

CI 735 L Swan

First name: Lachlan

Last name: Swan

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

A national classification scheme should be able to accurately inform an individual as to the contents of any media which has been classified. Moreover, this information must be effective at letting the individual decide whether or not the material is suitable for them. Eg. A parent looking for a film to watch with their child will most likely purchase a "G" rated movie.

Q3:

No. A medium in which particular material is accessed should not be classified, as this stereotypes that particular technology or platform to its most extreme end. Eg. If the internet were to be classified, it could not be rated in a conventional way due to its huge variety of information which it contains, most of it being helpful, but some being crude and even obscene.

Q4:

Only if the classification protects the worth of the content. If the information is highly valuable and beneficial, then a classification which helps it spread to as many people as possible whilst protecting it would be an advisable outcome.

Q5:

Potential impact should bear no affect on content's classification, as the impact the content has on society is only a guess. Actually allowing the content a fair classification is the best outcome.

Content which has been specifically made for children, with verification from the content's developer, should have the option to be classified as "designed for children".

Q6:

No. All content deserves fair classification, regardless of who may or may not interact with the content. An effective classification should be able to give an individual the ability to make up their own minds as to whether the content is appropriate for them.

Q7:

For providing consumer advice, yes, but not to restrict access. Art, especially when displayed in a public area (the art gallery), should not have access restricted to it, for this can tread on grounds of discrimination based on age, ethnocentricity, or socio-economic status.

Q8:

No. Only consumer advice (in the form of a warning) should be given in the chance the audio media contains explicit language or other such references.

Q9:

No. Content should be classified based solely on what the media is, not what it might be. This also maintains the integrity of the classification system.

Q10:

No. But it is up to the individual to make sure that they are accessing content they believe to be ethically satisfactory.

Q11:

If classification prevents content from entering the public domain, then perhaps it is time to broaden the spectrum which the national classification scheme uses to deem whether content is fit for access by an individual.

Q12:

The internet is decentralised and anarchic, attempting to control access to online content is ultimately futile. Firewalls can be cracked or avoided all together, websites can be hacked and reconnected to the accessible internet. The only true way to control access to online content is to remove all physical access to the internet, but that is redundant.

Q13:

Through parental supervision.

Q14:

Such content should be located away from "G" rated material and even covered in a translucent plastic to obscure the front and rear.

Q15:

When the markings contribute to consumer product awareness and helps them make an informed decision.

Q16:

Government agencies should thoroughly analyse content and provide a classification based on what was demonstrated by the content. Industry bodies (film, music, games) can then either accept that as their classification, or edit/ redevelop their product so it makes a different classification. The user should ultimately be able to access all content, but is limited to their own tastes which a classification can help hone.

Q17:

Perhaps. Such a model could be a solution to Australia's lack of "R" rating for video games, as working with game publishers and they with their developers could yield a better end result for the consumer. Could be trialed, but can easily lead to a corrupted regulator.

Q18:

None. Industry classifying its own products without external review can only lead to poor classification, consumer misinformation, and gross misuse of power in the attempt to increase industry profits.

Q19:

No subsidation should occur, whatever the circumstances. A standard fee should remain in place regardless of who produced the content.

Q20:

MA15+ rated video games can cause confusion, as they make up a large proportion of new release titles, but the extremity of their impact varies greatly, from a game with strong violence and strong coarse language (normally an R+ movie) to a game with drug references, adult themes and language, something which would normally fit into the MA+ rating for films. If an R+ rating were in place, this confusion would most definitely be eased, cutting very clearly through what would be an exclusively

adult game to a game essentially accessible to everyone. Games are no longer exclusively for the young children of yesteryear, or the basement dwelling hermits of stereotypes. Instead, today's gamers vary as much as cinema goers do, and they both are looking for an immersive story and a captivating spectacle on the screen, only the gamer's movie ticket can cost about \$80.

Q21:

An "R" rating is needed for video games. Games deemed too violent, sexually provocative or dark themed are refused classification, where they are either dulled down - potentially damaging mechanics and overall art value of the game - or not released at all on Australian borders (although piracy is making it harder for RC games to remain out of Australian households). When an RC game is re-released into the MA15+ category, it can cause much confusion to prospective customers, especially parents unfamiliar with the rating system - these same parents would never even consider purchasing a R18+ film for their children, but an MA15+ film seems reasonable for teenagers under 15 to watch. The "R" rating for video games would both allow more content onto our shores, bringing the unedited experience to gamers all over Australia (legally) as well as improve a classification system which has, so far, failed its purpose to inform the public about what they can expect from this content.

Q22:

By using the coloured E, G, PG, M, MA, and R ratings for books and magazines. Although attempting to do such a thing may be met with resistance by people happy their books and magazines are free from any ratings dotted upon them.

Q23:

Yes, that may just be beneficial.

Q24:

A naive question, treading more along the lines of "what do you wish didn't exist on the internet?". Nothing can be truly prohibited online.

Q25:

No. Many games which are legal in other countries have been refused classification in Australia purely because we lack an "R" rating for games. If we were to prohibit content online for the same reasons, then it would merely be a form of laziness on behalf of the classification board for not expanding what can be classified with existing systems.

Q26:

Uniform laws are important, but I do not see promotion of the laws throughout the states and territories as being necessary.

Q27:

A scheme similar to that of Sweden's. A set of laws which protect information, so classification is less about keeping things out of the state, but more about informing people as to what they can expect from this product, or that content, and thus make their own judgement to decide whether they will purchase said good, or interact with said content.

Q28:

Only if the proposed legislation will improve accessibility to all forms of media, as opposed to shutting more forms of media out.

Q29:

With an R18+ rating for video games.

Other comments:

Why is there no R18+ rating for video games in this country? Even New Zealand has a explicit level of classification for video games.