

CI 173 P Lum

First name: Patrick

Last name: Lum

Q1:

A new framework for classification.

Q2:

Providing quick, accurate, and consistent guidance as to the content of mediaforms; the avoidance of censorship in favour of information provision; allowing consumers to make informed decisions for them or their families; to allow all content to become available to their respective audiences.

Q3:

It seems impractical to attempt to classify all content available via the internet, for example, or smartphone applications. Theoretically it would be better to classify all media but this is impractical and implausible.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

Only insofar as it relates to children and materials deemed to be inappropriate for children.

Q6:

Market position or potential audience size should not affect content classification.

Q7:

Not within the classification scheme; perhaps at the discretion of the exhibitors.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No (the potential size and composition of the audience is now almost always very large and global)

Q10:

Yes. Content on display in public is difficult to regulate what kinds of persons can see it, and should thus always be acceptable for younger viewers.

Q11:

Q12:

Taking down offending websites, age gates/pay gates, etc. Censorship via blocking is NOT the answer - easily circumvented, easily corruptable.

Q13:

Parental education and control.

Q14:

What we've got now works fine.

Q15:

At all times.

Q16:

For governments - advisory for the most part, although if laws are broken (child pornography, promotion of crime) they should step in. Industries bodies are advisory. Users contribute towards the 'mood' of society and the relative moral standards of society, and thus should be consulted at regular intervals.

Q17:

Hmmm... the ESRB in America seems to work quite effectively, as did the self-regulating Comic Code before its time until the relative moral desires of society took a turn. However, I think the back up of legislation that renders the classification code enforceable at law is a good one, or would be if there was an acceptable rating system for all forms of media.

Q18:

Q19:

Independent content is often prevented from becoming published due to excessive content classification fees; for example, some software is not available on Nintendo's DSiware service because it is perceived not to be worth the money to classify it in the Australian market.

Q20:

The slew of differences between M, MA, R18, X, especially within the separate videogame classifications.

Q21:

Classifications should be uniform across all media forms - G, PG, MA15+, R18+, and X. G is for all audiences, PG may contain some examples of fantasy violence, slight explicit language, drug references, slight sexual references. MA15+ may contain explicit drug references, medium level violence, implied or moderate sexual materials. R18+ might contain strong violence and strong sex sequences, so long as it remains simulated. X category material is probably just explicit all around.

Q22:

Perhaps use of an 'interactive' criteria in relation to videogames (violence in a film v violence that the player themselves causes in a videogame, for example).

Q23:

Q24:

Materials that involve actual nonconsensual harm to a human being (torture/snuff/rape etc.) that do not possess credible value (for instance, footage of riots or of actual warfare would not be prohibited, provided it was for informative purposes), child pornography.

Q25:

No, especially in relation to videogames.

Q26:

Consistency is important, although how it would be promoted is sort of a question for constitutional scholars.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Either an R18 rating for videogames, or a comprehensive overhaul of the entire system.

Other comments:

Many commentators run along the lines of "think of the children", implying that increased sexual exposure and violent content in magazines, films, books and videogames are creating behavioural problems with the youth of today; but this seems counterintuitive to the Classification Scheme's true purpose, which is to create an accurate framework of recommendations for consumers to make their own decisions about media consumption. There are many things that some members of society find repulsive that should still be legitimately enjoyed by other members of society, provided it is not forced upon those persons who find it repulsive. The only things that the classification scheme should censor entirely is exploitative materials that were created by causing harm to a human being, unless there is some kind of informative purpose behind it (the example that I am thinking of is of the execution of a Vietnamese soldier by General Nguyen Ngoc Loan that was photographed and widely disseminated). Everything else should merely be rated, and of those, only the R18+ rating - if any - should be enforceable at law. Adults should be able to enjoy pretty much anything they want, and what goes through the eyes of children should be the parent's concern.