

CI 2166 D Eddy

First name:

Denis

Last name:

Eddy

Q1:

Regardless of the quality of the prose, today's comment at <http://www.abc.net.au/technology/articles/2011/07/14/3269534.htm> makes adequately clear that attempts to classify the content of—let alone to block access to or delivery of—all 'media' are as difficult to realize as is universal classification, control or proscription of thought. Importation to Australia of physical media may have some slight chance of being controllable, but there is no such possibility in the case of 'downloadable' content from the Internet, and nor should there be. To attempt the latter will result in far more loss than gain.

However, there is some perceptible advantage in creation of a classification-system that warns or advises about the content of media, given that that warning has no legal consequences for the proprietor of a medium, or the 'author' of the medium's content, other than that the classification be displayed at the head of the content on pain of suppression of the content's distribution. Even imported physical media could be susceptible of such a mandatory requirement, although downloaded digital content could not unless it were sourced within Australia.

In the context of Australia and the ALRC's purview, I therefore believe that 'a new framework for classification' with a different purpose is far preferable to any scale of classification that implies that its 'ratings' reflect the value, or recommended audience or viewership, of content for consumption by Australians. The 'scale' for classification should then be explicit as to content only: eg, romantic comedy, political or social propaganda, simulated extreme violence, self-mutilation, animal wildlife, bestiality, and so on, expanded as necessary to embrace the intensity or kind of presentation.

It is a given that those who may be impressionable by a given classification of content cannot be constrained, beyond a certain but variable age, by prohibition of their access to it. Accurate 'classification' may, however, allow the accompaniment of its consumption by another person who is capable of ameliorating, explaining or advising 'under-age' or incompetent consumers about the import of the content. In short, it might restore to parents and carers some of their rightful role that officialdom is all-too-ready to abrogate. For (presumed) adults, self-determination must rule, as must the consequences of their consumption of the content of media.

Q2:

Explicit forewarning of the nature of the content of media

Q3:

No

Q4:

No

Q5:

No. The potential effect is not within the purview or the competence of officialdom, or the few, to arbitrate for the many.

Q6:

No

Q7:

No

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

No

Q11:

Cession of the right to think for oneself (and dependants) is what gives a polity the government that it deserves.

Q12:

Control is not necessary. Informed (and responsible) advance warning/advice about content is as much as is required and possible.

Q13:

Within the home, anywhere between completely and negligently. Outside the home, not at all.

Q14:

Control is not necessary. Informed (and responsible) advance warning/advice about content is as much as is required and possible.

Q15:

Always, but with the exception of 'consumer-advice': never.

Q16:

None other than their innate or intended sensitivity towards consumers, unless the material be actively seditious or treasonous.

Q17:

If the aim were descriptive rather than prohibitive, perhaps. But such a scheme would be bureaucratic overkill if the mandate were simply for accurate description of content rather than even the best-intentioned prescription of recommended/permitted viewing.

Q18:

All

Q19:

No

Q20:

All, even for the classifiers

Q21:

Yes, as already proposed.

Q22:

Irelevant. Plain language, in a single paragraph, will obviate all contorted classifications for all but the illiterate. And even they can ask someone else.

Q23:

No. Burnt at the stake.

Q24:

None. Ever nailed honey to the wall?

Q25:

RC-classified material simply promotes confusion and contention. No content should be RC unless it is specifically enacted as being illegal.

Q26:

By Federal enactment of content-description only without assignation of consumer-classifications.

Q27:

As preceding

Q28:

Yes, if their governments have the intestinal fortitude to acknowledge that they are servers, not rulers, and should not be swayed by squeaky wheels.

Q29:

By respecting the liberty of citizens to go to Hell in hand-carts of their own choosing, hand-in-hand with their due respect for other citizens' liberties and for the rule of law in support of human liberty.

Other comments: