

CI 1819 R Marshall

First name: Robert

Last name: Marshall

Q1:

The current framework is effective and capable. Addition of R18+ or X restricted ratings for some media currently lacking it would be desirable.

Q2:

Informing consumer choice. Specifically the classification system should be used to inform consumers of a media products content, not to decide whether it is suitable or to censor.

Q3:

No, content is content, the way that it is accessed is completely irrelevant to what a consumer is exposed to.

Q4:

All media that currently needs a classification system has one in place. Improving the current systems should be a priority, rather than extending what types of media is classified.

Q5:

No. As stated before, classification is to inform a consumer of the content of a product, not to determine what is 'suitable'.

The classification of children's content is a waste of time and money better spent elsewhere, parents are already warned of whether a product is not appropriate for children, they don't need to be told what is appropriate additionally.

Q6:

Content specifically targeted towards, and only exposed to, adults or children supervised by adults (such as artworks in a private or public museum or gallery) does not need classification. As stated above, all the media needing classification already has a classification system in place, no extension to new types of media is needed.

Q7:

No, artwork exhibited in galleries and museums is only exposed to those who choose to access them. Minors are not at risk, as to enter a gallery they have to be accompanied by an adult, thus the decision as to what a minor is exposed to is determined by the choice of their parents/guardians and the intervention of the classification board is not necessary.

Q8:

The current classification/explicit language system is more than enough, no changes or additions are needed.

Q9:

As stated above, no. No extensions of the classification system to new media types is needed, and all media that needs classification already has a system in place.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Classification is a guide to potential consumers to inform them of what a product contains. If something does not contain sufficient information on packaging or advertisements for a consumer to make an informed decision about their purchase, then classification is helpful. This is already in place in warning labels for explicit content in music, as well as scaled classification systems for video and interactive entertainment and is not needed elsewhere. In no other situations is classification necessary or beneficial to the general public.

Q12:

Parental guidance. All other methods are ineffectual, expensive, easily bypassed and liable to impinge on the rights of the public.

Q13:

It can't. The only effective method is parental guidance. If parents wish to use a content filter there are many commercial products available which they may elect to purchase. Any system put in place by the government would be a poor substitute, easy to bypass, expensive to implement for tax payers and liable to impede online access to the general populace. For an example see the car crash that was the Howard era government provided internet filter.

Q14:

The magazines show no explicit content on their covers, are sealed, so cannot be accessed unless purchased, and are not purchasable by minors. The current system is perfectly adequate.

Q15:

When it is necessary to aid consumer choice (i.e. if the product is not clearly intended for a mature audience, yet still contains mature themes).

Q16:

Policing of illegal material. 'Regulation of content' is better left to an informed consumer.

Q17:

The current system is adequate.

Q18:

Explicit language warnings on music.

Q19:

Q20:

They are currently clear and well labeled, with the exception of video game products, which need a further R18+ equivalent rating. Requiring producers to censor a product designed for adults to achieve a 15+ rating is confusing to consumers as products designed for an older audience are bunched with products intended for teens.

Q21:

An R18+ rating for video game products is needed. The current system of classification refusal is needlessly harmful to Australia's IT retail and product development industries and completely ineffectual in protecting minors from inappropriate content.

Q22:

With the exclusion of video games the current classification guidelines for media is perfectly understandable and representative of it's content.

Q23:

Q24:

Illegal content should be prohibited by law, as it already is. No changes to the current system is desirable or necessary.

Q25:

No, as refused classification often does not equate to illegal material.

Q26:

Ideally there should be a single classification system nation wide, as it would be more cost effective and clearer for the public, however this is not a priority or a necessity, as the current system is functional.

Q27:

Q28:

Ideally, yes.

Q29:

Equality of classification over the currently classified media types.

Other comments:

The use of an Refused Classification rating in Australia is archaic and harmful to consumers. The only products that should be refused classification are the ones that break Australian Law, all other materials part of one of the existing classification systems should be classified so that consumers can make informed decisions about what products they purchase. The classification system is in place to inform the public about the media they purchase, not to censor or act as our moral compass.