

CI 421 S Mclaughlin

First name: Sam

Last name: Mclaughlin

Q1:

Improving key elements. The system does not need to be replaced, simply modified.

Q2:

To respect an Australian adults own choice on what they view, and what their children will view.

Q3:

No, all media content sold & advertised for sale in Australia should be classified beforehand. The same reasons now apply to the near future. The classification provides information on the media's contents prior viewing.

Q4:

No, in my opinion all media content for sale and advertised for sale should have passed through the classification process without limiting an adults choice of media viewing beyond the law.

Q5:

The future impact can not be a reason for classification. Groups have been trying to prove the social impact of violent music, movies, games for decades with no clear outcome or reasoning other than personal belief. The fact is, media evolves and pushes boundaries which usually are more forward than the previous generation's media. Each generation has the generation before it criticising the current. A cliché but still very true.

Q6:

No, why should corporate influence change anything?

Q7:

consumer advice for sure, but restricted access I don't think.

Q8:

In my opinion, digital media would make any sort of audio classification/restriction futile. Definitely use as a guide though.

Q9:

No, how is one person more important than 5?

Q10:

Yes, public display is not always avoidable to people who would otherwise not wish to see/hear it. Personal choice is just that, and should not be forced upon others.

Q11:

Q12:

Online content is world wide, so there isn't any realistic solution. Especially an Australia wide internet filter which has and will be abused by those in the position to do so.

Q13:

Up to the parents and their level of care I suppose.

Q14:

The control methods in place are already pretty secure in my opinion. Magazines are covered, sale is restricted.

Q15:

At the bottom of the packaging where people already expect to see it

Q16:

Government to provide guidance through classification, industry to provide suitable material and full disclosure, users to be responsible with their purchases.

Q17:

Who ever will listen and evolve with the publics tastes/wants with respect.

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

All the current categories in my opinion are straight forward and clear.

Q21:

No, there is a classification for almost every subject of question available already.

Q22:

Currently the difference between M15+ and MA15+ are not clearly outlined, so the difference is marginal in the eyes of the consumer.

Q23:

No, as computer games are animated violence and do not depict real world situations in the same context as movies.

Q24:

Child pornography only.

Q25:

Not one bit. The internet is a wide scope of free information that should be available to all. It is not a distributed media up for censorship by a democratic government.

Q26:

Of course, are entertainment choices should not be limited by our states current out of touch/technophobe government when compared to the rest of the country. Why should one Australian in one state be permitted to view one movie, and us in another state denied?

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

Basically our entertainment within the law should not be censored by our government. How does the conservative opinion of a 55 year old male politician in a high pay grade, circulating in a similar social circle reflect the entertainment desires of a low/middle income earner from age 25 to 35? It doesn't and is down right stupid.

We should not be restricted in our decisions on entertainment.

BUT! There of course needs to be consideration on how content not suitable for minors is advertised/displayed/distributed as well.