

CI 2296 R Palmer

First name: Robert

Last name: Palmer

Q1:

A new framework should be developed.

Q2:

a) Allow users of content to make informed choices regarding their media consumption
and

b) prevent unwanted access to content which is offensive

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

No

Q6:

No

Q7:

There should be no requirement for artworks to be classified. However, artists and galleries should be able to voluntarily classify their works, exhibitions, etc.

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No, however it should affect the way access to the content is controlled and regulated.

Q11:

Q12:

There are no effective methods of controlling access to online content. Technological measures to enforce such controls (DNS filtering, etc) are trivially circumvented.

A modern classification system must recognise this reality, and accordingly place less emphasis on "banning" or restricting content. If the aim of a classification system is to allow users to make informed decisions, while preventing unwanted exposure to offensive material, then more resources should be put in to educating users in the use of the Internet.

Q13:

Through

a) Parental supervision

b) educating children on "safe" use of the Internet

Q14:

There are already adequate controls in place. Restricted content can be sold in opaque, sealed packaging to minimise unwanted exposure. ID checks can be performed at point of sale to ensure restricted content is not sold to minors.

Q15:

If content has been classified, then that classification should be clearly displayed. That is, the criteria for requiring classification information to be shown should be the same as the criteria for determining whether classification is necessary in the first instance.

Q16:

Government should set the standards for classification. In the case of content likely to be unrestricted (i.e. G, PG, M), industry should apply these standards to classify their content. However, there should be a government agency to which these industry classifications can be appealed (in the event of a complaint, etc).

Content likely to be restricted (MA, R, etc) should be classified by government agencies. These classifications should also be able to be appealed (as is currently the case).

Responsibility for enforcing access restrictions on content should rest with both government agencies and users. Customs should control content imported into the country, and state police should enforce restrictions at retail outlets. However, users (e.g. parents) should be responsible for regulating access to content within their own homes.

Q17:

Yes. In particular, they are likely to be cheaper to operate, and may reduce the time taken to classify new content.

Q18:

Content that is unlikely to fall into a restricted category (i.e. content likely to be classified as G, PG, M) should be classified by industry according to a common standard. In the event of a complaint or appeal against an industry given classification, the content could be reclassified by the Classification Board.

Q19:

Only in limited circumstances, for example as part of a government sponsored film festival. It would be better to allow industry and artists to self classify more material (see Q18) to reduce costs.

Q20:

The existing categories are generally well understood.

Q21:

No.

Q22:

A common set of classifications and ratings across all media should be created. The classification guidelines should refer to the likely impact of the content itself. Thus there does not need to be anything media specific in the guidelines.

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

Access to content which has caused serious harm to people or society in its production (e.g. child pornography, snuff films) should be banned entirely.

Content which is only extremely offensive (e.g. necrophilia, drawings of children engaged in sexual acts where no real children are involved) should not be banned. A ban should (for the most part) be based on evidence of actual harm having occurred, rather than nebulous arguments about "potential" social harms that may occur if content is allowed to be accessed.

However, in some cases, it will be necessary to consider potential social impacts. For example, texts which advocate violence could lead to actual violence, particularly if accessed during a time of political instability. In such cases, a temporary ban can be justified. However, the ban should be reviewed periodically.

In considering which content should be completely censored, it is important to remember that the mere act of reading or viewing an offensive text does not lead inexorably to the reader or viewer adopting the offensive practices depicted.

Q25:

No. The current definition of the RC category is too broad.

Q26:

Ideally, there should be consistency in the state and territory laws.

Q27:

The current scheme is adequate, though difficult to change or amend. The focus of this review should be on developing a framework that does not need to be amended regularly and can adapt to changing circumstances.

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: