

CI 1427 M James

First name: Mark

Last name: James

Q1:

The development of a new framework is necessary course of action, due to antiquated preconceptions associated with the current system and the restrictive criteria, unable to cope with modern artistic and exploratory interpretation.

Q2:

The primary concerns of the new system should be to recognise the simple familiar symbols, codes and colours of the old system whilst embracing a new set of standards applicable to all media, without discrimination.

Q3:

No. All content should be classified, but arguments regarding "games being worse than movies which are worse than books" reek of an inherent lack of distinction in the motive of all these mediums; the communication of a story. It is this story which should form the context for the classification, similar to the current television model, rather than the sole notion of one individual. Books and television seem to have lead the way in regards to this contextual classification scheme; we specifically have books and explaining death and sex to children as well as television programs containing gore and sex in the context of a medical and educational view. To relegate this classification scheme only to one media shows a bias towards other platforms, such as digital and film, for the simple reason that the ruling body is uncomfortable with that media.

Q4:

No. Complaints of individuals can be the most destructive approach in democratic process, if focussed upon. Rather than seeking to please a distinct minority, the classification scheme should aim at providing a basis for individuals to determine their own usage and act accordingly with respect to their families.

Q5:

Content should always be contextually justified by the rating which is to be sought, and the standardisation of all media will help people find appropriate entertainment levels rather than a confusing mish-mash, like the television vs. film example used above.

Q6:

All content should be classified, but classification is only a guide for adults (and minimally restrictive for minors)

Q7:

Like religion, the government should not be involved in the content of art, but should encourage the activities and pieces that are largely beneficial to the community. Consumer advice is an excellent way gauging the suitability of pieces, but the appropriateness of works should be determined on a gallery basis, rather than at a governmental level. Censorship should not be used as a force, but clear messages from the community about appropriateness should be used. This is another aspect where the voices of the many should be regarded instead of the voices of the few.

Q8:

All media should be classified across an unbiased scheme, but only as guide for adults (and minimally restrictive for minors)

Q9:

All media should be classified across an unbiased scheme, but only as guide for adults (and minimally restrictive for minors)

Q10:

Content should not impeded on another person's lives or sensibilities in public arenas without their knowing consent, if the content could be misconstrued morally and contextually.

Q11:

Primarily context, some content features

Q12:

There is no effective method. The role of online content monitoring is a parental issue, and should be left entirely up to an individual to determine. It is both impractical and expensive to try and police the internet, and legislation debate would be more useful in other areas.

If this issue cannot be left, a free version of a Net Nanny style software should be made freely available to be downloaded at the individuals and can use the same standards as applied to all other media

Q13:

The only control should be parental supervision, or as stated above a completely voluntary Net Nanny Software piece be used.

Q14:

It is adequately controlled

Q15:

As content is displayed now, in a standardised place on packaging and/or in before the beginning of any content with minimal effect on and no interruption of the content

Q16:

Users should be the primary regulators, guided by government information, which is based on reviewing industry applications.

Q17:

The proposed would allow the industry to adjust to guidelines and approach the most appropriate classification compared with the binary decision of an arbitrary government body.

Q18:

All. Industry should apply with the appropriate level, with justification, and should be reviewed by government and either accepted or a compromise reached.

Q19:

Definitely. The application should include an approximate audience or product amount and a fee be introduced accordingly.

Q20:

The symbols are, but the composition of the categories are not.

Q21:

The system should either use the current ones but focus on the category levels, or introduce new ones entirely.

Q22:

New system

Q23:

The classification guide should be remade without bias towards adult orientated material

Q24:

None.

Q25:

No content should be restricted by government

Q26:

Classification should be federal guideline

Q27:

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: