

CI 1654 J Prince

First name: Jared

Last name: Prince

Q1:

Creating a new framework.

Q2:

Primarily the objective should be to allow parents to know if material is suitable for young children. It would, however, remain the parent's responsibility to protect the child from inappropriate material.

It should not be compulsory for children's media to be classified, however it would be advantageous to the author, since any responsible adult would only allow their children to view media approved for children by the government. Primary schools would only allow content approved for children, for instance.

Not all material needs be classified, only stuff that is "government certified" as suitable for small children.

Q3:

For merely practical reasons, yes, because there are many fundamental differences between a magazine in a real public newsagent versus a website online.

1. A magazine in a shop might be seen by any person accidentally, whereas online content is almost always only seen if deliberately sought out. So online content is effectively already self filtered.

2. The volume on content online makes it totally impractical to classify it all. The think that every online "published" blog, facebook page, or website can undergo a lengthy and expensive classification submission is patently ridiculous.

3. The steps required to censor and filter the internet effectively are so extreme and dangerous to free speech that they must be avoided.

Primarily the issue isn't what technological platform is used to access the content, but rather whether the content has been deemed suitable for children. So for instance it would be inappropriate for a newsagent to put a copy of "Playboy" in the magazine section set aside for children. It is the material in sections put aside for children that needs to be classified, to confirm that it is indeed suitable.

Q4:

No, this won't work, because certain noisy groups will complain about anything they have an ideological problem with. A prime example of this was the way the Christian lobby managed to get a Safe Sex promotional poster removed just by making a few complaints.

No material should be required to be classified. However stuff intended for children would benefit in the market by getting itself classified, so that parent's can be confident that some book, game or whatever is genuinely suitable for children. A responsible adult, given a choice between an unknown, unclassified childrens book and an unknown but classified childrens book would obviously choose the latter.

Adults should be allowed to view what they want, short of child pornography or snuff films.

Q5:

Material for adults need not be classified. Adults can decide for themselves what to watch. Of course, child pornography and snuff films would be illegal, but this doesn't require classification, since these illegal films by definition won't be put in for classification.

Getting stuff for children classified should be optional. However, in practice authors of children's media would need to get it classified since otherwise responsible adults wouldn't buy it for their children, and schools wouldn't stock it.

Q6:

Yes, because in reality it's impossible to classify the hundreds of millions, or billions, of blogs, games, youtube videos and other online media that pour onto the internet every day. It doesn't matter what "should" be done, from a merely practical point there's what can be done, and that's not much.

Again, to protect children, parent's could only allow their children to only visit state sanctioned childrens web pages. You could have a domain like something.kids.au, and the parent's home based computer filters and school based filters could only allow children to look at those few domains confirmed suitable for children by the government.

Q7:

No, absolutely not. It is a ridiculous restriction and expense for artists to face, and a massive infringement of free speech. (Yes, I know Australia doesn't have free speech, but it should!)

Adults should already be fully aware that if they go to see art, they may see things that are confrontational or inappropriate for children.

However, a gallery could go out and specifically request a classification to prove that their exhibition is suitable for children, if their marketing indicated that would help. Responsible parents would only take their children to art exhibitions that have been officially classified as safe for children.

Q8:

Only to the extent that they shouldn't need to be classified at all. Again, if the makers intend the product for children, then it's in their best interests to get it officially classified as suitable for children.

Q9:

No, because classification should be optional. But if the media is intended for children, then it is in the creator's best interests to get it officially classified as suitable for children, or else responsible parents won't allow their children to attend.

Q10:

Councils and state governments might insist that many public spaces such as parks and streets be made safe for children. In those cases, any material that goes there would need to be officially classified as safe for children.

Private material for adults should not be subject to classification at all.

Q11:

Apart from having some public spaces safe for children, no classification is needed. And not all public spaces need be safe for children either, for instance a public rock concert need not be safe for children.

Some media such as child porn featuring real children or snuff films obviously should be illegal, however this has nothing to do with classification since such material is already illegal and would never be submitted for classification in the first place.

Q12:

The most effective method is home based filters for parents and schools. All other such filters, such as mandatory ISP level filters, are incredibly dangerous to free speech and the rights of consenting adults.

ISP level filters fail to stop traffic in child porn and snuff films since such material is mostly traded over secret networks rather than open web pages. The rallying cry of child porn is just an excuse to censor vast amounts of other stuff the government doesn't like, such as wikileaks or X-rated material featuring consenting adults, which adults should be allowed to view if they choose.

Q13:

The government can set up a list of approved childrens sites, and then parents and schools can get personal web filters that only allow access to those sites.

It makes much more sense to create a small pool of media guaranteed as safe for children, than it does to try and make the entire internet safe for children. Firstly, it's impossible to rate the entire internet, and secondly, it is wrong to treat the internet as a children's space instead of an adult space. The internet is the ultimate conglomeration of human ideas, and as such it needs to include ADULT ideas, not just stuff suitable for children.

Q14:

It doesn't need to be better controlled, it is already controlled very well. Only certain premises are allowed to sell sexually explicit material, and you need to be an adult to enter those places, so the call for "better control" is ludicrous.

If anything, the controls should be relaxed, since the current prohibitions on what can be displayed are way too restrictive. We have the absurd guidelines that make female ejaculation and women with small breasts grounds for banning a magazine. This is ridiculous. It should be legal to display anything sane, consenting adults do.

Q15:

It should never be required. However, if the material is intended for children, then responsible parents and schools will only ever allow media that has been officially classified as suitable for children. So in that case, it is in the creator's best interests to get their media classified and proudly marked as suitable for children.

Q16:

The government should primarily task itself with vetting media intended for children that has been voluntarily submitted for classification. It should also task itself with maintaining an official list of websites approved for children.

Industry bodies would self regulate material intended for young adults and adults. It's marketing would need to reflect the true content of the product, or be subject to accusations of false advertising.

In the modern age classification by government is unnecessary, since parents or concerned groups can consult various websites to determine if some media is suitable for themselves or not. For instance, many christian groups maintain their own ratings of films that are consulted by christians more so than any government rating.

Q17:

Yes, although the classification should be optional, not mandatory.

Q18:

Assuming it is done voluntarily by the creator, then anything can be so classified. Creators always have a target audience in mind to begin with, be it children, young adults or adults, so they know the classification it is intended for.

The only exception is when an author wished to get official, government approved "suitable for children" status.

Q19:

All classification should be freely provided by the government, if someone decides to optionally get their media classified.

If this is impractical, then since the only material really needing classification is stuff intended for children, a small but easily affordable fee could be charged, say something like \$50 to cover the 15 minute vetting process required.

Q20:

The existing categories are understood, and largely resented.

Q21:

If classification is to be forced on us, then we need a new adult classification for games. R18+ for games is long overdue, and an X18+ for sexually explicit games should also be allowed.

Q22:

We should be allowed to have R18+ and X18+ video games.

Q23:

Hmm, don't know, this sounds like a technical legal question. However, if it allows for R18+ (and maybe X18+) video games, then it sounds like a good thing.

Q24:

Child pornography that features real children and snuff films are already prohibited. So there's no need for additional prohibitions. Attempts to block most of this stuff online is futile, but what can be done is to track down websites producing or hosting this material and prosecute them, and to prosecute people found to own this stuff within Australia. This already happens.

Make-believe "naughty" adult sex play should be allowed, such as: Adult fantasy depictions of sadomasochism, fantasy domination/submission play, "naughty schoolgirl" type fantasies featuring obvious adults, fantasy "rape" or "abduction" films featuring adults who are obviously only playing a role and really quite enjoying the scenario, should be allowed. Censors need to distinguish between fantasy and reality.

One area of problem is that too much material is being deemed "child pornography" when in fact it features young adults. Censors are using the breast size of adult women to classify adult pornography as child pornography, in an attempt to tarnish and stifle what consenting adults read on the internet.

For this reason, hysterical campaigning that uses child pornography as the catchcry for censorship needs to be treated with extreme suspicion. Often the material they seek to censor is much broader than real child pornography.

Q25:

No, it is way too prohibitive. RC needs to be removed as a category. If the content is film of a real criminal act, such as genuine non-consensual violence or a real child being sexually abused, then this is criminal material and the makers need to be prosecuted. "Classifying" such material is beside the point, it is a criminal act to produce or to own such material.

However, this applies ONLY to real child pornography and real torture/murder film. Just because a video or game depicts something illegal is NOT grounds to ban it.

And a further caveat is that if the film is designed to educate or record and injustice, it wouldn't be criminal. For instance, videoing an assault for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of the attacker would not be illegal, while filming it for entertainment would be.

Q26:

Yes and no. Ideally, the least restrictive scheme would apply to the whole of Australia. However the most progressive, least censoring states/territories should not be required to become more restrictive merely in the name of consistency.

Q27:

Across the country, the government should restrict itself to creating a list of materials officially suitable for children. Other material should be unclassified or optionally classified. A small core of material (child porn featuring actual young children, and snuff movies featuring violence against consenting agents) would remain illegal, and those producing or consuming such material would face prosecution.

Q28:

The federal government should be able to override states that censor and restrict too much, however states should be able to override the federal government if it, federally, censors or restricts too much. This would allow a baseline level of free speech.

Q29:

Mostly the framework should be completely removed. It is archaic and paternal, and intrudes where it has no right to intrude. It's only real valid function would be to create a government certified pool of media that is suitable for children. Adults should be allowed to view what they like, apart from child porn featuring real children and snuff films featuring real violence against non-consenting adults.

Other comments: