

CI 643 D Gormly

First name: Daniel

Last name: Gormly

Q1:

There is no reason to redevelop an entirely new framework for classification however, there certainly are elements which need to be revised

Q2:

Primarily, to provide the general public a scheme in which they can understand the nature of published material and make an informed decision whether or not they want to subject themselves or their children to it. Secondly, to restrict certain more sensitive materials to young children.

Q3:

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

Artworks and live exhibitions should not require classification.

Q8:

Censorship of music and other sound recordings should not extend beyond an 'explicit lyrics' warning label.

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

There is no method of accurately and thoroughly classifying and restricting information accessed via the internet without infringing on public freedom. Internet censorship should be handled on an individual's own terms.

Q13:

A highly competent, well regarded software development firm should be employed to create a cross-platform application which can censor inappropriate content. The application should provide a system in which schools, parents, and guardians can filter content. Most importantly, the application's source should be made freely available, its mechanism's absolutely transparent and users should be able to challenge the restriction of content. There software should focus purely on sexual and violent content.

Q14:

Sufficient control is already in place.

Q15:

The current system is effective.

Q16:

Q17:

If the classification scheme were to include the classification of some newer distribution models, such as smartphone app distribution methods (iTunes, Zune, etc), independent video games (Xbox Live,

Steam etc), etc then a code within these markets would be far more effective and practical. However, in many cases, simply not enforcing classification law upon these markets would make much more sense. Often, a rating is already enforced under foreign law which will act as a warning for Australian audiences - if a service is already operating under a foreign law or its own code, which meets or exceeds Australian classification requirements, there is no point layering Australian classification laws on top of it.

Q18:

Video games and films which are entirely abstract in nature, more representational of an artwork rather than traditional entertainment forms should be able to be classified by industry. Educational works should also fall under the same arrangement. However, there needs to be a clear criteria of what makes up these works.

Q19:

If the cost of classification prohibits production, then subsidisation/alternate classification methods/exemption from classification should all be looked at.

Q20:

The current classification scheme is easily understood.

Q21:

No.

Q22:

Q23:

Absolutely. There is painfully obvious widespread support for this consolidation. The absence of an R18+ rating in video games does not at all reflect public opinion and is simply a statutory relic.

Q24:

Access to content should not be blocked at a user's end. If content is deemed illegal, such as child pornography, the content should be taken down at its source after it has been appropriately investigated. The classification of the frequent and prolific amount of content generated by the public across the globe is quite absurd. No sustainable system of classification has the resources to accurately and thoroughly classify information published on the internet and so any scheme designed to do so, will ultimately sacrifice the public's freedom of speech for a broken and pedantic system of censorship.

Q25:

Access to online content should not be prohibited.

Q26:

A single, federal level classification board should make the initial decision, as it is currently doing. However, the classification of INDIVIDUAL works should be able to be challenged by the public at a state level.

Q27:

Q28:

As stated in question 26, the classification of INDIVIDUAL works should be able to be overruled at a state government level.

Q29:

Other comments:

An overwhelming majority of Australians believe that an R18+ video game rating should be introduced. It is ridiculous to postpone this introduction further.