

CI 329 J Martin

First name: Jacob

Last name: Martin

Q1:

You should improve it by making the classification system less restrictive on artists and creative people who wish to have their voices heard and content viewed despite various extremist lobby groups claiming that art should not be seen in case it offends people. This attitude offends ME.

Q2:

To inform through guidelines, not through the ban-hammer of the law, what families and other people of interest would find appropriate for their children or themselves without legislation restricting what other differently minded individuals are allowed to see or read.

Q3:

I am concerned that one would argue that all media needs to be classified, as it implies that all media needs to be guarded by some government or other such watchdog that bites the fingers off legitimate artists who attempt to have their works seen on the internet and so on because other galleries give them no freedom or lobby groups have their work taken down because it "offends people".

Q4:

That's very badly worded and there's a difference between giving something an advisory rating to the audience and classifying it out of viewing because a minority lobby group used their clout to ban it. I do not think that complaints should affect the classification of media at all, because often the very people who complain are the lobby groups that impeach my freedoms as an artist and general young person.

Q5:

That's again very badly worded, and I don't think books should be classified as a medium because we didn't need books classified by the government for more than two hundred years, other countries don't do this, and it smacks of censorship because parents may be discouraged from showing a child a book about say, homosexual parents, because it had a higher, more extreme rating than it deserved. This is why I am terribly afraid that classifying all media on the basis of "potential impact of content" could go horribly wrong. The only potential impact this will have is to suffocate the freedoms we have so little of in this nation.

Q6:

First of all, do not charge content producers or distributors money to have their work classified, because it's expensive enough making our content as it is. And classifying content based on the market reach of material is corrupt and is too open to abuse such as cases that might arise such as independent artists being discriminated against due to their lack of political clout.

Q7:

No artworks should be classified at all, it is a terrible idea that smacks of censorship and the idea that you should restrict access to work that challenges the viewer's point of view is possibly the worst outcome I can imagine from this abomination of an idea.

Q8:

No, they should not. For the same reasons I have listed above for artworks. Oh, and by the way, I write books too, so if you try and classify audio books just because you think it's offensive to some people, I'm actually wondering if you're going to classify all books as well. This scares me as a lover of freedom and I don't like it.

Q9:

Size and composition of audience? Now you're just making me think you're going to classify every item of medium that young people like me ever considered a respite from the doldrums of corporate media and political propaganda. No this should NOT affect whether content should be classified. I am disturbed by what you are suggesting.

Q10:

No it does not affect whether it should be classified, because I never trusted the government to decide what I'm allowed to view in public or in my own private home to begin with.

Q11:

Child pornography is already illegal, so it doesn't need to be classified. The Refused Classification rating is a cop out which politicians can exploit to hide the truth from voters and media which might challenge government mandated ideology.

Q12:

I am not going to tell you what the most effective methods of controlling access to online content are, because I do not want you to infringe on my personal freedom this way. If I want your Classification Scheme to be mocked as an impotent joke for the faulty, blundering censorship regime it is, I'll keep that information to myself, because you don't deserve my help.

Q13:

By making parents do their job properly. Personal responsibility. Not a nanny state.

Q14:

Why should these things be controlled at all, you're just forcing people to spend petrol money to drive to Canberra and back just to get the porn they rightly fought for, and you good sir, censors of the Australian voice, would dare take their smut away after such valiant efforts have been made to get our legal smut for ourselves? Shame on you!

Q15:

Classification markings are ugly and destroy the integrity of the box art of content. I'd prefer it if the Classification System as it exists (a draconian law that puts a nanny state in my home) was disbanded and I never had to see one of those stickers again.

Q16:

Government agencies should remove themselves from what is considered appropriate for the "reasonable adult" to view, because I have never trusted them at all.

Q17:

I'd prefer it if government bodies did not use a Classification System they've conned the public into thinking it's for their own good to censor and silence media and art that people of intelligent minds want to see.

Q18:

I am uncomfortable with anybody deciding what I am allowed to watch actually.

Q19:

In the worst case scenario where I become a graduate of art school and am forced to have my works classified, I in no way want to have my art censored while you take my money and run. So in that hellish scenario, classification of media should be subsidised. Not that I'd want art to be classified.

Q20:

Refused Classification is the most abusive, rapacious and dishonest category of the Classification System because of the fact that it is designed to be a smokescreen behind which important news like Wikileaks, and art that critiques governments are hidden behind, not to mention sexual freedoms repressed by a Puritanical System.

Q21:

There are no need for new classification categories, God help us, because I just want it to stop getting worse when it comes to censorship.

Q22:

I don't want greater convergence between media formats because that implies you want to classify, and therefore censor everything.

Q23:

Your wording of this is vague and intended to confuse people intentionally, so that young parents will fall for your lies. Make everything clearer, but not in a way that involves more censorship being widespread.

Q24:

Nothing should be prohibited online, child porn is already illegal so why would you bother filtering it?

Q25:

The Refused Classification category only reflects the ignorance, cowardice and prejudice of a government body that wishes to censor, and infantilise the minds of an entire country that is suffocating. It reflects a great shame I and many other Australians have in not being able to call ourselves truly free.

Q26:

If all states forced the same nanny state on me as a free thinking mind, I might as well kill myself now.

Q27:

Not legislation, but guidelines that are not enforced by law, that are transparent and free from corruption by lobbyists.

Q28:

I don't know what that means, but it probably means you'd be giving up power Australia has to the Queen, and I'm not so hot about letting her be my nanny state monarch either.

Q29:

It can be improved by reducing censorship and being more transparent to Australians intelligent enough to make choices for themselves.

Other comments:

I am upset and bewildered that I live in a country where increased censorship under the black flag of Classification is still present in our 21st Century age. I'm embarrassed when I talk to Americans and people of other nationalities online who have mocked us for having backwards censorship for over five years.