

## CI 293 B McFarlene

First name: Brendan

Last name: McFarlane

Q1:

Developing a new framework

Q2:

To enable clear and accessible classification to materials, to genuinely inform consumers of the type of material classified and to better inform consumers as to the reason certain classifications are given.

Q3:

No. Classifications should be homogenous in their application. The media is the target of classification, not the medium through which it is delivered. You cannot classify certain live feeds from the internet for example, however for static and known material that is subject to the classification authority, there should be a blanket determination of the content, regardless of the delivery mechanism.

Q4:

Yes. Classification should only apply to material that has been pulled out for special mention. Classification of all material is a pointless and draconian measure. Materials pertaining to certain industries of mass consumption, for instance films and video games, should all have a classification as they have the greatest opportunity to reach the highest level of exposure.

Q5:

Not sure what is meant by this question.

Q6:

Absolutely. The size and nature of certain distributors / producers directly affects their ability to reach a greater market audience and should therefore attract due scrutiny.

Q7:

Absolutely not. Classification is a subjective form of control. Where it does good is in the protection of maintaining society's prescribed norms and values. However art, as much as I hate to say it, is a function of change and spurs new thought and sometimes even paradigm shifts in a society's view of what is normal and acceptable. Classification authorities, and the process itself, should recognize that there are some sources of material that must continue to function as agents for progression and change.

Q8:

Only as a guide for informed decisions. Classification of any material should only be seen as a guide - only once the consumer experiences the material will the real, unique and personal affect be known.

Q9:

Yes. Where the producer has no control over the market uptake of their content and is unable to also control the monitoring and reporting of the consumers of the media, classification is required as a tool for guidance and information.

Q10:

Public content cannot vouchsafe its audience's credentials and should therefore be classified according to reformed, socially aware guidelines.

Q11:

When you consider that most material can be accessed through the internet, and that access to the internet is almost universal, it is very hard to see the justification for a classification system anyway. If somebody wants to see the latest gory movie or violent zombie video game, they will just download it.

Classifying something above a certain audiences legal ability to access it may sometimes have the reverse effect of what is desired. We all want what we can't have and putting a classification on some materials may lead to more people actually accessing it that would have done if it were not classified. The act of classification exalts material to a special status and those who are therefore barred from accessing the material will no doubt go out of their way to do so just to see what the fuss is about.

Q12:

Good luck.

Everyone who does not know how to circumvent government mandated internet barriers knows someone who does. By putting the power of content access into the hands of the computer and technology literate, you will create a market whereby those technologically elite will disseminate the classified or restricted information down to those who don't know how. People will pay for this service too.

Q13:

By their parent's knowing how to put a BIOS password on the computer? How do you control your child's access to any material offline? You don't! Children are by their nature inquisitive and very clever at outsmarting whatever barriers are put in place to stop them. Unless of course you wish to have brain-dead sheep growing up in Australia...

Seriously, train the parents. Does the responsibility honestly rest with the government to control this? REALLY? I never want my government to think it should be held responsible for ANY aspect of my children's upbringing. That is the responsibility of the parent. Assistance is appreciated, and there is enough of that already for the people who need it, but to think that the majority of parental responsibility rests with anyone other than the parent is a form of intellectual chloroform.

Q14:

I believe it is already pretty well controlled. You will never have a perfect system when children or teenagers are involved.

Q15:

If it satisfies the criteria of being a material that can be accessed by an uninformed, general target audience or market.

Q16:

Information for decision making purposes only.

Q17:

Yes. There must be a level of responsibility and flexibility allowed to industry material creators and distributors. Clear violations of set policy should be acted upon. By allowing industry a level of self

governance and responsibility over the classification of content, the scheme will be able to reach and classify more markets and materials.

Q18:

Educational materials. Historical texts and media. Non-contemporary materials.

Q19:

Where the target market is so small and distribution small also, the burden of cost should rest solely with the government.

Q20:

Yes. Expanded explanations of content may be necessary.

Q21:

Expanded content classification would be helpful. Just saying "violence" or "graphic violence" may not be informative. It should include descriptions that are contextual and an accurate portrayal of what occurs.

Q22:

Not sure.

Q23:

Have not read those materials.

Q24:

This comes back to the question of the effectiveness of such controls. Giving an answer on materials considered socially or morally offensive now will only look silly in the future when those norms and values change, as they do over time. By suppressing access to information regarding, say, self-harm techniques is not the right way to go about preventing people from hurting themselves. Preventing access to child pornography probably does not reduce the instance of child sexual abuse, although that's just speculation.

Censorship never works and only represses or mis-directs the search for information and can lead to uninformed debate and actions as a result.

Q25:

Have not seen that document.

Q26:

The norms and values of the Australian society should be designated at a federal level, if at all. It should not be that the norms and values are seen to be different between two different states. If the classification applies to one, it should apply to all, otherwise the justification for the classification stands on very shaky soil.

Q27:

Federal, standard classification scheme, if it doesn't exist already.

Q28:

Yes, if the rule applies to one, it should apply to all. Classification at a federal level is the only answer here then.

Q29:

By not treating its citizens as children who need to be spoonfed information. Sure, there are a bunch of wallys out there who don't understand the impact of certain materials and require guidance, but

banning materials for the whole group based on the incompetency of a few is not a pathway to greater education or understanding, it just pisses people off.

Other comments: