

CI 1444 K Lang

First name: Kim

Last name: Lang

Q1:

A new more transparent framework is the most desirable outcome.

Q2:

Transparency and the correct classification of all materials. Not censorship or denial of classification for materials currently beyond the scope of the system.

Q3:

Yes, classification of some content is prohibitively expensive. Forced classification in fields such as online video, web games, phone apps would make participation in the industries undesirable, stifle creativity and put the Australian market at a disadvantage internationally.

Q4:

Yes, but there should be a framework for the dismissal of frivolous complaints so they cannot be used to hinder competition.

Q5:

No, see response to Q3. Voluntary classification should be more than sufficient.

Q6:

No

Q7:

No, absolutely not. People Do Not have the right to not be offended.

Q8:

No, strong language warnings are quite sufficient possibly superfluous.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

There are none. Seriously the Internet perceives censorship as damage and routes around it.

Q13:

Better, by putting serious onus on parents to keep computers public and in open spaces, and not use them as baby sitters. Children will find ways around any censor ware with relative ease the more important approach is to make sure they browse safely.

Q14:

There is no need.

Furthermore the current classification regime perpetuates negative body images, as magazines censor normal genitalia. leading women to get vaginoplasty and breast augmentation.

Q15:

in retail sale

Q16:

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Q19:

Yes

Q20:

Yes

Q21:

Yes, Computer games need an R 18+ pretty desperately.

As it stands there is no consistency as to what will or will not be granted classification in the MA15. Often times games that are R rated elsewhere in the world get put into the MA15 here where they do not belong. while other games are simply denied classification altogether. I am an adult age 33 I work, I vote I play games, I play games not made for kids.

Q22:

Pretty obvious really.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

None. Illegal content should be monitored and prosecuted where possible but attempting to censor the Internet is ultimately futile and a massive waste of resources.

Q25:

No. Much that is included in the RC category is well within acceptable public standards. Among my main objections to censorship are:

A. it is almost inevitably wrong, banned content is often held in high esteem over time (see lady chaterlies lover, A clockwork Orange etc.).

B. Censors are often a full decade behind what is publicly acceptable.

C. censors seemingly never apologise.

D. Censorship is opaque hard appeal and very powerful.

Q26:

Yes, states add an altogether unnecessary layer of bureaucratic nonsense. Nationalise classification.

Q27:

A transparent national system.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Other comments: