

CI 684 S Ross

First name: Steve

Last name: Ross

Q1:

Develop a new one, the existing one is out of date and ineffective

Q2:

To provide information to the end user, the system should not be used to force the moral views of various pressure groups onto the wider community.

Q3:

No, through out history 'new things' have always been seen as some great evil or source of corruption, if your not familiar with the term Luddite, look it up.....nothing really changed.

Q4:

If the system allows for self classification by publishers, then yes.

Q5:

When I was young I saw one movie that gave me nightmares, for years. Picnic at Hanging Rock, I believe it has or had a G rating. My point, it's difficult to gauge the potential impact of anything, things effect different people differently.

Q6:

No, why should small groups not be afforded the same protection as larger ones.

Q7:

Providing consumer advice is fair enough, restricting access to it is not. That advice should be provided by the artist or venue, as mentioned above the classification board should only need to become involed if there are complaints that the provided warnings are inadequate.

Q8:

How, I mentioned above a movie that gave me nightmares, the most disturbing part for me was the music, pan flutes, there was nothing offensive about it, but it was what gave me nightmares, was that foreseeable, if so the ratings people of the time failed me miserably.

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

As mentioned above ALL things should carry warnings and/or ratings supplied by the author/publisher, in general the ratings board should only be involved if there are complaints.

Q12:

There are no effective methods, atleast none that aren't more offensive than any content you may try to block. Will we as a nation start scanning every ones emails, block peer to peer transferes how about blocking encrypted data from proxy servers. It's impossible to control it effectively with out destroying it, in the end any government that tries will lose office.

Q13:

That should be a parents responsibility, maybe we should asking how we stop irresponsible people having children. Talk to DOCS, there are much greater risks for children than looking at naughty pictures on the net.

Q14:

As above this should be to domian of the parent. It's interesting to note that, in NSW atleast, you can legally have sex at 16 but your not allowed to look at the pictures until 18, it's no wonder so many kids get themselves into trouble. It's way past time our country grew up, we really aren't protecting our kids by hiding the real world from them.

Q15:

Always but voluntarily.

Q16:

Read the next question, it's the perfect answer to this one. The end user should be the one to decided what they do or don't look at.

Q17:

YES....I'd like to put this answer in bold text and underline it.

Q18:

All of it, common sense should come first, government should only intervene if there are complaints that the information provide is misleading. That said, content warnings are far more valuable than ambiguous ratings and provide far less motivation for the publisher to be misleading.

Q19:

It's reasonable although a system as suggested in question 17 could largely remove the need.

Q20:

I think their understood, just not overly useful, as a result I don't believe many people pay much attention to them.

Q21:

Ideally, I'd like to see them done away with altogether, content warnings are far more meaningful.

Q22:

Q23:

All forms of media should be treated the same, one of the main reasons we're having the current issues was the lack of foresight shown when computer games were first subjected to classification. Computer games were for children and couldn't possible be too offense, thats when space invaders was new. Now the technology has advanced and the players have grown up (mostly), the classification system hasn't. A while back I saw a science article on a plastic film similar to cling wrap that was capable of show video footage, think what could be done with that. A single standarized system is the best chance for future proofing.

Q24:

The obvious answer to that is child porn, but I'm not so sure it's true. I've worked security for a major shopping centre and for the health service, I've arrested child molesters and I've seen the results of what they do. I'd be more than happy to see them staked out in a paddock so we could throw rocks at them. So why shouldn't we ban access to to it, simply put it's a gutless pointless approach to the problem. Censorship does nothing to protect 'at risk' children and anyone who thinks it's protecting the community at large is deluded. "The only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do

nothing." - Edmund Bourke, and nothing has ever been truer. Censorship is the equivalent of closing our eye and hoping the problem will go away, I can tell you it hasn't worked so far. Perhaps if more people knew what was actually happening in the real world our governments would be forced to allocate the resources to address the problem. Ultimately, censorship protects two groups, pedophiles and the cowards who would rather ignore them.

Q25:

Refused classification is censorship and censorship is wrong.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

I'm about to move interstate, as a result I am now a big supporter of 'One country, One government', do away with the states altogether, stop the drain on resources, stop the buck passing.

Q29:

Other comments:

Like many other gamers this isn't the first time I've made a submission like this, last time it was to the SCAG, all they seemed to do was look for reasons to ignore what they were told. Is it any surprise that gamers are becoming more and more frustrated, jaded even belligerent. Look through gaming forums, each time a game is censored or RC'd more people openly state that they'll just import it or download it, they know it's illegal, they know there are consequences, they're beyond caring. Sure, eventually there'll be crackdown, ask Sony how that worked for them, they sued a hacker and got hacked for it, almost six months later they're still cleaning up the mess.

If our system doesn't keep pace, it will become irrelevant

My belief is that our governments should be running the country, not running our lives. Sadly they don't seem to agree.