

CI 1712 E Heinzle

First name: Erich

Last name: Heinzle

Q1:

Changing well recognised classification criteria, while giving the impression of action and forthrightness on the part of the ACMA and ALRC, may only serve to confuse the public. It would be better to extend and refine existing classifications, to preserve the utility of the well established classification "brands".

Q2:

The primary objectives should be to simply and clearly inform the public, who can then proceed to make more informed decisions as consumers of content, and to allow more objectionable content to be safeguarded with appropriate access controls and policing in the retail sphere and customs environment, and to allow illegal content to be policed effectively.

Q3:

digital convergence, whereby one can read a book, watch a movie, listen to audio content, or play a game on the one device, or purchase any of these on the said device, makes a classification scheme partitioned by platform somewhat absurd.

Q4:

Wikipedia's page on the the copernican revolution should not be classified just because it offends the sensibilities of those with strong views on papal infallibility. Content produced by a gay and lesbian support group should not be classified if it offends the sensibilities of those with strongly held religious beliefs. Similarly, content promoting safe sex and drug use harm reduction should not be classified if it offends those with strongly held religious beliefs relating to contraception or drug use. If anything, the new media should be allowed to help us to progress the work of Copernicus, Gallileo and Newton, who ignited the flame of observation, evidence, science and reason informing our individual beliefs and decisions, rather than an individual's choices and opinions relying on received and sometimes incorrect dogma.

Q5:

The issue of classification and legality of certain forms of content has only arisen because of concerns about the impact of certain types of content in society. Impact must therefore inform classification decisions, as must illegality. It is clearly reasonable and sensible to mark child suitable content across all media.

Q6:

Naturally, illegal content should be categorized, regardless of size or market position of the producer. Content with mass market reach, either physically in stores, or via extensive advertising campaigns, or in cinema chains, is more deserving of classification than more obscure offerings available only in very small niches of the market. There should not be as much rush to classify niche products which are not illegal to produce and are not widely marketed.

Q7:

"Should some artworks require classification before exhibition" would be better wording. Art is a nebulous, ill defined thing, but most people know pornography when they see it, and most police and customs officers have an idea of what is illegal. If an exhibition is more art than pornography, then classification need not be mandatory. Vague, I know, but the catwoman movie and the statues of venus de milo and david could be considered pornographic or fetishistic to some, when clearly they are acceptable to the public.

Q8:

It is reasonable for producers to voluntarily indicate what products are child suitable, but mandating classification seems impossible, given the small file sizes, the ease of sharing such content, and the limited mass market impact of such content in this age of audio on demand.

Q9:

There is the "potential" for someone to walk off the edge of the grand canyon and die. Should bunting be put all the way along it to prevent this? There are limits to what is reasonable public policy to prevent theoretical or "potential" risks. Clearly, content aimed at non adult audiences or media channels such as daytime or evening television and radio warrant more attention in terms of classification, but something should not necessarily warrant classification simply because of a "potential" for access by a non-intended audience.

Q10:

There is more rationale for classification for material accessed outside of the home in public venues, such as cinemas, or on plain display such as in retail stores. Niche products, if they are not illegal, and are accessed from home, do not warrant the same degree of classification and regulatory oversight.

Q11:

if it's illegal, by all means, prohibit it. If it is suitable for children, indicate it clearly. If it is distasteful, but not illegal, by all means classify it, but it should not be prohibited. The refused classification (RC) label is too vague, too broad, and encompasses product niches that are not illegal to produce. Why should a gay man be prevented from watching consensual sadomasochism in the privacy of his own home? Even the good book foresees situations in which one might covet a slave of either gender: "You shall not covet your neighbour's house; you shall not covet your neighbour's wife, or male or female slave". If it is suitably labelled and age based access controls are in place, what is wrong with it? Even in the USA, a very religious country, this is the direction in which they have headed.

Q12:

Technically speaking, Internet filtering is about as effective as dunking witches, doing nothing more than salving the consciences of moralisers. A more mature approach is to let people make well informed decisions for themselves, assisted by clear and unambiguous classification schemes that apply across all the media platforms. Internet filtering doesn't even work in China, whose "Great Firewall of China" is using cutting edge cisco and nortel network technology, and where one risks a firing squad or forced labour camp for infractions. Plus, internet filtering leads us down the steep slippery slope of censorship. Who decides what is filtered?

Q13:

Nanny software, better informed parents, unambiguous rating systems, and age based access control implemented by vendors of such content, as is commonplace in the USA.

Q14:

If it isn't illegal content, age based controls at the point of sale should suffice. Honestly, I didn't think the younger generation read much on paper these days....

Q15:

When the content is only suitable for more mature audiences, and is physically for sale in Australia, or on an Australian operated website.

Q16:

Industry should play a major role in self regulating classification and access by minors. There should be uniform laws across all states, and government agencies should focus on policing labelling, age verification at point of sale, and preventing importation or supply of illegal content. Input by users is fraught with the danger of moralisers who seek to impose their views on everyone else, absent reason, science or logic, such as the issue of safe sex campaigns or harm minimisation programs.

Q17:

Yes. This is far better than a draconian but at the same time "emperor wears no clothes" arrangement which makes a small minority of moralisers feel good but merely imposes cost, complexity and no real change to access and production of more objectionable content.

Q18:

Illegal content, animal cruelty, child exploitation should not be allowed. Violence, and strong sexual themes should obviously be classified for more mature audiences. Industry should be able to classify "G rated" content aimed at children.

Q19:

Yes, especially if a pointlessly draconian and tedious system is devised.

Q20:

The usual ratings for prime time television are fairly well understood, but as discussed above, RC is too vague, too broad, and too easily applied to niche products, i.e. fetish content, which are not illegal and should be allowed in the privacy of one's home.

Q21:

As discussed above, the RC category needs overhaul, and clearly labelled adult categories should be allowed within some of the content currently covered by RC.

Q22:

make it a uniform system of content classification, easily understood by parents, that applies across all media types.

Q23:

There should be one code to rule them all.

Q24:

Other than outright illegal content, people should be able to access whatever other they content they please in the privacy of their own home.

Q25:

The RC category is overly inclusive, as well as being vague and ill defined. Why should people be prevented from viewing consensual fetish material that is not illegal to produce in the privacy of their own home? The RC category should be replaced by categories prohibiting illegal content and

promotion of illegal behaviour, with other adult categories created for non illegal content, such as fetish material.

Q26:

One should not be breaking the law just by crossing a state boundary. There should be uniformity across all states, deriving from commonwealth legislation.

Q27:

A commonwealth legal framework rather than patchwork quilt of laws and attorneys general.

Q28:

Yep.

Q29:

As discussed above, labelling must be made unambiguous and uniform across all media types, to facilitate informed decision making by parents. Filtering and outright prohibition will not work in this digital age. The focus should be on empowering parents, while preserving the right of mature adults to access what they choose in the privacy of their own home.

Other comments: