

CI 2094 R B

First name:

Rees

Last name:

B

Q1:

New

Q2:

Advise people on content of media

Q3:

Unsure, perhaps in the sense that some platforms contain too-large amount of content to classify.

Needs to be realistic about what advice it can give.

Q4:

Classification should serve only as a content description summary - so, perhaps, if there is a product which people might want to know the content of.

Q5:

My interpretation of the word "classification" means to describe, what people chose to do with that descriptor is not relevant to the act of classifying.

Q6:

Same as Question 3.

Q7:

Classification means to describe. Restricting access is unrelated, and should be a matter of debate in courts if somebody has non-consensually done something to another member of society.

Q8:

If people really desire such a warning on the content, the warning labels could perhaps be prefixed by 'audial-' in the same sense as 'cartoon-' is used to prefix the descriptor 'cartoon-violence'

Q9:

It would seem practical to only classify products in a way which would provide useful information to the people who desire to know. Thus a university lecture podcast, for example, need not be classified, as it is a waste of time for a disinterested audience. I suspect that most of us would care to be warned if footage showed live surgery, arguably due to our own squeamish shortcomings, so I personally wouldn't mind seeing such a classification warning where practical. I'm sure that I'll survive without one though.

Q10:

A description is a description, so long as it has practical use to the taxpayer then location of access does not matter.

Q11:

Practicality of providing the description - whether anybody will care, and whether it's doable.

Q12:

I speak as a programmer when I say that there are none, as the entire IT community within this nation has explained to the non-technical. The only method which may vaguely have any worthwhile gain is the charging of people who access illegal content, the small portion of it which can be tracked in that sense.

Restriction is no longer a matter of classification however (classification meaning to describe), it is a matter of an individual imposing themselves into the life of another, their neighbour, uninvited. If the content is not illegal (or rather, if it does not hurt somebody else), then such a censorship would be nothing more than unwarranted attack and hence tyranny by the mainstream, or powerful. Individuals seeking to co-exist cannot make this mistake and still call their society fair, equal, or just. They are problem neighbours just in the sense that a murderer is, incompatible with what is known as The Golden Rule.

Q13:

Advice to the caregivers responsible is the only practical measure, or possibly the invention of a limited sub-web for that purpose. (The Internet consists of far more than The Web - as new protocols are invented every day for file-sharing, communication, bank processing, etc, a purposefully invented protocol could be created for a child-specific sub-web, of monitored information by whichever group so feels the urge. Alternative software could be configured to process this alternate inter-linked document web. Such a voluntary space could have been invented at any time if there was a real demand. Control is impractical & impossible to impose on the current model, as every communication across the Internet is a conversation between computers in whatever code that they so desire to use)

Q14:

These still exist?

Q15:

Whenever consumers care to know, if practical.

Q16:

One agency to cost effectively classify (describe) content.

The courts exist to charge and imprison people who are not compatible with society, if they are producing (or seeking that which requires the production of) acts which involve genuine non-consent (Such unjustified non-consensual acts would include, for example: paedophilia, rape, attacks on the homeless, racist attacks on others based on their appearance, censorship out of varying taste, etc - anybody who partakes in such acts proves themselves to be the violent aggressor who should be locked away from society, unable to coexist with their neighbours who have not made an aggressive move towards anybody else). Note that this varies from simulated violence in the form of, say, Boxing, or an episode of Band of Brothers, or Video Games, or Spanking, or Recreations Of The Crucifixion of Jesus - which are all simulated violence for the purpose of the consenting individuals. So long as nobody unwilling was involved, it is up to the individual to decide what they wish to seek within their lifetime, and anybody who would attempt to censor would be making an unwarranted attack and performing unjustified tyranny due to their own distastes - in the same way that one might attack another due to the colour of their skin, and feel comfortable in the act due to racism being common.

Q17:

If a classification is simply a useful descriptor, then why not let the content producers describe their own content, and be responsible if they fail to describe it adequately. It would save tax payer money and not create slow bureaucratic hurdles in the creation of economically productive content.

Q18:

I can't imagine what wouldn't be easy to flag (classify) if the exact flags were defined.

Q19:

If there is a list of classification flags that need be appended, they should be short, simple, and only about content which people might care to be informed on. So it shouldn't be hard to classify one's own product.

Q20:

No. Due to miscommunication by the current Communications Minister, many are under the impression that Refused Classification content contains only illegal and genuinely non-consensual acts such as child pornography. Much of it is legal and in very wide taste amongst the population.

Q21:

There needs to be a category titled Illegal, and then everything else, tagged with simple descriptor flags for those who may be interested.

The illegal category should not be a matter for a hidden and unproven panel. It should only contain content which, if somebody was producing, would give grounds for charges in a public court.

Q22:

Just be made consistent, not more consistent.

Q23:

Too unversed to give an informed opinion.

Q24:

Illegal content. Anybody who says otherwise is tyrannising their neighbours out of difference in taste, and is a poor sharer of society.

Q25:

No, it contains legal content - specifically, consensual content. It is inconsistent, when boxing or war fiction would be considered acceptable violence, while erotic acts would not. Especially given the prevalence of those of us who wish to consensually partake in such simulations, it is not very neighbourly to invade another's life and tell them that they cannot partake in consensual acts, when their interests do not negatively affect anybody else. The censor is the unwarranted attacker, as is the racist basher or the paedophile.

Q26:

No opinion.

Q27:

As described above. Classification as a useful descriptor, open courts for dealing with un-neighbourly conduct.

Q28:

Can't imagine why not.

Q29:

It should be turned into a classification system, rather than a closed censorship system which operates outside of the courts.

Other comments: