

CI 895 D Hames

First name: Duncan

Last name: Hames

Q1:

The latter, developing key elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to enable adult citizens to easily assess the suitability of any content, both for themselves and for their children. Censorship is to be avoided at all costs. A society that feels a need to censor content from its citizens is a society that lacks belief in itself.

Q3:

No. Whatever the content, the final impact on the consumer of the content is decided by the moral character of that person, not the technology it is delivered with.

Q4:

Yes. Affording industry a certain degree of self classification would lighten the workload on the classification board and reduce bureaucracy.

Q5:

No. Potential impact is far too vague to be properly classified. Parents and guardians need to take more responsibility for the content their children are partaking in.

Q6:

No. Market size has nothing to do with it. The same rules must apply to everyone.

Q7:

Yes, if an artwork is going to be quite controversial then it is reasonable that the classification board look at it and provide an assessment to avoid certain extremely loud sections of the community becoming upset that they saw a nipple.

Q8:

Yes, of course. Content is content. The results or implications of that content are subject to personal interpretation, otherwise it's not art, is it? Simplifying classification will do a great deal towards making people responsible for their own reactions, rather than blaming an artist they listened to.

Q9:

Perhaps in some cases. Particularly sexually related content, which is by its nature very segmented. Certain people find some things offensive that others may find arousing, but as long as it is not harming people unwillingly then that is their own business.

Q10:

Yes, I think for similar reasons as I gave in the previous answer. What people want to do in the privacy of their own home, so long as they are not wilfully harming others, is of no concern to government, religious groups, any other group or individual.

Q11:

I think there are already quite enough factors for content classification, adding more is unnecessary.

Q12:

The most effective methods for controlling access to online content is an old fashioned thing called parenting. It is not hard for parents to learn about Net-Nanny type software and effect some discipline. Blanket censoring is not the answer.

Q13:

It is always going to be nigh on impossible to control all access. Parents cannot watch their kids 100% of the time, and kids are naturally curious about taboo subjects. Trying to solve this with technology is futile. I personally sought out taboo subjects when I was young and I have turned out OK, because my parents instilled the basics of right and wrong.

Q14:

Access to this type of content is already extremely controlled. Magazines are covered on the shelf in convenience stores; the only other place you can buy them is adult shops. Going further would be ridiculous.

Q15:

When it is above the G rating, and in a public place that is not adults-only.

Q16:

Industry bodies should be given more tolerance for self classification, but where there are complaints or controversy, the classification board should be given the power to apply the classification guidelines and classify content accordingly. State governments should have the option of setting individual classification guidelines, or using a federal standard, to avoid the current situation where unelected governor-generals are effectively disrupting the entire system.

Users should continue to have the right to complain, and the people their complaint is affecting should have the right to tell the complainer to avoid their content.

Q17:

Unquestionably, yes. Classification schemes around the world are generally quite similar, with minor differences in target ages. Industry knows this and creates towards these classifications.

Q18:

Sports content, children's educational content are two that I can think of.

Q19:

If the co-regulatory models as alluded to in Question 17 are adapted, I think subsidisation will be largely unnecessary.

Q20:

I think the main confusion in the community surrounds the lack of R18+ rating for video games. It is well known amongst gaming enthusiasts that the average gamer is actually above 30 years of age, and not the stereotypical nerdy teenage boy in a basement.

Q21:

Just the addition of the R18+ video game category, and possibly even a sexually explicit category of video games for those so inclined.

Q22:

The simplest way is to classify all media with the same guidelines. No matter the media, it is still a subjective interpretation that is involved in formulating a reaction; whether that reaction is negative, positive, indifferent or outraged is a matter for the individual.

Q23:

Yes. Yes. Yes. Despite great efforts, a causative link between video games and violence has never been established. Individuals being unable to distinguish between a screen and reality are going to have problems no matter what society allows them to watch or play.

Q24:

Rape, snuff, child pornography. All of these have in common a non-consensuality which is what makes them perverse and irredeemable. Everything else is subject to taste. In the vast, vast majority of cases, people who are not actively seeking a particular subject will not be subjected to it. People who have a fetish for various acts or depictions which others may find offensive should be able to view them in the privacy of their own home, just as they can and do with actual physical sexual acts.

Q25:

Yes, it perhaps even goes too far. Bestiality, whilst not to my personal taste, does not involve animal cruelty and as such should not be illegal. People's perversions, and we all have them, are their own business.

Q26:

No it is not. As I suggested in Question 16, states should have the option of conforming to a federal standard, or setting their own classification. This will avoid the problems of the current legislation.

Q27:

I am in favour of the co-regulation model as outlined in section 38 of Issues Paper 40.

Q28:

Yes. Any system whereby unelected governor generals cannot effectively hold the entire country to ransom will be an improvement.

Q29:

Overall, reducing load for the classification board and emphasising that just as people have a right to watch things, others have a right to completely avoid them. Individuals complaining about content being released in Australia, particularly morally pious religious groups, should be encouraged to boycott the content and are free to encourage others to do so. Government censoring content to appease a few loud groups is the worst thing that can possibly happen, and is a very slippery slope towards the complete watering down of content to a bland and boring rubbish.

Other comments:

In relation to an R18+ classification for video games; whilst I am pleased that the community has been consulted quite extensively, I am concerned that the message is still not getting through. The average gamer is a male in his thirties, not a basement-dwelling nerdy teenager that the stereotype proclaims. My father is in his sixties and revels in racing, flying and yachting games.

Every day that Australia goes without an R18+ rating for video games reinforces the (obviously misled) global perception of our being a technological backwater.