

CI 646 S Chesterfield-evans

First name: Sam

Last name: Chesterfield-Evans

Q1:

I believe the ALRC should be able to implement an effective R18+ classification for games while preserving much of the existing framework. The MA15+ category should be scrutinised to classify games appropriately, excluding material unsuitable for the under 18 aged audience. I have stated below, major changes have to be made to the way the Australian Classification Review Board is run.

Q2:

The national classification scheme (NCS) should look at up-hauling the redundant nature of making changes to National Classification Code which currently requires unanimous votes from all state censorship ministers. The NCS should also be progressive by implementing a long over due R18+ classification for games and setting out a "Bill of Rights" protecting topics (such as euthanasia) and free speech from internet censorship.

Q3:

No. The material should be classified based purely on the content, not how someone has chosen to access it. Until there is overwhelming published scientific evidence supporting the age old myth that "Video games are more effective at manipulating people to commit crimes than books or movies" or similar, all platforms of media should be treated under the same classification categories. Decisions to bias one platform of expression over another should be only made based on hard science not social and media stigmas.

Q4:

Possibly in the case of the internet. I believe all movies, books, video games and TV should undergo classification by under a national scheme. Classifying the internet could be accomplished on the basis of complaint, because classifying the entire content of the internet is impossible and any attempt to do so is a waste of resources.

Q5:

As I have stated above, all offline content should be classified if possible.

Q6:

No it should be classified in the same way as a small content producer would.

Q7:

Only if they include extreme levels of sexual violence.

Q8:

Possibly explicit sticker for explicit language/content. Nothing further.

Q9:

Yes. The target audience should be heavily considered when making classifications.

Q10:

Content in public should have priority for classification.

Q11:

Q12:

By informing parents to educate and supervise their kids online activities if they are worried about potential online content.

Q13:

By informing parents to educate and supervise their kids online activities if they are worried about potential online content.

Q14:

By restricting the age of sale with identification required to prove age.

Q15:

When it is no longer suitable for the majority of children to watch. I would say the current M15 rating and above should carry warning under the new system.

Q16:

Classification should be controlled by the government to help families make informed choices. Restriction of access to content in public should be controlled by age restrictions. Private homes should not be restricted to accessing content.

Q17:

Q18:

Music, with a simple explicit sticker if the album/song warrants it (as is already implemented). Books could be classified in a similar manner with a simple sticker to denote explicit content contained.

Q19:

For Australian content classification should be subsidised.

Q20:

Most are. Video games however are classified inconsistently which leads the community to withdraw faith in the classification scheme.

Q21:

R18+ for video game obviously, with the MA15+ category being review as aforementioned. I believe books should carry the current explicit content warning which music albums do.

Q22:

Similar classification criteria should be employed across platforms and media.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Child Pornography as it is already. Nothing else!

Q25:

No. Child pornography should be prohibited and nothing else. If articles detailing euthanasia (which fits the RC classification) as banned then we limit the potential for debate on important topics in this democratic country. Drug use website for example can provide harm reduction/minimisation techniques to existing drug users improving their health standards, future opportunities and support base while and lowering their burden on society and the cost to the tax payer. There are so many more examples which I just don't have time to go into.

Q26:

Q27:

A national classification scheme.

Q28:

Yes. The national classification scheme (NCS) should look at up-hauling the redundant nature of making changes to National Classification Code which currently requires unanimous votes from all state censorship ministers. The current system stifles progression and democratic process.

Q29:

The classification criteria for media should be highly transparent, along with classification reports including media (even online) that has been refused classification.

Other comments: