government agencies, industry bodies and users need to work together in the regulation of content. The government needs to design and set out the framework for classification that the industry bodies and users can then work to design their content around. Ultimately self regulation, like that of in America and most European states would be the best method. But if the government feels it must or has to flex its authority over its people, then setting up the classification framework and guidelines based off of user submissions is a relevant task that it can oversee.

Q17:

Yes, this form of setup would be more practical and acceptable than current arrangements. It would take longer to set up and might require more work in the short term, but the long term benefits to the population would be worth the increased time.

Q18:

Either all content should be classified by the industry based on guidelines set out by the government. Or no content should be classified by the industry, and instead all content to be classified by the government under its classification frame work. There should be no middle ground, either the industry self regulates or the government fills the void. Splitting the tasks would only allow for errors, incorrect classification and other problems to arise.

Q19:

The Government should subsidise the classification of any home grown Australian content. This would, even on its small scale, help to promote Australian industry.

Q20:

The main basis and theory behind the classification categories are understood, with the exception that the community doesn't understand why different forms of media have different standards appropriate. All forms of content should be subject to the same guidelines. A theme doesn't change or become any less thought provoking simply because it's distrusted in a magazine instead of over a television set.

Q21:

G, PG, M, MA 15+ and R18+ should be applied to all forms of content. Having different categories for different distribution types or platforms is ludicrous and archaic.

Q22:

Employ a standardised format for classification markings and criteria to be used by all classification submissions.

Q23:

Yes, these should be consolidated in the one relevant act. Unnecessarily complicating things is foolish, and most people in the community find the situation mentioned above complicated in regards to finding information.

Q24:

As established in a previous question, the control of content online is not achievable. Instead, view it that the person browsing online will only access content they feel appropriate. There for, if you classify content that is not online, the general classifications will follow over to the community when they access online content, and only access what they feel appropriate.

Q25:

No, the current scope of Refused classification content is subject to different opinions.

Q26:

It is very important. It should be promoted because it is what the community wants, having different laws for different states makes things difficult and is unnecessary. It provides over complication of what should be a simple matter - the matter of classifying material to help consumers make informed decisions about what they take in in their daily lives.

Q27:

The states and territories should agree with the commonwealth upon a set of classification guidelines and a framework to be employed on a national scale. This should be reflected in appropriate legislation.

Q28:

Yes. The country is in need of unified laws in regards to the classification framework.

Q29:

In summary, if the classification of media content is to be treated equally, on the basis of themes contained within the work and ideas relevant to the content itself, and that all categories of classification are relevant to all forms of media content regardless of distribution or platform, and the established guidelines and framework to be implemented nationally instead of differing state to state. Then this would be an improvement.

Other comments:

If the point wasn't clearly made earlier, video games need a R18+ classification category, as does all media.