CI 1972 T Randle

First name: Thomas
Last name: Randle

Q1:
A new framework; there are aspects of the existing framework which have not been a failure, but overall the outcome of the ALRC review should be a recommendation for a new classification scheme.

Q2:
The primary objective should be to provide a recommendation about the suitability of content for persons under the legal adult age, but only where reasonable; and only where there is a societal demand for a recommendation of suitability.

No classification scheme should be capable of censoring content. The Australian classification system must not have the effect of a backdoor censorship system (censorship by another name). Censorship must be called what it is and be transparently justified to society.

The resulting censorship of content and ad-hoc reaction to changes in content delivery mediums by the existing classification framework has demonstrated the unacceptable nature of censorship and the inability of the existing classification system to handle societal change and progress.

Q3:
No, if identical content cannot be classified by a classification framework because of a difference in technology platform, it simply shows the failure of that classification framework's attempt to classify content in such a category, and that classification attempt should be reduced to something function across all existing mediums. Different classification approaches to content based on different platforms shows an unacceptable flaw in the proposed scheme.

Q4:
Yes.

Q5:
Classification of content should be viewed by the producers of content to be something useful to their consumers. The practicality of classification must also be considered. For example it is impossible to classify all uploaded videos to Youtube. Entire internet content classification is also completely unacceptable and unworkable, please do not attempt it. Content designed for children is less likely to need classififcation in general.

Q6:
Unsure, but the requirements must not burden creators, or create artificial environments of "State" approved content.

Q7:
No, exhibitors probably should not be deceptive in their exhibition promotions prior to events (consumer protection law, unless the example is a free entry exhibition). But if you go out in public, you may be offended. An individual can always leave an exhibition.

Q8:

Yes, the same approach should be applied to all mediums, and that approach should not be unable to accommodate unknown mediums without legislative change.

Q9:

Unsure, I don't know enough to hold an opinion on this question.

Q10:

Potentially, the right of the individual to live in an un-offended and isolated bubble environment at their home (whilst incredible unhealthy) should be possible. But in public; democracy needs the free exchange of ideas, content and information. The public arena must never become a less than adult maturity zone. There is and always will be a place for mature content in public.

Q11:

Patent and copyright considerations should play absolutely no part of classification scheme considerations.

Q12:

This appears to be loaded question. You're specifically asking about technological methods for censorship online. The classification scheme should not be able to control access to online content. Content control is not the mandate of a classification scheme, you're thinking of censorship; keep the two concepts completely separate in your recommendation.

Q13:

Potentially-inappropriate content may be a good category to allow children access to some of the time during their development, it's the inappropriate content which should be the actual concern and that is the responsibly or parents. Government can help them, but should not dictate to them.

Q14:

Successfully increasing restrictions on access to sexually explicit magazines will only drive the demand in other mediums, primary that is obviously the internet and the faster end of the print medium, NBNCo will be happy if you succeed.

Q15:

Unsure.

Q16:

Any organisations purporting to represent the moral fabric of society should probably be left outside the room.

Q17:

If content producers are to be required to have content classified, then in the first instance co-regulations appears a cheaper option than large Government bodies. However industry self regulation does not work when there is a sufficient financial incentive for industry to break the rules in favour of their bottom line.

Q18:

Nearly all.

Q19:

Unsure.

Q20:

They are reasonably well understood, though that understanding is eroded by the different approaches applied across content delivery mediums. Uniform classification categories should be applied equally across all mediums and platforms.

Q21:

R18+ and X18+ must be added to the computer games medium and all other mediums it current does not apply to.

Q22:

By applying the classification markings, criteria and guidelines to all content mediums................ The computer games classification debacle has clearly demonstrated the ineptitude of Governments to change the law where the majority very clearly expressed their view. The Australian Government cannot have the largest every community response to a public consultation in Australian history and then turn around and say it needs more "community consultation" as the end of the process.

Q23:

That sounds like a good idea. As long as the classification scheme review can stop what has happened to the computer gaming classifications from happing again to the next new medium, our classification system will have been improved.

Q24:

None, the classification system should not be used for censorship.

Q25:

Refused Classification (RC) should be abolished, as it is censorship in disguise and does not belong in a classification scheme.

Q26:

Yes it is important, but the States and Territories have to agree and work together in everybody's interest. If there is a single dissenting member of COAG, then they really need to ask if they are to suffer, or are they just blocking change for the sake of political games or their own personal opinion.

Q27:

This sounds like the main question for ALRC to answer.

Q28:

Absolutely.

Q29:

Other comments:

None