

CI 606 A Hartley

First name: Asa

Last name: Hartley

Q1:

Whichever is the least costly option. I don't believe this is an overly difficult issue on which to find resolution. Having said that, the only thing wrong with the existing framework is the fact that, due to lack of an R18+ category for games, many games that should belong in this category get shoehorned into the MA15 category largely unchanged, while others, clearly meant for an adult audience, simply get banned.

Q2:

It's simple; to accurately and adequately classify consumable media in such a way as to not disadvantage a major portion of the community, as is the case now and to adequately inform parents about content that may be unsuitable for those not of mature status.

Q3:

Yes, in a way. You cannot classify the internet, period. The internet doesn't work that way.

Q4:

Traditional media (movies, music, games) have a classification (if somewhat broken) procedure. Complaints generally come from right-wing religious nut-jobs with nothing better to do with their time than complain and assert their "moral" beliefs on the rest of society. Fortunately, the rest of society are intelligent enough to come to their own judgement about whether content found online is suitable for consumption. As I stated before, you cannot classify the internet. The internet doesn't work that way.

Q5:

This is a loaded question. There is no empirical evidence to confirm or deny whether content has any impact at all on peoples behavior.

Q6:

No, why should it? Content is content is content. It doesn't matter who produces it. An efficient and robust classification scheme should not discriminate.

Q7:

That is an interesting question, as art is subjective, but I have seen "art" that should not be subjected to viewing by children, so I guess the answer is yes.

Q8:

Yes. Audio content (especially spoken word) can contain subject matter unsuitable for some people.

Q9:

No. Refer to question 6. Same argument applies to the audience, as to the producers.

Q10:

No. a classification scheme should not be about restricting access to content, but about informing consumers about the nature of said content. Once informed, it is the sole responsibility of the consumer to decide whether said content should be consumed.

Q11:

Q12:

Education, education and education. As stated in two of the previous questions, you cannot classify the internet, period. The internet doesn't work that way.

Q13:

Education, education and education.

Q14:

I don't believe there is a problem with the way such magazines are currently controlled. Most, if not all of such content is packaged in such a way that it can not be perused without purchase, thus shifting the responsibility of sale to the retailer.

Q15:

Wherever it needs to, without being overly obtrusive. I believe that currently, classification markings on media, whether on shelves or on television, are more than sufficient.

Q16:

This is kind of a no-brainer isn't it? Government agencies should provide the framework for classification and review content according to the framework. Industry bodies should adhere to whatever rules are required of them by said government agencies. Consumers should seek to educate themselves about the classification.

Q17:

Experience has shown, that bodies with vested interest in industry are rarely capable of responsibility where self-regulation are concerned. Regulation should ALWAYS be performed by independent, non-invested parties. That party should be government.

Q18:

Industry should not classify. Government regulation should classify.

Q19:

The cost of classification should be the sole responsibility of the government. This is the only way to ensure a fair go for small or independent content creators. Furthermore, the cost of classification should never act as a barrier to the market, as it would now if mobile phone game creators were to become subject to the classification scheme as was planned.

Q20:

Having just viewed the ratings Here:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Classification_Board#Film_and_video_game_classifications I don't believe there should be much confusion.

Q21:

Perhaps a category specifically for children, if only to better inform parents on making purchasing decisions.

Q22:

All types of content should be treated the same.

Q23:

Probably? I don't know. I'm not going to take the time to read them all and try to discern their differences. I say, if it makes sense to do so, then do it.

Q24:

None. You cannot classify the internet, period. The internet doesn't work that way.

Q25:

No. Currently the RC category is used to prohibit content that would otherwise be perfectly legal.

Q26:

Yes. Any classification should be national. Content has no borders.

Q27:

National Classification Scheme.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Introduce R18+ classification for games would be a great start. This would stop the punishment of mature individuals by allowing them to access content that would otherwise be perfectly legal, and also stop content that would otherwise be rated R18+ to be shoehorned into the MA15+ category.

Other comments: