

CI 1352 R Annen

First name: Robert

Last name: Annen

Q1:

I feel that ALRC should look at all of the classification throughout all of media. Its not being fairly applied to all media. An R rated movie is available with the same content of an unclassifiable video game. The amount of video gamers over the age of 18 is far more than those under 18. Its an antiquated system that needs to be changed completely.

Q2:

Personally I don't feel that a classification scheme in its current form works, and its aims are not clear. Is it to reduce the impact of violent or sexual content to children? Is it to socially modify society? If it is to reduce the exposure of children it takes far more than a classification system to do that, and there should be funds in place to educate parents and children about different sort of materials.

Q3:

No it should not.

Q4:

That sounds like a good solution, that only items where there are complaints the classification board should look into. That way it minimises the resource use, and allows all media to be covered by classification.

Q5:

I would question the presumption that media can be classified as for children only. There is a lot of material that is all ages, how does one come to the decision of what is solely for children. The premise that video games are for children has led us into this classification debacle in the first place. There are various studies to show that violence and sexual material does not inherently affect children and the parenting and explanation of such material has a much more profound impact.

Q6:

No. Material should be classified based on its content not on its market appeal.

Q7:

I steadfastly oppose artwork classification. Often people will view some artwork and see it as pornography. I don't trust the government to make sound decisions in this area and would risk stifling the artistic community.

Q8:

Personally I don't think anything should be classified unless there is a clear risk to society that is documented with research and has a valid reason for censorship.

Q9:

No. Material should not be classified based on its market demographics.

Q10:

No, the employers role should do that.

Q11:

Q12:

Education to children and parents

Education to adults about online material and its effects on society, children's welfare, women's welfare etc.

Online filters do not work as they can be subverted so easily and are a relatively quick solution to a difficult problem that the government refuses to address in a sensible manner.

Q13:

By better parental supervision.

Q14:

Well I don't feel that sexually explicit magazines do need to be controlled per se unless there is documented evidence to show that it creates serious harm to society.

Q15:

Consumer advice and education.

Q16:

Industry has a responsibility to produce products that aren't harmful to society (i.e. violent pornography that depicts women being beaten)

Government agencies should look into complaints and educate the public on materials.

Q17:

Yes, it would empower industry to self-regulate which they can do I believe.

Q18:

Most video games are in my opinion of the type that don't need to be necessarily classified.

Q19:

Well if the government makes industry pay for classification I see this as a flawed system already.

The government if it feels it needs to classify things should foot the bill and not the industry.

Q20:

Well there are different classifications for different types of media. Nobody understands why R rated video games aren't allowed to be sold in Australia.

Q21:

I feel that if there has to be a classification system there should be just three a) safe for everyone b) potentially harmful for children c) harmful to society as a whole.

Q22:

See Question 21, but by making the question about safety to children and society then the classification would become much simpler. Governments should not arbitrarily ban items because they feel it is offensive to themselves. They need to have documented research that shows certain items have meaningful harmful impacts to either children or society as a whole.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Any material that is illegal and or harmful to society

Q25:

The refused classification already used is too broad and subjective so no.

Q26:

It should fall to the federal government and the state governments should give up their powers.

Q27:

One that has a panel of child psychologists, psychiatrists, mental health, and other professionals not politicians.

Q28:

Yes see Q26.

Q29:

Other comments: