First name: William
Last name: Cullen

Q1:
Q2:
Artistic freedom
Consumer choice
Q3:
My inclination is to say no. However, in practical terms some technologies and platforms lend themselves to content classification more easily than others. For example, the classification of movies shown in cinemas is possible because there are only a small number, relatively speaking, released each year. Compare that to online content - the sheer volume of material uploaded to just Youtube on a daily basis would make classification impossible. Likewise, it would probably be impractical to attempt to classify all new books released.
Q4:
Yes. Further, the cost of classifying the content should be borne by the complainant.
Q5:
Yes - why waste resources on something that will never do any harm.
No - it's impossible to classify all online content designed for children - there's potentially too much. It's probably also not worth classifying children's books - I would judge them to be extremely low risk.
Q6:
Yes - why waste resources classifying something that will probably never be seen by anyone. However, theoretically almost all content on the Internet has mass market reach. Attempting to classify all content on the Internet is impossible.
Q7:
No
Q8:
No
Q9:
Yes, in that it's a waste of resources to classify content with a miniscule audience. It's also worth considering that the potential size of an audience may be nothing like the actual size. For example, the potential audience for a particular video on Youtube, just within Australia, is millions. However, there's no guarantee that such a video will be watched by anyone.
Q10:
Yes. If someone wants to access content in the privacy of their home let them.
Q11:
Q12:
There are no effective methods. All methods are easily circumvented. Further the sheer scale and dynamic nature of the Internet precludes effective classification and access control. As has been previously said by others - "it's like trying to boil the ocean". Do we open all packages that come into

Australia searching for material that may have been refused classification? - no. Why should we attempt to do the same for online content - especially when for all practical purposes it's impossible to do so. Why waste resources on the impractical or impossible.

Q13:

Parental supervision. Installation of appropriate software on the home PC.

Note, trying to block content at any other location is ineffective as it's easily bypassed and/or it may prevent legitimate consumers (e.g. adults) from accessing legal content (assuming "inappropriate content" means inappropriate for children). In any case, it's the parent's responsibility to decide what is and is not appropriate content for their children. The definition of appropriate content is also likely to vary amongst parents. Indeed, parents might be happy for their older children (e.g. 16 years old) to view certain content that they might consider inappropriate for their younger children. Such granular restrictions can be most easily deployed on the home computer. Attempting such granular access control closer to the source is more difficult if not impossible.

Q14:

Why does it need to be better controlled? Who says that existing controls are not already adequate?

Q15:

If the material has been classified and it's practical to do so.

Q16:

As minimal as possible. At the end of the day consumers should be responsible for the choices they make - including what content they decide to consume. However, there is room for industry to self

Q17:

Yes

Q18:

Q19:

If the Government chooses to classify content then shouldn't it also be responsible for the cost of the classification regardless of the content or the size of the producer or distributor - especially if the cost burden of classification might otherwise prevent content from being made available.

Q20:

Generally, there seems to be a lack of consistency across media. For example, some content might be allowed in printed form, but not online.

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Yes. The current restrictions on computer games are ridiculous.

Q24:

Nothing should be prohibited online that is not prohibited offline.

Q25:

No, it's too broad.

Q26:

No

Q27:

Q28:

No

Q29:

Other comments:

Regarding RC material I am of the opinion that if an activity is legal then watching it should also be legal (even if it's something that I might personally find disgusting).

Some of the best TV drama being produced in recent years has come from HBO in the USA. I think it's no coincidence that HBO is not subject to the same restrictions on content as the "free to air" networks in the USA. Censorship potentially stifles creativity and the society in which we all live. It should be minimised as much as possible.

I would also make the point that censorship has been possible in the past because a) there was a fairly limited amount of new content released each year; and b) only a small number of organisations were involved in the importation or distribution of that new content. This meant that it was relatively easy to impose classification requirements on importers and distributors.

However, technology is changing this distribution model. Now anyone can be a producer and everyone can be an importer. I understand that it's now possible to watch TV programs and movies streamed over the Internet directly from other countries - totally bypassing local distributors. Only copyright restrictions are preventing greater access to such services (e.g. Netflix). This might not always be the case though. There is, for example, no reason why a service similar to Netflix, and outside Australia's legal jurisdiction, could not purchase the rights to distribute content online to all countries. Content producers are also now able to sell directly to consumers bypassing international borders. In such scenarios Australia might well find it impossible to classify material, or to enforce any classification that has already been made. How will any classification and censorship model deal with this new world?