

CI 2492 L Mancell

Full name: Luke Mancell

Proposal 5–1:

This review starts with the unstated premise that censorship of what adults watch is necessary and will continue because a vocal minority claim to have a special insight on what represents "community standards". How can this be a valid review if the possibility that censorship is not necessary is not included in the review and no attempt is made to determine if there is actual proof that censorship of legal adult material and video games for adults is required.

Proposal 5–2:

Proposal 5–3:

Proposal 5–4:

Platform neutrality. Why did this concept fall in favour of Internet censorship?

Our current, open Internet has allowed access to all material, on a pull basis, for years. There has been no negative results for society. Law and order haven't broken down. Sexual assault and abuse rates haven't increased. Applying outdated bans on pornographic material because prurient pressure groups don't like it is not reason enough. Why haven't these groups been called out and asked to prove their objections with some sort of cause and effect model? There are plenty of things that I don't like in the world but other people like them and I can't show actual harm so that's the end of it. If prurient pressure groups don't want to look at porn they should stop looking at it instead of saying that I can't look at it.

Bringing the Internet under the Broadcasting Services Act 1992 overlooks that the Internet isn't broadcasting. It is a strictly pull medium. It only presents what you look for. If anti-porn crusaders don't want to see porn, they should stop looking for it.

Who is going to classify the Internet? If it is not possible to classify the all of the information on the Internet and access to that information cannot reasonably be restricted and the material cannot be shown to be harmful, why is the government wasting tax payer's money chasing this classification rainbow? MY tax money! Tax money that could be spent eliminating waiting surgery waiting lists at children's hospitals, for example.

How will this choke point be established? The Internet will simply route around any regulator. In 10 years time when the government and the legal system finally catch up with the technology that routes around, the next route around will be in place. Even backed by draconian punishments such as those enjoyed by Saudi Arabian and Chinese people, Internet Censorship doesn't work. Once this is in place proponents are going to ask for harsher penalties for breaches, more policing, more censorship.

Who will foot the exponentially increasing bill for this fool's errand?

Anti-open-Internet crusaders may say: "Well, we can't just do nothing". Why can't we do nothing if there is no harm shown? Evidence based law and policing is required. The current system is based on complaints generated by offence and misinformation. People do not have the right to not be offended. I don't claim that right and use it to infringe upon the rights of others.

Proposal 6-1 :

If a film is censored, people will be more likely to simply download a torrent of it. If one person in the world has access to a film they can convert it to a torrent and share it. Literally, within minutes of sharing there could easily be a thousand copies of this movie being shared. This will allow any movie or TV show to be viewed at DVD quality by any person in Australia. If you ban a torrent site, users will proxy around your ban. Black lists aren't even going to touch the layer that torrents operate on.

To mix metaphors: this law is closing the gate after Hydra has bolted.

Why, if we are saying that classification protects children, isn't content said to be for children classified whilst content said to be for adults unclassified? This system isn't designed to protect children, this system is designed to restrict adults from consuming porn because some people find the idea distasteful.

Proposal 6-2:

Why can't we have material that is unclassified? For an adult person to be able to really claim that they are an adult person they should be able to say that they can choose legal content for themselves, not rely on the government to spoon feed it to them.

Proposal 6-3:

The protection from censorship of art and culture needs to be re-enforced so that we can avoid another Henson incident where pointless moral panic combined with ignorance caused a waste of police resources.

Proposal 6-4:

Why is this even under question? Are the people in the ACT magical? They can watch X rated movies yet people just over the border will be irrevocably harmed by it? That the removal of restrictions on non-ACT adults still exists, and that its removal is not a given in this law reform review, indicates that this review never intended to reform any part of the laws, just re-apply the status quo to the Internet.

Proposal 6-5:

RC just shouldn't exist. If an illegal act is filmed (child abuse for example) the producers can be pursued for that crime. Showing illegal activities would be illegal anyway.

Proposal 6-6:

Proposal 6-7:

Proposal 6–8:

So industry can be trusted to self regulate as long as it doesn't involve porn? Is porn a magic thing that isn't able to be classified by industry bodies?

Proposal 7–1:

Again, we are censoring material for adults instead of material for children, showing that the whole scheme seeks to undermine adult freedoms, not protect children.

The category "Unclassified" is needed so that adults can decide for themselves. Adults do not need to be parented by the church and government.

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 :

Every technological protection will have a technological work around that only kids will know how to operate. Gifting parents a false sense of security about online content by telling them "we've got a filter now so let the kids lose on the net" will cause more kids to see adult content.

Proposal 8–2:

Proposal 8–3:

Proposal 8–4:

The government needs to take a neutral position towards adult content instead of trying to legislate conservative morality. Neutrality from the government is not an endorsement of pornography. If the government started producing and supplying pornography I could understand prurient concerns.

Question 8–1:

15 year olds are more likely to stay up late than their exhausted parents.

Proposal 8–5:

Proposal 8–6 :

Proposal 9–1 :

Proposal 9–2:

Proposal 9–3:

Proposal 9–4 :

Proposal 9–5 :

"Community Standards" is a pretty way of saying the tyranny of the majority. I suggest you apply evidence based standards. If seeing or hearing something has been shown to do harm to people, then it shouldn't be seen.

Communities like GLBTI communities are alienated by this. They are a community based on orientation alone yet they are not allowed to access material that expresses that community purpose.

Proposal 10–1:

'community standards' and 'offensiveness'

Community standards and offence are non-arguments. If you are offended by porn, stop watching it. That's the simple solution.

Sexual abuse and assault aren't illegal because they are offensive or fail to meet community standards, they are illegal because they cause harm to the victims.

People who want this aren't going to type sexual abuse material into google and go straight off to [www.sexualabusematerial.com](http://www.sexualabusematerial.com). Filters aren't going to touch the P2P networks where this material is traded so pretending that we are protecting people by blacklisting websites is nonsense.

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: