

CI 383 A Gabrielli

First name: Alessandro

Last name: Gabrielli

Q1:

I see little reason to waste further time and effort by throwing the baby out with the bathwater. For example, amendments can be made to the existing framework to accommodate an R-18 and X-rating for computer games, with a suitable revision to the M 15+ classification to deal with any overlapping content.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to appropriately classify viewing material so informed adults can make rational choices about what they do and don't wish for themselves - or more importantly, their children - to consume. The role of the government should not be to make decisions on whether people are allowed to view simulated violence, sex or profanity, which is largely already present in the accepted media formats we consume on a daily basis.

Q3:

Content is content, regardless of the mode it arrives at my consciousness via. The interactivity of video games shouldn't have bearing on whether it ought to be classified - all content should.

Q4:

All content should be classified so consumers know what they are getting when they buy it, especially if it's being bought as a gift for someone under the age of 18. Abstaining from action until a complaint is made defeats the point of the classification system. Furthermore it is my understanding that material without a classification can't even be sold in this country, so how would the material be complained about -before- it was to be consumed?

Q5:

The potential impact of content is impractical to gauge. Games with horror-themes will have no effect on some, and give nightmares to others for days. The only reasonable course of action is to classify the content on its own merits and advise caution. Every game that has horror or violence themes in it already has a splash screen at start-up indicating that it may contain content which is not suitable for all viewers, regardless of age.

Q6:

No, extrinsic factors are irrelevant. If content is inappropriate for young teenagers, it shouldn't matter how much of their money you can squeeze out of the larger playerbase. If their parents wish to skirt the rating system and buy it for them, that will happen regardless of the lettering on the box. Classify the product on the content it contains and nothing else.

Q7:

First of all, how many underage kids are in art galleries viewing potentially disturbing art? I'd wager very few. Second, the very purpose of art is to illicit an emotional reaction in its viewer, and whether that emotion is disgust, admiration or lust is entirely dependent on the viewer and the preconceptions they bring to it. Should the Venus be given a classification of 18+ because it has exposed breasts? Of course not. This is not a pornographic representation, nor even an erotic one. It's an expression of beauty, of admiration of the physical human form.

Q8:

Yes. Most rap has lyrics that are explicit, and should be classified according. Audio books may fall into a similar category - and I feel like a broken record saying this - so long as the classification is based on the content and nothing else. Extrinsic factors such as a person with an overactive imagination having an adverse reaction to a reading of a book on war, or a classic with supernatural themes like the Brothers Grimm, shouldn't have any bearing on its classification. Others will consume and enjoy it for the fiction it is.

Q9:

I believe this was answered in the relatively larger point of question 6.

Q10:

No. Classify on the merits of the content only. Extrinsic factors are irrelevant. People don't watch pornography in Net-Cafe's.

Q11:

No other factors. Classify on the merits of the content only. Extrinsic factors are irrelevant.

Q12:

There aren't any. Filtering through ISPs will just force people to learn better ways of accessing the content they seek. An Internet filter is doomed to fail before it starts, and should be abandoned. I personally have never had a problem accessing content which has been prohibited from my viewing by copyright interests via the use of simply proxy add-ons that come free with Firefox. Filtering is a waste of money and human resources.

Q13:

Net-nanny and better parental education of exactly what is out there. Google has its own Safe-Search which can be tweaked for personal preference. Other systems involve white-lists for your kids until they are deemed old enough to view the material. This is not the government's responsibility, but that of the parents.

Q14:

They're already in concealed plastic bags. The only further thing to do would be to conceal them behind the counter, or only sell them specifically in erotica stores.

Q15:

As it is already: on its packaging, and before the movie/game/CD/audiobook starts delivering the

content to your eyes and ears upon playback.

Q16:

Governments role is to classify based on what is in the content.

Industry bodies, such as producers, are charged with ensuring the contents of the media is delivering to its appropriate audience (ie: no swearing in that which is aimed at pre-schoolers).

Users such as parents decide what their children (and they themselves) consume, with classifications as a guide.

Q17:

Probably not. It is in the interest of the industry to classify material as low as it can get away with, in order to reach the largest audience and purchasing base. Their interest is not as closely aligned with users as it ought to be for this endeavour to succeed. Misclassifications are usually a boon for the industry anyway, as the 'moral outrage' perpetrated by some members of the community and mass media are the cheapest forms of advertising - free.

Q18:

If any at all, content for pre-schoolers and young children.

Q19:

For small independents I believe so. It's hard enough to get funding to get a film shot and edited without having to worry about where it's legal to show it afterwards.

Q20:

I believe the current categories are satisfactorily easy to comprehend.

Q21:

Perhaps the merging of M with M 15+. Maturity doesn't track well with age, especially with the previous two generations. Best to just leave it as 'M' for Mature.

Q22:

So long as the same icons are used across all formats I don't see an issue arising.

Q23:

Yes. Be consistent across all platforms.

Q24:

The sexual exploitation of children seems to be the hot button topic for this part of the debate.

However, as I've alluded to previously anyone who wishes to obtain this material doesn't punch it into a search engine or find it on iTunes. They get their material through background channels on Usenet and IRC, which is fundamentally unblockable due to its nature. This is why Internet filtering is ineffective.

Q25:

It would have been nice for the ALRC to provide the scope of the RC category for me to read, rather than having to hunt it down myself. As I have previously stated, you can't prohibit online content - the logistics of it make it impossible.

Q26:

Consistency is important. Promote it through an advertising campaign or post leafleting.

Q27:

A unified classification scheme across all media, across all states and territories.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

I have nothing further to add.

Other comments: