

CI 411 R Dransfield

First name: Rory

Last name: Dransfield

Q1:

The current framework is fine, but it needs to be applied equally to all medium that fall under the same jurisdiction, i.e. everything that is viewed as well as heard should be considered equally. Everything that is only viewed or only heard should also be considered equally.

Q2:

Protect minors from content deemed inappropriate to their social and mental development/well-being. Prevent access to content deemed illegal by the government.

Q3:

It should only affect HOW it is classified. There's three types of mediums: visual, audio, and audio/visual. Each of these three require their own set of guidelines.

Q4:

No, all should go through the same classification process.

Q5:

No. Who's to judge what 'potential' something has or does not have? As for children's content, it should receive the same level of classification as media for any other age group.

Q6:

Absolutely not.

Q7:

Yes. Films are just as much of an 'artwork' as paintings or sculptures, and both are as easily accessible as one another so they must be classified equally.

Q8:

No, simply because the guidelines for films, video games, etc, do not apply to audio because audio lacks visual content (quite obviously). While there are similarities, audio needs to be separated from media consisting of both audio and visual components.

Q9:

Absolutely not.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

Forcing internet providers to allow their customers to decide what level of filtration they desire for their plan, thus allowing parents to control what their offspring view on the internet without them having to be around to police every online activity. Enforcing filtration across ALL internet in Australia - regardless of the age of the person paying for their internet usage - is not a very smart move because, you know, adults like to decide what they can and cannot view in their own private time, and they find it demeaning that they cannot look at naked people if they want to because that is a freedom provided by the constitution.

Q13:

As mentioned above.

More observant parenting always helps as well.

Q14:

In the same way that children cannot easily obtain cigarettes.

Q15:

When it is provided for sale or for open public observation.

Q16:

Government bodies should be the sole ones involved. Industry bodies will consider profits over social benefits and there are too many 'users' to provide an even representation of opinion for regulation. Groups who decide to involve themselves more than others will have the final say even if they do not represent the public majority, i.e. the Australian Christian Lobby. That's how George W. Bush got elected the second time.

Q17:

Absolutely not.

Q18:

The most blatant of children's content, e.g. anything by the Wiggles, as it would be unlike them to try and slip something 'under the radar'.

Q19:

An exact budget cut-off should be applied to decide subsidisation. Any project that exceeds the allocated budget cut-off should have to pay for classification. Anything under it should be subsidised by the government.

Q20:

The only area where confusion is prevalent is in regards to the ratings for video games. Because of the restricted nature of the ratings system in Australia, many games that should be considered R18+ often fall under MA15+ ratings, and thus parents - often believing their children to be mature for their age - will provide them to kids as young as 12 or 13. Video games need to receive the same classification guidelines that are applied to all other audio/visual media.

Q21:

As mentioned above, an R18+ for video games is necessary. As it stands, minors as old as 15 can currently obtain content which would be unacceptable for an MA15+ movie. When a video game is denied classification, it usually alters very tiny facets to alter this outcome, i.e. removing bleeding from corpses or even the viewing of female nipples. This does not at all detract from that fact that there are people dying and engaging in sexual acts.

Q22:

Video, audio, and video/audio media need to be considered as separate entities. Consistency must be applied for areas where it applies to both (coarse language or drug references, for example), but each still has to be considered for what it is providing to the audience. The Bible mentions people having intercourse multiple times (particularly Abraham, that saucy dog) but we do not see it, thus it needs to be considered differently to a Biblical film where we actually see Abraham performing the deed.

Q23:

You might wish to phrase this question more simply, because almost all the people answering it will answer 'yes' or 'no' without understanding what has been asked.

But the answer is yes.

Q24:

Anything that is considered illegal by the Australian government, i.e. child pornography, videos of rape, etc.

Q25:

Absolutely not, especially because we do not yet have a consistent classification of content across similar media.

Q26:

It's quite important, but I cannot be bothered suggesting how to promote it because I am not being paid for any of this.

Q27:

A very similar scheme, though one that ensures that all media of a similar nature receives even classification.

Q28:

If it is required.

Q29:

I may have listed it above, but by treating every medium as it deserves to be treated. All audio gets treated the same, all visual gets treated the same, and all audio/visual gets treated the same.

Other comments:

This survey has been poorly publicised and I was only able to stumble across it due to my involvement with a certain community. If the government's final decision is based on the limited opinions of 14 year old gamers and 68 year old Catholic bishops - rather than Westernised common-sense - then may God have mercy on us all.