

CI 599 M Wilks

First name: Michael

Last name: Wilks

Q1:

Focus on developing a new framework for classification. The current framework is not up to standard and is misaligned with the key issues relating to classification.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to make a consistent, fair and unified classification scheme. There should be clear distinctions made between actual facts and fear mongering by minority groups and the media. With that in mind, the classification scheme should not be ridiculously strict wherein it restricts an artists freedom of expression or ruins creativity.

Q3:

Yes there should be differences. Technology is used in a multitude of ways and there are clear differences in how and when they are used. This in turn would have to effect classification.

Q4:

This is a tricky question. I don't see the need for everything to be classified and I definately don't like to be nannied either. The only problem I see is misinformed minority groups crying wolf and tarnishing peoples work. A complaint deemed genuine should be investigated.

Q5:

Yes as long the potential impact is based on actual fact. Restricting the sale/distribution of a product based on "research" done by some made-up media company is not going to fly. I think it is a very good idea to have unified classification for children's content. A straight forward system which actually aids parents would be quite beneficial.

Q6:

Obviously this will have some effect on content classification. It should at least have some bearing on a decision, especially considering the amount of time and money invested in projects. That said, I would feel bad, if not worse if a independent artist was refused classification and lost out. This is not to say anything should be allowed to be classified there are limits.

Q7:

No. Definately not, the public should be free to decide for themselves. If something is offensive after public viewing, then by all means restrict access and provide consumer advice.

Q8:

Music and audio media should not be as heavily regulated or classified as other media (ie movies).

Q9:

It will effect classification, but should not be major contributing factor.

Q10:

Yes. The is a clear difference in use between public and home content.

Q11:

Q12:

I strongly oppose restricting online content. With exceptions obviously (ie major crime, sex offenders, etc)

Q13:

It all rests on parents shoulders. Its not something people want to hear, but it is true. Everyone keeps looking for excuses and someone to blame for their failings. The only way to appropriately monitor content is supervision.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Yes definately. The classification cheme has to actually reflect reality. Who better to work with than the industry itself.

Q18:

Q19:

Yes definately. The independent scene has to be supported. Without their creativity we would live in a boring mass produced world.

Q20:

No. The most confusion is related to game classification. It is by far the most misrepresented category.

Q21:

Yes. R rating for games

Q22:

Unified system incorporating logos. Needs to be functional and able to be differentiated at a glance.

Q23:

Q24:

Major crime and websites related to sex offenders.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes. Without unification the laws will be weak. It should be promoted as a positive step forward for the community. It is a good thing to have a clear idea of issues relating to media and a well informed public.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes I think it would be easier for the Commonwealth to oversee proceedings.

Q29:

Other comments: