

Question 1. In this Inquiry, should the ALRC focus on developing a new framework for classification, or improving key elements of the existing framework?

I believe this question is primarily to establish the need to change the framework to try and cope with the new age technologies and mainly internet access. Lets face it the old framework clearly does not work on old technologies – why can I as an adult not play a game with an adult rating? If it is an attempt to censor the internet the question should be exactly that.

Can the internet be censored? And the simple answer is – NO!\_

This has not been achieved anywhere before and the very nature of the internet is openness and no gate keeper technology can restrain it. People have and will find ways around this faster than you can imagine. It has been proven over and over again that there is no effective way of doing any filtering even at an ISP level. The downside is a slowdown of at least 5% to as much as 12% of the ISP service, extra staff (expenditure) to try and monitor the the impossible, a particularly frustrating experience for an adult should the want to look at say a naked painting on the web (or play adult games ....) and whatever else the is being hidden without any knowledge of what this may be (nanny state secretly deciding)). Why indeed should Australians be subjected to a nanny state when as an adult I could go overseas and look at a naked painting, in say the Louvre in Paris, take pictures of it and bring it home but I am not allowed to watch it on the internet. Whilst I approve of the government looking for ways to filter things they may deem inappropriate for under aged children, the focus should be to deal with that and make it easier for parents to apply such filtering – that is for users who want this to apply to their internet supply – however I still believe it just drive child pornographers further underground and in fact makes it harder for authorities to apprehend them. The focus should perhaps be to deal more severely with these perpetrators via the court system.

The objective should be to see what can be removed from the existing classification schemes. Hiding things can and never will make them go away – they just somehow find other ways of re appearing further underground.

Why classify and regulate content?

Question 2. What should be the primary objectives of a national classification scheme?

How about giving the Australian public FULL and COMPLETE information that is available anywhere in the world. Why indeed should we suffer a lack of information because of the narrow mindedness of our politicians. What is next ? Adults not allowed to play children's games? The retarded music industry dictating to the government other ways of preventing our legally purchased music to be played anywhere on any device that may become available and copyright holders allowed to disconnect services of subscribers based on allegations without any due process in the courts? . Any "banned" item cannot be discussed? I believe that any censoring of information available is simply holding Australia back further than countries where it is available. Fancy having one of the best broadband services in the world (NBN) and artificially slowing it down and on top of that restricting what can be extracted with it.

It is the first time in the history of mankind that information on this large scale can be made available to everyone in the world and the the economic gains that can be achieved if all artificial constraints (blood sucking middle men, copy right holders and large multinationals that uses patents to stifle

innovations) are removed is unimagined. I mean just think for one moment how much better a piece of technology can become if more people are allowed input and never lose focus of the economic truth – “ the price of a product will be forced down to be as near as possible to the marginal cost of that product if no artificial constraints are imposed “.

The objective should be to see what can be removed from the existing classification schemes to make the above an economic reality.

Pieter Pelsier