

CI 1932 J Fredkin

First name: Jessica

Last name: Fredkin

Q1:

whichever insures that there is no banning or "watering down" of content. Adults should be able to decide what they want to play!

Q2:

ensuring no banning of watering down of content.

Q3:

no, as long as it is still universally accessible

Q4:

no, people will always complain. It is a slippery slope.

Q5:

this concept seems a little flawed to me, perhaps it is the wording but it seems a little up in the air; "potential impact" is a very vague idea.

Q6:

I say universality is needed, either leave it the way it is, or give everything a fair and consistent rating.

Q7:

no, this is ridiculous nannying.

Q8:

what would be the terms? seems like a lot of work and money for something fundamentally useless.

Q9:

no

Q10:

no, another ridiculous idea!

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

By their parents. It is not fair to treat the whole population as children, they are in the minority of gamers and their access to inappropriate material should be monitored by their parents. it is not fair to forbid adults from adult content on the off chance a child might see it.

Q14:

again, minors should be controlled by their parents and adults can decide for themselves what to see/watch/play

Q15:

on the container

Q16:

there should be a basic and consistent set of rules that defines the codes.

Q17:

Q18:

excessive violence and aggravated sexual content

Q19:

apply codes universally.

Q20:

RC is confusing to me

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

nothing, we have the right to decide what we watch.

Q25:

Q26:

yes, federal laws

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments:

we do not need any more of a nanny-country! I support ratings if it means there is no restriction or watering down of content which I believe is fundamentally wrong. As an adult and an Australian I feel it is my right to be able to watch/play whatever I like.