

CI 1045 T Phan

First name: Thai

Last name: Phan

Q1:

I suppose improving key elements would be cheaper and less time consuming. I mean, it's already pretty good -- just needs a couple of tweaks here and there.

Q2:

It should give people an idea of the content of the product they are consuming, e.g. violence, sex scenes. It should not be about what should and should not be allowed to be sold in Australia.

Q3:

Yes, a domain as large as the internet contains a plethora of content and information. Unless the classification board resorts to censoring the entire internet (which it shouldn't be allowed to do), it would be unfeasible to classify every single piece of content online. You should also keep in mind that a lot of the publishers online are from other countries not subject to Australian laws (and so won't bother to get classified) or are too poor to afford getting a rating. It should be up to them whether or not they want classification.

Q4:

I believe that in cases where content doesn't usually get classified, e.g. small independent films, independent video games, classification is not necessary at all (and may actually be more costly to the producer than the creation of their product). Even if it was extremely objectionable, the content would have a limited audience and those who consumed it would probably boycott further productions by that creator.

Q5:

No. It should be up to the distributor to decide whether they want to be classified. The classification board should not ban or not ban something. They should just provide advice to consumers,

Q6:

Yes. Smaller content producers do not have the resources to afford classification. They should only worry about getting a classification if they're interested in distributing their product to retailers.

Q7:

It should be classified for the purpose of providing consumer advice. Nothing should be restricted.

Q8:

I suppose that would make everything more consistent. However, we've had music since cave man times and I'm pretty sure they didn't require classification!

Q9:

No. The distributor should be allowed the choice to submit his product for classification. Retailers generally only sell content that's been rated anyway so they'd be pretty dumb not to.

Q10:

No. Would that mean that public addresses by the Prime Minister has to be classified? Would private home videos need to be classified?

Q11:

It should be optional for content producers to submit their content for classification. However, there should be incentives for them to do so (such as make all retailers only stock rated content).

Q12:

I don't think we should control access to online content at all! However, if I had to give a suggestion, perhaps we could have secret police busting through the homes of people who publish and distribute restricted content and executing them with a bullet through the back of their head. That'll frightening most people into not breaking the law. The rest could just meet the same fate as the aforementioned enemy of the state.

Q13:

Parents are ultimately responsible for the content their children is exposed to.

Q14:

I believe retailers are doing a good job in limiting exposure of pornographic reading material to kids. In the home, I guess the father could find a better place to hide them. I recommend placing it inside the pages of a Bible or an accounting text book.

Q15:

It should always be displayed as to maintain consistency throughout the medium.

Q16:

The government's job is to provide advice to consumers on the content of their purchase. They should not be able to ban something that they consider objectionable as that is a subjective criteria. Industry bodies, having applied for the rating, should respect it and display it on their products to aid consumers contemplating making a purchase. Based on this rating, it is up to the user whether or not they wish to consume it or expose their children to it.

Q17:

I believe that a model where all stakeholders have a role in classifying content (as opposed to just the government and industry bodies) would be the best one.

Q18:

The industry should only classify content in conjunction with the government and consumers.

Q19:

Providing subsidies to small productions is a good idea as it could finally promote more local content and art.

Q20:

Yeah, they're pretty well understood.

Q21:

There should be an R18+ rating for video games. The classification board should only provide advice to consumers and not have the power to effectively ban content from Australian shores.

Q22:

I think the way things are are pretty good at the moment. However, the markings could be a bit less prominent. It takes up, like, a quarter of the cover! Some consumers who purchase a product also enjoy its cover art. This isn't really a big issue though.

Q23:

I don't know. Would the "Keep It Simple" principle apply in this case?

Q24:

No, the classification board should not have the power to ban things. And besides, in a country where the freedom of speech should be respected, nothing should be censored. The police may choose to take action against people who frequent unsavoury websites but an individual should be allowed the choice to voice his opinion (no matter how controversial).

Q25:

No. Nothing should be prohibited online. Refused Classification should not even be a classification.

Q26:

It would be good that they were consistent. However, each state and territory is different and what might be considered an objectionable theme in New South Wales, e.g. freedom of speech, right of assembly, might be considered something even a child is entitled to in Victoria. Classification should reflect this (but should not outright ban it).

Q27:

I like how North America has a single classification scheme for Canada, America and Mexico. We should do something similar with our neighbours (or maybe even apply for membership in the North American board). Goodness knows that we're inundated with American media as it is.

Q28:

No, the Commonwealth has too much power. The states should be allowed to exercise their independence in this regard.

Q29:

There should at the very least be an R18+ rating for video games.

Other comments:

Censoring the internet is a terrible idea. The criteria for banning websites will be subjective. It will be ineffective as banning one website will result in five more springing up in its place. Rather than trying to protect children by denying them their freedom of information, we should take a more active role in communicating to them the dangers of the internet and hope that they and their parents are responsible enough to avoid them.