

CI 2002 G Mackenzie

First name: Gordon

Last name: Mackenie

Q1:

Improving the existing one. The vast majority of Australians are already familiar with it.

Q2:

To make it easy to identify the nature of the content in media products so that consumers can readily decide if it is likely to be suitable to themselves and/or their family.

Q3:

No. I can see no moral reasons why content should be treated different according to the way it is accessed. I can see that there may be practical limitations on the process of classification depending on the nature of the service such as where sheer quantity makes it near impossible to classify everything. In such cases the guidelines should remain the same but the creators of such media should be encouraged to provide classifications themselves.

Q4:

I do not believe a squeaky wheel policy is best for classification as it would lead to too much inconsistency.

Q5:

I'm not entirely sure I understand this question. As content designed for children should be relatively inoffensive to anyone I don't see why not classifying it would be an issue but wouldn't it still have to be looked at to confirm that it is designed for children, in which case why not slap a G on it while you're at it?

Q6:

In theory no, but if the majority of the population is saying something should be classified and as what constitutes offensive is entirely subjective surely if the classification system is at odds with the population it indicates that there is something wrong with the classification system.

Q7:

Define Artwork.

If you are referring to physical and sculptors then I see no reason that advising people of the nature of a gallery before they enter would be a bad idea.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Not the criteria in which it is classified. It should affect the manner in which it is classified as publically viewed content is more likely to be exposed to people who did not intend to come into contact with that particular content.

Q11:

Practicality. There is only so much any official governing body can do. As I have mentioned before I believe self regulation should be encouraged wherever possible.

Q12:

I do not believe access should be controlled. Public education is the key, Parents and individuals should be empowered to make their own decisions.

Q13:

Parental education. Keep that computer in the living room, keep an eye on your children, talk to them about what they do etc.

Q14:

Make older brothers illegal (sarcastic).

Short of draconian methods I believe current methods are as effective as they can be. I do not approve of draconian methods.

Q15:

When it is distributed to the general public, though retail sale or otherwise.

Q16:

Industry should regulate themselves as much as possible, government should encourage this and step in where it fails. Users should be able to let both government and industry know when they feel something has failed.

Q17:

Yes due to the enormous volumes of content requiring classification.

Q18:

The vast majority of it.

Q19:

If industries are permitted to classify their own works subsidies should not be necessary depending on the model they choose.

Q20:

Yes, they are understood.

Q21:

Materials should not be refused classification unless they conflict with Australian laws.

Q22:

By using similar rating criteria across all media types.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None - there are already laws in place for child porn and the like.

Q25:

Assumes a positive answer to the previous question.

Q26:

Individual states and territories should treat the classification laws of other states or territories as non jurisdiction precedents. As a guide but in no way compelled to follow.

Q27:

See above.

Q28:

I don't feel I have enough knowledge in this area to provide an answer.

Q29:

Introduction of R ratings for video games.

Other comments:

It is my strong belief that in a democracy it is not the role of the government to limit what information is available to its people. Classification system should be used to advise, not to control.