

CI 429 T McArdle

First name: Tristan

Last name: McArdle

Q1:

Yes.

Q2:

Ensure freedom of information.

Q3:

No

Q4:

Yes. Unclassified content could then be broadly ignored by those who wish to avoid controversial or provocative material. Those who do not wish to expose themselves to material they find objectionable should have the sense to avoid it. We are each responsible for our own well-being and this includes the sort of information we take in. I don't believe it is fair to restrict information available to the masses, simply because some choose to complain, the onus should be on upon the individual to provide their own censorship, not the state.

Q5:

No and Yes. Content designed for Children should be classified, adults should be able to make their own decisions based on experience. A classification system is designed to assist with making informed decisions on which material we might enjoy, this is more important for children as the psychological implications of the material taken in during formative years would presumably be greater than for adults. An adult should be to determine through their own experience and self-knowledge what they would and would not like to be exposed to and take steps to avoid it.

Q6:

No. Classifications or lack there of should be based on the applicability of content to children. If the entertainment/program/information is considered to be OK for general consumption, by all means classify it as such. Otherwise content should simply be ignored and people allowed to make their own decisions.

Q7:

No. The nature of the exhibition should not be altered, censored or restricted. At most the advertising media for the exhibition should indicate the nature of the exhibition's content.

Q8:

No.

Q9:

Yes, material designed FOR children should be classified as such.

Q10:

Yes, with the contingent that this applied only in the sense that people should not be unwillingly exposed to content they do not wish to see. A Cinema for example would not qualify as 'public' since every patron is there of their own free will. An advertising banner on a building on the other hand would be viewed routinely by people who may not necessarily wish to see it.

Q11:

Lack of classification should not make content unavailable to Australians. Working from this assumption, only material which is designed to be viewed by young children should necessarily require a classification code, where as other gradations of classification should be optional.

Q12:

I DO NOT support internet censorship. The only filtering that should be allowed should be software that can be installed on the user's computer, by their own choice.

Do we really want to join such illustrious company as China, Iran and the Arab Emirates? Blanket censorship is immoral and a serious erosion of civil liberties, I'm shocked it would even be considered in Australia.

Q13:

Parents. Parents. Parents. If children are too young to be left alone while playing around on the internet, don't leave them alone! Ultimately it is a parent's responsibility to care for their child, just as it is their responsibility to do the same for themselves. Teach the child how to use the internet and what sort of sites they should be avoiding, if you feel you must, install a local filter on the home computer to restrict access to whatever sites you deem to be inappropriate.

Q14:

Does it need to be controlled? Simply by requiring ID to purchase such content and holding the vendors responsible should be sufficient to restrict access to such content. Again, it is the responsibility of the parents to look after their children and this is not a responsibility that should be palmed off to anyone else.

Q15:

As stated above, unavoidable public displays of content such as mass market advertising and prime-time television should display classification codes and warning as appropriate.

Q16:

Users should regulate their own access to content. A person is responsible for their own well-being, for their own health and peace of mind. Adults should thus be able to control whatever type of content they choose to take in.

State censorship is a slippery slope and one that we as a nation should not be standing on the edge of. The logical conclusion of ever increasing protection and restriction is total control.

Is it not said that the road to hell is paved with good intentions?

Q17:

Yes, however I still do not believe that unclassified content should be restricted.

Q18:

Well obviously material intended for children would be the first candidate. Television is ubiquitous and unlike games or internet content, tends to be broadcast audio-visually to all persons within, at the very least, the room. Thus content to be played within the bounds of prime-time TV should be classified. Console games intended for children would also benefit from classification, however unclassified games should not be restricted, on the understanding that anything which has not been classified is not suitable for children.

Q19:

No we are moving into a discussion about the state supporting the arts. It is important to promote cultural and artistic development and as such, yes: fringe and independent media development should be supported.

Q20:

Yes, they are quite clear.

Q21:

The addition of an R rating for video games or the cessation of banning non-rated video games is required.

Q22:

Simply realign the codes into a cross-media standard. Rather than having different standards for different platforms and delivery methods, have one set of codes for all of them. A unified approach would provide more consistency.

Q23:

Yes. Consolidated and reviewed.

Q24:

None. Absolutely none. People should be guaranteed the freedom to access whatever information they want as the responsibility for their own intake of content is and should remain their own.

Do not censor the internet, it can only lead in a direction which ill-suits our open, egalitarian culture that we so pride ourselves on. Do WE want to transform ourselves into one of those countries people look at and sadly think to themselves "Those poor people... living in the dark."

Q25:

Material that is refused classification should only be restricted from public display, not entirely banned from sale and access. The only content should actually be banned is material that is illegal in and of itself (e.g. Child Pornography, 'Snuff' Films, etc)

Q26:

No. Consistency is not essential as if one state decides to lock itself down and restrict all content access it would at least allow citizen's who see freedom of information as an important right another place to go.

Q27:

.

Q28:

No, it should be a cooperative effort to develop a new system.

Q29:

Dismiss the ideas of online censorship.

Other comments:

Please do not consider online censorship, I'd prefer to remain proud of my country.