

CI 979 E Reeve

First name: Edward

Last name: Reeve

Q1:

Improve on existing elements. Standardize the current classification system, including the addition of an R18+ rating for video games, and ensure retailers adhere to those industry standards.

Q2:

To inform the consumer of the content of whatever media they choose to view, in order that individuals may make informed choices. It should not be to censor or restrict in any fashion, but rather to facilitate. It is the responsibility of parents and/or guardians to determine what media is suitable for their children, and they should be able to use a national classification scheme to inform these choices.

Q3:

No, because such platforms are merely a medium through which to transmit ideas and content. There is not currently, nor has there ever been, any conclusive research to support that harmful or long term effects on individuals are inherent to any particular form of digital media, but rather this is dependent on the content of said media.

Q4:

This is a pointless question, as there is no known subject matter on which every individual will agree. It is a basic fact of society that everything will offend somebody, and thus anything which might possibly be complained about will, inevitably, be complained about.

Q5:

No. There is always the potential for harm even in seemingly banal media, thus it would be practically impossible to classify all content on the basis of its potential harm. The only way to ensure a free exchange of views and information is to restrict content only once it has been proven beyond reasonable doubt to be a significant danger to the public.

Q6:

No. As before with the question regarding whether the technology or platform used to access content should affect its classification, the medium through which content is transmitted has no bearing on judgements relating to the content itself. This also extends to include the pervasiveness within society of that medium.

Q7:

If so, a decisive definition of "artwork" would first have to be reached. The design of household furniture or architecture requires creative input, as well as practical consideration; to what extent do these endeavors qualify as "art"? The creation of a video game requires the employment of teams of "artists" including writers, modelers and graphic designers; yet still video games are struggling to gain recognition within our society as an "art" form.

Again, this is another pointless question. It focusses on how we label the medium through which content is transmitted, rather than looking first and foremost at that content. The purpose of classification is to assist individuals in choosing what type of content they wish to consume, therefore

it is pointless to attempt to account for every possible variable in how those individuals might experience that content.

Q8:

See Q7.

Q9:

See Q7.

Q10:

See Q7.

Q11:

See Q7.

Q12:

It is practically impossible to control access to online content. The internet, by its very nature, is a completely free and open medium. The only effective way to approach it is to ensure sufficient public education so that individuals will be in the best possible position to access only the content which they choose to, and that parents/guardians may be informed enough to properly monitor what content they wish their children to have access to.

Q13:

That is entirely the responsibility of their parents/guardians, and no one else. It is the responsibility of the government to ensure those parents/guardians are educated sufficiently that they may make those choices for their own children in an informed manner.

Q14:

See Q13.

Q15:

In whatever manner may make it most visible without infringing on the content.

Q16:

Governments are responsible for educating the public so that they may make informed choices about what type of content they wish to consume. Industry bodies are responsible for upholding those governmental standards. Individuals, and only individuals, are responsible for regulating what content they wish to consume.

Q17:

Don't know.

Q18:

There is no such thing as an obvious or straightforward concept, it is entirely based on individual perception. See Q4.

Q19:

I fail to see what relevance this has to content classification.

Q20:

I have never encountered a situation in which any content categories are not clearly understood. The one exception is the distinction between the R18+ and X18+ categories, as it would appear the latter is somewhat redundant because any content it might contain could potentially be covered the former.

Q21:

There is no need for new classification categories, the current categories are sufficient in informing the consumer. There is also no need for reconsideration of the restrictions placed on the MA15+ and R18+ classifications, as long as such classifications are consistent across different types of media and as long as industry bodies uphold to government standards.

Q22:

See Q7.

Q23:

Don't know. I do know that classification standards should be upheld based on content, regardless of medium.

Q24:

None. It is impossible to properly enforce such prohibitions without potentially infringing on the freedom of unrelated or innocent content, as well as the fact that the majority of prohibited content online is shared in a Peer-to-Peer manner and thus completely impractical to monitor effectively.

Q25:

See Q24.

Q26:

It is very important, as it reflects the national government's responsibility to educate the entire public. The choices of individuals should not be constrained by what state they are located in. Freedom of speech and freedom of choice are fundamental human rights; I fail to see how state governments might alter them based on geography.

Q27:

Replacing the current system is unnecessary, rather it simply needs to be further refined.

Q28:

See Q26.

Q29:

See Q1.

Other comments:

Unless I have not yet made it clear, introduce an R18+ rating for video games. I think it's about time we joined the rest of the civilized world on this issue, hmm?

Have a nice day :)