

CI 465 I Anderson

First name: Iain

Last name: Anderson

Q1:

Improving key elements.

Q2:

Consistency across mediums, availability of publications currently unavailable due to being refused classification.

Q3:

Yes, internet content is located around the world and cannot be expected to necessarily comply with Australian legislation. Ensuring the internet is compliant with Australian standards is impossible. Classifying locally released content is appropriate.

Q4:

For some kinds of content this may be appropriate.

Q5:

Impact is relative to the person, and classification based on content and context would be appropriate. Certainly, it would make sense to classify games in the same way as films.

Q6:

Classification should not restrict the ability of content producers to act swiftly. If, for example, every edition of a podcast or other current publication was required to be classified before publication, it would cripple the ability to publish. Due to the differences in speed of distribution, it is probably appropriate to require classification for physical media, but not necessarily for online media. The world of publishing is changing, and by some definitions, even posting on Twitter could count as publishing. Online-only media should be excluded, as it's always someone's choice to view it -- unlike TV, where content is delivered without explicit request.

Q7:

If on public display, or available for retail sale.

Q8:

Self-regulation, by marking musical works with strong language, seems to be working.

Q9:

If a physical product is marketed to children, it would be appropriate to require classification. An online-only product marketed to children and produced in Australia could self-classify, and have this classification modified following any complaints.

Q10:

Public content can be reasonably expected to be suitable for children unless warnings are given. I support the classification system's utility in informing consumers, but as an adult, I generally expect to be able to access content up to and including X-rated content should I so choose, in my own home or in a dedicated private venue such as a cinema.

Q11:

I support the current bans on illegal content such as child-based or violent pornography and similar content, and so am generally in support of requiring physically distributed media to be classified.

Q12:

A voluntary filter for anyone who requests it -- mandatory filtering is doomed to fail. An adult will not accidentally stumble across unsuitable content in the same way a child will. Any worthwhile filter will slow down internet use, so parents who want to protect their kids can make that choice.

Q13:

Parental education. Free, voluntary filters from ISPs if requested.

Q14:

Plain packaging behind the counter is fine. The current situation in Queensland (and elsewhere) where women's genitals are photoshopped ("healed to a single crease") to comply with the maximum M rating here is absurd, and leads to body image issues for women.

Q15:

When on display in public if over a certain threshold. It wouldn't be appropriate to require Gardening Australia to show a "G" rating, but it would be appropriate to require Penthouse to display its rating.

Q16:

Governments should classify publically exhibited content and respond to reasonable public complaints. Industry bodies can self-certify where appropriate. Users should be able to get information about movies at cinemas or on disc, and should be capable of deciding for themselves about less widely distributed content online.

Q17:

Potentially. A system whereby industry self-regulates but can be challenged could be appropriate. It would be helpful to avoid a situation where films are self-censored (and ruined) to achieve a certain rating. It's also unhelpful to simply quantify the number of swear words that can be used per hour; context is important. If industry can't decide this easily, government agencies could.

Q18:

Currently excluded content. Nature documentaries and similar content.

Q19:

If classification is required, then smaller independent films could receive a discounted rate. The Australian film industry is in deep enough trouble as it is.

Q20:

Only the missing "R18+" for games causes confusion.

Q21:

R18+ for games is urgently needed to correctly classify some games intended for adults. Accessibility of MA or R rated magazines across Australia.

Q22:

The current logo in a corner seems fine.

Q23:

Simplify the system if possible. All ratings should equally apply across all physical media.

Q24:

While I don't think it's feasible to filter it out, but I support the illegal status of child pornography, violent pornography, and similar material.

Q25:

No, because it doesn't allow for adult (R-rated) video games.

Q26:

Yes, it's important, as noted above. Given the availability of all kinds of content across state lines, restrictions on physical content sales within states are doomed to failure. Imposing a national standard would be appropriate, so long as X-rated content is not banned for those who seek it out.

Q27:

A national, consistent scheme.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

I think at present, violent imagery is seen as more damaging than sexual imagery. Violence can receive quite a low rating, while sexual content always receives a high rating. I believe that this is a mistake we have inherited from the Puritan-originated US. More reasonable ratings for consensual sexual acts and potentially higher ratings for violence or death might encourage a more positive view of sex and less acceptance of violence.

Other comments: