

CI 1487 L Spencer

First name: Leon

Last name: Spencer

Q1:

Although for the most part the actual classifications are clear, the focus should be on descriptors: to inform. And the practice of using the term 'classification' to mean 'censor' needs to end. It simply makes Australia look like a backwater, it restricts the growth of legitimate art forms and it stifles industry because of a market - children - that are not the target audience of works specifically designed to appeal to adults.

Q2:

To allow parents to make informed decisions about media for their offspring without censoring artists. To empower artists to be able to protect their work from children as it protects parents from ignorance. To protect the rights of adult consumers to enjoy artistic expression of any form, regardless of how 'controversial' that art may be believed to be by however number of people.

Q3:

Yes. Hardware with inbuilt parental controls - including every video game console and most modern smartphones - already is capable of being set to lock out content parents believe is inappropriate, with its own rating system policed by the platform holder. It is a waste of money to classify this content.

No classifications should be mandatory. In many countries, such as America, industry groups self-classify.

Furthermore, any attempt to classify the Internet's content is a complete waste of time. Any person suggesting such a thing is possible should not be in a position to do so; it clearly signifies a total lack of understanding about the breadth, depth and permeability of the medium.

Q4:

No content should be required to be classified. We live in a globally connected world. Forcing publishers to stay away from our country simply harms local retailers as it is trivial to import any content across any border, and it will only become easier. Small independent publishers should not be penalised due to their small budget and inability to pay for certification. Retailers here, as in countries such as America, will simply shy away from non-rated products if their demographic is family-oriented.

Q5:

No content should be required to be classified. We live in a globally connected world. Forcing publishers to stay away from our country simply harms local retailers as it is trivial to import any content across any border, and it will only become easier. Small independent publishers should not be penalised due to their small budget and inability to pay for certification. Retailers here, as in countries such as America, will simply shy away from non-rated products if their demographic is family-oriented.

Q6:

No content should be required to be classified. We live in a globally connected world. Forcing publishers to stay away from our country simply harms local retailers as it is trivial to import any content across any border, and it will only become easier. Small independent publishers should not be penalised due to their small budget and inability to pay for certification. Retailers here, as in countries such as America, will simply shy away from non-rated products if their demographic is family-oriented.

Q7:

No, absolutely not. Restricting art of any kind to be exhibited in Australia simply diminishes our already dangerously dwindling cultural community. It is a parent's responsibility to restrict media from their children, not the government. The government should provide tools and support for both parents and artists to do this. Sacrificing artistic freedom for a hypothetical child's upbringing simply means when that child grows up they will live in a cultural void, a wasteland that people of other countries will point and laugh at.

Q8:

Yes, in that publishers should be able to optionally obtain classification they can use on their marketing and packaging to make their product more appealing to family-oriented retailers.

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Online content should attempt to be controlled. It is so trivial to circumvent any attempted controlling access that it does nothing but make our country look backward in the international community and waste taxpayer money. There are no effective methods of controlling online access. I speak from a technical perspective here.

Moreover, access of any kind should attempt to become restricted by any government. Dressing up fascism as child protection is not something a government can do and call itself democratic.

Q13:

By better educating parents and requiring parents who purchase Internet access to pass a quick online tutorial that proves they understand that they must supervise their children when using the Internet and that computers are not surrogate babysitters.

Q14:

No content should be restricted. It's a waste of time and money. Sexually explicit magazines more so than most; it has been decades since they have been anything but a dying industry.

Q15:

When retailers require it of goods they stock so they can present a family-friendly face to the public.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide a means by which a certification certificate can be purchased by publishers. They should have legal means to prosecute publishers who use incorrect or fraudulent certificates on their products. The only content that needs to be regulated are those age certificates themselves.

Q17:

Much more, yes.

Q18:

Q19:

Any small studio or self-publisher should be allowed to request subsidised classification. Independent artists are the most important group in any culture and their products must be allowed to be sold next to large commercial ones.

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

None. The first speech censored, the first thought forbidden, the first freedom denied, chains us all irrevocably.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

One of voluntary classification.

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: