CI 1777 A Benson

First name: Adam
Last name: Benson

Q1:
Either/or. The current classification framework for most mediums achieves most of the goals it sets out to achieve - the most important of which being allowing parents to make informed decisions about the content that their children are exposed to. There are some shortfalls which should be improved (i.e sometimes a lack of consistancy with ratings in other countries, as well as ratings nationally that differ across extremely similar content). The most important goal for the classification system should be to provide information to make informed decisions, rather than enforcing (debatable) morality.

An arguement for developing a new framework would be the lack of accuracy in an age-based rating system. Obviously there needs to be some restrictions on the accessiblility of extreme content to children, however which content is suitable to which age group is a highly debated issue. Some content rated MA15+ many parents would be happy for 10-15 year old children to consume, however others rated with the same rating those same parents would feel is highly inappropriate.

Whilst age brackets are required to prevent children accessing extreme content, emphasis should be on the specific content of the media, so that parents (and viewers) can make an informed decision based on their own beliefs and ethics. Otherwise the risk is an 'Americanisation' of our rating system, where sex and love is deemed less approprate than explosions and violence.
Q2:
To focus on the core purpose of the classification system - allowing people to make informed decisions about the content they and their children are exposed to. Some issues with the current system which need to be addressed include the lack of an R18+ rating for video games, resulting in publishers making subtle adjustments to sneak inappropriate games into a lower age group, or worse encouraging piracy so that children and adults alike can access the same content that their international peers have access to.

By encouraging more people to seek out unclassified sources for content they believe they should have access to, it 'legitimises' these illicit outlets which cant feasibly be controlled by the government. This can expose children (and adults) to content that is inappropriate by anyones standards, so results in contradicting the original goals of the classification scheme, not to mention encouraging people to see piracy as a good thing (freedom) rather than a bad thing (stealing).
Q3:
No. Classification schemes are not only applicable to children - some adults use them to judge appropriateness of content for their own beliefs, so accessiblilty of the medium should not be a factor. The only exception would be the feasbility of classifying the content. In the case of the internet, it would be infeasable to build a reliable and accurate rating for all of the pages of content available online. Instead, the government should provide advice (as they do) to parents on how to allow their

children to safely browse the internet. Emphasis however should be on supervision and parents deciding on what is approprate or not on a case-by-case basis, rather than enfoced morality.

Extreme content (such as child pornography) should be fiercely prosecuted rather than simply 'filtered' and encouraging the criminals to move underground.

Q4:

This actually isn't a bad idea for the web - it could alleviate some of the work behind classifying everything. The exception however should continue to be movies, games and television - parents need to be able to make an informed decision prior to purchasing an item, rather than waiting on somebody to make a complaint.

Q5:

Content that is appropriate for children should be classified as such no matter what the medium (assuming feasible). Multimedia (including movies, tv, and video games) is a fundamental part of our lives, so parents need a quick and practical way to make decisions as to the appropriateness of the content for their children.

Q6:

Once again, depends on feasibility. Ideally yes, everything that could potentially offend should be classified so that people can make a decision before being exposed to it.

Feasibility analysis would come down to the cost of classifying vs the likelyhood of people being offended by being exposed to the content in question. As an example, it would be impractical for each painting in an art gallery to have a classification "door" in front of it before exposing the viewer to the artwork. However, it *is* practical to have ratings advice on the packaging of media such as dvd's and videogames.

Q7:

Can of worms. Classification should never be about preventing access to content which isn't illegal. The likelyhood of people being traumatised by artworks is slim (vs a movie anyway), HOWEVER people should be able to inform themselves about the content of anything they are exposing themselves or their children to prior to doing it. If a gallery contains particularly controversal content it should be made clear to people before they visit.

Q8:

Yes. Music, movies, video games, audio books, books, and any other forms of media product that can be feasibly classified should provide advice prior to being consumed about the appropriateness of the content.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

The only factor I believe worth considering is whether or not somebody will take offense. If it's likely that somebody will (or wouldn't want their children exposed to it), then the content should be classified to allow people to make an informed decision.

Q12:

Supervision, monitoring and education.

All other enforcable methods (such as a website blacklist) will be as effective as anti-piracy measures have been. If people want to access content, they will do it. If it is blocked, people will work out ways to circumvent the blocking. The more people who bypass it, the more it legitimises it, resulting in people being exposed to content likely far worse than they would have been ordinarily.

Hypothetical example: Aus govt blocks a website talking about abortion that some religious groups find offensive. A friend in another country later mentions to me something on the website, I try to visit it and am blocked. I beleive the government shouldn't block that content as it isn't illegal, and morality shouldn't be enforced - so I set up a virtual private network on my computer to bypass any blacklists. My children use my computer and are exposed to controversal content that isn't filtered due to the bypass. My children then talk to their peers about this 'awesome content' they found, resulting in other parents children learning how to bypass restrictions.

Q13:

Supervision, monitoring and education. Software can also be voluntarily installed to help to this end, but it is the same issue as controlling childrens access to drugs. Making them illegal hasn't stopped people (including children) from getting access to them. The best countermeasure is education and responsible parenting.

If you can't montior your children online, then you shouldn't allow them to use the computer if you find the content objectional. It's just not feasible for the government to classify and control all web sites, just as it isn't feasible to control all of the things people say in public. The web should be thought of as a massive discussion, some of which some people wont like and can walk away from, but impossible to effectively regulate. The only exception of course is illegal content such as child pornography.

Q14:

These are already controlled in a perfectly acceptable way, magazine shops dont sell them to children. Once again, responsible parenting is the best method.

Q15:

Whenever it is likely that somebody would like to understand the classification prior to consuming the media. ALL retail media products fit into this category.

Q16:

Govt/industry bodies should review content and provide an easy to understand breakdown of the material contained within. Users who wish to be informed (such as parents) should be able to easily obtain this overview (i.e on the packaging) and/or find more details if necessary.

Q17:

Quite possibly, so long as there is effective motivation for the industry to do so. As an example, the video game industry might intentionally rate a game as appropriate for children just to boost sales when it clearly isn't.

Q18:

If the classification is obvious and straight forward (i.e a book about seafood cooking) should not be classified as it is obvious and straight forward that it contains no content that could cause offense to those who view it. The point of classifications is to demystify the content so that users can make a decision. If the content is obvious, there is no reason to classify it.

Q19:

No, but the classification costs should not be prohibitively expensive for small providers. Perhaps the costing of classification should be based on the profits likely to be made on the content, or the profitablilty of similar content.

OR alternatively allow low circulation content to be self-rated but with the government able to provide a different rating if it deems necessary, if a complaint is made, or penalties for obviously incorrect ratings.

Q20:

They are for movies for the most part, however for video games there is a lot of confusion and debate about the appropriateness of games - which means a lot of children are playing games and exposing their peers to content that some parents are fine with, others find highly objectional.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Only illegal content - and it should be prosecuted rather than filtered.

Q25:

No, unless RC becomes a new "Extreme" category that isn't prohibited but is quite clearly content that many would find offensive/distasteful. By attempting to block it it gives credence to underground distribution which encourages people to be exposed to it.

Illegal content however such as child pornography should not fit anywhere in the classification system - it should be prosecuted and thoroughly investigated. Beyond illegal content people should be free to access whatever content they are interested in so long as they are aware of what they will be viewing.

Q26:

Yes they are important as Australians frequently travel and one should expect that a classification in one state is the same as in another.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Classifications currently are extremely vague on the content contained within media which leads to people not trusting their accuracy. In a modern age with technology like we have, it might be prudent to implement a system that allows viewers to get detailed information about a specific classification for media. Perhaps a qrcode on the classification that when you point your phone at it would bring up a detailed list of consideration for that media:

1. Low Level Violence

2. Religious Overtones

3. Rascist comments

4. Kissing between a man and a woman

5. Kissing between members of the same sex

6. Heavy petting

etc etc etc.

Other comments: