

CI 1764 D Jansen

First name: Damian

Last name: Jansen

Q1:

Improvement on the current system. Classification criteria appear to be generally sensible, however the system also appears to assume that adults are neither incapable of monitoring the behaviour of a younger audience nor are entitled to view such Refused Classification content themselves.

Q2:

To inform, but not to restrict. Every person has the right to choice - but it should be an informed choice. In regards to content, adults need to have the information on hand to consider not only what they see, but what those under their care can see.

Q3:

The question is not as to whether it should be classified, but if the classification is affected. Everything should be classified, and if the content is directly interactive then further consideration should be given, however the platform is irrelevant.

Q4:

No, everything should be classified on its own merit, not on complaints. This is reactive - the content has already caused one or more people "harm" thus the whole concept of classification has failed.

Q5:

Again, the content should be classified regardless. Potential impact should be a consideration on how the content is classified.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

If it is indeed beyond that what is considered mainstream art, and portrays obscenities, then perhaps yes.

Q8:

Yes. It is still a media of content that can cause disturbance.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Again, the content should be classified regardless. Location is not the point, the information is.

Q11:

Nothing, it comes down to classifying what is available to ensure that the person has a point of information which they can base their decisions upon.

Q12:

Controlling access should be on the part of the parent. The information needs to be made available by the source.

Q13:

It simply cannot, other than informing the parent/guardian of the child.

Q14:

It simply cannot, other than informing the parent/guardian of the child, and maintaining an age restriction on purchase.

Q15:

Always, else the person cannot make an informed choice.

Q16:

Restricted content, if allowed to be purchased by a minor, should be a punishable offense.

Q17:

No, this would lead to loopholes and bypassing the management of classification.

Q18:

None. This behaviour would contradict the point of classification as the information is assumed, not researched.

Q19:

I have no opinion on this matter.

Q20:

I have no opinion on this matter.

Q21:

An R18+ classification. At present, anything that falls out of the M rating is denied, which is a contradiction to freedom of speech and own choice.

Q22:

It is reasonably straightforward as it is.

Q23:

Somewhat, but with exceptions. Interactivity may be deemed of having more impact on the viewer.

Q24:

That which is illegal to perform, and would have been illegal to create to distribute. i.e. child pornography, bestiality, murder (unless as part of appeal for information)

Q25:

No, it is too broad.

Q26:

Yes, what makes sense for one state makes sense for any other.

Q27:

I have no opinion on this matter.

Q28:

I have no opinion on this matter.

Q29:

Extend the display of classified media to that what is displayed within. For example, if a PG rated show is being displayed, it is an offense to display an advertisement for something that is of a higher classification such as M.

Other comments:

This must be open to give the viewer choice, but it also must be enforceable - and sensible. Take playing an advertisement for the M rated Buffy the Vampire Slayer, containing violence, the implication of sex and mature themes - during the showing of an episode of AstroBoy, rated PG.

As a parent, I have made my choice that my child can watch the cartoon, but it is unacceptable that he be subjected to the said display of mature content.