

CI 2491 A Ameri

Full name: Aryan Ameri

Proposal 5–1:

Proposal 5–2:

Proposal 5–3:

Proposal 5–4:

Proposal 6–1 :

In Chapter 8, the ALRC proposes that access must be restricted to all media content that is likely to be R 18+, including content that is not required to be classified.

I believe this in effect brings Internet censorship into Australia. The only way to 'restrict' access to content that is likely to be R18+ is to setup a filter, and we all know how effective and enforceable such a scheme is.

What the proposal does is to classify all adult websites, even though the discussion paper acknowledges that it is practically unenforceable. May I respectfully remind the Commission that setting unenforceable laws is not 'good standard', unlike what the Commission thinks. Studies have shown that the only side-effect of unenforceable legislation is to lower our citizens' esteem for law in general, and law enforcement in particular.

Proposal 6–2:

Again this is an example of another unenforceable law. How is any executive authority going to classify the thousands of games that are published on the Apple AppStore and Android Market on a daily basis? Do you really believe any entity, whether a game publisher or a software distributor will delay the launch of its title for Australia to classify it? If such legislation is enforced, the only effect of that is to limit access to such platforms in Australia, in effect limiting innovation in this country.

And how does the Commission propose we treat web-based games, such as very popular Flash games which are all accessible in Australia? More Internet filtering?

Proposal 6–3:

Proposal 6–4:

Proposal 6–5:

Proposal 6–6:

Proposal 6–7:

Proposal 6–8:

Proposal 7–1:

Proposal 7–2:

Question 7–1 :

Proposal 7–3:

Proposal 7–4:

Proposal 7–5:

Question 7–2:

Proposal 7–6:

Proposal 7–7:

Proposal 8–1 :

Proposal 8–2:

Proposal 8–3:

Proposal 8–4:

Question 8–1:

Proposal 8–5:

Proposal 8–6 :

Proposal 9–1 :

Proposal 9–2:

Proposal 9–3:

Proposal 9–4 :

Proposal 9–5 :

Proposal 10–1:

Based on what evidence does the Commission believe that ISP-level filtering is effective?

These filters are easily bypassed by anyone intent on bypassing them. We have seen their effectiveness in many Middle Eastern countries, where despite Government's best attempts, Internet filters are easily bypassed.

Instead of wasting tax-payers' money on a bureaucratic scheme which is effectively meaningless and does nothing to stop child sexual abuse or sexual violence, aren't our resources better spent on raising education, awareness, and pursuing actual perpetrators of such crimes?

Proposal 11–1:

Proposal 11-2 :

Proposal 11-3 :

Proposal 11-4:

Question 12-1:

Proposal 12-1 :

Proposal 13-1 :

Proposal 13-2:

Proposal 14-1 :

Proposal 14-2 :

Proposal 14-3:

Proposal 14-4:

Proposal 14-5 :

Upload supporting documents: