

CI 655 P Smith

First name: Peter

Last name: Smith

Q1:

The ALRC should focus on introducing an R18+ rating for games - this can simply augment the existing system.

Q2:

Q3:

No, never. Mediums should be subject to the same framework.

Q4:

With a strong enough framework that enables people to make their own responsible purchase decisions, works should be protected against complaints by free speech.

Q5:

Not merely impact, but artistic purpose needs to be considered in classification systems.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Absolutely not. Providing consumer advice may be acceptable, but restricting access creates an unacceptable level of censorship.

Q8:

Yes - bearing in mind that audio impact alone is relatively small in comparison to other parts of media.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Only content, and certainly not any bias related to interactivity of a medium.

Q12:

Parental control. No control over online content (besides that which is illegal) should be exerted by the government.

Q13:

Better parental filters.

Q14:

I think it's well enough controlled as it is. Such magazines feature plastic covers which restrict access to sexually explicit content when sold in public places. Games feature no explicit content in their manifestation on shop shelves and no further restriction is necessary.

Q15:

I think the current levels of display are appropriate.

Q16:

Users should be able to open investigations into classifications delivered by industry bodies if the classification is deemed inappropriate. Government agencies should not be involved, and only experts in the fields of ethics and the appropriate media should be employed in industry bodies.

Q17:

Perhaps, provided that censorship is not involved. As long as there is an appropriate rating for any product so that censorship does not happen and classification is never refused.

Q18:

What currently exists - general magazines, art, non-lyrics based music, etc.

Q19:

I think any inequity of subsidies will create problems. Simply keep the fees involved fair, equal, and small.

Q20:

I think they make sense and are understood, even if they aren't heavily acted upon.

Q21:

Yes, there should be the introduction of an R18 rating for video games. Currently, many works of artistic merit have been declined classification due to the absence of such a category. The introduction of such a category would still allow parents to responsibly control the games their children have access to, while allowing works to not be rejected or censored when ratings are sought in this country.

Q22:

I don't feel that this is a particular issue that needs addressing yet.

Q23:

Perhaps, if it includes the revisions quoted in question 21.

Q24:

That which is entirely illegal. But enforcing this prohibition should not be done with heavy handed internet filters. Threat of potential arrest for consumption or distribution of such materials should be enough.

Q25:

Q26:

The most lenient classification systems should be standardised across Australia.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

The main point I wish to address is simply the introduction of an R18 rating to the classification of video games.

Other comments:

All works, no matter how abhorrent or confronting, have a right to exist under free speech. While the distribution to consumers should involve advice through classification systems, the outright denial of distribution of any work is a travesty.