CI 1839 P Jankowski

First name: Paul
Last name: Jankowski

Q1:
The ALRC should develop a new framework, based on the presumption that the majority of content available to citizens today is received via unclassified channels (primarily the Internet) and thus the expectation that content producers will voluntarily approach the OFLC before publication is naive; the new scheme should be one of direct government regulation but with voluntary submission, self-regulation by publishers and individuals otherwise. Additionally, the National Classification Code should be adjusted so that only material created in a criminal fashion, or encouraging criminal behaviour, should be restricted.

Q2:
A national classification scheme should provide a consistent set of guidelines for the classification of all media, including the extent of the scheme's reach and the status of works outside its reach (e.g. what is the status of Web pages that have not been classified). The emphasis should be on protecting children rather than providing consumer advice (since this function is continually shifting to online forums) or censorship (because adults should be expected to be rational).

Q3:
No; a voluntary submission classification scheme is applicable across all technologies.

(This answer is contingent upon the adoption of a voluntary submission classification scheme. This answer is void if mandatory submission classification is continued.)

Q4:
Yes, such a policy should be applied to all media. However, voluntary submission should be available in cases where the publisher desires a formal determination.

(This answer is contingent upon the adoption of a voluntary submission classification scheme. This answer is void if mandatory submission classification is continued.)

Q5:
All content should be treated equally, with voluntary submission for classification if the content producer has doubts as to whether the material should be restricted or not. It is impractical and indeed impossible to classify all children's content across all media, but a voluntary system is feasible -- it is in content producers' interests to avoid the negative publicity that would result from publishing content unsuitable for the age range it's targeted at.

Q6:
No. It is likely that under a voluntary submission classification scheme, larger distributors will be more likely to submit works for classification, but they would not be forced to; whereas smaller publishers and individuals, for whom the current system is at times untenable, would be less likely to seek classification; and this state of affairs would be in line with public expectations.

(This answer is contingent upon the adoption of a voluntary submission classification scheme. This answer is void if mandatory submission classification is continued.)

Q7:

No; artworks for exhibition have traditionally not been the purview of the OFLC, since they are not published or distributed in any meaningful way; the same applies to theatrical performances.

Q8:

Yes; all media should be classified according to the same rules; however, those rules should take into account the lower psychological impact of a textual as opposed to graphical representation of the same scene.

Q9:

No, this would only make the classification process more opaque. Content creators need to be able to have a feeling of how a work is likely to be classified, and audience characteristics are not generally under their control.

Q10:

No; additionally, given the prevalence of portable computers and smartphones, and the move of most consumer content to electronic distribution, this question makes little sense, since there is little stopping citizens from e.g. viewing restricted content on a laptop computer on a crowded train. Such potential abuses are presumably covered by other legislation.

Q11:

Content should only be classified if it is voluntarily submitted for classification, or if there is a complaint about it.

Q12:

NetNanny-style filtering applications installed on computers and other media devices, giving parents control over the level of classification relevant for each family member.

Q13:

NetNanny-style filtering applications installed on computers and other media devices, giving parents control over the level of classification relevant for each family member.

Q14:

Offline content is already sufficiently well controlled, and its importance will wane over time.

Q15:

In a voluntary submission classification scheme, all material that has been classified as restricted must display a marking to this effect, while material that has been classified as unrestricted may display a mark at the publisher's discretion; unsubmitted works may be self-classified with the same marking requirements, however self-classified marks must be different to official marks. There must be text-only versions of the marks available for e.g. text-only media, media for the blind, embedding in digital file metadata, etc.

(This answer is contingent upon the adoption of a voluntary submission classification scheme. This answer is void if mandatory submission classification is continued.)

Q16:

Q17:

Yes; furthermore, the co-regulation model should be extended to media that currently lack industry groups (e.g. online, samizdat, etc.), permitting all content creators to self-classify.

Q18:

Most of it: the bulk of content created is either mundane (e.g. Tetris-style games, Play School) or racy (e.g. vanilla pornography); the middle ground where there may be doubt about classification is relatively small. A voluntary

Q19:

Q20:

Almost nobody understands the differences between R, X, and RC -- or is even aware of the existence of the latter. The different categories between computer games and other media are also confusing.

Q21:

No new categories are needed. Rather, the unnecessary division between R and X should be removed, and the bulk of RC material (all that which was produced lawfully and does not incite unlawful acts) should also be merged into this new 18+ category. It is not the Government's role to decide what types of kinky pornography, etc. adults should watch. In particular, material featuring both violence and sexually explicit content should be permitted, again as long as the relevant criminal laws are respected.

Q22:

All media should be classified using the same guidelines, into the same categories, with the same markings. The artificial limit of computer games to 16+ should be discontinued, and computer games with sexually explicit content should be permitted.

Q23:

Yes. This is part of the reason why a new set of guidelines is the best way forward.

Q24:

It would be nice to restrict access to material that was created through an illegal act, or incites to illegal acts; however, a much-quoted truism is that "the Internet perceives censorship as a fault, and routes around it", and in practice attempting to actually restrict access to content on the Internet results only in conservative votes for the party that promises it. Perhaps the best summary of why this is was given by an insider of the child pornography industry:

http://www.thechildprotectioncommunity.net/1/post/2011/07/an-insight-into-child-porn.html

Q25:

No; moreover, the current scope of the RC category reflects a moral rather than legal position. The RC category today is overly broad, not in line with modern attitudes, and embarrasses Australia on the global stage -- c.f. 'Romance' (Catherine Breillat, 1999). The only works that should be refused classification are the direct products of criminal activity (e.g. child pornography) or incitements to criminal activity (e.g. hate speech).

Q26:

Yes, consistency is of the utmost importance. State and territory governments should be encouraged not to override federal classification guidelines, e.g. restricted material should be available to adults in Queensland.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes; all inhabitants of Australia should have the same rights with respect to access to media, and it is unfair for states to have the power to override this for political reasons.

Q29:

Almost all content on the Internet is currently unclassified, and is permitted to stay that way for pragmatic reasons. This unclassified state should be extended to other media, so that classification becomes optional; content should be permitted to go unclassified, and unclassified material should not be restricted in the same way RC material currently is. Unclassified material could be voluntarily brought to the relevant body (e.g. the OFLC) for classification, or it could be self-classified, or neither; in any case, viewers could bring a complaint if they felt the classification (or lack thereof) was inappropriate. This is a realistic approach, given that the bulk of content available today is already handled in a similar manner.

Other comments: