

CI 1929 D Edquist

First name: David

Last name: Edquist

Q1:

Improving the current framework. The current framework, I feel, is good. Furthermore, it is well understood by the Australian public. More work should be done to make the ratings consistent across categories. For example, there is no good reason beyond historical prejudice for games to lack an R18+ rating. This confuses the public. Improving key elements should include eliminating confusion such as this.

Q2:

As this is classification, not censorship, the primary goal should be to inform adults of the content of media, so they can make an informed decision as to whether they or their children should watch it.

A secondary objective is the censorship of material for those too young to make rational decisions on the matter. Another is to make sure that material seen as generally objectionable is not shown in public (such as being watched on a bus with others around, or on a advertising billboard).

I do not think that it should be in the state's interest to censor anything for rational adults, so long as material seen as generally objectionable is not seen in public. An exception exists where the creation of the media causes harm - for a disgusting example, the creation of child porn necessarily involves the abuse of children. It is for this reason that it should be banned.

Q3:

Yes. This is simply for reasons of practicality. While a film that is downloaded from the internet will have the same impact as the same film on a DVD, it is a vastly more difficult task to force the classification of material on the internet. Hence, media on the internet should not be classified as a general rule.

Q4:

I think that a complaint based system allows for a still-effective but vastly less resource-consuming classification task. I think the current system where material on the internet is only classified if subject to a complaint works well.

Q5:

As the distinction of PG and G is meaningful to the parents of young children, I think light impact material should still be classified. However, the classification board (or equivalent body) is swamped with requests for classification of light impact material, perhaps an industry or co-regulatory scheme can be set up for light impact material.

Where practical, material across media should be classified consistently. Also, unless the content is significantly changed, one classification ruling for the content should apply across all media. A film seen in cinema will likely have the same impact on DVD - there is no need to re-classify.

Q6:

Yes, again, for reasons of practicality. It is much more expensive, relatively, for a small company to pay a classification fee than a large one. A better approach to this might be subsidisation or elimination of the fee for smaller producers and distributors.

Q7:

I don't think so. This hasn't been a problem in the past, and I see no reason why it will be a problem in the future. I think that any museum putting on a controversial exhibit will have the good sense to warn people before they experience the exhibit.

Q8:

I don't think so. Again, this hasn't been a problem in the past.

Q9:

Obviously, its most important to classify material which is bound for larger audiences.

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

There are no effective methods. Not ones across the entire populous. For parents seeking to control the content their kids see, there are some excellent software filters out there, which are subsidised by the government. However, such tools aren't as good as parents teaching their kids how to be safe, and building up a trusting parent-child bond.

Any compulsory ISP-level scheme (and any nation-wide blocking of content would have to ISP-level) will slow down the internet for all, and will be easily bypassed by the use of proxies and other technological tools. Furthermore, such a scheme could be used by future, less trustworthy governments (or corrupt servants of the government) to censor what they wished. Finally, and most importantly, any such scheme is un-Australian and un-democratic in the way it tramples on people's freedoms and rights. We should not be imitating China's solution to media on the internet. A far better solution is to increase funding to stop those producing such illegal content.

Q13:

See above. The best way to make kids safe on the internet is better parenting. This can include giving parents more education about what the internet is, and how to teach your kids the to be safe. How to set up a trusting bond between child and parent.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

For small content producers and distributors whose content must be classified, yes, the government should subsidise the classification fee.

Q20:

Yes. I have yet to meet someone who doesn't understand what the ratings mean, with the exception of what makes content X18+ rather than RC. I presume is because of the rarity of X18+ content in general consumption.

That being said, many (including myself) have expressed confusion over the lack of the R18+ ranking for games.

Q21:

Yes. There should be an R18+ rating for games. Possibly another rating for all media types, where the content is beyond R18+ but not refused classification, because I believe that rational adults should be able to experience what they choose to. This may involve a rather larger expansion of the X18+ rating, so a new name might be in order.

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Only that which inherently causes harm by the production of the content.

Q25:

Not at all.

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: