

CI 1319 T Smith

First name: Tony

Last name: Smith

Q1:

It should develop a community education role and get out of the censorship business entirely.

Q2:

There should not be one. It needs to be superseded by a policy requiring accuracy of labeling so people can avoid being confronted by things they do not need, including religious proselytizing and corporate-sponsored denials of established facts which are equally as dangerous as bomb making instructions.

Q3:

Only in so far as the labeling implicit in a web link can be a lot more specific than throwing a switch on free to air media, display on a sporting stadium scoreboard or newsstand.

Q4:

Complaints should be ignored save those relating to accuracy of labeling.

Q5:

You don't need a classification system to promote content designed for younger children. Leave that to the promoters.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

No.

Q8:

Yes, that is not classified at all.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No, save for the different dynamics of warning labels where going through the door of a gallery or theatre provides a decision point which may not be there when switching on broadcast media at home or in the car, at least not before programme labeling gateways can be made standard for broadcast media.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

Nothing should be classified by any authority, while allowing guidance rankings to be provided in a competitive market. The most effective protection from accessing undesired content is public education.

Q13:

Improved education.

Q14:

There is no valid requirement for any control beyond accurate warning labels.

Q15:

Warning and consumer advice should be required on any materials likely to give deep offense to a significant group within society with a difficult balance struck between exposing muddled thinking to proper critique and choking media with dishonest advocacy. There should be no official classification marking.

Q16:

Industry should accurately label all content they produce. Government has a role ensuring compliance to that requirement. Users need to take responsibility for the choices they make having read the warning labels.

Q17:

Yes, but don't get hung up on some coding scheme when a simple description is more meaningful.

Q18:

They be obliged to accurately label everything regardless of whether it fits some invented category. More can generally be said clearly in six words than any number of symbols.

Q19:

The government should not be classifying and thus not charging anyone so there is no context for subsidies. If an independent filmmaker cannot find six words identifying any likely severe offense then that is their problem.

Q20:

They are generally taken to mean "not me" no matter what the intent.

Q21:

No. All should be removed.

Q22:

Diversification is overwhelming any convergence, so the question is badly framed.

Q23:

In the rubbish bin.

Q24:

None.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

They need to all be scrapped, and local councils disallowed from trying to fill the gap.

Q27:

It should be entirely repealed and replaced with a very simple obligation for accurate labeling backed up by public education.

Q28:

Only if the Commonwealth is repealing all censorship.

Q29:

By admitting that it is a total waste of time and scrapping it.

Other comments:

No information including graphical representation, moving images, etc. should be denied to anybody who decides they have a need to know. The important thing is to provide a framework for putting reasonable counterpoints and cautions to minimise the always grossly exaggerated risk that inappropriate information will lead to inappropriate action. The worst evils of our society are better dealt with by being brave enough to talk about them. Censorship is lazy.