

CI 1075 C Crossley

First name: Colin

Last name: Crossley

Q1:

A new framework is unnecessary and will only serve to confuse. The existing frame work is sufficient for use but may require improvement to fill existing gaps where classification is applied in an unbalanced manner (such as how movies are currently allowed to show violent content, yet video games are not held to the same standard).

Q2:

To classify materials in relation to how sensitive they are to those that would view them. The aim of such a scheme should not be to decide which materials are suitable for viewing or not, it should be to simply classify which age groups should be able to view them. Censorship in any form has no place in a free democratic society, although restriction by age is a sensible precaution.

Q3:

No. Materials should be classified based on their content, not their delivery.

Q4:

Yes, and no. No person or group should have the power to abitarily decide for the rest of us what we should or should not see. On the same token, just because an item is subject to complaints this should not be used as grounds of additional classification. All classification should be based on the contents, and simply judged which age limitations (if any) should be applied.

Q5:

No, because 'impact' is an abitary term that means different things to different people. Content should be examined impassively, without judgement or discrimination. All content, regardless of it's target audience should be examined and judged based on what it shows.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No. It is not for others to judge what art means, or to control what others may see.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

No material, provided that it does not constitute promotion of violent criminal activity, should ever be banned. If material is of a sensitive nature, it may be classified for restricted access on a predetermined basis only, but never banned outright.

Q12:

There are no 'effective' methods because of the way the Internet is designed, anyone who knows anything about the Internet knows this already but I guess politicians never will.

The best way to control content is simply to classify it and let adults makes decisions for themselves what they wish to see or not see, not to control it.

Q13:

Education. Parenting. Search engine/web page content classification.

Q14:

A simple classification that shows what content to expect, and parenting.

Q15:

Search engines, advertising, products.

Q16:

To classify, but not to condemn or censor.

Q17:

Yes. The issue with government control is that it is impossible to remove politics from the conversation, and what one group of people consider offensive may not be offensive to others. Let people decide for themselves what they should and should not see.

Q18:

All content.

Q19:

Government should only enforce the laws, not control the conversation.

Q20:

Yes, the existing classification system is well known and well understood. What it needs is better transparency and a greater consistency in how it is applied. Far too much political influence controls what classifications are given today, this is unacceptable.

Q21:

No. The existing classification system simply needs to be applicable regardless of media type.

Q22:

They simply need to be applied evenly regardless of the format used.

Q23:

Yes. The laws should be simple, clear and concise.

Q24:

Any that promotes violence or serious criminal activity. Other than that there should be no censorship of any material. Most centrally, opinions must never be suppressed under any circumstances.

Q25:

The RC classification is widely overused at present and should only be applied under specific circumstances. Additionally, any and all material marked RC should be transparently known.

Q26:

Yes. A national classification scheme is needed.

Q27:

What ever scheme is used it should be fair, consistent, transparent, and free of political or partisan influence.

Q28:

Yes, this I believe is the only way to ensure constancy in how classifications are applied.

Q29:

Censoring any content should only occur under the most extreme circumstances and should never occur for opinions or ideas. If any item is to be censored the process but be fully transparent with legal avenues and method of recourse available to follow if censorship has been applied unfairly.

Other comments:

Censorship of any kind has a far greater potential to harm a society than it does to protect one.

Censorship should never come into conflict with the public's freedom of speech, and it should never be used to suppress ideas or political opinions (as has been done under the existing process).