

CI 2049 G Onishi

First name: George

Last name: Onishi

Q1:

Improve on the existing framework.

Q2:

- To provide a standardised system of classification that is consistent across all media types, and across all national jurisdictions (possibly even grant some consistency with foreign jurisdictions).
- To provide a system with sufficient clarity and coherence that can be readily understood by the public.
- To ensure that existing ratings are not only reflective of the need to restrict access of inappropriate material to minors, but also of the importance of preserving the freedom of adults to choose independently the media which they consume.
- To readily distinguish content that is merely immoral/offensive from content that is illegal in nature (e.g. child pornography, real-life depictions of rape or assault), so that the latter can be entirely restricted, and those responsible be apprehended.

Q3:

No; one broad system is sufficient for the purposes of classifying the appropriateness of ALL material, regardless of on what medium it is conveyed. Consistency and clarity are key.

HOWEVER, with regard to material found online, regulation via classification of ALL internet content is unfeasible, due to the sheer volume of accessible content. In such cases, self-classification should be implemented, and these may be reviewed and further classified if necessary on the basis of public complaints.

Q4:

Yes; see answer to Q3.

Q5:

No, all content (excluding internet material) should be classified regardless. This applies to content designed for children.

Q6:

No; again, consistency should be the main focus.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

N/A

Q12:

Internet regulation is unfeasible; there are no effective methods for controlling access to online content. Therefore, access to ILLEGAL content should be restricted by directly targeting the distributors of said material, rather than merely attempting to block access.

Q13:

This should not be a government policy issue, but an issue to be taken up by the legal guardians of children. If anything, policy should be directed at educating parents on how to better monitor the internet activity of minors in their care.

Q14:

These do not need to be better controlled; as far as I know, explicit magazines are not at all readily accessible by minors.

Q15:

Where the material has been classified, and made publically available to purchase.

Q16:

Industry bodies: self-classify where practicable (if sufficient resources to do so);  
government agencies: to review said classifications and modify where appropriate;  
users: to submit complaints in order to draw attention to material they believe ought to be classified or reviewed.

Q17:

Yes; distrubution of responsibility can shift any uneven burdens

Q18:

Q19:

As in my answer to Q16, the burden for government to subsidise for self-classification of content should depend on the resources available to the creator of the content; small independent producers should thus bear a smaller burden than much larger firms.

Q20:

Confusion arises to the extent of inconsistencies in the application of the classification system across various media. A great example of such inconsistency is the lack of an R18+ rating for video games, which creates further problems of games that would typically be rated R18+ being declared MA, just so that they may be classified. The effect of such inconsistency is the distortion of applied ratings, which are arbitrarily stretched or constrained. It is easy to see how this could lead to confusion in classification categories.

Q21:

An R18+ rating with regard to video-games, so that the same system will apply to all media types.

Q22:

See above, Q20 & Q21

Q23:

Q24:

Material containing the real depiction of illegal activities.

That said, given that absolute regulation of online material is impossible, the effort to restrict it should also be complimented by an attempt to monitor the activities of its viewers and distributors, mainly towards the goal of apprehending the latter.

Q25:

No, it is too broad and unreasonable. The RC category should be limited to illegal material; everything else should be labelled with a classification that will notify the consumer of its potentially offensive content, and its sale be subject to regulations that will effectively prevent minors from obtaining it.

Q26:

It is important; inconsistent classification laws will only contribute to greater incoherence, and therefore the inability of the Australian public to comprehend the relevant laws.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes; classification laws should be a matter for Commonwealth legislators to deal with. The legislation would be useless unless it is sufficiently consistent throughout Australia.

Q29:

Introducing an R18+ classification for video-game material. As it stands, the absolute restriction of material containing offensive content is completely unreasonable; in a liberal democratic society, it should be for rational and capable adults to decide for themselves what content they decide to consume. To this end, the classification system should not seek to completely restrict any material (except those with illegal content), and instead be used to notify the public of what certain materials contain so that individuals can have sufficient knowledge of what it is they are buying, and therefore make a rational decision that is in their own interests.

Other comments: