

CI 323 E Strumpher

First name: Elissa

Last name: Strumpher

Q1:

Q2:

To inform people about the nature of media, so that they can reliably gauge whether it is appropriate for them or for their children.

Q3:

The trick here is with the nature or the platform - a video, book, movie, etc is not easily changed once distributed. Websites are more prone - by the nature of the medium - to have changing content and multiple contributors. It is much harder to set a classification and be sure that it will remain accurate. Websites are also created, and deleted, at a prolific rate - it would not be practical for a classification system to keep up with all of it. Additionally, all the world's websites are easily accessible in Australia - not the case with books and video. Given the nature of the medium, I believe that the Internet requires a different approach than more 'traditional' media.

Q4:

This might be a practical solution to the prolific and changable nature of the Internet - it is surely not possible to classify all of it. Systems would have to be in place to prevent abuse by narrow interest groups (as with any other complaints systems).

Q5:

I don't understand this question.

Q6:

Yes, I think so. Too onerous a classification scheme would adversely effect emerging creators and markets. At the same time, now that the barriers to producing media are lower, some system which balances the needs of consumers and new creators would be best. On the other end, it should not be possible for large content producers to evade the need for classification.

Q7:

Such a system should err on the side of openness and easy access. Restrictive classification smacks of censorship, and if classification is difficult or expensive it would have a negative effect on the arts industry.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

Q10:

Content accessed in public should perhaps be more subject to classification. Content accessed or consumed at home is a private matter, and can be less tightly regulated.

Q11:

Classification should be about providing consumer advice, not about restricting access.

Q12:

A national filter will NOT be an effective method of controlling access. There are a huge variety of ways in which such filters could be evaded, including technical measures to bypass the filter, migrating media to other mediums (eg- from WWW to P2P, email, or even the old sneakernet).

Q13:

Supervision and parental involvement! This is the only way to reliably control what children access. Education for both parents and children is also important. A national filter, affecting even households or businesses that don't include children is both ineffective and too intrusive.

Q14:

I don't think that access to such content really needs to be better controlled.

Q15:

If it has been classified / is required to be classified, then yes.

Q16:

I am concerned about the power of special interest groups to disproportionately effect the classification of content. The system needs to provided checks and balances, to prevent either government, industry lobbyists, or consumer interest groups from having too strong an influence.

Q17:

I'm not sure how effective such systems would be. There would have to be an active and effective enforcement mechanism in place.

Q18:

Q19:

Easy access for small or emerging producers should be an important part of the classification system. If the system is complex or expensive, as system of assistance or subsidy should be included.

Q20:

I think the existing classification categories are well understood.

Q21:

There is a need for an R rating for video games. Under the current system games can be shoehorned into MA which would better fit into R. Most video game consumers are over the age of 18, and should be able to consume 18+ video games just as they do 18+ movies, etc.

Q22:

Q23:

I think that would be good. Surely the same community standards, etc, are applied to all media?
Shouldn't the criteria be the same too?

Q24:

Very, very little content deserves to be entirely prohibited, online or otherwise. Child pornography is the only category I think justifies a blanket prohibition. Even for other undesirable content such as hate speech or depictions of actual non-consensual sexual acts, I am wary of using the classification system to restrict access by categories. Restrictions should be on a case-by-case basis, with stringent conditions to prevent misuse and expansion of the restrictions to less seriously objectionable content. Only very offensive material should be entirely prohibited (again I am concerned about special interest groups and moral panics).

Q25:

I can see the validity in the argument that materials that meet RC criteria should be restricted in all mediums. As long as content prohibited online was limited only to the materials which would be refused classification in other mediums, I have no objection (except for the technical difficulty of achieving or enforcing such a prohibition).

Q26:

It would probably be nice to have, but it is not important to me.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

I am very concerned about the proposed Internet filter.

Firstly, it is practically impossible to implement an effective system for restricting access to certain content. Content can easily be moved to new locations or accessed through different technologies not affected by the filter. Technical measures can be evaded through the use of proxies and anonymiser services, etc. It is not practical on a technical level - and so would not be effective for those determined to evade it.

Secondly, I am concerned that the scope of the content which is filtered may be expanded through the efforts of special interest groups or governments responding to moral panics or fishing for votes. Systems for transparency, quality control, independence, etc need to be strong. The scope of the filter needs to be /severely/ limited - perhaps to the level of RC, but no further. Merely objectionable content should not be restricted - if I want to read erotic fiction or watch home-made sex videos, etc, I should be able to. As an adult, it would be my personal responsibility to ensure that children did not access such materials on Internet connections under my control.

I am also concerned about the definitions used for RC. Who is a "reasonable adult"? How do you know what a reasonable adult thinks? What methods or surveys are used to gauge community norms of morality and decency. What I consider reasonable and decent would probably shock and horrify some other members of the community, while some of their "reasonable and decent" beliefs would horrify me.