

CI 922 A Kirkpatrick

First name: Andrew

Last name: Kirkpatrick

Q1:

A new framework seems prudent since the current one is deeply flawed.

Q2:

To enable parents and guardians to protect the minors in their care, without limiting legitimate access to material by adults. Moral judgements by minorities should not affect free discourse and expression. All classifications should be made public including the reasons for them, so that the system fosters debate and can be self correcting.

Q3:

I think that the technology/platform is immaterial because it is changing so quickly; tying classification regimes to the means of delivery is to make a system that will be soon outdated.

Q4:

There is so much content being generated and consumed today that no classification system can hope to be complete. Therefore a significant proportion of the media consumed by the public should only be assessed for classification if it has offended someone sufficiently for them to make a complaint. The system should recognise that some people will complain about anything and everything.

Q5:

The potential impact should only be a concern with respect to minors consuming the media. Content intended for children should be classified on TV in order to help their parents decide what is appropriate for them. However attempting to classify broad categories like all children's content across all media is not reasonable. Its important to also realise that some programs have content that can be appreciated at more than one level, such as Invader Zim.

Q6:

Not at all.

Q7:

No. Art should only be classified upon complaint, and restrictions only applied to viewing by minors.

Q8:

I see no meaningful distinction between audio material and other content with respect to classification.

Q9:

Only when the composition of the audience is mostly minors, and even then the classification should not be applicable to adults.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

Only the most extremely illegal material should be in question - material that will unquestionably still be illegal for generations to come. Homosexuality was only legalised in Tasmania in the late 90s and clearly homosexual content was consumed in that state before then, and it was not wrong for adults to

do so. Euthanasia is illegal today, yet it is clearly a matter that could change at any time - if the Northern Territory had been a state its law could not have been overturned so easily. Therefore material about euthanasia should not be restricted to adults, or we are just holding back social progress and the march of history.

Q12:

Opt-in client side filters. Broadly filtering the internet is a self defeating exercise. Access to some content should only be restricted to children, by their parents. Everything should be accessible by adults, and if the material is extremely illegal such as child or snuff porn that is a police matter, not a censorship one.

Q13:

Education and support of parents, improved opt-in mechanisms such as local network filters.

Q14:

Keep it away from the counter at service stations so the kids don't have to walk past it to buy a chocolate.

Q15:

The current arrangements seem OK

Q16:

Government should establish what is safe for children of different ages to be exposed to. Industry bodies should only regulate themselves and submit to government regulation. Users should engage in open debate about complaints and discuss the rulings on different content (I think all classifications should be made public so they can be debated in the open)

Q17:

There should be a code which industry conforms to. Government can't hope to classify everything.

Q18:

Children's content, up to around MA.

Q19:

I do think small and marginally profitable productions should have their classification subsidised, but I don't think much material should be classified anyway - the main questions are, is it suitable for children, if so down to roughly what age? And is this content heinously illegal?

Q20:

Refused classification. Because these works go onto a black list they cannot be discussed. This is inappropriate in a free, democratic society.

Q21:

Fewer categories, and refused classification should be removed.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes, and stop treating computer games as though adults don't play them.

Q24:

None. If the content is extremely illegal, it is a police matter.

Q25:

No. RC should be abolished.

Q26:

There should only be a federal classification system.

Q27:

A federal one that is simple, transparent and emphasises freedom of choice and expression.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Too much power is in the hands of fundamentalist christians who have opinions on what others do and drive the system with complaints. The classification schemes tend to be run by conservatives that do not reflect the values of anyone I know.

Other comments:

Nobody who thinks that evolution isn't a valid scientific theory, because their minister told them so, should be allowed to reason about what content I can consume.