Subject: FW: Motion-Gratuitous Violence on TV. Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2001 10:29:31 -0800

From: Ernie Crist < CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

To: Nathalie Valdes < Valdes N@ district.north-van.bc.ca>

```
CC: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>
> ----Original Message-----
             Ernie Crist
> Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2001 2:59 PM
> To: Nathalie Valdes
> Subject:
             Motion-Gratuitous Violence on TV.
> Notice of Motion
>
> Report Councillor Crist
> RECOMMENDATION:
>
>
> THAT
> 1. Council sponsor a community wide seminar which should include but not
> be exclusive to, Churches, Fellowships, Community Groups, Health,
> Seniors, Women, Trade Unions, Youth, Law Enforcement, Judiciary, Social
> Services, "Together Against Violence", Cultural and Sports organizations
> to expose and stop TV advertising and TV programs depicting gratuitous
> violence.
> 2. the Council of the City of North Vancouver be invited to co-sponsor
> such a seminar; and
> 3. following such an event determining strategy and action, a resolution
> be drafted and be submitted to the UBCM and the FCM for consideration and
> endorsation in time for the respective UBCM and FCM conventions in the
> year 2002.
>
> REASON FOR REPORT:
> To sponsor a Seminar for the purpose of mobilizing public opinion against
> corporate sponsors of advertising and programs depicting gratuitous
> violence on TV and to submit a corresponding resolution to the FCM and
> UBCM.
> There is precedent for this in the USA where, several years ago, a large
> group of women organized and promoted a boycott of Mattel toys and, in so
> doing, forced the company to withdraw its "violent" toys from sale in that
> country.
> There is also a corollary in the struggle to curtail the advertising and
> promotion of tobacco.
> ANALYSIS:
> Gratuitous violence depicted on TV is extremely harmful. Young minds are
> especially vulnerable.
> To divert attention from its effects, the advertisers and sponsors of such
> programs camouflage their endeavor under the guise of freedom of choice
> and the right of the individual to learn from harmful experience, etc.
```

1 of 3

```
> Gratuitous violence is insidious since its effects are not seen directly.
> The social cost of manipulating young people's minds is staggering.
> Increased youth crime, increased police and judiciary costs, loss and
> damage to life and property, etc. are but some manifestations. Not
> included is the damage to emotional health, family, social and cultural
> stability. Just as the banning of cigarette advertising on TV has been a
> powerful tool in reducing smoking, so banning of gratuitous violence on TV
> would have a beneficial impact.
> TV simulated violence is particularly harmful in a country like Canada
> which puts fewer resources than any other developed country, other then
> the US, into protecting its children. Protecting children from the ravages
> of gratuitous TV violence must start either in the home under close
> supervision which, in most cases, is only possible for non working
> mothers or those who can afford to pay for expensive professionally
> supervised childcare.
> Canada and the US are the only countries in the developed world without
> universal childcare. To put a child in a professional childcare facility
> can cost up to $ 700 a month which is simply out of reach for many parents
> including single parent families or families of low income. Many experts
> believe that there is a direct correlation between the absence of
> universal childcare and Canada, with the exception of the US, having the
> highest crime rate, in the developed world.
>
> According to many psychologists and social economists there is also a
> strong correlation between being subjected to TV violence during
> childhood and the lack of potential for social, cultural and economic
> achievement in later years. In summary - to compete successfully in the
> global economy in later years, children need to be free of having their
> minds filled with poisenous matter. For a society to allow its children
> to be exposed TV violence will ineviately result in a steady decline in
> the standard of living of such a country and Canada is a prime example.
> Most economists agree that the decline of the value of the Candian Dollar
> is the logical outcome of this scenario.
>
> In attempting to address the issue of violence, the Together Against
> Violence Network, in a recently published pamphlet, made several important
> points. This included the need for increased public awareness on the
> issues of violence, development of strategies to address violence,
> creation of or amendments to policies to effectively deal with the issue
> of violence and changes in the environment which it claimed will reduce
> the likelihood of violence.
> The problem according to Together Against Violence is that for too many
> people violence is an ordinary way to be entertained. By the age of 18 our
> children have witnessed 200,000 acts of violence on TV including 18,000
> simulated murders. Together Against Violence points to the medical
> profession's opinion on the harmful effects of violence on children - it
> states that the American Medical Association, the American Psychological
> Association and the American Center for Disease Control have reviewed
> media violence studies and agree that violent entertainment of children
> contributes to violent behavior.
>
> What was not addressed by Together against violence, however, is the need
> for society to demand a stop to the number one offender and contributor of
> violence, namely television promoted gratuitous violence made possible by
> large corporations via paid advertising.
> The solution according to Together Against Violence is to turn the TV off
> for just one day. This is not the solution. This attitude is tantamount to
> capitulation in the face of corporate guilt. Instead of putting the
```

2 of 3

```
> responsibility for TV violence where it belongs, onto the shoulders of the
> corporate sponsors, it puts the responsibility onto the shoulders of
> parents who, for lack of financial resources, are frequently forced to
> leave their children in unprofessionally supervised facilites where they
> are being subjected to TV violence. The assault on childrens minds
> continues throughout their teens.
> In another attempt to confront violence, a number of individuals have
> addressed the issue of the Video Arcades.
> A resolution to this effect went to the UBCM and, in turn, was adopted by
> the UBCM.
> So far governments in Canada have ignored the research and facts that the
> parents and children of this province need our own legislation to screen
> and rate these games. The Liberal Government in BC leaves TV and video
> violence up to the "understanding and good sense" of corporations.
> This approach has produced little in the last 20 years and will produce
> even less in the next 20 years. It is like leaving the selling of drugs
> to the good sense of the sellers of drugs.
> Since the Provincial government appears to be loathe to curtail the
> "freedom" of corporations in their continued pursuit and lack of social
> responsibility, there can be only one solution to this plight - the
> public, but first and foremost, parents themselves must organize and
> expose this war against the minds of our children. The time has come via
> petitions, protests, demonstrations, letters, boycotts etc., to demand
> an end to gratuitous violence in all its forms and put the blame not on
> the victims and their families but at the door of those who, in the name
> of freedom of choice, sponsor programs depicting gratutaitous violence in
> the first place.
> Submitted by
> Ernie Crist, Councillor
```



Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64

3 of 3