

CI 196 D Kehl

First name: Daniel

Last name: Kehl

Q1:

I believe a consistent classification scheme across media is necessary, which in my mind would be considered a new framework

Q2:

Classification to inform potential users of content.

Q3:

No. I believe the purpose of classification is to inform potential users of content, not to make assumptions on impact.

Q4:

Yes. I believe moving forward, it's going to be impractical to classify everything.

Q5:

I believe that "potential impact" is something that is still not well understood. As such, I don't believe it's enough to base a law off of. If content is explicitly designed for children, then it should ideally be classified to help parents make better informed decisions.

Q6:

No. That said, the requirements to get content classified should not be a major financial burden on said producers and distributors. If it is, then things become significantly more complicated.

Q7:

This would depend on where it was being exhibited. In public places where people may be exposed to it without fair warning(say a billboard), sure. In a showroom saying "Art by X", I believe that it's the responsibility of the potential user to expect some potential shock.

Q8:

Ideally yes.

Q9:

Ideally no, but practically speaking I believe that potential audience would be a significant factor.

Q10:

Yes. Content in public has the chance to be exposed to the unwilling. Content in the home is up to the home user, and thus such content should have more leeway in regards to classification requirement.

Q11:

I believe it should come down to potential for those unwilling to be exposed to the themes of said content. Public advertisements, public television, etc, should be classified. On the other hand, media that one would personally choose to consume, while ideally classified, should be a significantly lesser priority.

Q12:

I don't believe that restriction should be part of classification, and I also don't believe that there are many practical methods of restricting content.

Q13:

I believe this should be the responsibility of parents or guardians, with aid through teachers, and potentially software at the individuals computer level. I believe that supervision and education is a better solution than restriction, which is not practical.

Q14:

In terms of public exposure, at a retail level, retailers should have some responsibilities to keep unaccompanied minors out of their establishments.

Q15:

I don't believe it should be *required* at all except in the case of things targeted towards minors.

Q16:

I don't honestly believe any. Classification is useful, but until "potential impact" of content can be definitively demonstrated, I don't believe that government regulation is required.

Q17:

I believe that this is the optimal model to inform users of what they may be exposed to in consuming media. It's in the interests of the industries involved to have their product get to users who actually want it.

Q18:

Whatever a large enough portion of the community finds objectionable. Which is anything but obvious and straightforward.

Q19:

Ideally classification would not be so expensive as to need this, but perhaps smaller providers of content could be subsidised

Q20:

I believe the M and MA distinctions are completely misunderstood. I personally at least largely pay attention to the age, and it's not immediately obvious what the difference is.

Q21:

I think that M and MA should be merged. I also believe that the concept of RC is a crappy loophole for

ensorship that's pretending it's not.

Q22:

I believe that it's the content of media that should be explained in the classification (sexual themes, violence, coarse language, etc), and not the "potential impact". Base the final rating on the content. Weighting for "potential impact" is completely unreliable and is what leads to the difference in ratings.

Q23:

There should be a consistent consolidation of what themes in a work equate to what rating it gets, consistent across all media.

Q24:

None. Any offensive content can be ignored by a user if they so choose. Content that is offensive by its very nature (such as child porn) would be better served by trying to prevent and/or punish those creating it than by pretending it doesn't exist.

Q25:

I think the concept of Refused Classification is a waste of resources.

Q26:

I don't believe it's practical. While classification should be a guide, the reality is that the guide has different value for different individuals. Even a state based guideline, while perhaps more relevant to the members of the state, would still need to be altered for any given individual for it to be of use to them.

Q27:

I'm not familiar with legislative schemes that would be appropriate, I thought the purpose of this submission was to create a new one.

Q28:

Classification should be relegated to the federal level. Having an additional state level provides limited benefit and far more overhead.

Q29:

See comments.

Other comments:

I believe in the right of adults to consume the media they choose, and in parents to regulate what media their children consume.

I believe that the purpose of classification should be to inform the potential audience of what the media they wish to consume contains. I believe it should be a guide, and not make assumptions on what is appropriate and what is not. For adults, it's to let them know that something may be offensive to them. For children, it should be used to allow retailers to prevent sale to said children without

parental consent(legally binding). For parents, it should allow them to make *informed* decisions about whether a particular piece of content is what *they* would consider appropriate for their child(a guide).

I believe that "potential impact" is not a hard science, and is not strong enough to found a classification system on. I personally am quite affected by the diagrams of the inner eye at the optometrist - they make me feel ill. However, I play a violent video game such as MadWorld (a black and white game featuring over the top kills) and find the silliness amusing - not ill, and not to go out and chainsaw people. Different people will have different reactions, and I don't believe we even partially understand how this works.

When it comes to children, I am all for legally restricting the sale of content to children without parents or guardians present, but ultimately parents are responsible for their children and should have the final say. Classification should be a guideline for them to make those decisions.

I find that restricting content from adults based on it having no artistic merit is flawed, because this is highly subjective. Is a gruesome war scene purely gruesome, or is it done to highlight how gruesome war is? Was that the original intention to highlight this? Does it even matter if that's what some observers take away?

In cases where making the content involved illegal activity(snuff films, child porn, etc), while I am not opposed to restricting such content, I believe resources would be far more productively spent in attempting to prevent it's production and punishing the makers. The role of a classification board, even were it to stop the community at large from viewing such content, would not make it go away or even impact it for the people most affected by it. And thus I feel it's largely a waste of time and resources on their part, that would be better spent elsewhere.