

CI 177 B Philippa

First name: Bronson

Last name: Philippa

Q1:

Q2:

A national classification scheme should exist to protect children from inappropriate material, and nothing more. The current system of ratings for movies and TV programs is useful in this respect. However, a national classification scheme should not act to restrict content available to adults. For example, some high profile computer games made overseas have recently been refused classification in Australia. It is embarrassing that our country does not allow mature adults to view the same media that other Western countries permit.

Q3:

It is reasonable to argue that classification should not depend upon the technology or media used to deliver the material. However, in practice, it is completely impossible to censor or classify the Internet in any useful way. All internet censorship programs can be defeated in various ways, and all are vulnerable to either incomplete coverage and/or falsely censoring material. However, the strongest reason for not filtering the Internet is that there is no way to distinguish between adults and children. There is no rational intellectual justification for preventing mature adults from viewing content which was produced legally.

The key point here is education. Everyone wants children to be protected online, and the proper way to do this is by educating their parents. Instead of pursuing an online censorship policy, the government should direct those resources into educating parents and children about how to be safe online.

Q4:

Q5:

The potential impact of material should affect classification decisions regarding access by children. However, adults should be able to make their own decisions about whether to watch material. It would be appropriate for high impact material to be labelled as such, provided that it was still available for adults. The goal of a classification scheme for adults should be to warn people about high impact material in order to allow them to make an informed purchasing decision. For Internet-based material, this is, of course, impossible, and so the government should focus exclusively on classifying non-Internet material.

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

The composition of the audience should have an impact. For example, an audience consisting exclusively of adults should have almost no classification beyond an age limit (i.e. purchase restricted to those showing photographic ID of being over 18 years old).

Q10:

Content accessed in the privacy of one's home should be subject to no restrictions whatsoever, except perhaps the proviso that it must be legal to produce the material. For example, there should be no restrictions on pornographic films provided those films depict adults engaging in consenting activity. I understand that consensual fetishes are currently refused classification in Australia. This is inappropriate: why should the government have any business interfering in the bedroom of consenting adults? These adults must be free to make their own decisions about the nature of the fetish material they want to see.

Q11:

Q12:

There is no effective method of controlling access to online content. Any censorship scheme can be easily defeated, for example, by using a VPN service based in a country which does not filter the Internet. Since VPNs are essential for business use, they cannot be blocked, and so any attempt to filter the Internet is a waste of taxpayer money. Should the government implement any online filtering scheme, many people - myself included - will publicise as widely as possible methods for defeating the online filtering. It is a pointless and futile endeavour, and I am ashamed that a secular democracy like Australia is even considering such a scheme.

Q13:

The best way to control children's access to online content is by parental supervision and/or parental controls implemented directly on the computer which children have access to.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

It is probably appropriate that computer games be subject to industry classification. Almost any game developer could honestly answer the question with only a moment's thought whether their game is appropriate for children or whether it should be available to adults only.

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

There is a strong and immediate need for an R18+ rating for computer games. In this way, content appropriate only for adults can be labelled as such, and games available legitimately overseas or for online purchase are still available in Australian shops.

Q22:

Computer games and movies should be subject to identical classification.

Q23:

Yes

Q24:

It is impossible to prevent access to online material because easy circumvention measures exist. Therefore, the government should not waste time implementing an ineffective censorship regime, and should instead focus on issues that actually matter.

Q25:

No, the current scope of the RC category is too restrictive. No content should be RC unless that content depicts non-consensual activity or the abuse of children.

Q26:

Consistency of state and territory laws is very important.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: