

CI 466 D Self

First name: David

Last name: Self

Q1:

The latter. The framework on the whole is very solid, but there are certain glaring omissions or inconsistencies which need rectification.

Q2:

To prevent the exposure of disturbing or affecting material to those who do not have have capacity to understand it or the wisdom to know the right way to react to it. It should also make accidental exposure to those who do not wish to be exposed very difficult, while never infringing on a right-minded, consenting adult's right to access the material if he or she so chooses.

Q3:

The only platform I can think of is broadcast media. One can easily envision a situation in which someone accidentally stumbles upon some material they find offensive while changing channels on TV or the radio. The same situation is impossible of a properly labeled DVD or video game, which the user must deliberately insert into a player.

Q4:

No. Putting classification of specific content in the hands of the end user is counter productive. Classification should be determined by unbiased viewers.

Q5:

Only if that impact is backed by scientific study showing a clear cause and effect.

Q6:

Absolutely not. The content remains the same regardless of how many people view it.

Q7:

Yes. Although access should only be restricted in extreme cases. Art is supposed to be cutting edge and it's supposed to offend some people, but I see no problem in advising the potential viewer of something which they may wish to avoid.

Q8:

Yes, although not banned. Never banned. Advising the potential buyer of possibly offensive material is just fine.

Q9:

No. The content remains the same regardless of how many people view it.

Q10:

I see no reason why it should.

Q11:

The key is consistency. If you classify some content, you should classify it all the same way.

Q12:

Q13:

It is the responsibility of their guardian to prevent them from viewing this content.

Q14:

It is the responsibility of their guardian to prevent them from viewing this content.

Q15:

It should be clearly visible on packaging and advertising.

Q16:

Q17:

Yes.

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

many do not understand that MA15+ and R18+ are legally restricted categories and supplying or showing minors content with these ratings is illegal. These should be better enforced, in my opinion.

Q21:

No. The current set of classification categories covers the range quite well, in my opinion.

Q22:

Current formats of the same colour, shape and positioning of respective categories is fine, if applied consistently across the board.

Q23:

Yes. There should be a single, complete, nationwide document outlining the classification of media.

Q24:

none.

Q25:

Q26:

Yes.

Q27:

The classification scheme should be handled by the commonwealth. This should not be a state and

territory issue, classifications should be consistent nationwide.

Q28:

Absolutely.

Q29:

Other comments: