

CI 769 S Helmrich

First name: Susan

Last name: Helmrich

Q1:

Improve key elements of the existing framework

Q2:

Clarity of classification levels, so individuals can make informed choices, whilst not being restricted or censored by government regulations

Q3:

No, classification should be based on the content, not the platform or technology used to access. However it would be useful to develop technology that can be applied to certain platforms that allow the consumer to block access to certain levels of classification. e.g. mobile devices such as smartphones or tablets are more difficult to monitor and block access of inappropriate content by children; these devices are highly accessible. However I don't believe that having different levels of classification for these devices compared to other devices such as PCs is the right way to go about the problem

Q4:

No. Content should be classified before it gets to the state of someone making a complaint. Also there will be a wide variety of what is acceptable in the community, classification should be predetermined by a panel of experts not at the discretion of powerful lobby groups or vocal fundamentalists.

Q5:

It is almost impossible to predict what the potential impact of content will be for all groups who may or may not access such content. Content should be classified for what it is, and not what some-one might interpret. Keep classification objective not subjective! Yes, content designed for children should be classified across all media. Unfortunately the sheer volume of content that children are exposed to today is huge, and it is often this that courses desensitisation or acceptance of material that would otherwise be unacceptable, or unknown by children. However saying this it would be extremely difficult to classify all media, specifically that of print material (books in particular); focus should initially be geared at video, advertising, magazines and newspapers.

Q6:

No, content should be classified for its content, not its potential to reach a certain market, or mass market. If prioritisation of classification was an issue however, then targeting content that has mass market, or potential mass market distribution first would make sense.

Q7:

No, I don't believe artworks need to be classified, as art exhibitions always have a synopsis of the material/exhibition, this should be enough for people to make up their minds about whether they want to see the exhibition.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No, classify based on content not 'potential size and composition of the audience. Keep it objective

Q10:

Ideally yes, content in the home shouldn't need classification, as you have already made an informed choice of whether to watch/listen/look/read etc. Content in public is open

Q11:

How graphic the content is, if it is something you would be exposed to in everyday normal life, if it is something that requires further explanation (should children be exposed to it)

Q12:

Apart from removing the internet altogether, there is no effective way of restricting content on the internet. In a work or school environment blocking websites is effective, and this is reasonable for those environments. However for the home environment online content should not be classified or restricted. Adults should be able to have access to information (freedom of information I believe) and parents should be responsible for restricting access to content for their children (responsible parenting)

Q13:

By educating parents primarily. It is their (our) responsibility, not the governments! Software for home computers, parental monitoring and restrictions, teaching children about responsible and appropriate use for the internet. Placing censorship and restrictions/classifications is more likely to restrict the baby boomer generation than the y generation!

Q14:

Is the channel 9 or ABC news restricted? What did the world wake up to on September 11, who saw the story of the 9 year old girl raped and murdered, who heard about the family who were gunned down in the street? Is it really any worse to be exposed to these sort of things as sexually explicit magazines. I restrict the viewing of news for my children until they are of an age to understand the terrible things that happen in the world, that is my responsibility as a parent. The same as it is my responsibility to restrict or share sexually explicit magazines. It is reasonable to not have these magazines in the open on newstands, but really how different is the cover of playboy to the cover of any of the current fashion magazine, which show plenty of cleavage and skin. This is the world we live in, there is no going back, there is just reinforcing parental supervision and responsibility

Q15:

When it is open to public scrutiny/viewing

Q16:

To provide an expert (and unbiased) panel for the development and implementation of required classification. For industry bodies to be respectful of peoples choices, for regulatory bodies to be fair and just and not swayed by religious zealots, or radicals

Q17:

No. Regulation authorities should be comprised of a panel of experts, human liberaterians, consumers, government representatives, and industry partners. No one group should be responsible for developing classifications and codes, it needs to be consultative with the appropriate people

Q18:

If there are clear guidelines for classification categories/requirement it would be reasonable for industry to classify all content. Provided there was a system of notification or inappropriately classified content with relevant penalty to the industry who classified inappropriately

Q19:

Small independent local (i.e. Australian) content could be subsidised, or given the restricted audience this type of media gets classification free period or self classification would be reasonable

Q20:

Yes, although some confusion with regards to the M classification now that there is M and MA. It is more relevant to have classification based on content descriptors rather than age restrictions.

Q21:

R rated classification could be altered to include classification based on violence/horror or sexual content; with specification regarding the nature of the content (eg sexual content of an 'extreme' nature such as S & M etc vs heterosexual/homosexual sexual activity should be classified differently.

Q22:

Same symbols, criteria and content.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

Online restrictions should be the same as all media restrictions, there shouldn't be special restrictions for online content that doesn't exist in other media types such as movies, print material etc.

Q25:

No, refused classification shouldn't exist, and online there will always be people who get around censorship. It would be much better to classify this content eg R + Sexual extreme behaviour etc

Q26:

Yes, classification laws should be federally based not state or territory based.

Q27:

Federal/National classification scheme

Q28:

Yes, state representation on panel of experts developing and regulating classification would be reasonable

Q29:

Current levels of classification seem reasonable. Improve consistency between states, remove "refused classification" category, and reclassify

Other comments:

Censorship does not improve safety or minimise exposure of 'at risk' groups such as children.

Censorship promotes power inequity.