

CI 241 M Walsh

First name: Mark

Last name: Walsh

Q1:

Develop a new framework. The existing framework was created before most of the new technologies currently available, where even invented.

Q2:

To classify the materials given to them, so that adults can make their own informed decisions as to it's suitability for their situation. A society where adults make their own decisions, is called a free society. A society where the decisions are made on behalf of all adults, is a totalitarian society. After all, we aren't talking about guns, or explosives, or dangerous chemicals, things that need to be regulated because of the inherent danger to society these things pose. We are talking about video games. Video games aren't going to explode if not handled correctly, nor can you beat someone to death with a DVD case. A video game can't be used as a weapon to rob a bank, or dropped into the water supply and poison people. We, our society, does not need protecting from video games.

Q3:

There is nothing wrong with classifying material that is being made available to the general public. Classifying something helps people make an informed decision as to it's suitability for them However, classifying material is one thing, banning things is a totally different question. A video game about zombies should not be banned. A video game about zombies that comes in a case with razor blades sticking out of it, that can easily slice of a person finger, that should be banned because of the inherent danger the case poses, but not because of the content.

Q4:

Publishers should classify the material they publish in the first instance. Any material release to the public should have a classification. Should a complaint be received about the classification the publisher has given to their material, then the material should be reviewed to see if the classification given to the material is suitable. The current guidelines for G PG M MA and R18 are quite clear and reasonable, and a publisher should have no problems in deciding which classification their material should be given.

Q5:

Potential impact? The last Wiggles album they released has the potential to bring down civilisation as we know it. However, the probability of this happening is extremely unlikely, but, even so, no matter how slight the chances, this potential impact does exist. Classifying material based on it's potential impact is way to broad and subjective, where even the most crazy and outlandish potential impacts proposed would have to be taken into consideration. Now if you want to look at the probable impact of the latest Wiggles album. Well, hopefully the publishers have reviewed the material and have concluded that it is suitable for children of all ages, that it won't drive mom and dad nuts when played

over and over in the car so they'll be happy to buy it for the kids, and make the publisher a lot of money. I'm sure the publisher would be more than happy to put a big "G Rated Suitable for all age groups." on the cover. In the same way the publishers of Southpark, put up a warning before every show saying the show is offensive, and should not be viewed by anyone. Provided the material isn't breaking any laws, laws against rape, laws against mistreatment of animals, etc, material shouldn't be banned because it depicts a zombie getting hit with a shovel, or because a character in the game injects himself with morphine after being wounded in a battle against space aliens.

Q6:

No

Q7:

Yes

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

Yes

Q11:

Q12:

There is no effective method. Any first year IT student at uni can tell you that. The internet is an all or nothing thing. Either you have access to it, or you don't. If you have access to it, then you have access to every piece of content that is being made available on the internet, and nothing can stop you from accessing it. Just as the people in China use Tor to access all the websites the Chinese government tries to block. Of course, that doesn't stop companies selling dumb politicians, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of useless equipment.

Q13:

By parents taking an active interest in what their children are doing. Allowing your children to use the internet is no different to allowing your children to play in the local playground. When your children are young, you go with them to the playground. As they grow older, and they demonstrate they can be responsible, you allow them to go to the playground by them selves. By this time, you've taught them about stranger danger, or other dangers, like crossing the road safely. You still have restrictions though. They are to go to the playground, and only to the playground, no going anywhere else. They have to be home by a certain time etc.

Q14:

There is no effective method. Any first year IT student at uni can tell you that. The internet is an all or

nothing thing. Either you have access to it, or you don't. If you have access to it, then you have access to every piece of content that is being made available on the internet, and nothing can stop you from accessing it, other than the content being removed, and even then, it's highly likely to have already been mirrored, and continues to be mirrored, so copies of the original content will be available indefinitely. Just as the people in China use Tor to access all the websites the Chinese government tries to block. Of course, that doesn't stop companies selling dumb politicians, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of useless equipment.

Q15:

I think all content should by default, be considered as restricted to adults, unless it explicitly states the content is suitable for children, the classification that applies, G, PG, M, or MA, and should carry consumer advice. I think that providing content for children up to the age of twelve, and young adults, aged thirteen to seventeen, is a privilege, given by parents to publishers, and that privilege should be revoked if a publisher is providing inappropriate material, that is, that doesn't meet the guidelines for G, PG M and MA.

This should apply no matter what form the content is, a movie, tv show, book, video game, art exhibition at the local gallery, toys etc. There would be nothing wrong with an art gallery having to start that an exhibition was 'G' and suitable for all ages, or M, not suitable for children under 15, or R, only adults over the age of 18 will be admitted.

Q16:

The 'regulation of content' is the responsibility of the attorney general, and unless we are going to change the way our government works, that isn't about to change. Or did you mean to ask what the respective roles government agencies, industry bodies and uses in the classification of content? Everyone should have input. And remember, views about what is acceptable and what isn't, change. A movie called The Moon is Blue, released in the early 1950's, was deemed to offensive to be seen by any adult, and was refused classification. Today, you can get that same movie at your local DVD shop, and it's rated G, suitable for all ages. Yes, a movie that was once refused classification for being so disgusting, that no adult should ever see it, is now deemed as suitable for any eight year old to watch by our current classification board. If this delightful movie, was instead a video game, as a classification refused item, it would be illegal to possess this movie in the form of a video game.

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Any content is easily classified using the current guidelines for movies. The current guidelines for classifying movies are pretty straight forward and suitable for classifying content regardless of the delivery method, movies, video games, books etc. If in doubt though, it should be as easy as possible for industry to have an items classification reviewed, and possibly even a reward such as a 'seal of approval' for publishers that consistently demonstrate responsible classifications of the things they publish.

Q19:

Having a small independent film classified shouldn't be so expensive that it needs to be subsidised by the government in the first place. I can't imagine why it should cost more than a couple a hundred dollars to have a film classified. I'll gladly classify a film for you for fifty bucks.

Q20:

I think the existing classification categories have been around for so long, they are well understood by the community and don't cause any confusion.

Q21:

No, the current system is just fine.

Q22:

Use the same ones that movies/DVD's currently use. They have been working fine for many years, and have proven very effective.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Are you suggesting that there are things that should not be able to be discussed, or even reported on, by an online news service? Should the prohibiting of putting information about suicide machines online, also prohibit a news site from reporting on suicide machines, or a forum site from discussing the pros and cons of assisted suicide? Who gets to decide which discussion on suicide machines gets to stay, and which one gets banned? Should every reference to suicide machines be taken off the internet, other wise children will read about them, and make their own? I'm sure there are lots of topics our government, any government, wouldn't like it's citizens to be discussing. But people should be free to discuss, anything they want online, without fear of government repression.

Q25:

No, because the current Refused Classification category, includes video games, that while never intended for children, have been banned, because they were not suitable for children. The current regulation has ended up with a situation where adults, intelligent consenting adults, have been banned from playing video games that are designed to be played by adults, because these video games, you know, the ones designed to be played by adults, are not suitable to be played by children. Or, another way to put it, only children's video games are allowed in this country, adult video games, by proxy of the Refused Classification category, have been, totally, completely, one hundred percent banned. Or, put another way, the entire adult population of Australia, must be protected from these dangerous adult video games because otherwise, their children will get access to them and that will be the end of society as we know it.

Q26:

State governments are a waste of space and resources, and are nothing more than a money sink for

our taxes and should be abolished. We live in one country, where everyone is equal, and the laws should apply equally to everyone, and not depend on what side of an imaginary line on the ground they are standing on.

Q27:

A commonwealth classification scheme is all we need. Some imaginary line on the ground should not be the basis for deciding what books I can or can't read. A book or movie, or video game, if available to some, should be available to all. To say that, you people on that side of this imaginary line on the ground that you can't see, are allowed to play such and such a game, and the people on this side of the imaginary line on the ground that no one can see, can't play that very same game, or read that book, or see that movie...pretty stupid huh?

Q28:

The states should refer all their powers to the commonwealth, close down, and go get proper jobs. Time to get rid of this ridiculous duplication of resources. What is available to some Australians, should always be available to all Australians.

Q29:

Stop treating media content as if it is some sort of plague that Australians need to be protected from.

Other comments: