

CI 1678 D Lacey

First name: Dylan

Last name: Lacey

Q1:

I feel that developing a new framework would give the best results for future classification.

Q2:

The primary objectives of a national classification scheme should be:

A. To inform media consumers of the NATURE of a piece of media, not determine its suitability for consumption as a whole

B. To provide guidelines for informed consumption choices WRT various categories, such as sexual nature, educational value, violence, political discourse.

At no point should a classification scheme attempt to make moral judgments or ban content outright, unless that content is inherently indicative of actual non-committal harm, such as snuff films.

Q3:

No. Content is Content is Content. Competent adults are able to distinguish fantasy from reality regardless of medium, so the ultimate impact of any piece of content is the same.

Where children are concerned, content that is inappropriate is inappropriate regardless of medium. It is up to individual caregivers to determine if a means of consumption makes content worse.

Q4:

This seems like an excellent way to ensure prompt classification of content, by allowing some content to pass "by default" unless subject to complaint, so yes.

Q5:

Potential impact of content is too subjective to be taken into consideration. It is a decision best left up to the consumer of that content.

Classifying children's content across all media gets to the concern of providing children with inappropriate content. In doing so, the classification scheme ensures that the only area where harm could be done (Because honestly, competent adults are able to make their own value decisions) has mitigation strategies.

Q6:

Absolutely not. If the aim of a classification scheme is to inform consumers of the nature of a piece of content, then that nature is unchanged by the appeal or reach of the content. Attempting to adjust ratings based on 'impact' puts the classification organization in a position of making moral judgments, which is inappropriate for a government body OR a national organization serving the public.

Q7:

For the purpose of providing consumer advice, absolutely. For restricting access, that is the responsibility of the consumer or their guardian.

Q8:

Absolutely.

Q9:

To attempt to make a subjective judgment on audience size and composition would make a classification system seem schizophrenic and unfair. It would be better to have clear guidelines for a "lite" classification scheme and its applicability. For example, perhaps films shown at festivals with under 500 tickets could simply be 'speed-rated' for the appearance of violence, erotica or hate-speech. The screening and consumption would then be left as a decision for the consumer.

Q10:

Ideally private consumption would be as unfettered as possible. In practice, providing classification allows people who avoid specific sorts of media to avoid it more readily, or make choices about its consumption.

Q11:

None. Non-judgmental classification without an ability to 'ban' material, done fairly, would be applicable to all content.

Q12:

I don't believe the national classification scheme should be restricting access to anything. I believe they should be recommending that caregivers restrict access to material and that individual adults have a right to access the content they believe suited to them. Any sort of "restriction" is basically censorship and has no place in a democratic environment.

If people wish to have content access controller for their households they should purchase or use one of the many free content filters.

Q13:

By their guardians monitoring their Internet usage, using filtering software at home and discussing issues with their kids. It is the responsibility of society to support caregivers, provide assistance and training, not the responsibility of government to sacrifice informational freedom to allow parents to be less involved.

Q14:

I think the current means of control are perfectly adequate.

Q15:

Always. In a fair, equal system every piece of content is equal, regardless of its classification. Classification is information about the product and is thus always relevant.

It should be sufficient for groups of content all having the same rating to be classified once, on access. For example, a pornographic website should only require a non-explicit "Splash Screen" before entry, notifying consumers that all content within is explicit.

Q16:

Government Agencies should be responsible for classifying material into objective groups and providing that information freely to consumers, not restricting access. They should also be responsible for enforcing compliance with the requirement to be classified. They should never make judgments on the suitability of material in such a way as to restrict its availability to informed, competent adults, except where the content is generated from exceedingly harmful acts (ie snuff films).

Industry Bodies should be responsible for implementing classification result display, providing their members with assistance in getting material classified and appealing classification decisions they feel are unfair.

Consumers should be responsible for judging the classification of the material against their own morals and requirements, and determining if the material is suitable for their consumption.

Q17:

I believe that these models would be faster and less prone to political pressure than current models, so yes. Industry bodies would need to be scrutinized regularly to ensure they are not classifying material too 'low' or 'high'.

Q18:

The guidelines provided by the classification scheme should be sufficient to allow most content to be classified by industry bodies. Any "complex" material could be discussed with government bodies at the discretion of the industry body.

Q19:

Government should subsidize classification where the work is being produced for artistic reasons more than financial. This includes independent films, indie games, non-commissioned artwork for art's sake.

Q20:

I believe most people consider each classification category to be an "Appropriate Age" for consumption, despite their name. So many parents won't allow their children to consume PG13 movies before they're 13, regardless of their actual content. This would give lie to the idea of "Parental Guidance".

Q21:

Yes.

Pure political content should be classified as such.

All pornographic content should be classified in the same category, as adults are able to make their own choices based on the description of the material whether they want to consume it.

Video games should be subject to the same classification as film. To do this an extra "Extremely violent" classification would be suitable, for both film and games.

There should be a "Dangerous Information" classification, for discussions of weapons or ill-advised stunts.

Q22:

By applying the standards of classification to the content itself, not ideas about how it affects people or whether it's "worse" in different mediums.

The classification standards should be consistent across all media, describe the media in terms of material contained (Education, Commentary, Sexual, Violent, Political) and applied evenly.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Snuff films and other content created to celebrate the ending of life. Material which celebrates non-consensual sexual acts (ie rape). Real life actual harm violence which is not presented in a factual manner (Thus allowing journalism).

Q25:

No. It is too broad.

Q26:

I don't believe that states should be involved in the classification process.

Q27:

I believe the Commonwealth government should be responsible for classifying materials, and their availability should be dictated by commercial pressure, not state law.

If a community does not like having a certain material available for purchase or consumption, they are able to petition the content distributor or seller for removal. Having state governments ban categories outright is allowing the loudest parties to run roughshod over the quieter population's right to choose.

Q28:

Absolutely.

Q29:

Other comments:

Classification can be used for good or bad. When good, it allows informed choices on an individual basis. When bad, it allows one party to forcibly impose their views on another, with little right of appeal.

I believe our classification system is currently one of the latter.

If a competent adult chooses to not allow themselves or their children to consume content, that is their choice. I do not believe they should be allowed to impose that choice on other adults. I also believe that allowing government bodies to ban a range of content outright that they gain powers of censorship, and that censorship is never EVER a positive influence on society.

I am a video gamer. I have played many violent games, many peaceful ones, many over the top bloody ones. I'm a Justice of the Peace, a certified Engineer, a Civil Marriage Celebrant, a Scout Leader, and generally a nice guy. I've never punched anyone. I've never deliberately caused harm to anyone. I've never blown up a building, shot up a school, raped anyone, burned any churches or run over any puppies. I am not a bad person. Playing video games has NOT made me a monster, because I am an informed adult.

I believe the classification system has a responsibility to enhance choice, not restrict it. It is often

claimed that Mark Twain said "Censorship is telling a man he can't have a steak just because a baby can't chew it." I believe that the current classification system is bordering on censorship, and I think it would improve society to make it more fair.