

CI 1385 A Brookes

First name: Abraham

Last name: Brookes

Q1:

Improving key elements. The classification system has worked for years for movies.

Q2:

To allow artists to better define the content of their work and educate consumers about the choices available to them.

Q3:

No, entertainment industries should all be treated equally

Q4:

No, common sense would hopefully prevail.

Q5:

Definitely, isn't that the whole idea of classifications?

Q6:

Yes. Some media forms may be obscure enough that they don't need to be classified, but as an industry grows it needs to be classified to better inform the growing consumer base.

Q7:

Yes, some artworks that are potentially high impact should be classified for consumer advice.

Q8:

The classification system of music (warning: explicit lyrics) seems to work fine. With video games and movies you have a whole other layer of stimuli, the visual, which can depict more than audio alone.

So sound recordings should be classified, but not necessarily in the exact same way as visual media.

Q9:

Yes, it would be a waste of time and resources to have an entire classification system for a tiny niche audience (as gaming once was) but as the industry grows is it necessary to regulate it.

Q10:

No, content is content.

Q11:

I think you guys have covered it pretty well

Q12:

ISP locks. If a parent doesn't want their kid looking at certain sites they should be able to ring up their ISP and request that they are refused access to it. No access should be universally controlled, this is a restriction of freedom of speech.

Q13:

Parents parent, governments govern. If parents want to raise their children unethically there is nothing anyone can do to stop them.

Q14:

A lot of people don't see children seeing explicit magazines as a bad thing. It is not up to the government to stop children from stealing and viewing explicit magazines.

Q15:

When someone is going to spend money on it. If I buy a movie expecting it to be mild and it turns out violent I would be upset that my money was not better spent.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide the tools for restriction of content to the users, but not enforce any of them. It is up to the users to decide on their own restrictions. Industry bodies would need to ensure their product is compliant with the tools, but should be allowed to show the full extent of their work to the users who deem it appropriate.

Q17:

I can't make that decision, that is what a government funded classifications board does.

Q18:

Up to the current "pg" classification is very easy to pick, that could be left up to the industry.

Q19:

What does it cost money to get something classified? That's preposterous! Classification is a government enforced rule and then they have to pay for it as well? Silliness.

Q20:

I think M and MA walk a bit of a blurred line but other than that the classifications are clear enough.

Q21:

No. The current ratings are sufficient and well understood.

Q22:

Same symbols and same rules. Games and movies share classification systems and symbols so the system looks more congruent across the board. Other media formats could use some of the same classifications, or at least the same design for new classification symbols.

Q23:

Yes, and they should share the same framework and levels of classification.

Q24:

Nothing. A webserver should be held responsible for the content it carries under the law of the country it carries it in. Any restriction to any content is unfair. Yes there are horrible things on the internet but if someone wants to see them they will find a way with or without restricting access. Restricted access holds the risk of restricting access to the wrong content. The internet is a unified worldwide communication tool and all efforts should be made to make it as accessible as possible to everyone.

Q25:

No content should be entirely prohibited for viewing.

Q26:

A classification system should be adhered to on a federal scale, there shouldn't be any differences from state to state.

Q27:

Well, I'm hardly qualified to draft up legislation for you. The main points would be that it should be federal, informative and should not totally refuse publication to any form of content.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Computer games need to be embraced as a media format that is enjoyed by all ages. It is the fastest growing entertainment industry in the world now and content is going to get more and more mature. Parents and children need to be informed of the content of games and artists need to be able to express their work to its full extent. A classification system that treats computer games as what they are, entertainment for all ages, just like movies, is a very important step for a vast number of people in society today. This will allow the gaming industry to flourish as the movie industry did. Overseas game companies have come to avoid publishing games in Australia because of the archaic classification standards and this is restricting what should be unfettered growth in a potentially multi trillion dollar industry. It's just a logical step to allow freedom of expression and choice to the populace of a democratic government.

Other comments:

Restriction of access to online media may sound like a good way to protect children, but there is nothing you can do to stop children from playing up. They are children, it's what they do. It's what we all did. Claims that violent computer games lead to violent actions are unfounded and almost facetious. A violent video game did not grant anyone access to a gun. That's poor parenting. If the population wants to restrict access to content they should be allowed the tools to do so, but not have the use forced upon them. A man of 40 years should not be subjected to the same covetous restrictions as a boy of 4.

Video games are a form of entertainment and media, and a very large, profitable one at that. A proper classification system would allow artists freedom to express their art fully to the right demographic. A parent who does not realise the potential content of a game needs to be better informed of what they are purchasing, and introductions of higher classification ratings would allow this. Refusing classification to high impact forms of media isn't protecting children, it is restricting adults. Children are children for 16 years, adults are adults for the rest of their life. Who is the majority here? Refusing classifications to games means that artists will try to dodge the system in order to get their game published and the classifications given may not be accurate. A higher classification rating for computer games would be a more effective way to protect children, as it would give their parents a better idea of what content their children are gaining access to. It would also allow adults to experience the media in full, and allow creators the freedom to create their full vision.

The internet is an amazing tool in its infancy. It has the potential to create a renaissance that would dwarf that of the 1400s. The vast wealth of knowledge, advice, communication methods and content it provides is unrivalled by anything else that exists. The unified knowledge of the entire globe. This is the type of stuff that idyllic utopian future societies are made of, and to restrict access to any of it for anyone is to plunge the world into a second dark age. We have the tools in our hands right now to further our planet by hundreds of years beyond what we could in the past and to misuse them for fear of misguided, ethereal repercussions is the kind of stupidity that crumbles civilisations.

I, and hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of other citizens of Australia feel that the restriction of access to any content is a blatant disregard for the basic rights of the people of a democratic public,

and I am relying on my government to make the right decision on what could be a turning point in history. No restriction of acces.