

CI 427 T Rowe

First name: Tim

Last name: Rowe

Q1:

The existing framework definitely requires revision, but if a new framework addresses the obvious holes, this will be an acceptable substitute.

Q2:

Providing an informative, non-restrictive method of assisting adults in making an own decision on what is acceptable content for themselves and minors they are responsible for.

Q3:

No. Technologies change, as do the publics attitudes and biases towards or against them over time.

Q4:

Depends on the nature of the complaint. Some 'complaints' are merely thinly disguised orchestrated agendas and vendettas.

Q5:

All media, regardless of platform, should be subject and permitted to be classified under the same guidelines. 'Potential' impact draws too much possibility for variation and should therefore not be considered. The same standard of what a 'reasonable person' would consider to be objectional should be used consistently across the board. Classifications should not need to cater for vocal minority groups.

Q6:

No. Something being popular doesn't make it any more or less able to cause damage or influence formed morals.

Q7:

Yes, under the same guidelines as any other media.

Q8:

Classified, yes; regulation should only happen in terms of allowance of sale to minors. Adults should be free to decide what they purchase and listen to, regardless of the nature of the content.

Q9:

Again, No. See Q6.

Q10:

If this is not the case already, then how is content currently being classified? Is there somehow an assumption that content won't be accessed at home? Classifications should be done on the assumption the content is to be shown very publicly, or broadcast.

Q11:

The reaction of a reason, average person should be considered, in contrast to one with a political or religious agenda.

Q12:

The most effective method is to not attempt to control or restrict access. It should be the responsibility of a person who discovers objectional content to report it to authorities, and only if it is produced where laws are applicable should action be taken.

Q13:

Better parenting.

Q14:

By better education of children. Ultimately this is why we have restrictions, and if children are better educated to understand right from wrong, the effect of material will be diminished, which could even eventually negate the need for restrictions.

Q15:

A standard classification suggestion should be provided on all material that is classified, in a standard location and form.

Q16:

Government agencies should be responsible for the publication of guidelines, and the investigation of illegal activities and content only. They should have no place in enforcing the distribution of content where an adult is able to make their own decision to view or not view content. Content which is considered to contain illegally created content should be able to be reported to authorities for investigation, and information on how to report this content readily available. The same government should not be responsible for both classifying and determining rules of distribution.

Q17:

Yes - this would prevent the situation we have come to be in where political and special interest groups have been able to rally sympathetic governments who do not wish to alienate these voters, despite them having little in common with the opinion of the majority of the public and consumers responsible for the consumption of content.

If consumers object to the content publishers are producing, they will simply not buy the products. If parents object to their children possessing or viewing content, then it is up to them to educate or regulate what their children are exposed to.

Q18:

Childrens content aimed to an young audiences and general public viewing.

Q19:

NA

Q20:

The lack of an R rating for video games causes mass confusion in how such an inconsistency in available ratings could be allowed to continue. The influence of minority, organised special interest groups affecting classifications also causes some head-scratching.

Q21:

Classification categories should be consistent across all mediums.

Q22:

Better understanding and involvement of the classifiers of the industry and mediums they're actually responsible for. Too often, the actual classifiers are 'outsiders' to the industry and their opinions are not reflective or representative of that of the general public.

Q23:

Yes, for simplification.

Q24:

No content should ever be prohibited from being accessed. There should be a mechanism for citizens to report to authorities material they consider may have been produced in illegal ways, so that the creation of that content can be investigated.

If the contents creation falls outside the jurisdiction of the Australian government, then it is up to the government to either convince that outside party to see their case, or accept that the decision of what should be illegal is not necessarily shared universally and worldwide, and that they might not actually always be correct in their lawmaking decisions.

Q25:

Absolutely not. Many titles are pushed in to this bracket both due to unavailable other rating brackets, or due to biased classification.

Q26:

Yes, classification should have a single national standard, however enforcement could be handled at a state level.

Q27:

Don't know. However we need to get away from a system where just a single AG can veto or reject any proposal.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Better involvement of industry. Better reflection of breakdown across industry sizes.

Other comments:

The federal government has recently proven that the unfortunate agenda of a single minister can have far too much control over what 20 million Australians see and hear. Systems need to be put in place so that this government censorship can not continue and eventually grow to encompass areas not officially disclosed under current plans, but certainly on the future agenda of these people and interest groups who support each other, can not occur. Adult Australians should be able to use their own discretion to decide what is appropriate content for themselves and their families, and not have this decided by others for them. It should only be the role of government to recommend, not enforce, on matters of what become censorship.