

CI 2036 M Durie

First name: Matthew

Last name: Durie

Q1:

Q2:

To ensure that potentially objectionable content is flagged as such, but with respect to individual rights to access legal content.

Q3:

Yes - there is a fundamental difference between a pre-defined content package eg book, movie, and a fluid environment such as the Internet and the content contained therein.

Q4:

Yes, and some content subject to complaint may not need classifying at all.

Q5:

Yes the potential impact is an important factor. I dont think all content for children need necessarily be classified.

Q6:

Again yes, I think the greater the wider marketing of the content will be, the more relevant classification is. Cf a website that does Bo market itself at all (other than search engine indexation). The more marketing, the more that content is thrust upon the public, and thus the more relevant classification is.

Q7:

No. I think so long as it is not an overtly public display then the protection of artistic freedom and freedom of speech outweighs any benefit of classification. There is a difference between display in a public park and a private gallery though (the former being more reasonable to classify).

Q8:

Published music should be classified in the way that it currently is, with advisory warnings of explicit content. Unpublished or live music should not. Audio books should be subject to the same warnings as music as it is more difficult for the consumer to self assess the content than if it were a written page.

Q9:

Yes. As stated above (large/public audience and wider marketing should necessitate closer scrutiny).

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Direct prosecution of people accessing current illegal sites eg child pronography should continue. A national filter will not be effective at controlling access to such content, as it will be easy to bypass (offshore encrypted proxies/tunnels for example), and is ineffective at identifying all such sites with such a large and fluid content environment as with the Internet. Furthermore the adminisfration and censorship of content on the internet as proposed would not provide adequate public scrutiny and government accountability, and susceptible to abuse from future governments or private individuals.

Q13:

Increased education for children and guardians about risks of Internet use should be the focus. Even a determined child will be able to bypass a filter with a minimal amount of time and advice from others online (eg forums). Do we then start censoring discussion of the filter as well? What about technology such as proxies and VPN tunneling, which have legitimate uses but could also be abused.

Q14:

I believe it is currently effective.

Q15:

When that content is marketed to an unselected/general audience.

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Yes. The intended/expected size of audience and extent of mass marketing is also relevant.

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Some content should be subject to prosecution if accessed as with current arrangements for possession of eg child abuse/pornography. Censorship however is unlikely to be effective at controlling such content, and unlikely to reduce either consumption or necessity for prosecution.

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: