

CI 703 G McDonald

First name: garth

Last name: mcdonald

Q1:

Improving key elements of the existing framework. I do not think anything in the framework is fundamentally broken. I think there is a danger that powerful commercial interests are using the pretence of changes in technology to promote wholesale changes that are not in the interest of our community.

Q2:

Q3:

Q4:

No. This seems to be an about turn for the philosophy used up now. This essentially amounts to self censorship which does not work. There are always going to be ways of accessing content that is considered to be contrary to community standards. This seems to me to be no argument for making such material easily and widely available. A broken fence piling is no reason for taking down the gate. I think this is a most dangerous change in approach.

Q5:

Q6:

No. There is a real danger that commercial and political influence will take precedence over community interest. It would be very dangerous to introduce an 'easy' path to market for small vendors that would inevitably be used by better resourced vendors as a mechanism for chipping away at the censors prerogative to represent community values. A single rule for all is a first principle that should be mandatory.

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

No. There is a real danger that commercial and political influence will take precedence over community interest. It would be very dangerous to introduce an 'easy' path to market for small vendors that would inevitably be used by better resourced vendors as a mechanism for chipping away at the censors prerogative to represent community values. A single rule for all is a first principle that should be mandatory.

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

I believe the current method of classification is appropriate. There is an argument that changes in technology require state regulatory input into methods for keeping content for different groups in our community (children in particular). It seems to me that any attempt to move past making and communicating classifications for content is destined to failure. By all means continue to police activities that contravene the classification. However any attempt by the government to inhibit the

evolution of online communications will have a serious adverse impact on Australia's economic growth. Any attempt to setup a 'great rabbit firewall of Australia' to compete with 'great firewall of china' will be ineffective and will fail. However in the meantime it would do untold damage.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

I beleive the current method of classification is appropriate. Any move to partial or wholesale self regulation should not be implemented. We rely on our state to regulate the behaviour of organisations that are driven by single motives to protect the wider interests of our community members. Abrogating this responsibility via self regulation or nullifying its effect in the community via opt out alternatives is fundamentally contradictory to our system of government and community values.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Yes. It seems logical that the cost of regulation should be mitigated where it adversely impacts the success of aactivities that are not primarily commercial in nature. This should remain under the discretion of the classification board.

Q20:

Yes I think the classifications are well understood in the community. There is a spurious argument put forward online that the current classification system denies access to some video game material by stealth. It is inferred that this material is kept from open community access by anachronistic regulations and this is not understood or endorsed by the community. I do not beleive this is the case. Overly violent computer game material and other material that is not suitable for the customers in a games shop in a normal suburban mall is not on show to my son under the current system and I am glad of this. I do not want more violent or sexually exploitative games material to be easily accessible to my kids. I do not see the need for a fundamental change in the classification system to make such material available to a loud and active online minority.

Q21:

Yes I think the classifications are well understood in the community. There is a spurious argument put forward online that the current classification system denies access to some video game material by stealth. It is inferred that this material is kept from open community access by anachronistic regulations and this is not understood or endorsed by the community. I do not beleive this is the case. Overly violent computer game material and other material that is not suitable for the customers in a games shop in a normal suburban mall is not on show to my son under the current system and I am glad of this. I do not want more violent or sexually exploitative games material to be easily accessible to my kids. I do not see the need for a fundamental change in the classification system to make such material available to a loud and active online minority.

Q22:

Q23:

No I do not think they need to be consolidated. Film is a broadcast medium and computer games are interactive and more immersive. There is a spurious argument put forward online that the current classification system denies access to some video game material by stealth. It is inferred that this

material is kept from open community access by anachronistic regulations and this is not understood or endorsed by the community. I do not believe this is the case. Overly violent computer game material and other material that is not suitable for the customers in a games shop in a normal suburban mall is not on show to my son under the current system and I am glad of this. I do not want more violent or sexually exploitative games material to be easily accessible to my kids. I do not see the need for a fundamental change in the classification system to make such material available to a loud and active online minority.

Q24:

Any material deemed entirely inappropriate by the censor should be prohibited online. I believe that the state should stop the availability of this material as soon as it is detected. However I do not believe that the state has any role to play in controlling the online infrastructure to deny this access. By definition they must remain reactive and in some way doomed to chase. However the alternative is against the interests of our community.

Q25:

YES.

Q26:

It seems silly that the NT & ACT operate under a different set of rules.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

I do not believe that the computer game classification system needs to change. It may be a moot point as games become more fully operated from the cloud and our censors chase their tail to close down off-shore sources. If this happens the market will come up with filters that we can use to keep our kids from this material. This however does not mean that we should allow such material in via the NT & ACT. However it also does not mean that the Australian government should join the Chinese government in trying in vain to control the entire flow of information to its citizenry in an attempt to stop a tiny proportion of that information.