

CI 1322 D Aked

First name: David

Last name: Aked

Q1:

Fine details is not adequate with existing framework. Framework is fine for 30 years ago. Not fine for current environment.

Q2:

Acknowledgement of a digital era (Online video, games, stories and content)

Q3:

No.. No scientific evidence that method of content access proves whether something is harder hitting or not. Broad overview is fine. (whether book, film or game)

Q4:

Ideally no. However, as noone can monitor EVERYTHING posted online, it will be a necessity.

Q5:

Potential impact is a dangerous term based on a minority group that has a loud voice. An example would be if I posted something anti-religious, representing my view point, could be viewed as having a major impact from the point of view of the religious lobby. So. No.

Q6:

No. Big or small. Same classification. No matter how many lawyers they have.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Yes. R or X rated material is prime example. They shouldn't be displayed in public. (Except in areas where consenting adults are present and aware that it will/may be displayed)

Q11:

Common Sense.

Q12:

Supervision. Almost all content is based on parental (or 18+) supervision. Combine this with Education. Nanny state will never work.

Q13:

Parental supervision. Parental education. (Filters do NOT work. If you can google how to bypass a filter than it is ineffective. 13 yr olds know how to google)

Q14:

As per Q13.. supervision and education.

Q15:

Packaging. Prior to display

Q16:

Fines to suppliers who fail to check for adequate identification. Information and advisory for parents + educators needing information on supervision and ideas.

Q17:

No. Throwing money down drain. It comes back to parental (18+) responsibility.

Q18:

Baited question. Content should be based on its individual merits.

Q19:

Classification is the realm of the the government and enforcers. If someone wants to release something, they must release it to classification first. If it passes, it gets distributed. If not. It is an offense to distribute.

Q20:

Classifications themselves understood. Reasoning behind individual pieces is shaky.

Q21:

All classifications in sense of G -> X are acceptable. No more needed. Provided all media are subjected to same classification.

Q22:

All content should be subjected to same classification.. To try and differentiate books/images/film/games is pointless as there is no evidence that one form of media has any more impact than another. (The bible in its written form affects as many people in positive and negative ways as the most violent first person shooter computer game)

Q23:

As I have not read the necessary acts I shall summarise my answer as "ALL media should be covered by the same rules"

Q24:

Good luck trying to police it. However, pedophilia, instructions on how to commit crimes that are not at the centre of ethical debate (Euthenasia, abortion).

Q25:

No. Not remotely. Too broad and encompasses the ideals of a conservation christian/catholic belief that in no way coincides with my atheist belief.

Q26:

Consistency is ideal, however, sometimes one state is more progressive than others. These should be respected. It will permit Australia the chance to move forward when you have one arch-conservative AG in 1 particular state blocking motions.

Q27:

Common sense prevails. (Won't happen)

Q28:

No. States still require individual powers. Again to prevent the issues of 1 idiot holding up the works.

Q29:

Acknowledgement of the wants of the people of Australia as opposed to a vocal minority (eg.. Australian Christian Lobby)

Other comments: