

CI 618 S Bales

First name: Scott

Last name: Bales

Q1:

The current framework works fairly well, I would just recommend you focus more on the descriptive side, such as "contains coarse language" and less on simply assigning a letter or two to each piece of media (ie MA, PG etc).

Q2:

To help parents decide what is suitable for their children to watch or play, and to help adults decide what they want to watch or play.

Q3:

No

Q4:

Don't think so, unless it is prohibitively expensive to classify all of it.

Q5:

Yes. Yes

Q6:

No - small producers/distributors should be classified in the same way, see Q19.

Q7:

They should have the same "nudity", "sex scenes" "cartoon violence" tags that movies have.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

There is no method of controlling online content that isn't

Q13:

Children accessing inappropriate material is a failure of trust between them and their parents. Most likely, it arose because parents installed a filter, which the parents thought was perfect and then the child easily found a way around it. Educate parents, tell them to sit down and have a talk to their children about potential risks, and how to minimise them.

Q14:

Don't store soft core porn directly next to childrens magazines

Q15:

Consumer advice - whenever possible.

Q16:

Government agencies should regulate based on the wishes of the public. Industry should accept this and have no other role.

Q17:

No. The industry has a financial gain to be made by altering their ratings, and the ratings of their competitors.

Q18:

None, even if they only handle obvious things, it's a slippery slope.

Q19:

When the content provider cannot afford to do it themselves, yes.

Q20:

Yep

Q21:

I personally would remove MA, and change R such that it is merely a recommendation. It is the parent's role to control their children, not the governments. However, I know that such a change would probably be political suicide, so no changes, apart from as mentioned in Q22

Q22:

Video games should be brought into line with other media. If there is legitimate scientific evidence that video games have more of an impact on us than movies, that is reason to classify video games to more stringent rules, not to simply assume that a 15 year old is as capable of handling a mature video game as an adult.

Q23:

Yes, definitely

Q24:

Hmm, this answer got slightly [NSFW]. Unless you happen to work at the Australian Law Reform Commission.

Sex involving one or more non consenting members, inclusive of all child porn, bestiality and rape should be prohibited online, but this is not including porn involving young looking or small breasted consenting adults, cartoon depictions of children, as long as they are not based off a real person or 'rape simulation porn', in which all performers are consenting adults. All of these should be permitted online.

Q25:

No, I don't approve of the RC category at all. The only content that should be censored at all is listed in my answer to Q24

Q26:

Not particularly. The advantage of simplicity and consistency is nowhere near as big as the fact that a single man was able to stop the will of other lawmakers and the public re: an R classification for video games - that's what consistency gets us.

Q27:

Q28:

Probably for the best, yes.

Q29:

Other comments:

In Australia, sex scenes, nudity and coarse language are taken to be quite serious, in terms of how a movie is classified. However, violence is not treated as particularly important in terms of classification. Some may dispute this, potentially citing the classification system in the USA, to which I would counter by citing the classification systems used throughout Europe.

This has always struck me as odd, perfectly natural things that are not considered criminal or immoral are given as much, or even more importance than violence and murder - some of the more serious crimes under Australian law.

Drug use is another descriptor that I feel is often classified harshly. Whilst I couldn't care how you classify movies that simply glorify drugs, I think that often, media that gives a balanced, or even critical view of drugs can be classified harshly. Fact is, many people have started using illicit drugs by 18. The majority of parents are unable or unwilling to discuss drugs in a meaningful way, and with the exception of the NSW crossroads section, schools are also not a place where students can learn anything meaningful about drugs. You have movie producers willing to stand up and help children in a way that no-one else is capable of, and you are stopping them.