

CI 2174 J Solomon

First name:

Jake

Last name:

Solomon

Q1:

The current framework is a good starting point to base the new framework on and so should not be scratched. As it stands most of the mediums have a good system going. The only system which needs attention pertains to video games. As of right now the G, PG, and M are pretty much in line with other mediums and so they are alright. The real work needs to be done in the MA rating by splitting it into MA and R so to reduce what people of a lower age bracket can not get access to certain material and allowing the R rating for everything else (this includes some material which is banned currently because of the systems current lack of an R rating eg extremely violent or sexual games).

Q2:

To extend the current framework so to incorporate material which has so far been banned but is acceptable in certain mediums. To make the framework equal throughout all the different mediums and not discriminate between them because of certain peoples perceived prejudices against them (eg video games). And to reduce the access young people have to high impact material in certain mediums (eg video games).

Q3:

The technology or platform should not affect if the content should be classified unless classifying content on that technology or platform is unrealistic. By this I mean that all physical and most digital content should be classified but it should not be expected that the government try and classify the entire internet because that would be unrealistic and unfeasible. This is because the internet is so large and ever changing that to classify anything on there would be pointless.

Q4:

With some content a review by complaint system would be good because it reduces the strain on time and manpower of the review system but reviewing material on a single complaint then no. If that was the case then a single person would be able to complain about almost everything and clog up the review system. In those situations it should only be addressed if a large number of people complain so to avoid the misuse and unnecessary strain on the review system.

Q5:

That again depends of the amount and stable nature of the material. There is only a finite amount of work the review board can process and if a certain media has such a large quantity of material which changes readily then it's unreasonable to expect that the material will be classified.

Q6:

Yes it should. Material which more people will access has a higher need of being classified but only if the material isn't constantly changing.

Q7:

This is dependent on what you define artworks as. If you mean paintings, pictures and sculptures then no the classification board should not be involved in them but some measures should be put in place so that the people running the exhibit inform the patrons that there may be some questionable material within.

Q8:

Music should always be reviewed. As for audio books as long as they don't deviate from the book which they are based on they should be treated as a book (but books should also be classified).

Q9:

Size yes, composition no. Reviewing material due to the composition of the audience is a form of discrimination and should not be allowed.

Q10:

No

Q11:

Q12:

Because of the nature of online content and the way people access it it is impossible to have an effective method to control the material. The ideas and schemes that the government have created so far are pathetic at best and harmful to law enforcement at worst. It is impossible to identify and block content that is deemed illegal by Australian law because of the amount of it, because of the different systems and ways that it is transferred and the simple means that anyone can do to subvert high level blocking systems. It would be a more effective use of time and money to track and take down the extremely bad online content (eg. child porn sites and the people who distribute them).

Q13:

The best method is always the simplest, parental supervision. This is the only method which has any real potential to work. A good aid to this is a free filter provided by the government that can be installed on home computers by families to help them out. These filters however don't replace parental supervision but are just an aid.

Q14:

Because of the nature of online content and the way people access it it is impossible to have an effective method to control the material. The ideas and schemes that the government have created so far are pathetic at best and harmful to law enforcement at worst. It is impossible to identify and block content that is deemed illegal by Australian law because of the amount of it, because of the different systems and ways that it is transferred and the simple means that anyone can do to subvert high level blocking systems.

Q15:

When it is a physical product or when the online store selling the product has an Australian specific online store.

Q16:

The government bodies should be controlling the industries so that they follow the will and ideals of the people. The system right now is flawed and is controlled by a small group of people who have their own agenda in mind. The classification system should be something that the all Australians and not just a few elected officials who don't represent the nation as a whole. The system is so broken that just one of those elected officials can block any progress from happening. It is a disgrace to our

country and its people that one person has that much power over all of us. Industry bodies should be self policing themselves so that the review system can be swifter and users should complain when they feel something isn't right and then when enough people complain then a new review should be taken.

Q17:

That system would work much smoother than the current system but there would need to be more people always checking to see if industry are actually complying with the code.

Q18:

Movies, video game, music and books.

Q19:

In those situations where the budget of project is low then yes the government should subsidise the classification.

Q20:

How can anyone understand the categories when the criteria from them is never released. There is also the lack of an R rating in video games which has no real reasoning. If you want people to understand the categories then release the criteria for them.

Q21:

For video games and an R rating should be put into place which restricts content to those over 18 years. Certain content which is currently allowed in the MA category should then be put into the R category (such as games with extremely high levels of violence). The R category should also allow content which had been banned in this medium previously such as drug use and high level sexual content, and sexual content as a reward.

Q22:

Adding an R ratings to video games is a start. As for a greater convergence between different media would need a more detailed look and the different classification board criteria to make a just opinion.

Q23:

Only if it improves the greater convergence between media formats.

Q24:

Child and animal porn.

Q25:

No, the current RC category does not in any way represent what the people of Australia really desire blocked and as such is pointless

Q26:

If you continue to allow one person to block any form of classification change then no its not important at all. If those state officials don't want change then let their states fall behind. The people in those states can then vote those officials out if they have a problem.

Q27:

One with parity between mediums, one not controlled by a few elected officials but by the people for whom these rules are for. One with a clear criteria that anyone can view so that the people of Australia can decide if they agree or not and one which respects the different views and feelings of people so to not block content because a few conservative people feel that it is wrong.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Refer to Q27 but also for now the introduction of the R category for video games.

Other comments: