

CI 1409 G Crce

First name: Goran

Last name: Grce

Q1:

Improving the existing framework.

Q2:

A scheme should inform the public about media content clearly and dispassionately, allowing people to make informed decisions about how they consume entertainment.

Q3:

No, we should be able to judge our entertainment on a standard set of principles that apply across the board, anything more is a belaboring of our moral philosophy and a civil society in which free speech is valued.

My understanding is that currently, the ratings boards watch footage of games and so on to classify them. I suggest the board hire staff who can play the games themselves to describe their content and the manner of interaction more accurately.

Q4:

No, the purpose of classification is to inform the consumer about content, the public deserves fair warning about what they may watch, listen to, or play.

Q5:

Medium should not play a role in whether or not the ratings board deems content objectionable for child audiences.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

All media can justifiably be classified, but one should err not to restrict access to exhibitions or performances.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Any kind of commercial, money making release should require classification. Content released for free on the internet should not be classified or its audience in any way restricted.

Q12:

There are no effective methods of restricting access to online content. Attempts to understand vast volumes of data and parse them properly for categorization according to content have occurred before. Many great minds have applied themselves to the problem of sorting internet data for certain kinds of

materials, especially in the field of national security. They have categorically failed. The problem is too complex.

With the history of data parsing attempts painting such a dire picture of even the most advanced attempts at 'internet filters', I am left with little hope that the Australian Government can successfully engineer a solution that wouldn't either be prohibitive and inconvenient, ineffective at hiding content, or both.

Q13:

Through supervision, and good parental care.

Q14:

Through supervision, and good parental care.

Q15:

In packaging, or integrated into the storefront page in the case of digital media.

Q16:

Users should be the ones who decide what media they will permit themselves access to. Government agencies should be obligated to inform users as clearly as possible about the content of media before they consume it.

Q17:

No. The job is straightforward and easy to perform as it is, the burden on the private sector to submit content for classification is not great, and the private sector's incentives for self-regulation are not readily apparent. The government should continue its work alone.

Q18:

I support the classification of all commercially released content, the question is not relevant to my position on the subject.

Q19:

The government should first look to lower the costs of applying for a classification overall before granting specific concessions.

Q20:

I personally feel they are understood, but also it seems many parents and interested parties fail to use them properly.

Q21:

Videogames currently do not enjoy a complete range of classification like other media, this should be remedied. Otherwise the current range of classifications is sufficient.

Q22:

Using the film system of G to R as a basis and developing standard categories for content like "strong language" or "violent themes" can then be applied to recordings, television, games, film... everywhere.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Depictions of child pornography and sexual violence should be pursued by investigators to discover and punish their makers and distributors. But not media depicting simulations of these acts (as in pornography where rape may be performed or paedophilic drawings)

Q25:

No, RC is actually rather stringent.

Q26:

States and territories should not be enforcing varying classification laws, we should be able to achieve a basic federal standard.

Q27:

Let there be a central federally based scheme that is well consolidated, well funded and easy to change in the future to reflect changes in arts and entertainment.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

It should be hardened against moral panics such as those surrounding videogames to better keep in mind more fundamental and testable forms of aesthetic and moral values.

Other comments:

Australia embarrasses itself when it bans videogames from sale. There's no reason to do this. A new videogame, no matter how bloody or crude, is usually a rather expensive thing, and the machine to play it on is expensive too, children cannot consume this content without the great help and active efforts of their parents, who can completely control their children's consumption of media. That fact alone makes such drastic measures seem crude and unsophisticated, they are not a credit to our culture.