

CI 1685 S Martin

First name: Scott

Last name: Martin

Q1:

Absolutely. The current framework is incredibly dated and simply does not accommodate the vast proportion of adults playing video games.

Q2:

To allow adults to make informed decisions about their media purchases for themselves and their children with a uniform set of standards across all media platforms.

Q3:

No. Not at all.

Q4:

This option does not offend me but it does seem lazy.

Q5:

The first question is meaningless nonsense, which I shall acknowledge only in saying: define "potential impact".

To the second question, I say yes. I exclude the broader realm of the web in general from this statement as I believe it should be treated by parents with the same regard as taking children out in public. If you do not take them to a porn store, they will not see porn.

Q6:

It should at least provide a sense of priority, perhaps. As independent writers, film makers and game developers are ever more prevalent, I do believe it is unreasonable to expect to classify them all upon public release. However, primary outlets of publication can surely manage.

Q7:

This is another stupidly vague question. Without examples, I can only guess at what was meant by "some artworks". If I were to attempt to answer honestly, I would say no.

Q8:

No more than it already is.

Q9:

Probably.

Q10:

Yes

Q11:

Q12:

I do not believe it should be classified at all. If a website exhibits illegal activity, the matter should be addressed by the police and the site stripped of DNS registration. As far as content is concerned, access control should be the responsibility of the end-user via the means outlined in the following question.

Q13:

Via locally installed parental controls on home computers. Content filtering technology is improving drastically and is easily manageable by local installations that reference centralised databases of catalogued sites. This model has been proven effective by a great many businesses. Households should have access to the same technology if they do not already.

Q14:

I do not believe the current means are at all insufficient and that any further restriction would simply be unfair to retailers and legitimate customers.

Q15:

Warnings and consumer advice is reasonable to expect on most media although, I believe this responsibility should lie with publishers. Classification markings should be required only on film, television, video games and theatre.

Q16:

Government bodies should be responsible for classifying film et cetera as they do now, however, I strongly believe that it is an infringement of our civil rights, beyond being incredibly intellectually insulting for government bodies to ever refuse classification thus banning release. Consumer advice and warnings et cetera should fall under the industry bodies' responsibility. The regulation of internet content, however, is entirely the responsibility of the end user, although, I believe the government should facilitate this by providing the tools to allow parents to do it.

Q17:

I think the idea has a good deal of merit and would be interested to see a thorough plan.

Q18:

If a thorough set of classification guidelines is established (ie the suggestion in the previous question), I see no reason why industry shouldn't be able to do it all. That idea aside, children's television, music, art exhibitions, news, non-fiction et cetera should be classifiable as such with very limited government intervention.

Q19:

I am unaware of the costs of classification and should you wish to get a genuine answer, perhaps it should have been included. Without that information, I can only guess but in doing so, I would suggest that some financial assistance be given to independent film-makers and game developers and the like.

Q20:

I believe they are. The only confusion arises when television shows are over-zealously classified regarding the specifics of what they contain. Terms like "Adult content/themes" are vague and often misleading (in that I often wonder at the end of a show what on earth they were referring to).

Q21:

Absolutely. Video games have been neglected severely. The fact that the majority of people who play video games are well over the age of 18, the fact that games for adults are consistently banned in Australia is simply outrageous. The fact that this issue has been so vocally represented throughout the gamer community while repeatedly countered by a few painfully old-fashioned conservative individuals is disappointing amelioration of the flaws in our legislative system.

Q22:

Media such as film, video games, and television that are far-reaching and especially personally engaging should all have a single framework for classification. To vary the standards between these mediums is simply foolish and unreasonable.

Q23:

Absolutely.

Q24:

Sites exhibiting the abuse of children, animals or other such illegal activity should be taken down and the responsible individuals pursued by police. Beyond that, nothing should be prohibited on the national level.

Q25:

I believe this is a futile avenue of discussion as per my answer to question 24.

Q26:

I believe it is important that people of all the states and territories be given the freedom to decide for themselves the media they partake in. Individual state representatives on conservative crusades should not be able to infringe upon the hobbies and interests of their constituents where no harm is perpetrated.

Q27:

I would like to see a government driven project to provide content filtering to households at either the software level or modem/router/firewall level (entirely within the household) with a centralised and maintained database of sites that can be flagged by end users to warn other end-users. I suggest this as a network administrator responsible for my company's content filtering who uses a Sonicwall appliance which works in just this fashion. The end result is a very reliable and thorough content filter that still provides the freedom to make specific exemptions for my company where what we have deemed necessary/acceptable differs from the database.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

The framework simply needs to involve more people. It seems to me that, as it stands, the same stuffy old people have been moderating our media and spoon-feeding the population for far too long. While we should, by all rights, be drifting away from the puritanical standards of the broader United States, it seems like we are involuntarily gravitating towards them. A great deal of Australia is not Christian or Muslim and thus have far more liberal views on sex than much of our media will acknowledge.

Other comments:

As I stated in the previous answer, I believe that the classification of sexual content is disproportionately severe in Australia. I believe there is a culture of traditional puritanism with religious roots within the classification board and that some of these guidelines need to be readdressed.