

CI 2095 D Cox

First name:

Damon

Last name:

Cox

Q1:

Improving the framework would be sufficient.

Q2:

The primary focus of the classification scheme should be ONLY classification. It should be in place to enable classification of material fairly, and for Australians of all ages. It should not be used as a vehicle for prohibition and content refusal based on the opinions, morals, or beliefs of the "noisy minority". Adults should have the right to choose what to watch, listen to or play, without these choices being limited by a classification system that either simply doesn't have the scope to classify, or by lobby groups with personal agendas. This also needs to be done in a logical, and economical way.

Q3:

In theory, probably not, practically, yes. The interactivity of gaming provides a different experience than that of books, music or film/television. However, said interactivity should not be used as an excuse to impose childish restrictions on adults. The refusal of classification for something like Left 4 Dead 2, while at the same time, movies such as Hostel are allowed, seems embarrassingly illogical. I don't see any reason to change the way online content is currently classified.

Q4:

I think complaints should be investigated, but only acted upon when there are either sufficient numbers, or the material is obviously outside of the guidelines. The classification, and the Refused Classification of the movie Ken Park a few years back was a perfect example of where classification should be able to withstand complaint from minorities, who in many cases hadn't even seen the movie.

Q5:

Yes. The classification exists to specify or mandate suitability of the content for different ages, while indicating in general terms the reasons for said classification. Content for children should be classified as such, content for adults should NOT be refused classification simply because of its potential impact on children.

Q6:

Yes. There is no workable model to applying classification to everything. Market size and reach of content has to be considered or there would be simply too much to classify.

Q7:

Only under self-regulation, not via formal government classification.

Q8:

No, however, application of more formal classification guidelines for consumers may be of benefit.

Q9:

Yes. RC of a product with worldwide acceptance, such as Left 4 Dead 2 is an embarrassment to the Australian classification system.

Q10:

Yes, public display of some content will not be appropriate, however, there may be no issue with private, or controlled display.

Q11:

Practicality. In addition, if it is legal, it should be classifiable.

Q12:

Parental education and assistance tools for control/filtering from ISP/Government, not mandatory implementation such as the proposed internet filter.

Q13:

Control of this kind unfortunately will be largely reliant on parental supervision in addition to Q12. The government cannot be expected to control and regulate the activities of all children in Australia.

Q14:

The sale of adults only material should be controlled in-line with other adult items, such as alcohol.

Q15:

When it is purchasable as a retail product.

Q16:

This is too big of a question to answer, but at the broadest level, it should be to set guidelines that classify content to ensure that all members of society have access to all legal media that they want. Adults should be able to read/watch/play what they want, with classification advice available to the content is known and an informed decision can be made.

Q17:

In some cases yes, however scope should be set.

Q18:

Music, TV and Radio are able to do this.

Q19:

Where necessary and affordable.

Q20:

No, the MA15+ category is often confused with both M15 and R18+. The lack of an adult rating for games adds significantly to this confusion.

Q21:

Yes. R18+ and X18+ should be applied to all media. All forms of media, such as film, books, and games should have all ratings applied to effectively classify all possible media. The R18+ rating for games is long overdue. Considering the average age of gamers in Australia, and the size and popularity of the gaming market, not having a capacity to classify games aimed at adults for adults is inappropriate and embarrassing for Australia in the technology marketplace. This deficiency in our system also causes other issues, such as games rated 18+ in all other markets being rated as MA15+ here, and thus available to a much younger audience. It also takes money away from Australian retailers as games are then imported by adults due to either censorship of the original material, or RCing of the title.

Q22:

All forms of media should have the same categories and markings ie, G, PG, M, MA15+, R18+, X18+. This enables parents and consumers to be confident and informed with their choices for both themselves and their children.

Q23:

i have not read the act in question, however, as an adult, and end user of books, music, movies, television and games, I think it is vital that the classification scheme for computer games is updated to be in line other forms of media, and that this includes expansion of the ratings system to include adult classification such as R18+. Also, this does not mean eliminating MA15 and moving it to R18+, rather retaining MA15+ as with film, and adding the R18+ rating.

Q24:

The people that want to access prohibited/illegal content online, such as sexual violence or child porn are not the people that the government can stop with blanket internet filters. They do not go to "Google" and just search for it. As such, prohibiting online media, is a very difficult issue to tackle and the danger is that in trying to stop the significant minority, you may hinder the significant majority. in general however, I don't approve on online filtering.

Q25:

I don't know enough about the RC categories relationship to online content to comment.

Q26:

Yes, Australia should have one set of classification guidelines, however, this should be taken out of the hands of state Attorney Generals and handled at the federal level with consultation to the states. The way in which the R18+ discussion for games has been hindered and delayed by straw man arguments and a vocal minority is completely unacceptable. The personal opinions of 1 or 2 SAGs should NOT outweigh the overwhelming public opinion (as evidenced by the SAG discussion paper responses to the R18+ debate, and all news polls I have ever seen) in relation to this issue.

Q27:

If the scheme is to be replaced, it should be a federal scheme as above. However, this scheme should have specific controls in place so that changes cannot be made contrary to the prevailing opinion of the Australian public.

Q28:

Yes, as above (Q27), the states have shown their inability to be either effective or efficient on the issue of classification, especially in relation to computer games. Their ability to ignore the prevailing public consensus on the R18+ games issue shows that the system is broken.

Q29:

See Q27/28

Other comments:

Overall, the key here is heading 52a and 52b from the issues paper, page 22.

52(a) adults should be able to read, hear and see what they want;

52 (b) minors should be protected from material likely to harm or disturb them;

The classification system needs to be updated to reflect the current media state, and be focused on

the above two items. It should also be that the goal of the scheme is to classify and inform, not restrict adults for the sake of minorities. The option should be there to watch/read/play whatever is not in the "illegal" category as an adult. It is the informed choice you make based on the classification and information that the scheme provides that is vital, that way, if there is something you don't like, or don't agree with, you have the choice to to participate, but do not restrict other Australians who have a different point of view.