CI 1909 T Cho
First name: Thomas
Last name: Cho

Q1:
A simple reformation of the present system to better reflect the demographics of the userbase. For example, recent studies have established the age of your average gamer to be around thirty years of age, and yet there is a compelte absence of an adult rating for video games. There are further problems when content within Australia - classified for adults elsewhere in the world - is released under an MA15+ rating. An 18+ rating would grant greater control over access to this material. It would mean that, while yes there may be one or two extra games no longer censored, the key feature would be seperating adult content from the realm of MA15+ content, creating a clear line between what is suitable for teenagers and what is suitable for adults.

Q2:
To accomodate greater representation and openness. To avoid the restriction of content to one audience simply because another might be offended.

Q3:
Only in correlation to strong evidence. If there is no clear consensus by experts within the relevant field, then those outside the field can not make judgements.

Q4:
No. All content should have a general classification purely because this aids consumer choice. The classification should be applied as objectively as possible. It will assist parents in choosing what is suitable for their children, and assist adults in choosing what is suitable for themselves. It will aid businesses in their distribution and sales of these products.

Q5:
No. The potential 'impact' is not a reasonable assessment. Content should be assessed generally with guidelines reflecting the content, not a possible subjective interpretation. If it contains excessive violence then the content needs to be clearly labelled as such, it needs to be restricted in sale to only adults. The only things 'refused classification' should be those which go beyond all bounds of reason - such as Child Pornography.

Q6:
No. All markets, irrespective of size, deserve equal treatment. If a product is refused classification to a small market for causing offence, then so too should a product be refused classification to a mass market for causing offence.

Q7:
For the purposes of consumer advice, a reasonable warning of the content needs to be made - a general list of what the artwork contains (violence, sex). A strict classification (Adults only) should be left to the exhibitor.

Q8:
No. Audio content should have a strict system for informing of the content, but not for an age restriction itself.
Audio books should be classified in the same way as normal books.

Q9:

No. All content should be allowed classification except that which is an actual practice of an already illegal act - a recording of a real assault sold as entertainment, for example.

Q10:

Yes. There should be greater clasifications on public content - but only where it can not be avoided. A 'public showing' in a private complex that requires deliberate entry in order to view can not be considered the same as a billboard.

Q11:

The only factor should be whether the act depicted is already illegal and not shown in a reasonable, educational context.

Staged acts - such as shoot outs in movies - should be considered as such, not as a depcition of a real shooting.

Q12:

Consumer education. People will bypass filters and children will always access content they are legally restricted from purchasing, so educate parents on how to manage their personal computer and internet use. You can't stop people from accessing 'restricted content'. It will happen on purpose, and by accident, and no matter how much 'security' you put up somebody will always tear it down.

Q13:

Again, consumer education. Educate parents on how to use the filters built in to many routers and modems. Give parents the choice to download a voluntary filter which they can customise, and give them access to education and instructions on how to do so.

Q14:

Proof of ID and reasonable organisation of displays. Adults purchasing sexually explicit magazines will want their privacy anyway. Many stores already do this.

Q15:

On the packaging and in advertisements. In the case of digital distribution, clearly on all pages when viewing the product in preperation for purchase.

Q16:

To establish general guidelines to which content can be categorised.

Q17:

Yes, because an industry responds better to consumer behaviour than a government. Ineffective or misleading classification will hurt businesses more than they would be willing to take. It has also, according to many studies, worked very effectively in the US.

Q18:

All content, if the approach is right. A general classification to categorise the content.

Q19:

If the organisation is small, and their finances limited, a classification fee should reflect this - but only in instances where classification is voluntary. If classification is compulsory then no fee should be imposed at all, in the same way no fee is imposed for attending a vote.

Q20:

MA15+

There is already an M15 rating, what is the purpose of an MA15+ rating at all?

Q21:

R18+ for adults in respects to video games. MA15+ could then be merged, leaving a clear line between adult and adolescent content in the forms of R18+ and M15+ respectively.

Q22:

Universal and generalised warnings, clear colour coding and labelling of those warnings. And consistent categories. If you have an R18 category, all mediums should have this category.

Q23:

Yes and no. A simply universal guideline for all mediums should be adopted, where deviations are only directly linked to clear, strong evidence held to be true by expert consensus in the relevant field.

Q24:

Any content which makes financial gain from non-consenting participants.

Q25:

No. The RC category doesn't even properly reflect some of the content that has been refused classification.

Q26:

Yes, absolutely. It should be promoted through education and fact. It would mean that when I purchase content in one state it has the same classification in another. I could, otherwise, simply purchase a product in another state if I wanted it badly enough.

Q27:

A national-level classification scheme operating not under guidelines of 'acceptable and unacceptable', but under guidelines which will properly and effectively categorise content.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

By refusing to adopt any prohibition based on offense. Content can not be restricted simply because some people might be offended. It should be prohibited because a very fundamental basic right is being infringed upon. Nobody has the right to be 'not offended'.

Other comments:

The classification system needs to know the difference between offensive and illegal. You can't simply prohibit something because enough people don't want it. That's not good enough. We wouldn't censor a political party because it doesn't get enough voters, so why are we censoring film, television and games in the same way? And why are we using outmoded and out-dated attitudes in our regulation of content? Classification should be utilised in a way that allows consumers to make an informed choice, to give them the tools and the means to know which content they want to view and which content they want to avoid. We can not allow one audience to prohibit another from viewing a movie or playing a game based on their personal tastes.