

CI 1745 K Grieser

First name: Karl

Last name: Grieser

Q1:

The current system is outdated and has been continually patched up as new media have been made the subject of classification. The system must be built afresh to incorporate the pervasive nature of the internet and publically accessible media.

Q2:

A uniform classification scheme for all media, with the same criteria used to classify material on all platforms.

Q3:

Q4:

Yes. Classifying all available content (including the internet) is infeasible. Furthermore, if the person making the complaint chose to access the material, rather than being exposed to it against their will, their complaint can be resolved by not looking at the offending material. Material should not be restricted to all if a single party voluntarily sought out the material and was offended by it.

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

No. If people are offended, they are free to not see it.

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Yes. Content accessed by people (who explicitly choose to access said content) in the privacy of their own home should not be scrutinised by the government or a classification body.

Q11:

The intended audience. E.g., if consenting adults are the intended audience of an art exhibition, it should not be classified. A publically broadcast sports event where the audience cannot be anticipated or controlled, should be classified.

Q12:

Manually classifying every web page on the internet.

Q13:

Better parental monitoring of the children. It is the parent or guardian's job to ensure the child is not accessing inappropriate content, and to decide what content is inappropriate for the child.

Q14:

Vendors making sure age restrictions are obeyed. I.e., not selling explicit content to minors.

Q15:

Q16:

Very little. Governments should not be able to choose what their citizens view. Citizens should be able to make their own choices on what content they desire they access, and their government should

respect those decisions, provided the content is legal. The government should not decide what is allowed or disallowed.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

As long as the audience of a piece of content (e.g., small film or small art exhibition) is aware of the subject material of the content and voluntarily chooses to see the content, no classification should be necessary.

Q20:

I think the current scheme is understandable (with regard to film and television), but its application to computer games causes confusion. As computer games have no R18+ rating, current computer game content is shoe-horned into the highest computer game rating (MA15+). This results in content that would be potentially classified as R18+ in other media being classified as MA15+ when occurring in a computer game. Computer games must be given a rating system comparable with other media to remove this ambiguity. I.e., an R18+ rating must be introduced to computer games to remove the exposure of inappropriate content to minors.

Q21:

See Q20.

Q22:

A single rating system that all media can be classified under.

Q23:

Yes. A single classification scheme is necessary for all media.

Q24:

None. People should be able to choose for themselves what content they wish to access in private. It should not be decided for them.

Q25:

Any classification system for online content is infeasible. No, the current RC category does not reflect the content that should be prohibited online.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

A single classification scheme for all content.

Other comments:

Privately accessed content that only impact on the accessor (e.g., books, internet sites) should not be subject to classification. Content that is broadly accessible (e.g., television, broad-scale film releases) should be restricted to appropriate audiences. Consenting adults should not have government bodies dictate what they can and can't see. It is their choice.