

## CI 572 A Williams

First name: Aaron

Last name: Williams

Q1:

There needs to be a new framework. There needs to be a radical rethink of classification systems in general. With the rapid changes in media of the last decade and the potential for further rapid changes the old "static" view of media needs to be reconsidered. The view of a classification as a guide to consumers is still valid, but as a form of control of who accesses such media - this is now impossible.

Q2:

Informing the consumer as to what they will be viewing/reading/playing/interacting. There need to be clear indications as to what content will be forthcoming. It would be unacceptable if a media product aimed at children depicted gross violence. But if forewarned that a documentary on war crimes contained gross violence, it would be up to the consumer to decide.

Q3:

No. It is patently ridiculous that under the current system still images of fetishes are allowed in print, but not on the internet. A video game that has repeated violent actions can be classified M, but the same images would likely be R+18 on a DVD again indicates the "broken" nature of the current scheme. All media should be classified under the same system.

However, this question and all the following questions (4,5,6,7,8,9,10) hinge upon the query "should". A more appropriate question is "can"? The sheer volume of media now available is huge and growing at an exponential rate. It would be impossible to classify all of it. In an ideal world all of that content would carry some form of guidance for consumers, but material produced in the USA would have different standards to that produced in Malaysia...so how would that translate to Australia?

Q4:

A complaints based system would be a "democratic" method of classification, but would likely end up overburdened and unresponsive as the production of media content increases exponentially with "user generated" and small producers flooding into the world. The most useful system would be self-regulation with some form of complaints based system.

Q5:

Again, can all content aimed at kids be classified? I think not. Only a form of industry guideline would be of any use.

Q6:

No. But can we classify everything?

Q7:

No. Access to art should never be restricted. Consumer advice would be good. But again, can we classify all content?

Q8:

No. Access to art should never be restricted. Consumer advice would be good. But again, can we classify all content?

Q9:

No. Can we classify all content?

Q10:

How would such a distinction be made in this tech-mobile age? Is my office "public", or my car? Is in my lounge room in front of all my friends "at home"? This appears to be a nonsense.

Q11:

Q12:

Home based filters and parental supervision. The rest would have to be based upon individual choice. To consider any form of ISP based filter is nonsense. The mind-boggling size of the internet and it's rapid growth renders any filter useless, as a "blocked" site could be mirrored multiple times, or a blocked video reappear in 100 sites in a day. It is beyond comprehension to think that any filter could be effective.

Q13:

Education of children and parents regarding the online world. When I was a child we were taught how to cross the road, wash our hands and not to talk to strangers. We now need to teach our kids about being safe and responsible on the internet.

Home/School based filters and supervision. They are more tech-savvy and will always seek out "naughty" things...so we as parents have to vigilant.

Q14:

Sexually explicit magazines should not be visible to minors. R rated movies should not be displayed...etc.

Q15:

It would be nice if all content displayed a clear indication / consumer advice.

Q16:

Industry should self regulate, users can then complain if they feel the regulation is inappropriate, a government agency can be the arbiter that directs industry to tighten up regulation.

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

All. Industry produces media for an intended target audience, therefore they can make a clear distinction as to a classification or provide consumer advice relating to their intended audience.

Q19:

Self regulation would incur no cost. If a complaint was made then the cost should be borne by whomever is found to be at fault; the producer of content incorrectly classified or the complainant who incorrectly raised the issue.

Q20:

Generally, yes. However the RC classification is vaguely worded and vaguely understood because RC includes illegal activities (child abuse, instruction in crime and incitement of terrorism) as well as legal activities/harm minimisation (fetishes, instruction on drug use, sexual activities that "offend" etc). The test of "offensive" is highly subjective and thus should not be a basis for classification. Objective measures should be used.

Q21:

R18+ for computer games - I am an adult gamer, but do not let my children see some of the games I play due to their violent nature. All are rated M in Australia. Many should have been rated R18+, but were "squeezed" into M...whereas in other countries they have an adult rating.

I also believe that the banning of fetishes such as bondage, golden showers and the like (if consensual) is a value judgement that adults can make for themselves. Many adults already partake in such activities and they are not against the law, so the depiction of such should not be banned.

Q22:

Create uniform guidelines for all content, regardless of format or delivery mode.

Q23:

Yes, and simplified where possible. There should not be differences between forms of media or between states.

Q24:

How do you stop it? It is impossible, unless you make it a crime to access said material...and then what about accidental exposure?

Criminal / Illegal activities should be something people are discouraged from seeking online or in the real world too.

Q25:

No, it is far too broad. It also includes the following: "depict actual sexual activity between consenting adults involving lawful fetishes, including but not limited to: Fetishes such as body piercing, application of substances such as candle wax, 'golden showers', bondage, spanking or fisting".

Q26:

The states should not have power to alter classifications. What if I am a resident of Victoria and access material via my mobile phone that is considered ok in VIC. But then I fly to Perth and find that accessing the same material is illegal in WA? This is ludicrous.

Q27:

A Federal system of industry self regulation with a complaints mechanism that refers to an independent review body.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Recognition that we can no longer control media and content but simply guide and educate users.

Other comments:

The internet and the rapidly changing face of human interaction has forever changed how we access content, and has forever removed the ability of governments to control (short of totalitarianism) what people see, what they say and how they act. The old system of classification where each and all publications were vetted is now impossible. Thinking that any form of government oversight can stem this tide is foolish in the extreme.

The logical conclusion is to create guidelines to help establish self regulation, and to create some form of feedback system to ensure that community standards are heard and help shape the environment, and to educate users how to best navigate the world that is the internet.