

## CI 1317 G Thonemann

First name: Grant

Last name: Thonemann

Q1:

New framework. The sheer passage of time and change in technology and habits has made the current system archaic. Whilst social and public mores will always be impossible to define (and probably never should be defined), they have undoubtedly changed since the current system was envisaged.

Q2:

1. Reinforcing and assisting in classification according to current criminal and quasi-criminal law. (i.e. it should not attempt to create another layer of criminality which does not already exist and should largely not attempt to predict the mores of our society or any substantial part of it.
2. Be transparent and have clarity when attempting to exclude as a result of classification.
3. Attempt to guide rather than "ban". Complaint should always be considered but should never

Q3:

No. This is a result of practicality which overwhelms other considerations. Were a book or film classified in cinemas or bookshops but readily available online it would make a system of classification unenforceable and meaningless. It is presently inconceivable to block all access to undesirable content whatever filters are put in place and a move to enforce national censorship would be undesirable as a matter of principle.

Q4:

Complaint should always be considered but never be a determinant as to classification

Q5:

Probably not. How is "potential impact" to be judged? After 40 years of research there is far from any definitive answer to the question of whether playing a violent game can lead to the player being violent. Probably the question itself is completely unsuitable to research, principally because society/context is the cause of which a game is simply a small derivative part.

Probably "content designed for children" needs no classification at all! If the content contains egregious violence or recognisable pornography then it is not "content designed for children. Putting that aside and assuming "impact" is a relevant consideration (which may be a big assumption) then it may be that different classifications should be considered. Still, how a film watched at home should be differently classified from a film watched in a cinema is hard to see. But then what about the same film watched on a small mobile device?

Q6:

It is tempting to consider enforcement of stricter standards on larger producers or distributors. Sadly this has failed miserably in the past and as a matter of principle is probably inappropriate.

Q7:

Never. Never ever. If the content breaks a law, so be it. Galleries routinely describe the works to be exhibited, is it necessary to spell out that blood appears, or breasts, or death or whatever.

Q8:

Yes, but normally this should mean not classified at all.

Q9:

Yes, insofar as a musical performance for toddlers should not contain adult content.

Q10:

No. (see above as to why this means most content cannot be classified).

Q11:

Real violence in its context should not be classified, though there are circumstances where dwelling upon or focusing on a particular feature of violence or a repetition thereof may give rise to classification. Thus fetishistic displays in a public context should be classified, this might also apply to fetishistic sexual public content.

Q12:

There is probably no effective way. As to most effective, properly resourced policing and international policing co-operation is probably indicated.

Q13:

Better parenting.

Q14:

Better control is a pointless exercise. Appropriate guidelines as to display and access to minors is sufficient.

Q15:

Q16:

Government and industry should play a minimal role.

Q17:

Probably, though the imbalance of power amongst the biggest media players would be a major concern

Q18:

If it is "obvious and straightforward" then all such examples

Q19:

Small independent whatever should be subsidised otherwise the suppression of creative or new works would be ensured.

Q20:

I don't know, my impression is that very little attention is paid to anything but the broadest and most basic tenets of any classification.

Q21:

Most intermediate classifications should be removed, leaving us with an "X" and a "good for most kids"

Q22:

Reduce the layers, reduce the classification groupings.

Q23:

Q24:

If it is illegal (eg sexual traffic in children) enforcement agencies (the police) should be properly funded and empowered. International co-operation should be appropriately funded.

Q25:

No

Q26:

The states are irrelevant in a national and online environment, underfunded and uninformed. I believe that the Constitution would allow the Commonwealth to override the States.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes, if that is necessary.

Q29:

Other comments: