

CI 945 JHitzke

First name: Joseph

Last name: Hitzke

Q1:

The inquiry should focus on the development of the framework but only on the condition that it does not bar currently accessible media and aims to broaden the media access in the country, ie: adult rated games - etcetera.

Q2:

The proper classification of media for each medium, allowing the rating of items but only restricting by age and not eliminating content entirely. Any adult should be entitled to watch what they wish - if that content contains illegal material it falls to the correct policing body to police and such illegal material should be classified by existing laws.

Q3:

Yes. I do not believe in the classification of websites as a standard of freedom of information. There are many corporate bodies who have done work on classification of websites and if you wish to filter an Internet connection for a child there are many free and paid services that would gladly help. The censorship of INTERACTIVE media is a personal choice made by the legal adult or the parent/guardian and SHOULD NOT be decided by a government department - however they should use classification to ADVISE of content.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

The potential impact of content varies from individual to individual. It is up to the individual or parent/guardian to make the choice for the content they view / interact with. The classification of the content is meant to advise the individual or parent/guardian - NOT limit the material available unless the individual in question is a minor.

Q6:

No, that is corruption of the system, everything should be classified to INFORM of the CONTENT in the material, but not censor it.

Q7:

Artwork exhibitions work on the premise of you voluntarily exposing yourself to them, it is an individuals choice or the choice of the individuals parent/guardian. They shouldn't be classified but people should be warned prior to the content of said exhibition.

Q8:

Yes, classification to warn of content but not censor or restrict.

Q9:

No, that is corruption of the system. Classification is to ADVISE of content NOT censor it.

Q10:

No, that is corruption of the system. Classification is to ADVISE of content NOT censor it.

Q11:

All content should be classified. Classification is to ADVISE of content NOT censor it.

Q12:

There is no way to control access to online content, there is always a way around any attempts to. All attempts to filter the content WILL affect the speed and reliability of the service and will breach privacy of individuals using the system. Classification of the websites is fine because classification is to ADVISE of content NOT censor it.

Q13:

By active measures by the parent. It is the PARENTS responsibility to control their children's access to the internet and what they should be exposed to and NOT the governments.

Q14:

The only control that can be put in place that does not breach privacy is age limitations to buy said materials.

Q15:

If you truly believe in classification for all material to ADVISE on the content of the material then it should be displayed always.

Q16:

Classification for materials is to advise of the content in the material. The only regulations that should be in place for content is the age limitation of buying sexually explicit or violent material. The classification should ADVISE of content NOT censor it. Materials should not be REFUSED CLASSIFICATION. If materials have illegal material, ex: snuff, child porn, zoophilia, etc they should be forwarded with all information to the correct policing authority (Federal Police or other)

Q17:

Yes, if the industry knew the limitations of the ratings system and they wanted content to be marketed towards a target audience they would better be able to market it towards them with a greater understanding.

Q18:

I can't think any.

Q19:

All content should be classified by the same organisation, if media flow becomes an issue then hire more people.

Q20:

Classification categories are understood but the requirements to fall within categories are not explicitly clear. How much violence is required to push a movie from M15+ to MA15+ for example.

Q21:

Yes. Adult rating for interactive media. The view that an adult rating when involving interactive media is absurd and offensive - all other media has an adult rating and interactive media does not which is restricting creativity and expression of ideas.

Q22:

A clearer classification system. The classifications should advise on what content is in the media, not who the media is for. Ex: strong language, sex scenes, drug usage.

Q23:

If the consolidation allows the ratings system to advise on content in the media and is a standard across all mediums, yes.

Q24:

None. If people want to access content on the Internet that is prohibited or blocked they will always find a way around it. Consider filtering as putting your thumb to the end of a hose, it's about that effective too.

Q25:

No, the current scope is too vague and too easily changeable. Especially in the case for Internet websites, any website that allows communal interaction via posts or comments is able to have illicit material posted upon them - and just because of events of this happening shouldn't mean the site should be prohibited. It should first have to be proven that the existence of the site is for posting material of that form before it should be "Refused Classification". However, I think the government needs to understand - it is impossible to censor or control what people view on the Internet, it is only possible to advise about the content and as it stands the Refused Classification list just stands as a list for people who are interested in that material to go through to find it, a signpost if you will.

Q26:

No, the classification needs to be federal.

Q27:

A classification system that only advises on content and doesn't censor it by refusing classification.

Q28:

Yes, but only on the condition that the media will only be CLASSIFIED, and advise us on the content, as opposed to CENSORED.

Q29:

Getting a broader spectrum of ages working in the classification part, giving more ages greater input on classification. I don't want to be told by an older representative that I can't read a book because it promotes homosexual-ism, I also don't want to be told by a Christian representative the same thing. There are many generational differences in views and currently the classification board is only representing a generation long past.

Other comments:

Classification is to advise individuals or parent/guardians on the content in material/media, it does not exist to CENSOR what material we can or cannot view.