

CI 2366 Y Wildheart

First name:

Yari

Last name:

Wildheart

Q1:

Preferably focusing on improving key elements of the existing framework - i.e. providing an R18+ rating for games in order to allow for a sensible and up-to-date system. The majority of gamers in Australia are adults anyway.

Q2:

Providing for a system that means less censorship, not more. Adults should be in charge of what they see, and parents should be the ones doing the parenting - not government. The national classification system should serve as an information source for the public, not as a way for the government to ban media.

Q3:

With the exception of the internet, it shouldn't. Media should be classified with the same ratings across the board, in order to allow for a reasonable, transparent and clear system of classification. Furthermore, we should be encouraging open government and not building a police state that controls what people can access - let us decide for ourselves by simply giving us access to appropriate information.

The internet is an exception as it is a fundamentally different platform that bears little resemblance if any to music, film, literature or games. Especially as it is international in scope, and classifying content not even hosted in Australia would allow for unreasonable, police-state-like activity such as takes place in states like China where content is banned via route of classification.

Q4:

This question is somewhat vague as to its purpose and intent, and so I will not place a proper answer here.

Q5:

No content should ever be refused classification. It is reasonable to say 'content designed for children needs not be classified' but it should be for the sake of consistency.

Q6:

No. This would simply be unfair, and may result in censorship or outright banning of material simply due to its reach.

Q7:

This question is too vague. No answer provided.

Q8:

Yes. The limitations of the media themselves (i.e. no visual components) just mean that there are less areas that need to be classified, this does not necessarily mean that an entirely different system is necessary for classification.

Q9:

No. Again, classification should occur based on the content itself, rather than externalities.

Q10:

No, as many forms of content can be accessed in both public AND the home. What this means is that in order to include such an externality effectively, one must either formulate two different classification systems for each venue, or use the same system for both venues. Neither would be effective or worthwhile - if some content has harsh restrictions placed on it due to its accessibility in public yet many prefer to view it in the home, why should those viewing it in the home also be restricted? Yet if a system was devised for each venue this would be needlessly complex and confusing for the consumers of said content.

Q11:

I feel that content should only be assessed based on its own merit, i.e. a film should only be classified based on the content of the film itself and no externalities. The people are capable of managing the media they view and should thus be treated like the adults they are.

Q12:

A scheme of internet censorship such as the one the Federal Government is attempting to build, or the "Great Firewall" as it has been nicknamed is neither an effective method nor a just one.

If there are those violating laws, pursue and punish them. But the internet should not be censored, and the very act of doing so is not only a violation of human rights but is also not effective as we can see in nation-states that do this - proxies, tunnels, routers and VPNs are all effective methods of circumventing this.

Q13:

Not by legislation, but by government keeping out of the job of parenting. It is not the job of government to be parents to the children of Australia.

Allow parents access to filtering software that they may freely choose to adopt - this way parents may choose what they wish their children to see or not see, and the rights of Australians are not being violated by a zealous political class intent on exercising its authority or flexing its political muscle in the face of the population.

Q14:

By ensuring appropriate packaging, labeling, and monitoring of sales at the counter.

Q15:

Using the current scheme, when content is of the rating MA15+, R18+, or higher (where applicable).

Q16:

Industry bodies should be included and consulted during the entire regulation process. Users should be able to, with enough support (perhaps akin to petition), challenge decisions regarding classification.'

Q17:

Yes - many parts of the world, such as the USA, have applied such a situation and they have proven to be both effective and practical.

Q18:

I am unsure as to the nature of this question and furthermore, it appears to be poorly worded. I will not respond to this question.

Q19:

I do not know enough about this issue in order to make a statement or submit an opinion.

Q20:

The lack of an R18+ rating for games causes much confusion throughout the community, particularly as the majority of gamers in this country are adults, and furthermore much content is needlessly refused classification. This is not only a confusing policy, but also a very unpopular one.

Q21:

Yes- an R18+ rating should exist for all media, and the RC category should be reserved only for material that is criminal in nature.

Q22:

Ensure the same markings, logos, and artwork for classification markings. Ensure the public understands the criteria and guidelines, and make both freely accessible to the public.

Q23:

I am unsure of the content in one of these documents, so I shall not answer.

Q24:

I do not feel access should be prohibited to online content, unless it is criminal in nature and endangers the lives or liberty of citizens.

Q25:

Yes

Q26:

It is very important. It should be promoted via giving more power in regards to classification laws to the federal government.

Q27:

The current scheme is an extremely undemocratic one. When one individual from one state can veto any changes at all to a policy, despite the amount of public support, it is blatantly obvious that the scheme must be changed.

Q28:

Yes - the Commonwealth should be in charge of establishing classification laws, and should furthermore be in charge of making changes to them.

Q29:

Ensure that content is only refused classification if it is criminal in nature, or endangers the lives or liberty of users.

Other comments: