

CI 816 N Carruthers

First name: Nicholas

Last name: Carruthers

Q1:

In this instance, as long as the proposal addresses the full spectrum of classification, then whether it is a new or an improved framework is moot.

Q2:

To provide the consumer with clear guidelines about the nature of the content on sale.

Q3:

No there should be no discrimination based on technology or platform. If it's available then the classification guidelines should be uniform.

Q4:

No. Complaints should never drive classification; only aid in ensuring classification was correctly applied in the first instance.

Q5:

Yes, If it is not, then all classification is arbitrary censorship, rather than censorship driven by commonplace acceptance of social norms. All content should be classified across all media.

Q6:

No. Again, this undermines the validity of classification. It should be applied, on a non-discriminatory basis to all media regardless of scope/exposure/medium.

Q7:

This needs more definition. "artwork" is very loaded and ambivalent language. "Art" from a classification perspective will inevitably always be wrong. I cannot comment without some stricter language definitions.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Not whether it should be classified, but how it is classified can be affected.

Q11:

Personally, I view classification exclusively as a method for identifying elements of a product without spoiling it - for instance, I am not a fan of horror, so when the classification flag for a movie states supernatural horror elements, I know, without ruining the movie for myself or anyone else, that I am not the target audience. This is really the sole factor for classification; it is a tool to ensure the appropriateness of what we are viewing, nothing else. Any other bases for applying censorship are asserting propaganda and moral judgement rather than practical employment of classification.

Q12:

Good luck.

Q13:

Parenting. Parenting. Good parenting. Exclusively, parenting. Anything else is a lie and an intrusion.

Q14:

Does it need to be better controlled? I have not seen any evidence that shows that there are problems with how it is currently controlled.

Q15:

All content should show the classification advice (even if it is just to say that this content is G rated) and the relevant ratings indicators (eg: drug references, adult themes, et al)

Q16:

Establishment of transparent, rationally based rules for applying classification then a polite, but complete, withdrawal from the field. Provision of Oversight Committee that conducts hearings publicly is ok.

Q17:

There are no instances of media-providers with self-regulated codes ever actually doing anything productive with those codes. For example, Australian journalism functions under the auspices of an industry regulated code. The code has proven to be worth less than any reprinting of it that occurs. It's unenforceable and its controllers have a vested interest in never investigating any alleged breach.

Q18:

Either none or all. There should be NO middle ground.

Q19:

This can be means tested; am not averse to subsidising relevant parties. Only stipulation is that steps must be taken to ensure that any means-testing is relevant and particular to the format - as costs are not comparative across different media.

Q20:

Yes they are. The only confusion is the ridiculous discrimination applying to video games not having an 18+ rating.

Q21:

There needs to be an 18+ video game rating for four crucial reasons:

- 1) At present, the ratings system is discriminatory (by applying different standards to different media) which makes it propaganda. Levelling the playing field (by giving video gamers 18+ rated games) means that we have a rational system based on clearly identifying needs and content rather than arbitrary value judgements.
- 2) The average age of video gamers is 31 years of age. As such, the current classification hierarchy means that mature adults, with families, votes, full time jobs et al, are being deprived material that is made for them.
- 3) The current system creates a false dichotomy where it appears to provide protections without actually doing so. Case in point: Sega's 2010 Aliens Vs Predators game. It was initially denied classification. Sega refused to change any details and resubmitted it for classification. On its second attempt, it was granted an M15+ - meaning that, under the guise of protecting children, adult content was released with an M15+ rating. Which is not any kind of protection at all.
- 4) Actual protection - when there is an 18+ rating for video games, no-one has any interest or potential gain in trying to get their games "underclassified" - the main market for video games is people over 18 with disposable incomes - so games publishers have a vested interest in providing

content and not alienating their fanbase. As such, providing 18+ rating actually DOES protect children as inappropriate materials will not be legally available to them.

Q22:

As I have discussed at length above, any time there are discrepancies between classifications across media, this is propaganda, not productive classification.

Q23:

Yes, and corrected.

Q24:

Online it is impossible to prohibit any content. To attempt so is to waste public money openly.

(Note - there is plenty of material that is not wanted, but that was not what the question asked.)

Q25:

Not until there is an rebalancing of the classification criteria. At the moment, due to these discrepancies, there is a significant body of material that one could attempt to restrict (as per video games classifications) then fail to uphold due to other classifications codes.

Q26:

It needs to be uniform and federal.

Q27:

What are the options? Without some context, this question is a waste of time.

Q28:

Yes,

Q29:

Take it out of the hands of Attorneys General to ensure that a vocal minority does not get to stranglehold the nation's interests.

Other comments:

The legislation at present mandates that people who play video games are children and must be treated so. This is in spite of significant evidence to the contrary. Worse, the main victims are people over 30 (so voters, taxpayers) and there is a significant IT presence in their numbers. It is as if the government is trying to tell its people that while we want the social benefits of an informational infrastructure, we will assume anyone involved with it is a child.