

CI 1556 E Brus

First name: Elly

Last name: Brus

Q1:

I approve of a standardised set of classification rules, but as advisory to the public only. The existing framework is not consistent.

Q2:

They should be an efficient way to inform the public about the content and nature of media, without restricting our right to access it. Classification should not equal censorship.

Q3:

The internet is unable to be wholly classified, as that would require minute-by-minute analysis of every piece of published content online. Therefore the system used to classify physical media cannot apply. I am unable to think of a negative affect on Australian caused by the internet being unclassified, however if an attempt were made to create a "safe-zone" this may lead parents into believing minors do not need to be supervised online.

Q4:

No. There is way to administrate this in a way that would work, and it would only cause problems.

Q5:

As advisory to the public only.

Q6:

As advisory to the public only.

Q7:

For consumer advice only, never for the purpose of restricting access.

Q8:

For consumer advice only, never for the purpose of restricting access.

Q9:

Q10:

No. This is not able to be determined and is pointless.

Q11:

Q12:

Informing parents. Parents should be aware that their children need supervising as they do in every other area of life. If a highly desired material is restricted, even a ten year old will be able to find a copy of it somewhere if they have the motivation. There is no effective way to filter online content, and doing so may provide parents with a false sense of security.

Q13:

Parental supervision, and awareness of what their children can do online.

Q14:

Q15:

When it is available for purchase, and contains material not suitable for those under 15

Q16:

Advisory only.

Q17:

Television broadcasts seem to use an acceptable classification standard. This can apply to all industries. If a mistake is made, the industry itself is held responsible which leads to greater quality control.

Q18:

Any media which is available for purchase.

Q19:

Industries may opt to have the classification of their content subsidised if they are unable to classify it themselves for any reason.

Q20:

There is no difference between sexually explicit "restricted" and violent "restricted". M and MA causes a lot of confusion.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

It should be made clearer.

Q24:

It is not possible to prohibit content online, and there is no need for it. Most negative impacts of the internet come about through either social interaction, or through already illegal channels.

Q25:

No. There are many inconsistencies.

Q26:

Beyond this, consistency of international classification laws is important. Division of state, and even country is less and less visible, especially in regards to online interaction.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

There should be an R18 category for computer games, an industry which is in many ways bigger than the movie industry and a huge part of Australian [adult] culture.

Other comments:

I believe a section of the internet relevant to Australians could be classified, as a guide only, but it should be understood that this is a service the government provides to help Australians make informed decisions about content online that they view, rather than restricting them from viewing it. A voluntary filter using this is an option, but could lead to parents believing the internet has been made safe for their children, when this is clearly not the case. An analogy would be sending your kids to Bondi beach and not bothering to supervise them in the water because you've been told the beach has a shark net.

I would like to see investigation into a government protected safe-internet-zone, that is completely opt-in. Authoritative, legal, selected and rated by the government.