

CI 1260 D Burn

First name: Daniel

Last name: Burn

Q1:

Q2:

To provide warnings to citizens about potentially offensive content. It should not under any circumstances be to censor content. All legal content should be available to all adult members of the public. Censorship, particularly internet censorship, is inherently risky and endangers democracy. The focus should not be on restricting access, but rather on providing fair warning to the public, and stopping illegal activity at the source.

Q3:

It should not be related to the technology, except where the technology involved makes it impractical (eg. it would be completely impractical to try to classify the whole internet).

Q4:

That makes sense for platforms where it would be impractical to classify everything.

Q5:

Q6:

This would make sense. An approach that insisted everything be classified would be a waste of taxpayers money. A sensible approach would be to focus on classifying the material likely to be exposed to the most people (eg. TV and radio broadcast, magazines and newspapers).

Q7:

No, it would be destructive to society to attempt to classify artworks.

Q8:

Yes, audio content can be as difficult to explain to the kids as visual material.

Q9:

That makes sense - see answer to question 6.

Q10:

Only insofar as it affects the size of the audience, and whether they are likely to be children.

Q11:

Q12:

Controlling access to online content at a national level is a terrible idea. Firstly, it is impractical to try to censor the internet; any content that gets censored will move elsewhere. Secondly, it creates the dilemma of whether to have a secret list of censored sites (which is undemocratic), or a public list of censored sites, which just brings attention to them.

Access to network access filtering software should be an option provided by ISPs, or available to people in the home. I don't think that the cost should necessarily be footed by the taxpayer. If the Australian Government were to try to classify the internet, it would be sensible to provide a public listing of websites and their ratings, which ISP and home network filtering systems could download and use as a basis for decisions about filtering.

Q13:

Network filtering software installed by their parents in the home, or installed at the ISP level.

Q14:

It seems pretty well controlled currently. If my children want access to these, they would probably do it by bribing an older child who is legally allowed to buy them.

Q15:

I think it's generally a good idea to display warnings, when they are available.

Q16:

Q17:

Yes, if there was a complaint mechanism that resulted in fines for improperly rated materials, and possibly an auditing process where the government would sample random items and check their classification was correct. This would be an excellent step forwards, as it would reduce costs overall.

Q18:

Most content would be fine to be classified by industry, if there were a complaints mechanism and a random auditing process.

Q19:

If classification is a costly hurdle prevents producers of material for small audiences from creating, then it is a failure. Small independent films should definitely be subsidised. A clearly defined industry code would allow the producers themselves, or the distributors, to sensibly rate their own products.

Q20:

Q21:

Ratings should not be generic, but specify the reason for the warning - for example, a film might get an M for violence but a G for sex, or vice versa. The current classification scheme makes it hard for parents to work out whether a particular PG film would be suitable for their children, based on their shared family moral code. I know some families who are perfectly happy to let their children watch highly violent movies, but object to anything more sexual than a quick peck on the cheek or a knowing smile. Personally, I don't like my children watching violent television, but have no major objection to them being exposed to concepts of human sexuality. Both myself and these other families are let down by the current system. An example of something useful might be (for, say, a Tomb Raider movie):

Overall: M <--- this would simply be the highest rating across all categories

Sexuality: PG

Violence: M

Blasphemy: PG

Language: G

Q22:

Simple standards about the set of ratings (G, PG, M, MA, R) and what they mean across all media would make it easier for the public to work out what is meant.

Q23:

I'm not sure about the details of each set of rules, but it sounds sensible.

Q24:

None. If there is severely problematic or dangerous content, it should be taken out at the source, and the makers of it arrested. Censorship doesn't fix the problems, it only allows us to pretend they don't exist, and lets the perpetrators continue unhindered. Every dollar spent setting up national internet censorship infrastructure is a dollar not spent on tracking down and incarcerating criminals.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: