

CI 1324 S Harris

First name: Simon

Last name: Harris

Q1:

A new framework is needed. The current form of censorship via "classification" is outmoded to say the least. We live in a world where adults should be given greater, and better informed, access to otherwise legally obtainable material.

Q2:

To inform the general population as to the nature of otherwise legally obtainable material, NOT to prohibit the distribution thereof.

Q3:

Yes

Q4:

Yes

Q5:

Yes

Q6:

No

Q7:

No

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

I believe in an ideal world, ALL content would be classified to the extent that classification implies: that which enables an adult to adequately assess the nature of otherwise legally obtainable material.

Q12:

What an adult wishes to otherwise legally view should NOT be restricted. Rather, individuals should have access to education so as to better control content accessible by minors in their care or in situations where it would be reasonable to expect minors to have access to such materials.

Q13:

By properly education adults and perhaps providing mechanisms by which adults may OPT-IN to well-known and understood filtering mechanisms.

Q14:

By making said content available in a manner that precludes general access to minors. Informed, consenting adults MUST have the right to choose for themselves if they wish to access otherwise legal material.

Q15:

I would be happy if ALL material were classified to the extent that classification implies: that which enables an adult to adequately assess the nature of otherwise legally obtainable material.

Q16:

To provide guidance to adults as to the nature of otherwise legally obtainable material.

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Q19:

The role of government, through taxes, is, among others, to inform and guide the population so as to be able to make sensible choices. To this end if a classification scheme is mandatory, the government should subsidise in part the classification of materials.

Q20:

Not even remotely. The general population as a whole does not, for example, understand that Refused Classification does NOT in fact mean illegal. Something governments have seemingly deliberately failed to understand themselves.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Access to all otherwise legal material should be unrestricted. Mechanisms should be made available to allow individuals to OPT-IN to filter out legally prohibited material. Otherwise the existing laws governing the access, distribution, and use of prohibited materials IS sufficient.

Q25:

As it is not possible to determine what material has been classified under the current scope this question is unanswerable.

Q26:

Yes

Q27:

Whatever scheme is used, surely it must come under the purview of the Commonwealth.

Q28:

Q29:

To those within the digital industry, It is patently obvious that governments do NOT understand fundamental aspects of the technology they wish to control. The mere notion that it can be controlled per se is ridiculous in itself. Where decisions about technology are to be made experts within the industry at large MUST be consulted.

Other comments:

As I have repeated many times throughout this submission, a classification system should exist to enable individuals to make informed choices about the otherwise legal material they wish to consume. At a minimum, we MUST therefore make all determinations of the classification review board transparent and accountable to a public ombudsman (or similar body).