

CI 1497 A Wallis

First name: Alistair

Last name: Wallis

Q1:

Improving elements of the existing framework.

Q2:

To properly classify media released within Australia. Not to censor, ban, or otherwise make decisions regarding the appropriateness of release of the material on behalf of the public. Simply to properly classify it within the ratings system.

Q3:

Internet classification is a ridiculous, impossible and arguably harmful notion, and should not even be attempted by the classification board.

Q4:

In regards to internet classification, complaints could possibly feed into an opt-in filter database, but I can see no reason why broader classification of internet material should even be attempted. Otherwise, no, I think complaints should be irrelevant to the work of the classification board.

Q5:

The decision regarding what is and is not "designed for children" strikes me as a potentially dangerous one. Media should be classified based on its content, not guesses regarding its "potential impact". There should be no reason for the classification board to even consider this - the system should be used by parents to protect their own children based on their own beliefs, but the system should certainly not be forced to protect children for or instead of parents acting responsibly. Nor should any parent have any reason to decide what is or is not appropriate for any other person's children.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No. Absolutely not. The very idea of classification and restricted access to artwork is abhorrent and offensive.

Q8:

Audio books should be subject to the same classification measures as physical books. Music is a more problematic medium, and while I believe there is certainly a possibility that music can cause offense, I do not believe that it requires the same kind of rigorous classification system as films, TV, etc.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Outside factors should not influence the classification boards decisions in any manner.

Q12:

Opt-in filters. The previous Government offered one for free. The current Government seems to believe that this, along with proper parental supervision, is inadequate. This is erroneous, dangerous and potentially harmful to the freedom of Australians in general. The classification board should have no place in "regulating" the internet at all. I cannot word that strongly enough. There is no reason to go beyond opt-in filters. No reason at all.

Q13:

Through opt-in filters and proper parental supervision. If parents are not prepared to supervise and take steps to use any of the hundreds of available internet filters, they should have no right to complain about online content.

Q14:

Sexually explicit magazines are sold in opaque bags and only to people over the age of 18. This, to me, seems like entirely enough restriction.

Q15:

When it is being sold to potential consumers of said content.

Q16:

The classification board should handle classification. Dialogues with users such as this form are undoubtedly useful, but otherwise the board should be separate and immune to interference from the Government, industry bodies and users.

Q17:

No.

Q18:

None.

Q19:

Certainly, in terms of independent content - films, TV, video games - the Government should subsidise classification.

Q20:

The current categories are well understood.

Q21:

The only addition that should be made is that of an R18+ category for video games.

Q22:

My belief is that they are already consistent across media.

Q23:

Q24:

None. Absolutely nothing. The Government and the classification board should have no say in material that can and cannot be accessed online.

Q25:

The Government and the classification board should have no say in material that can and cannot be accessed online.

Q26:

Consistency is certainly important. Classification laws should be applicable nationwide.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

The introduction of an R18 rating for video games is massively important.

Other comments:

Senator Conroy's bizarre and costly vendetta against internet freedoms must stop. It is unquestionably reviled by a majority of Australians, and makes the entire Australian Labor Party look like utter and complete fools for allowing him to continue with it. Furthermore, his reluctance to speak clearly - and particularly his reluctance to debate the topic - is offensive and rude from someone in his position.