

Dear Ms Smith,

I wish to submit the following response to the Discussion Paper on 'Material that Advocates Terrorist Acts'.

*Proposal to amend the Classification Code and guidelines:*

The discussion paper states that:

'Publications which fall within the criteria for 'RC' classification cannot be legally imported or sold in Australia.'

As an Australian Citizen who subscribes to the ideals of free speech and freedom of information that modern Western societies pride themselves on, I find the intention to introduce a National Classification Code of RC for material that is defined as advocating terrorism to be alarming and overly reactionary.

My objections are that:

1. The definition of material that advocates terrorism is overly broad and ambiguous. It is possible that items that pose no risk of 'inflaming' the populace could be removed from our libraries and shops. This legislation appears to be poorly thought through.

2. Law abiding citizens are being denied access to information they have every right to access. Blindfolding ourselves to the motivations and tactics of groups and individuals defined as an enemy seems paramount to shooting oneself in the foot. Without cross-cultural understanding, education, and dialogue how can any advances be made in the current political landscape? Force alone cannot solve the current political crisis, nor can wrapping ourselves in cotton wool protect the Nation from attacks provoked by ideologies that incite violence. Education and knowledge are power, and denying innocent people access to that knowledge is no answer to the current challenges posed by international acts of terror. Researcher's work will be reprehensively limited and, therefore, the society they work to inform will be frighteningly blind to important international political movements (for that is what is truly behind the majority of terrorist ideology).

I am aware that this submission represents little more than a note, and if I had time to submit a more professional submission I most certainly would. Nonetheless, it's sentiment is heartfelt, and even if it's emotive and quirky nature are not appreciated by the review panel, I trust that the opinion of a law abiding, rational and non-threatening citizen will be noted when the votes are tallied.

Yours,

Danielle Smelter