

CI 324 G Dick

First name: Graeme

Last name: Dick

Q1:

Developing a new framework in line with other the framework that every other media enjoys.

Q2:

Bringing the scheme up to date with the rest of the world, giving the consumer a more informed choice.

Q3:

No, because the only sensible question is, does this technology/platform have its own safeguards that ensure the classification restrictions are enforced? Since all current and future technology/platforms can be secured from access by minors whether by physical or electronic means, then the technology/platform in question should not come into consideration. Instead it is a question of personal responsibility.

Q4:

Yes.

Q5:

Potential impact is too vague a term to be considered as it leaves no room for clear delineation as to what has too much impact. Impact rides upon the individual's experience, meaning that any one piece of media could have as many different impacts as there are people. To relay something from personal experience, when I was about 12 or 13 I saw two very different movies one was "The Terminator" and the other "The Never Ending Story" which were classified M15+ & G. I thought the Terminator was cool at time, still do actually. The Never Ending Story however gave me nightmares, very vivid nightmares about the wolf at the end of the movie. Yes, a G rated movie was more scary to a child than The Terminator.

This is not to say that I don't think there are things that shouldn't be shown to children, there definitely are things that are inappropriate. I just think potential impact is not the way to go about defining just what those things are.

Oh and yes content for children should be classified across all media.

Q6:

No, never.

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

If the intended audience is a primarily that of minors then yes. If intended for an adult audience then no.

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

No content should be censored, ever. This is because it is self defeating, even content that is unquestionable wrong such child pornography should not be censored because at the end of the day the individuals that want such material will find a way to get it. It won't matter how harshly it is censored it will never stop everything. Also it leaves the door open to the question of "where do we stop" at what point is too much?

What we should be focusing on instead is improving communication between online users and the government/rest of the world on who to report such content to and what content exactly is illegal.

Q25:

No. The reason I say this is that there are things that have been given RC that I do not agree with personally, which is another way of saying that the current scope of RC is flawed and should not be extended to other media.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

I believe it is the right of any reasoning, mature individual to decide for themselves whether they wish to view/read/use any given content in "private". Provided that the creation of said content has and does not continue to inflict (unwilling) harm (physical or otherwise) on any individual or being. Only content that can be provably shown to have inflict such harm should be Refused Classification, and in all probability deemed illegal and its creators punished.

I believe it is the responsibility of any reasoned, mature individual to protect those who lack such from content that may impact on there development to becoming a reasoned, mature individual.

As such any new classification scheme should be a guide to help a individual fulfill said responsibility.

Public consumption however is a different matter entirely. Content displayed in a public area where audience is under no restriction is beyond the scope of such a scheme.