

CI 1540 G Ahloy Martin

First name: G

Last name: Ahloy-Martin

Q1:

Improvement of the existing framework, introducing a standardised form of classification for all media types.

Q2:

The addition of an R18+ level of classification for video games in Australia: the average age of people who play video games is well over the age of 18, and the government's need to babysit the underage minority via not implementing an R18+ to, for lack of a better term, prevent children from being scarred later on in life, can be handled by the parents of said children. While the issue is not entirely avoidable (children under 18 obtaining video games intended for those over 18), I would imagine that a black R18+ sticker on the front of a box is enough to turn parents off buying that game for a younger child. An updated, clear set of classification rules and regulations (inclusive of an R18+ rating for video games in particular) is necessary.

Q3:

No, the way in which content is accessed should not dictate varying levels of classification of certain types of content.

Q4:

No, the classification of all content should be necessary.

Q5:

No, the measurement of "potential impact", cannot be an accurate measure as to whether content should be classified. All content, designed for children or otherwise, should be classified across all media forms.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

This is more or less dependent upon the type of artwork being exhibited. Whether it should be classified or not is dependent on the level of explicitness associated.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No, regardless of where the content is accessed, it should be classified.

Q11:

N/A.

Q12:

There is no (or should not be any) definite form of preventative measures for viewing content. In the case of underaged viewers, the use of parental supervision, and the implementation of a parent's

wishes are required. As for adults, the discretion of the viewer at hand should dictate what they should and shouldn't view (non-inclusive of illegal content).

Q13:

Proper parental supervision and monitoring.

Q14:

The restriction of offline content to minors is an issue to be handled by parents, not the government.

Q15:

Content with a classification level should have this level displayed clearly, with reasons as to why it achieved this rating easily obtainable by potential customers.

Q16:

Government agencies should be responsible for the classification of material, and the regulation of that.

Industry bodies should assist in the supply, and also giving guidelines to the government regarding classification.

Adults are responsible for the content they view, and underage users should have their content regulated by their parental body.

Q17:

Yes, the industry is aware of their target audience and the content they are delivering to said audience. The government should serve as a gateway of sorts, allowing access to that which is seen to be legally classifiable.

Q18:

No answer.

Q19:

No answer.

Q20:

The classification for content such as film and television are thoroughly understood by the community, however, a lack of an R18+ rating for interactive media such as video games represent how behind Australia is when compared to other countries that already have an 18+ level of classification, and show the common, albeit wrong, belief that video games are just for children. It shows Australia's unwanted babysitting of the older generations whom choose to play video games.

Q21:

The R18+ rating for video games is one area of classification which needs to be implemented. The existing classifications are thoroughly understood by the general community, however the lack of an 18+ classification in Australia for video games, with the same system being implemented in other countries results in the same media being sold to our youths, censored or not, or simply being outright banned. Adults in Australia, who are supposed to have free access to this form of media are being forced to play censored video games, or being disallowed from it entirely, as it was not suited to the underaged minority.

Q22:

No answer.

Q23:

No answer.

Q24:

That which is considered to be "criminally motivated", and considered illegal in parts of the "first-world world".

Q25:

Simply put, no.

Q26:

Yes, confusion and disarray results from not having a consistent form of content classification.

Q27:

No answer.

Q28:

Yes, classification should be regarded and referred to as a federal matter.

Q29:

No answer.

Other comments:

The allowance of content to children is largely dependent on the parents, and the altering of the current classification system (especially in respect to video games and interactive media) needs to take place in order to attain a more just and caring system for Australia and her people. The government may not be able to prevent parents from buying MA15+ video games for their underaged children, but they can decrease the likelihood of a parent buying an R18+ for their underaged child by a substantial amount. The majority of parents are NOT incompetent at parenting, and are NOT unable to control their children's viewing of certain contents.