

CI 1205 J Korner-Godsiff

First name: Joshua

Last name: Korner-Godsiff

Q1:

The ALRC should focus on developing a new framework for classification. While there are many aspects of the current system which have merit, and which could be carried over to any new system, I believe the current system is fundamentally flawed in a number of ways. In particular, I believe the current system of ratings (G, PG, M, MA, R, RC) should be scrapped in favour of actually detailing the potentially harmful content in a piece of media being classified. The reason for this is two-fold: firstly, when considering a piece of content, most parents will only consider the rating, not the actual content, and secondly, removing these rating removes any attempt by the government to enforce its own version of morality on the people of the nation.

Q2:

To provide reliable, accurate and understandable information to responsible adults, to aid them in their decision of whether to make a certain piece of content or media available to a minor under their care.

Q3:

Yes. A classification scheme can provide valuable information on certain types of media - particularly the kinds which are released to the public in discreet, immutable 'chunks', and which are purchased and consumed as such (for example, music, movies, television shows, books and games). However, for other kinds of media - particularly rapidly released/updated media such as news-media and content on internet websites - any attempt to classify the content would likely be 1) Out of date/Irrelevant by the time it was published, 2) Be overly burdensome on the classification board and/or the publishing body to have it classified prior to release, and 3) Not be readily available to a person consuming the content.

Q4:

Yes. Only classifying certain types of media if a complaint is made about a specific piece of content could drastically reduce the burden on both the classification board and on publishers of that type of media. This is particularly true if any attempt were to be made to classify internet content, where any form of required classification would quickly overwhelm both the classification board and the publishers.

Q5:

Yes, content which is of a potentially higher impact should have a higher priority in terms of whether it should be classified than content which is unlikely to affect anyone. Content designed for children (under-12's) is probably the least in need of classification.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Only if there is a high likelihood that the content would be extremely harmful to small children (i.e. would be classified as MA, R, or RC under the current system), and only for the purpose of providing

consumer advice. Even then, the burden should be upon the artist or exhibitor to submit the work for classification.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

Yes. So long as the content is not illegal, what someone does in their own home is their business. Content which is sold and purchased in public but consumed exclusively at home should still be classified for the purposes of providing information to the consumer.

Q11:

Not answered.

Q12:

Don't. If the material is illegal under Australian law, then the classification board should notify the appropriate authorities, who should work to remove the content at its source. Any other material - including material rated RC - should not be controlled in terms of online content. If a person or organisation wishes to filter online material which has been classified, the government should make available some program which they may install locally.

Mandatory control or filtering of any online content is rife with civil-liberty issues, and the current proposed system of filtering at an ISP level is likely to be unviable for technical reasons, as well.

Q13:

Ultimately, it cannot. Every proposed or possibly viable scheme I'm aware of can be bypassed, if it is a person's intention to do so, and children in this day and age are highly technically-literate. The best hope, from both a civil-liberties and technical point of view, is to try and filter content locally (i.e. at or near the point of access), which allows fine-grained control which can be tailored to the specific needs of the children accessing the internet from there, and is considerably more difficult to bypass (at least from those points of access), than a proposal such as ISP-level filtering. This also allows adults to access an unfiltered internet, which is essentially all that the people protesting about internet filtering actually want.

Q14:

It is already sufficiently controlled, in my opinion.

Q15:

When it is relevant, technically viable and not overly burdensome to do so.

Q16:

Government should - where viable - regulate the sale of potentially harmful content to minors. It should not attempt to regulate the sale to adults or consumption by adults of any content except illegal content. Industry should attempt to take a responsible, self-regulatory approach with regards to providing access of content to minors, but this approach should be up to the individual businesses involved.

Q17:

Not in my opinion. America has such a system (notably for film, video games and - until recently - comic-books), and in my view it produces biased and overly puritanical results.

Q18:

Any content which they believe should definitely be restricted to adults, or any content which is so mild as to not be harmful to anyone.

Q19:

Classification of content should be free in all cases where it is required by law.

Q20:

The difference between M and MA is often not well understood.

Q21:

I personally believe the existing classification categories should be scrapped entirely in favour of detailing the specific potentially harmful content. Even if that is not achieved, I believe the current RC rating should be removed, or merged with R. (I don't believe the government has a right to deny adults access to content unless it is actually illegal).

Q22:

The same set of ratings (G, PG, M, etc) should at least exist for all media formats. The notable current exception, of course, being that video games lack an R-18+ rating. In general, I believe that markings, criteria and guidelines should be as consistent as possible across all media, only differing where there is a specific difference between two forms of media. For example, if the existence of coarse language in a piece of content automatically gains it a PG rating for film, the same should be true for music, games and books. However, depictions of violence might be rated quite differently between the film and games, because the first is a passive medium, and the second is interactive.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Material which is deemed to be illegal under criminal law (as distinct from material which is currently rated RC, but which it is still legal to possess).

Q25:

No. Only material which is explicitly deemed illegal should be prohibited.

Q26:

Yes. I know it's probably legally impossible, but having 8 different laws for the 8 different states and territories is absurd - it should be federalised in its entirety.

Q27:

Not answered.

Q28:

Yes

Q29:

Not answered.

Other comments: