

CI 1279 P Dixon

First name: Peter

Last name: Dixon

Q1:

Yes, the current system is oppressive, restrictive and outdated. It won't stand up to the scrutiny of a web savvy generation, it had a hard enough time standing up for its own.

Q2:

Providing a more thorough system to help parents, educators, entertainers and supervisors decide whether something is relevant or appropriate for a targeted audience. Controlling and censoring content should not be a goal of a Government, unless we live in North Korea.

Q3:

Definitely not. How you access information is irrelevant. It's that you can access it in the first place that is important.

Q4:

No, any content can be subject to complaint. If I complain about the content of the federal budget would that require classification to stop anyone else who may complain from seeing it?

Q5:

No, just because something may have far reaching ramifications beyond Governmental control doesn't mean it should be refused classification and vice versa, just because something seems to be irrelevant and trivial shouldn't make it fair game for refusal of classification.

Q6:

I fail to see how any of those factors changes an individual work. Works should be judged on their own merits, as I will say again and again later free of context to the environment to which they are going to be released. If it is inappropriate for children then it is inappropriate for children, it doesn't matter where it is being released from.

Q7:

No. Either all do, or none. Classification should be used to provide consumer advice on content, not shutting down artists whose work may be a bit sketchy to the public (or political) eye.

Q8:

If it is, why not classify written works as well? They contain exactly the same content as the audio books read from them.

How about spoken word? Then the question arises: How, in this ever more connected and ubiquitous world, can you stop someone from making a speech and broadcasting it as a recording before it is classified? More importantly, should you?

Q9:

No. If classification is really necessary, it should be on the merits of the individual works free of context.

Q10:

No. See Q9

Q11:

Q12:

The only truly effective (I say effective as it would be the most likely to, not eliminate but, minimise access to online content which would be restricted under the National Classification Scheme) method would be totalitarian control system with a white list of sites and refusing access to everything else by taking control of all telecommunication providers. This, however, would be a cruel and unusual punishment to everyone in Australia as it would not only sever access to creative content outside but also medical journals, scientific discussion and views on the political climate which aren't in line with the Classification Body's views.

Again, those who are already breaking the law online, will find a way around this.

Q13:

By their parents or possibly education to a certain extent. Children still steal adult magazines from news stands. And no matter how hard you try to (laughably) censor the internet (with a blacklist nonetheless) there will always be new sites which circumvent your (pathetic)filter. Any online community will contain "inappropriate content" it is up to the child to know how not to approach it. Same reason you stop children from wander the back alleys of a pub district in a major city at night.

Q14:

Put it on a higher shelf? All tightening the grip on physical media will do is increase the level of bootlegging which is already predominant in the industry.

Q15:

At all times, it helps young people pick the most disturbing content.

Q16:

Rating the content should be as far as Government agencies go. Industry bodies should step in to prevent artists and content providers from being censored unjustly.

Q17:

I can't imagine so.

Q18:

No classification is obvious and straightforward. Look at Play School scandal with the two-mothers. Look at films like the Dark Knight getting past on a PG rating as they managed to hide most blood and sex in it.

Q19:

Small independent films, politically motivated publications, independant music, written works. Basically in as many places as possible to allow small groups and individuals to have their voice heard.

Q20:

The M15+ rating for Video games, it contains games which, if they were movies, would otherwise be judged R18. This causes confusion and exposure to young people of particularly gruesome content.

Q21:

Maybe having another level for Extreme content, which would otherwise be refused classification. Possibly requiring a license or registration of some type to access.

Q22:

Quite easily, allow the same leway for Film and music that is given for written works.

Q23:

Yes, having redundant schemes is a waste of money and provides no extra benefit, apart from inconsistencies which fairly allows content to get through.

Q24:

None. Accessing content should never be a crime, even that of the most heinous nature (like Snuff, rape and child porn, there are definitely worse things out there but these are the limit to my imagination.) The people who create and help distribute content of this type should be found and arrested/shot.

I personally take pride in the fact that even though I have the ability to access that sort of content and I choose not to. I don't want to have that taken away from me. The reason I don't view it is because I believe it is wrong and perverse (I think most people would agree with me on that), not because I am unable to. Is the inverse really a message you want to be sending out to people? If the reason you don't view it is because you can't, what is there to stop you when you are in a situation when you can?

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Consistency would be useful, but as long as every State and Territory has a clear, easy to understand set of guidelines regarding their laws then it wouldn't be such a problem.

Q27:

A fair and just one which allows for greater access to more content by a greater number of people.

Q28:

If new legislation and framework is definitely going to be established then yes.

Q29:

Allow for complete transparency. Provide a list of classified works/content and all that has been refused classification. Allow for an appeals process so an individual, or Organisation, can, free of charge, contest their rating if they have been unfairly censored and have a completely transparent independent body with a strictly enforced code of conduct to do so.

Other comments: