

CI 1066 P Hodgkin

First name: Possum

Last name: Hodgkin

Q1:

The disparity between the various legislative texts governing different media and at each level of government only results in viewer confusion. All classification guidelines should be unified into a single piece of legislation, and state guidelines should be removed in favour of a national scheme.

Q2:

To educate the public so that they may make their own informed decisions.

Q3:

No, how a content is viewed does not usually significantly alter its content. However, the way in which content is produced can certainly affect the viability of classification. Everyone can record video of anything and upload it, requiring each and every video to be classified is not realistic. Rather there should be safe havens, in which all material is classified, places where parents and children know they will not run into unclassified content, and then there should be the rest of the web, where informed citizens can make their own choices and take their own chances.

Q4:

I am frequently offended by today tonight, should it have a warning stating "lies within"? No, just because one sensitive person found something "offensive", does not mean all other adults should be restricted from it.

Q5:

Potential impact is impossible to judge, media should be classified according to its content, the impact should be left to viewer discretion

Q6:

Yes, given that we have limited resources available, prioritising classification to media with a large audience seems financially prudent.

Q7:

No artwork should be "required" to be classified, if an item is classified it should only be for consumer advice.

Q8:

It seems logical to assume that all media be treated equally.

Q9:

As I said earlier, there should be "safe havens", mediums through which viewers can expect classified content.

Q10:

There should be no restrictions on what media one can consume at home, however, providing classification for consumer advice is reasonable.

Q11:

Media should be classified when a viewer is unlikely to have researched or had prior warning of the content.

Q12:

There are no effective mechanisms for "controlling" access, people will get whatever they want online, that can't be stopped. It is possible however to educate children on how to surf the web effectively and safely. Education is far preferable to, and far more effective than, censorship.

Q13:

It can't be "controlled", stop trying to control everything, educate children and parents well and let them take care of themselves.

Q14:

It should not be "controlled", children are not stupid and adults can make their own decisions. Inform and educate, let citizens make their own informed decisions.

Q15:

When it is displayed in a "safe haven", through a method of transmission where classifications are expected.

Q16:

Industry bodies should voluntarily create media "safe havens", where all content is classified, government should set the guidelines for each level of classification and ensure industry follows those guidelines, and the users should be able to choose whether or not to view classified content or unclassified content.

Q17:

It would likely make the quick classification of reactive and interactive media quicker and more responsive.

Q18:

All content which clearly falls within the well defined parameters of government classification guidelines. Particularly where content has not changed in nature significantly since the last iteration of a product.

Q19:

All media should only need to be classified if it will be displayed in a "safe haven" of classified content, otherwise there should be no requirement for classification prior to distribution.

Q20:

They are broadly understood but mostly ignored. The difference between M and MA is largely technical since it is rarely enforced and seems rather arbitrary. RC is ridiculous. R18+ is the only really usable point of distinction between things suited for minors and things suited for adults.

Q21:

M and MA should be merged. RC should be removed. There should be R18+ rating for all RC content, and all forms of media should be able to have an R18+ rating.

Defining content based on the viewer's age is anachronistic, since people develop at different rates. Instead classifying content solely by the relative level of violence, sex, and adult themes should be enough to let an informed populace make its own decisions.

Q22:

Simplified rating guidelines for users, clearer markings of actual violence/sex levels. Links to user reviews of content.

Q23:

yes.

Q24:

None. It is entirely impossible to prohibit access to any content online, and it is outside the scope of a geographical government to control a medium that is without borders or location. The perpetrators of crimes against children should be prosecuted, not those who witness those crimes online. In the majority of cases child abuse happens in the home, not on the internet, and it is perpetrated by family members, not by strangers. Stop trying to build these ridiculously ineffective little firewalls, actually go after the people who are hurting kids.

Q25:

No. The RC category should be abolished and replaced with either R18+ or some form of X (extreme) classification. It is not the job of government to dictate what informed adult citizenry can and can not watch.

Q26:

yes. state laws should be abolished and replaced with a unified national scheme, to reduce viewer confusion.

Q27:

Classification should be voluntarily undertaken by content distribution services, under unified government guidelines, the government should enforce the level of compliance these distribution services claim to provide, and vet the voluntary industry classification.

Q28:

Yes. States are ridiculous historical entities that are now largely meaningless.

Q29:

The government should stop trying to be a guardian of "decency", and stop trying to control what informed adult citizens can watch. Classification is a public service intended to inform the viewer. Classification will always be taken as a recommendation, and will often be ignored, trying to make it mandatory is ridiculous and impossible.

Other comments: