

CI 1033 J Hardgraves

First name: Jonathan

Last name: Hardgraves

Q1:

The only focus should be establishing an 18+ rating equivalent so that the rating system can become an appropriate method for media selection rather than a vehicle for censorship.

It's disgraceful that for so long the rating system has been hijacked by those who wish to restrict the freedoms of others under the guise of 'protecting the children'.

Q2:

Preventing, at all costs, restricting the sale and distribution of media.

Providing information so that third parties can select appropriate media for young people.

Encouraging personal responsibility in the raising of children.

Q3:

Only media sold in stores without restrictions should be classified. Those who make purchases online are easily able to access information about the content of media. The only protection required is for those who do not have ready access to the likely content of the media which they wish to purchase. Classification should only be required to be displayed unrestricted within stores, it should not be a barrier just because at a future point this may be desired (online sales should be allowed prior to classification).

Q4:

An exemption from classification should be given to all media which believes itself clearly within the published guidelines for each classification below a newly established 18+. Once 25 complaints have been made the classification should be reviewed and penalties applied to those who willingly violated the rating guidelines equivalent to the cost of several nighttime tv spots.

Q5:

The impact of media has been shown by multiple studies to be far below expectation. The 'impact' should of course be taken in to account as that is the entire purpose of a rating system but only so far as to provide information to purchasers. Each individual is different and those closest to them have the best judgement as to the potential impact of media. It is the rating system's purpose to inform not to dictate.

Q6:

Complying with the ratings process is a costly affair which acts as a barrier to many smaller producers of media. Ratings requirements should take in to account this impact and only require classification where the viability of projects are not likely to be significantly impaired by this requirement. Large content producers should only be required to receive external classification if they have a history of violation or as per the answer of Q3.

Q7:

No. Attending an exhibition carries the implied assumption that some works may go beyond an individuals tolerance. This is the fault of the individual and not the exhibitors.

Requiring classification would effectively censor any possibly offensive material as individuals who do not respect individual freedom would coordinate campaigns to censor this material via the costs of classification compliance.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

None, the ability of content holders to afford classification should be the primary consideration.

Q12:

There is no effective method for restriction of online content. The only hindrance of such a scheme would be to otherwise law abiding citizens who must then jump through hoops to view media.

Q13:

Through parents taking personal responsibility for the safety and well being of their children. Public restrictions will only foster a false sense of security which will allow lazy and irresponsible parents to offload their responsibilities on the rest of society.

Just as it is an individual's choice to have children it should be an individuals responsibility to take care of them.

Q14:

They are already controlled to an adequate degree.

Q15:

When it is being sold in a physical store where shoppers are unable to access the content of the media before sale.

Q16:

Agencies should provide information where required, penalise those that willingly violate ratings guidelines, and ensure that any policy is not used as a weapon of censorship. Industry bodies should ensure that their interpretation of ratings does not lead to a lack of availability of content. Users should take personal responsibility for their children's upbringing.

Q17:

I'm not well enough aware of the topic to give an opinion.

Q18:

All content that is reasonably judged to be appropriate for those under 18.

Q19:

Any content in which classification would require subsidies should not be required to receive classification. If industry is effectively requiring classification then government should take steps to prevent this restriction.

Q20:

Most people understand current classifications from my experience although none can comprehend why a 18+ rating does not exist. Most don't believe you when you tell them.

Q21:

18+

Q22:

Comparisons between media will often lead to ridiculous classifications. The most important aspect of classifications is to find the real impact of media on those who are underaged. If no real harm is being done then a classification is unnecessary.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None. It is impossible to stop people accessing information online, censorship only hurts those that do not have a true motivation to infringe upon whatever is being restricted via false-positives or additional points of failure.

Q25:

No. No content should be restricted online. Individual users are easily able to access information as to the content of online media.

Q26:

Yes. Yet I have an inadequate level of expertise to suggest solutions.

Q27:

Yes. Yet I have an inadequate level of expertise to suggest solutions.

Q28:

Yes, provided the commonwealth demonstrates that they do not wish to censor the choices of individuals.

Q29:

Consistency and logic.

Other comments: