

CI 2455 S Gunther

Full name: Steve Gunther

Proposal 5-1:

Proposal 5-2:

Proposal 5-3:

Proposal 5-4:

Proposal 6-1 :

Proposal 6-2:

Proposal 6-3:

Proposal 6-4:

Proposal 6-5:

Proposal 6-6:

Proposal 6-7:

Proposal 6-8:

Proposal 7-1:

Proposal 7-2:

Question 7-1 :

Proposal 7-3:

Proposal 7-4:

Proposal 7-5:

Question 7-2:

Proposal 7-6:

Proposal 7-7:

Proposal 8-1 :

Proposal 8-2:

Proposal 8-3:

Proposal 8-4:

Question 8-1:

Proposal 8-5:

Proposal 8-6 :

Proposal 9-1 :

Proposal 9-2:

Proposal 9-3:

Proposal 9-4 :

Proposal 9-5 :

Proposal 10-1:

Proposal 11-1:

Proposal 11-2 :

I was alerted to an issue by this article by reporter Kirsten Drysdale from the ABC:

<http://www.mamamia.com.au/news/why-australian-law-demands-all-vaginas-be-digitally-altered-nsfw/>

The issues are basically that despite the best intent of the current regulation, there are some problems in practice, that seem to relate to both the attitude of the censors, and the behaviour of the industry. It has to be seen, if you read the article and watch the video, that the reality is a position which is clearly untenable: female genitalia are effectively censored by the regulator, and self censored by the industry, so they are 'neat', non-offensive to the particular category of censorship, and are not considered against the guideline of:

“Realistic depictions may contain discreet genital detail but there should be no genital emphasis.”  
Discreet....no genital emphasis...

What this ends up with are airbrushed female genitalia which resemble most closely that of younger girls - no sticking out bits, generally no hair, and certainly nothing of the range of normal female genitalia.

I myself am not a purveyor of porn, so in one way, who cares? But on a sociological level, this is of great concern. These policies are evidently shaping the porn industry, producing airbrushed vaginas which become the standard men expect, and women also think they should fit into. By not depicting the range of vaginas, a very false social image is created, maintained, with the help of the censors. Of particular concern is that these vaginas look so young in essence. That represents a kind of grooming of men who look at porn to be attracted to young vaginas. This has to feed somewhere a kind of latent or potential pedophilic response, obviously particularly in men who may be inclined that way.

I have written the minister about this matter, and his reply was bureaucratic and unhelpful. He basically said, theres no problem, the censors are doing their job, the industry is doing whatever its doing, and alls well in the best of all possible worlds. He directed me to put in a submission here.

I am hoping that you will grasp the bigger picture in your review, and do something about this. It seems that somehow both the classifying and the implementation of the classification needs to be changed. The article says it better than me.

Proposal 11-3 :

Proposal 11-4:

Question 12-1:

Proposal 12-1 :

Proposal 13-1 :

Proposal 13-2:

Proposal 14-1 :

Proposal 14-2 :

Proposal 14-3:

Proposal 14-4:

Proposal 14-5 :

Upload supporting documents: