

CI 1641 E Harvey

First name: Evan

Last name: Harvey

Q1:

Yes

Q2:

To correctly inform the public about the content of media etc in accordance with established community and valued standards. It should not be to impose arbitrary restrictions on the community. For example, the idea of an internet filter is a misuse of power. It will not stop illegal activity, and is highly vulnerable to corruption and abuse. The currently proposed method of control whereby an unobtainable list of blacklisted sites, which is not subject to public scrutiny, nor appeal, is inappropriate. It is inappropriate not because of the illegal material it seeks to restrict, but because it does so in a way that cannot be examined, and the public has no way of knowing what is or is not available. That the current government of the day is capable of adding whatever sites they deem restricted opens the door to serious abuses of trust. A proposal such as this cannot be considered without an examination of the ways that it may be abused in the future. This is also a solution that should be decided upon by the people, and not introduced without their approval, unlike the way the Gillard government has bowed to the fringe Greens and introduced a carbon tax after promising not to do so.

Q3:

The platform or technology is irrelevant to a certain degree. It should be recognised, however, that new technologies pose serious issues in terms of awareness and understanding. The appropriate safeguards need to be created that deal with changes to technology as well as a way of informing the public about risk and correct use. Issues such as jurisdiction, origin of content etc need to be formally considered and discussed with international partners if an effective solution is actually desired. Part of this involves setting up the appropriate laws that deal sensitively with different countries and their cultural needs, as well as informing the community about the established standards.

Q4:

No.

Q5:

Yes. Classifications should be broad enough to encompass all media. What is illegal on tv should be illegal on the internet. What is classified on tv should be classified on the internet.

Q6:

No. Illegal is illegal. Restricted is restricted. Available is available.

Q7:

Yes. The term "art" should be a de facto for lawless. Whilst the challenging of community standards is to be expected and even welcomed in some instances, the law should apply regardless. This needs to be applied in a sensitive manner so as not to stifle the freedom of expression, and should be based

on community standards rather than an arbitrary law made by those who do not understand the social complexity and desires of the community.

Q8:

Yes. Any form of classification should be accompanied by efforts to educate parents and the community. Unless the actual core of a given problem is addressed, trying to fix the symptoms is futile. Adopting a stance of censorship and oppression will not solve the issue and is a poor and unintelligent form of control.

Q9:

No. Social, religious and community standards should inform and shape legislation. A sensitive approach needs to be applied with regards to religious and community standards. One section of the population cannot claim exemption from law, regardless of religious or social requirements.

Q10:

Yes and no. Some material may not be appropriate to display in public, but is allowed in the freedom of private viewing. However, this should not deal with matters of illegality. If material is illegal, it should not matter whether it is public or private. However, community standards

Q11:

Prevailing community standards should influence classifications. Typical government knee-jerk reactions should be avoided and a measured and informed decision made.

Q12:

Public education. Whilst the idea to restrict access to certain illegal material on the internet sounds appropriate, the current proposed methods present serious concerns regarding corruption and the violation of freedom.

Q13:

By educating parents on the issues and solutions available to them. Until the government makes a clear choice to do that, any other efforts to control people will be futile. The solution is to challenge the problem, not waste valuable time dealing with the symptoms.

Q14:

I think it is currently sufficient.

Q15:

Where it falls into certain restricted categories as determined by either legislation or community standards.

Q16:

The government should advise the public about content. Some forms of censorship are appropriate, but it is only a minority of cases that this should affect. Industry should be regulated if necessary to conform to the accepted standards without curtailing freedom of enterprise and the changing social values of the community. Users need to be educated about what is and what is not acceptable.

Q17:

I am unable to comment on that.

Q18:

Illegal content as currently outlined by Australian law as well as any age restricted material.

Q19:

Classification needs to operate across the board in a way that is transparent and unobtrusive. The idea needs to primarily be to inform, not restrict.

Q20:

Yes. The issue is primarily not with classification itself, but with education and the balance between protecting the vulnerable (such as children), restricting illegal material, and yet allowing freedom within accepted standards. Classification should not be about oppressive control.

Q21:

There have been calls for R18+ video games. This is reasonable given that other forms of media carry this classification. However, the concern that minors may be able to access this material is a matter of educating parents. Minors can already get R18+ film and other media, so the idea that video games should not be allowed this classification is indefensible. The idea of classification should primarily be to inform the public about content, with the secondary goal of controlling access as per accepted community standards.

Q22:

The consistency should be in the standards applied, and the visibility of classification marking.

Q23:

There should be one document that outlines classification standards, made up of many constituent parts that deal with the various forms of media.

Q24:

This is an issue of major concern. No one disputes that illegal material should be restricted, and that law enforcement efforts made to convict and curtail the propagation of such material. However, the proposed internet filter solution fail to understand the technology and the problems that may arise. The idea of blacklisted sites that have no accompanying visibility is contrary to the established community ideas of freedom and accountability. Various commentators have raised the idea that organised crime that deals with illegal content will not be affected by a proposed internet filter, by the use of technology such as virtual private networks that the proposed internet filter will not be able to detect. We can see how oppressive regimes such as China have restricted the freedom of their population in ways that are abhorrent to our standards and promotes government level abuse. The concept that the internet should be arbitrarily filtered by a government body will enable the abuse of that power, and such abuse is inevitable, regardless of the intentions of the original drafters of the legislation. There is no simple answer to this issue. The only solution is to work with international agencies and establish common laws that are capable of dealing with these issues.

Q25:

Yes.

Q26:

Yes. There should be a national standard that reflects the nations values as a whole.

Q27:

A single national standard should be created.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Other comments: