

CI 1073 P P

First name: Patrick

Last name: P

Q1:

Improving key elements.

Q2:

The classification scheme should be used to inform consumers about the products they choose to consume.

Q3:

No. The classification method should be determined by the merit of the piece. Entertainment should be classified a different way to advertising while art, political discussion, and personal conversation should generally be exempt from government scrutiny.

Q4:

Yes, in many cases works can include 1000s of hours of content, which would be practically impossible to review.

Q5:

Perhaps, although "designed for children" is a fairly broad term. Religious texts are often taught in a context directly aimed at children, should they also be subject to classification? Should we censor classic fables (such as the tales of the Brothers Grimm), or do we conclude that the cultural value of such works over rides any upsetting content? If so, are we then excluding modern works from potentially having such cultural worth?

Q6:

Yes.

Q7:

No. Ignorance of culturally significant works of art is far more damaging to society than seeing depictions of the human form and activities which take place and need to have attention drawn to them. To remove the ability of art to occasionally confront the viewer with something uncomfortable is abhorrent.

Q8:

I think language is not visceral enough to warrant censorship.

Q9:

Yes.

Q10:

Yes, absolutely.

Q11:

Artistic merit and cultural worth. I also think works made for a commercial market should be considered differently from those not made for profit.

Q12:

While often used for broadcasting, the internet is also the primary means of person to person communication for many people as well as being a crucial tool of political action. Any censorship

methods that involve the monitoring and censoring of network traffic, could therefore be considered on par with censoring people's telephone and mail conversations. With that being said, I think the already strict rules for registering .au domain names and using the internet as a broadcast publishing medium for Australian commercial content may include regulations on what may be published (although I would have expected this to be the case already). The only effective manner of censoring online content would be a publisher based approach rather than one which scrutinises user activity.

Q13:

Educating parents about the use of technology, including but not limited to: knowing how to access the parental controls for gaming systems, knowing how to install and secure parental control software on their local machine and making sure to provide proper supervision (such as keeping computers in shared areas).

Q14:

Having never been exposed to a pornographic magazine which I haven't actively sought out, I don't think there's an issue.

Q15:

Classification should be made clear at the time of purchase.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide information about content with the co-operation of industry bodies. Industry bodies should make product information clear and take measures to avoid R rated content being sold to minors. Users have a responsibility to take heed of censorship information and make informed decisions about purchases made for themselves and their family.

Q17:

It would certainly be more cost effective, as the flow of information is far too strong for any single agency (youtube has 24 hours of video uploaded every minute).

Q18:

I don't think any classification is obvious or straight forward.

Q19:

The government should not just subsidise content, but in the case of industry bodies ensure that they are impartial (many commentators claim that industry bodies such as the MPAA have a clear bias towards the funding studios at the cost of independent film makers)

Q20:

Classifications are inconsistent over different forms of medium, and sexual content tends to be rated more heavily than violence.

Q21:

Video games need to have a category for the classification of adult content, rather than splitting it across ratings for adolescents and refusing classification all together

Q22:

For starters, use the same classifications.

Q23:

If you're referring to the idea that video games and films should be classified to the same standards, then yes.

Q24:

As a primary means of person to person communication, monitoring and censoring of online content should not be considered. If the police feel that their powers for pursuing child predators is limited, then that should certainly be considered as a separate issue. However some token blacklisting is not going to significantly reduce cases of child abuse, and the expenses would be better used in investigation and mental health funding.

Q25:

I think the RC category is overly broad and does not reflect the global, multicultural standards of the online community.

Q26:

It's not really an issue that I'd considered

Q27:

Q28:

No.

Q29:

Other comments: