

CI 144 S Liefman

First name: Samuel

Last name: Liefman

Q1:

Develop a new framework due to the unworkable nature of the previous framework which fails to account for the rapid growth of material which an army of classifiers could not assess.

Q2:

To preserve the right of free speech for creators and to allow adults to consume any material they wish which's production does not require involuntary pain and suffering on the part of others, which lacks newsworthiness. It should detail what the material which may be objectionable to some, however any material aside from that which is not newsworthy involving involuntary pain and suffering, eg. child pornography and dog fighting should be banned, while scenes of terrorism should not be.

Q3:

No. All material should be treated equally unless consumption of the material is mandatory, eg. films viewed as part of a student's education should be classified while sites upon the internet should not be.

Q4:

Yes. The growth of user generated content makes it impossible to keep up with app stores and blogs to all be classified and any such attempt is ultimately futile.

Q5:

No. Adults can chose to seclude themselves from certain kinds of media and attempts to ban media for the general population because small segments find it objectionable should be disregarded.

No. User generated content can be aimed at children and is impossible to classify.

Q6:

No. Child pornography forms a tiny segment of the market and ignoring it simply would do a disservice to the children whom deserve protection.

Q7:

Only if exhibited in public.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Q12:

There are no effective ways to control content on the internet short of a white list of sites accessible to Australia, removable of all computers and replacement with new ones running only government approved software. This would legitimise dictatorial regimes whom restrict information and stifle Australia's place in the global world, restrict business and create a generation of unimaginative children unsuitable to run the country.

Q13:

The low uptake of government provided filters indicates a solution searching for a problem.

Q14:

There is no need for this. The current system prevents the offline material from reaching those it is unsuitable for adequately.

Q15:

When in public or a situation where it would not be expected to be viewed.

Q16:

The government should have a voluntary classification scheme where a government body classifies material the industry wishes it to. In essence the American style of classification but instead of industry bodies doing the classification the government would handle it.

Q17:

No.

Q18:

Pornography, extreme violence.

Q19:

When the lack of resources to pay for classification means Australia would likely not see the media without subsidisation of the price of classification.

Q20:

Fairly well. The difference between MA15+ and M.

Q21:

Yes. An R18+ rating for games. RC should be reduced.

Q22:

The rating system should apply equally to all kinds of media.

Q23:

Yes the current rating system is confusing due to the multiple different kinds of ratings for different media.

Q24:

Child pornography. The filter should be published because otherwise it lacks accountability and it should only be made by elected Australian officials.

Q25:

No. Much of material should be protected free speech and the category is overly broad.

Q26:

Yes. A single federal classification scheme.

Q27:

A purely voluntary scheme with the only material being banned that which includes material which's production requires involuntary pain and suffering, which lacks newsworthiness.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Less restrictive and be aimed at allowing adults to consume the material they wish.

Other comments: