

## CI 1813 S Weeks

First name: Shannon

Last name: Weekes

Q1:

Developing a new framework - one that includes an 'adults only' rating.

Q2:

The primary objectives should be 1) to make as many materials as possible available to adults (so long as they don't present actual footage of real-life illegal acts), and 2) make it clear to purchasers which materials are suitable for adults, and which are suitable for juveniles.

Q3:

No, the technology or platform used to access content should not affect whether content should be classified. Adults need to be able to make informed decisions about what they want to watch/consume/play, and what their children and teenagers will be permitted to watch/consume/play.

Q4:

No, all content should be classified. With respect to video games in particular, there should be an R18 rating which indicates that the material has been viewed, classified, and is suitable for adults but not juveniles. Some materials currently rated MA15 should be moved into the R18 category! (e.g. the game Stalker comes to mind).

Q5:

Potential impact is very difficult to gauge. Better to classify everything and let people know where they stand.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

For the purpose of consumer advice only. How many kids do you know who wander around art galleries unaccompanied by their parents?

Q8:

Yes - so long as this doesn't prevent access to classics of literature that depict illegal or 'disturbing' acts, e.g. the book Lolita. Generally I think that more information is better, but it should be provided in order to help adults make informed decisions, not to prevent them accessing works.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Content should be classified when it is offered for sale, or when it is open to 'unavoidable' public viewing (e.g. billboards).

Q12:

Active parental supervision of their children's online activities. People my age (~30) are the first generation to have 'grown up' with the internet, and to know more about it than their children do. I can

see why older people might freak out a bit about what's out there, but supervision is really the answer. Certainly, my parents did not adequately supervise my internet access, and had no idea what was out there, who I was talking to, and what I might have been looking at. Any filter they might have bought (e.g. net nanny), I could have circumvented. But putting the computer in the lounge room would have been most effective! The generation who are starting to have kids now, know that this is the case, because they were kids and teenagers on the internet too!

Any adult who is interested enough in underground illegal activities (e.g. child pornography) probably has enough nous to work utilise VPNs and other ways of transmitting data securely. Blocking sites, with the noble aim of preventing children from accessing them, only prevents adults from looking at things that they really should be able to access.

Q13:

Parental supervision is paramount.

Q14:

Put magazines behind the counter, and make people ask for what they want!

Q15:

On a website, there should be a 'front page' that displays consumer advice (and content warnings) before any content is displayed. E.g. 'this website may contain x, y, and z. If you find this material objectionable, please do not visit this site'. Anything with content rated MA15, R, or X, should contain this warning.

Q16:

Government agencies should review content, and provide consumers with information about it, e.g. a general rating, and the reasons for that rating. Industry bodies should have no role, other than to make comply with government requirements to display ratings and content warnings. Users should be able to make informed choices according to the information supplied on content, and adults should regulate the content that is accessed by minors under their care.

Q17:

I don't personally trust industry to classify their own content - they would aim for a rating that would give them a greater market share.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

Classification should be done by the government.

Q20:

'Refused classification' causes confusion, because it's unclear whether this means 'didn't have enough info to classify', or 'so bad that we don't even have a rating for it'. Most parents have been desensitised to ratings and think kids in their early teens should be permitted to play MA15 games, and watch movies of similar rating.

Q21:

An R18 rating for games would be beneficial. It would reflect the fact that competent adults can tell the difference between actual violence and simulated game violence, especially in unrealistic games like the zombie title 'Left 4 Dead 2'. It would also bring games classification in line with movie

classification. We could also merge some of the 'borderline' or 'higher end' MA15 games into the R18 classification, effectively lowering the severity of content in MA15.

Q22:

As per Q21 - an R18 rating for games would be fantastic. I suspect that

Q23:

Yes!!!

Q24:

Child pornography and snuff films, since consuming these materials feeds the demand for them. Depictions of other crimes or 'gory' images (e.g. the video of a hostage being beheaded) at least arguably serve an informative purpose.

Q25:

Q26:

We should have nationwide classifications - it's laughable that I can't access something here, but it's OK if I'm living there.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

Most importantly, I'd like to see a R18 rating for games, and some games in the current M15 band moved up to R18 to reflect the degree of violence they contain. We agree that competent adults can tell the difference between what's OK in a game and what's OK in real life, and if we think teenagers cannot, we should bump a whole lot of content up into the higher rating bracket - but not ban adults from accessing it. I would also like to get rid of 'unclassified' and replace it with 'illegal', just to be clear about things.

I think that any material that doesn't depict actual people being harmed in actual crimes (e.g. Japanese manga that features cartoon children, sexual content featuring women who 'look young\*' but are consenting adults, Bill Henson's photos of kids), should not be banned but merely rated. Informed choice and parental supervision are key. Simply being offensive is not reason enough to ban something, it must be directly harmful. Child pornography harms the children who are filmed for it, in a way that violent movies, porn (assuming that the participants are consenting), and computer games simply do not.

\*What does this mean, anyway? Who decides?