1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	
3	
4	MARKETING VIOLENT ENTERTAINMENT TO CHILDREN:
5	A WORKSHOP ON INDUSTRY SELF-REGULATION
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	Wednesday, October 29, 2003
L2	9:11 a.m.
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	Federal Trade Commission
L7	FTC Conference Center
L8	601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
L9	Washington, D.C.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	<u>I N D E X</u>
3	
4	Introductory Remarks:
5	By Chairman Timothy Muris
6	By The Honorable Frank Wolf
7	By The Honorable Joe Baca
8	
9	Morning Session:
10	An Overview of the Rating and Labeling Systems
11	
12	Dialogue Among Industry, Consumer and Research
13	Groups: Discussion of Rating and Labeling
14	System
15	
16	Afternoon Session:
17	Cross-Marketing and Merchandising of Branded
18	Products
19	
20	Retailers' In-Store and Online Practices
21	
22	Next Steps
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

2 - - - -

CHAIRMAN MURIS: Good morning. Let's come on and have a seat. Hi, I'm Tim Muris. I'm the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and I'd like to welcome you to our workshop on the Marketing of Violent Entertainment to Children, and I want to thank you for joining us today. I'd especially like to thank our distinguished panelists for sharing their insights and expertise on this very important topic.

As you know, the Federal Trade Commission has issued four reports on the self-regulatory programs of the motion picture, electronic games and music recording industries. Now, we are working on a fifth report.

We've examined an important question for parents in the entertainment industry, namely, whether these industries promote products that they, themselves, acknowledge warrant parental caution in venues where children make up a substantial percentage of the audience.

Today, we have assembled an impressive group of industry members, consumer and parent advocacy groups, marketing experts and public health officials to discuss and debate what needs to be done. I expect that during the day we will hear about what has already been accomplished and much more about what could still be

done.

When I testified last spring before the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, chaired by Congressman Frank Wolf, who is with us today, I said that culture matters, and it continues to be true today. Youth violence remains a troubling issue for all of us. The exposure of our children to excessively violent media, be it in our entertainment products or on the news, remains a major worry for me as a parent, as I'm sure it does for all of you.

At the same time, it is an area of free expression in which the Government may tread only cautiously. Parents must, in large part, rely on themselves and on the self-regulatory efforts of industry. But we in Government have a role of reporting on and illuminating various aspects of this crucial issue. Our approach today is designed to look at what efforts are being made and how well they are working.

Let me begin with a few common sense principles that I hope we all, or at least most of us, can agree on. Industry should market its products consistent with their ratings and parental advisories. Parents should have access to useful information on the ratings for products before they purchase them and retailers should consider

whether entertainment is rated or labeled as inappropriate for children in adopting sales policies.

Again, I'd like to welcome you all here and thank our panelists for their contributions, to what we expect will be a productive and enlightening day.

Now, it is my privilege to introduce

Congressman Frank Wolf. He represents part of Fairfax

and Loudon Counties just across the river in Virginia and

was the first member of Congress I met with after my

confirmation as Chairman of the FTC in 2001. I'll let

you decide if the fact that he was our appropriator had

anything to do with the fact that that was my first

meeting. At that meeting and on several occasions since,

we discussed Congressman Wolf's strong commitment to

protecting children from the marketing of violent

entertainment products.

I know he has followed our reports on this topic closely. On this and many other issues, the Congressman has been very supportive of the FTC and its mission through his position as Chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee. He's a good friend of the FTC's and we are very pleased to have him with us today.

Mr. Chairman.

CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Thank you, Tim. Good morning, Chairman Muris. Thank you for holding this

important and timely workshop, and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss a serious and a growing problem in America today, the marketing of violent video games to our children.

It is becoming nearly impossible to shield minors from graphic violence. Exposure to these images is taking a toll on our society. Now, children who -- for whom we are all responsible, are seeing acts of violence and then acting out what they see in the media and in video games. The problem has grown so severe that lawsuits are beginning and being filed against the creators of some of these violent video games because children are mimicking the violence they're watching.

I want you to watch a short video clip. We've taken out most of the violence and, I think, the more offensive stuff. You will see more of these images from another speaker later today, but I thought you needed to see a taste of what is being peddled to our children today.

Could we see that short video?

(Video segment played.)

CONGRESSMAN WOLF: These images are hurting our children. Some say there is no correlation between viewing these images and committing acts of violence. I disagree. It has been said, garbage in, garbage out.

The American Psychiatric Association concurs and it says,

I quote, "The debate is over. Over the last three

decades the one overriding finding in research on mass

media is that exposure to media portrayals of violence

increases aggressive behavior in children."

Think for a minute about the image, perhaps a famous and beautiful painting or sounds, perhaps the theme from the music of Chariots of Fire, or words, perhaps a prayer from Mother Teresa for which you have found positive inspiration or motivation. I believe that society can be moved for good by what it sees or hears or reads, but isn't the opposite just as logical?

If what society, especially the young and the immature in society, sees or hears or reads is filled with violence, is there not motivation associated with these images toward the wrong kinds of behavior? We are running out of time and turning the corner on protecting our children from media violence.

The time has come for an aggressive plan, not tomorrow, not next year, but today. How many more Columbines must occur before effective action is taken to keep violent material out of the hands of children? How many more Paducahs? How many more Jonesboroughs. The violence in video games is being acted out in our schools and communities by children imitating the violent acts

1 they see.

For the well-being and safety of our children, ways must be found to control the marketing of violent entertainment. According to a recent Gallup poll, boys age 13 to 17, more than 70 percent of them have played the extremely popular video game, Grand Theft Auto.

Seventy percent. What good can come out of 70 percent of the young people seeing that? What redeeming social value is there to our society to even produce that, but let alone to see the young people to see it?

The most recent installment called Vice City allows players to kill policemen -- my dad was a policeman -- pedestrians and the elderly. Players can even have sex with a prostitute who they can then kill to get their money back.

Grand Theft Auto is rated M for mature and is not supposed to be sold to anyone under 17. Then how are 13-year-olds playing the game? How are 13-year-olds playing the game and buying the game? How do they know it to describe it as cool? The Gallup survey found that children polled are imitating the violence they see in Grand Theft Auto.

The FTC's own undercover survey of stores found that 69 percent of teen shoppers could buy M-rated games, 83 percent could purchase explicit label recordings and

36 percent were able to buy tickets for R-rated movies.

The FTC survey shows the system is failing our children

and failing society. Young people are obtaining adult
oriented games and studies show they are committing

violent acts at a higher rate than those who do not see

6 the games.

I know we will hear this. Some will say that there are no marketing rules in place to shield children from adult-themed violent entertainment. But, frankly, the industry is doing a poor job at self-regulation when it comes to our children.

Think about it as yourself and those from the industry. How long will our society that says it cares about our children permit this to continue? Many of the children and grandchildren of people right here in this room -- in this room -- may very well get caught up in the violence of this or be the victims of the violence. Labeling may be a start, but much more needs to be done.

If we cannot come up with some way to put the brakes on violent entertainment, then frankly the only option that parents may have left will be to do as they're doing now in greater numbers, to turn to the courts and continue to sue and sue and sue and sue and sue the industry and have this go the way of tobacco.

What are you going to say to the parents of the

children who were killed at Columbine, Paducah or Jonesborough? What will you say?

In my region, have you been following the stories down in Virginia Beach of the sniper case? What would you say to those families? Some people say that one or both of those snipers had looked at video games and had trained on video games. Do you remember, those of you who live in this region? You were afraid to go to the gas pump to buy gasoline. You shielded yourself.

One was killed in my district. As I drove today coming down Route 50, I thought as I passed the Home Depot where the FBI employee was killed. What do you tell those families with regard to what took place?

This forum, hopefully, today offers a chance to make a positive difference in the lives of our children. The challenge is to step forward and come up with a plan, a plan that everyone can be agreed on to protect the very future of our society and our children from the violence that they are being bombarded with daily through the media.

I wish you the wisdom and courage necessary to address this problem and my commitment to the parents, as a father of five children and seven grandchildren and two more that are coming, as long as I stay in Congress, we're going to stay on this issue. And I may be a slow

1 starter, but I finish fast.

I ran for Congress in 1976 and lost. I was a Government employee. I ran for Congress in 1978 and lost again. And, finally, through the good offices of grabbing Ronald Reagan's coattails, he pulled me across. We're going to stay with this issue until we solve it in each and any way we possibly can because it is unacceptable for our society to continue the coarsening that we're seeing and the impact that it is having on our children.

Thank you very much and thanks for having me here, Tim.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN MURIS: Thank you very much, Mr.

Chairman. Next, I'd like to introduce Congressman Joe

Baca. Congressman Baca represents Southwest San

Bernardino County in California and we're especially

appreciative of him being here today. All members of

Congress are very busy and he's especially busy as some

of the fires in Southern California are in his district.

Like Chairman Wolf, Congressman Baca has shown a strong interest in the issues we are exploring today. He's the chief sponsor of the Protect the Children From Video Game Sex and Violence Act of 2003. We're honored to have Congressman Baca here with us this morning.

1 Sir.

CONGRESSMAN BACA: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here attending this workshop on marketing of violent entertainment to children. I want to thank Chairman Muris and Congressman Frank Wolf for taking the leadership because this is a very important workshop. It's really about protecting our future, it's about protecting our kids. And I say our future and our kids.

It's important that we come together,

Democrats, Republicans. This is not an issue that

pertains to one party or another. This is an issue that

affects all of us together. That is why we will be able

to prevent games of violent and sexual content from

getting into the hands of our children, from getting into

the hands of our children because the effects, as

Congressman Wolf said, that it has on a lot of our

children in our society and how it changes.

Let me explain why I'm here. Last year, I received a call from a parent in my district concerned about the newly released video game, Grant Theft Auto III. They were concerned about its sexual violence contents, about how easy it was for kids to buy it. How easy it was for kids to buy it. How easy.

Sony's own game description says that these games contain violence, blood, gore in gleeful

abandonment of moral responsibility. Let me repeat that, that's violence, blood and gore of moral responsibility. These are the values our children learn when they play these type of games. When they play these type of games, the aggressive behavior that they begin to get involved in because when they play it they're assimilating the action. It's like not watching TV, not watching a movie, but actually playing the game itself. It's like they've taken a part of that person when they're there. It's like they're hypnotized and they're working on the video game. There's a whole difference.

When I learned that four out of five children today could buy these games on their own -- four out of five children can buy it, I knew that we had to do something about it and Congressman Wolf knew that. That is why I've introduced Protect Our Children from Video Game Sex and Violence Act last year, HR-669. I state, HR-669.

I have been amazed by the support we have received from parents, public health groups and others. We have worked closely with groups, such as Lion and Lamb Project, to make sure that parents everywhere know the kind of content that are in these games. It is wrong that our children are being exposed to this kind of violence at an age when their minds and values are still

being formed. When their minds and values are still
being formed. They play these games when many cannot
distinguish fantasy from reality. Today, it's an
important popular game and is full of senseless acts of
sex and violence and brainwashing of our children.

Grand Theft Auto III and Grand Theft Auto and Vice City show people having sex with prostitutes, carjacking soccer moms, using illegal drugs, killing police officers.

Postal 2 allows players to decapitate police officers. Police officers. This is our law enforcement that are positive images and models in our communities. And kill innocent people as they beg for mercy. Points are even awarded -- and I say points are even awarded for burning and urinating on black police officers or a drive-by shooting in some of these videos that are going on, so we look at the violence that has affected us.

If that isn't enough, Games like BMX, XXX even show live video footage of naked strippers. Live footage. And these are available to our kids. Is that what we really want our kids to be watching? I ask you, is that what we want our children to be watching? I know you're shaking your heads saying no. That's right. We don't want our children to be watching these kind of video games.

We need Federal law helping our parents to monitor what games their children should play. Let me be clear. It is the responsibility of parents to raise their children and determine what kind of games they are buying. We know that. Yes, it is the responsibility of the parents. But the industry also has a responsibility and I know that very much in our society right now with two working families, many individuals out there, latchkey kids, the kids have an opportunity still to go out and buy these and many times the parents don't even know that the kids have even bought it. And many times, they don't even know the content of what's in these video games.

For those parents that are getting educated now, they're saying, I'm appalled, I didn't know that this was the kind of a video game that was being shown.

FTC Secret Shopper survey released just a couple of weeks ago revealed that 69 percent of children -- 69 percent of children between the ages of 13 to 16, unaccompanied by parents are able to purchase video games with graphic and violent and sexual content. Sixty-nine percent. That is seven out of ten children that purchase games like Grand Theft Auto, BMX, XXX, Postal 2 and others.

Smaller sting operations across the country

show that same thing. Whether it's a store online, it is
too easy for our kids to get these games. A retail
tracker recently estimated that four million children 17
and under purchased M-rated games last year.

Some would tell you that early exposure to violence has no harmful effect, but a growing body of academic research tells us a different story. Several of the nation's most respected public health groups have found that viewing entertainment, video games, can lead to aggressive attitudes and values and behaviors, particularly in our children. Aggressive behavior, attitudes in our children.

But we have to go beyond the facts and figures. What does this mean to our kids? We're in a battle for their hearts, their minds, and the souls of our children. From Paducah to Columbine, we have seen the tragic consequences of youth violence. In the Washington, D.C. area, the sniper, Lee Boyd Malvo, practiced shooting snipers by playing video games. Practiced shooting. Practiced shooting, these video games.

Just this summer, two teenage boys in Tennessee who said they were copying Grand Theft Auto II engaged in a fatal sniping spree.

We have to do everything in our power to make sure that these tragedies don't happen again. And I

think it is all of our responsibility, all of us coming together, and I think we all can. But we've all got to take the responsibility.

The video game industry is a \$10 billion industry. But this can't be about money. It's about our children and that's what Congressman Wolf talks about. It's about our children. It's not about money. It's about values. It's about morals.

As an adult, I can shoot a gun, I can drink beer, I can smoke a cigar or a cigarette. But if I gave any of these to a child, I'm a criminal. I'm violating the law. When it comes to video games with violent and sexual content, the same should be true, isn't that right? It should be. The gun industry, the tobacco industry, the alcohol industry all accept regulations on the products when it comes to kids. They accept those. And so must the video game industry. And so must the video game industry.

We cannot let stores that are only looking to make a profit undermine the nation's parents. If parents want to buy these games for their children, that's their choice. But parents, not stores, should make those decisions. Parents, not stores, should make those decisions.

The sad fact is that our stores are not

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

enforcing their own policies. There are some that are, but there are many that are not and some do not even have any policies, and that is why I've introduced this bill and will continue to fight for our children. And will continue to fight for our children.

That's why I'm also creating a Congressional sex and violence in the media caucus. I state, that is why I am creating a Congressional sex and violence in the media caucus. I will be joined by Congressman Tom

Osbourne who will be my Republican co-chair. Congressman Wolf will also be a member of our caucus. We will be a strong voice with Congress to reduce sexual and violent content in the media. We hope that other members of Congress and the public will continue to work to protect our children from these harmful materials. And I state, we hope that other members of Congress and the public will continue to work to protect our children from these harmful materials.

This is just the beginning of a long and difficult battle to protect our children. We are not alone in this battle. Washington, Minnesota, New York and other states are following our lead. In a few weeks, Assemblyman Leland Yee, in my home state of California, will be introducing legislation to keep these games out of the hands of our children. These are encouraging

1 signs.

I know with your help, we can pass this

legislation, HR-669, and make this country safe for our

children. But we've all got to do it together. It's not

about me, it's not about Congressman Wolf, it's about all

of us coming together to protect our children.

I want to thank you. I look forward to working with each and every one of you, and I believe in today's important workshop. That we can look and hear what's going on to make sure that our children continue to be protected. I thank Chairman Muris for taking the leadership and caring about our communities and caring about our children.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN MURIS: If we could now get our panelists for the first panel, which Mary Engle will chair. Thank you.

(Whereupon, there was a brief pause in the proceedings.)

MS. ENGLE: Good morning. My name is Mary
Engle and I'm the Associate Director for Advertising
Practices here at the FTC. Probably one of the more
interesting assignments I've had since I've been at the
Commission has been to head up the Commission's study of

the marketing of violent entertainment media to children, which culminated in the Commission's report and subsequent Congressional hearings three years ago in September of 2000. One thing I learned there, and it continues to be true, is that people feel really passionately about this issue, and I'm sure we'll hear more about that today.

Anybody who has children knows that kids are avid consumers of entertainment media. Parents and others are naturally concerned about what their children are exposed to. All three of the industry segments represented here today, the motion picture, music recording and electronic game industries, have developed voluntary rating and labeling systems to provide parents with information about the content of their products so that parents can make informed choices about what their kids see and hear.

The first panel today will lay the foundation for the subsequent discussions. We will hear from representatives of the Motion Picture Association of America, the Recording Industry Association of America and the Entertainment Software Rating Board.

The panelists will generally describe how each industry rates or labels its products to provide information to parents about the product's content. We

will be particularly interested in hearing about changes to their systems that may have occurred since the Commission issued its first report three years ago.

A couple of housekeeping items, if you have cell phones or pagers, please turn them off and, also, please wear your ID badges at all times for security purposes.

Following the workshop, we will be accepting written comments. If you're interested, you can email comments to violenceworkshop -- that's violenceworkshop, one word -- @ftc.gov and your comment will then be placed on the public record of this proceeding and be available for viewing on the FTC's website.

And now, it's my pleasure to introduce the members of the first panel. Jack Valenti. Mr. Valenti is President and CEO of the Motion Picture Association of America, a position he has held since 1966. Mr. Valenti developed the motion picture ratings system, which went into effect in 1968, and he has presided over its implementation and occasional modifications since that time.

Mitch Bainwol. Mr. Bainwol is Chairman and CEO of the Recording Industry Association of America, a position he assumed last month. Before joining RIAA, he led the Bainwol Group, a lobbying firm here in

Washington, D.C. He previously served as Chief of Staff for Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist and over the years has held several leadership positions on the Hill.

Patricia Vance. Pat Vance is President of the Entertainment Software Rating Board, a self-regulatory body established in 1994 to apply and enforce ratings, advertising principles and online privacy principles.

Ms. Vance came to the ESRB last year from the Princeton Review where she served as Executive Vice President and General Manager for Admission Services. Previously, she was President and CEO of HalfthePlanet.com, an online network resource for people with disabilities.

And, now, Mr. Valenti.

MR. VALENTI: Thank you, Mary. A long, long time ago, in a galaxy far away, in the Mesozoic area, in fact, I became head of this Motion Picture Association.

And the first thing I confronted was a predecessor, Will Hayes, who had the Hayes Code, which was, to me, the most blatant and egregious catalog of censorship that I had encountered. The first thing I did was to junk it. In the interest of full disclosure, I will tell you I am a passionate defender of the First Amendment. I think those 45 words are the one clause in the Constitution which guarantees all the others. I think the First Amendment is the rostrum on which springs this free and

1 loving land.

But I found out quickly that nature, politics and the movie industry abhor vacuums and two motion pictures then intruded on my young tenure. One was, Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf, directed by Mike Nichols, Burton and Taylor the stars, and for the first time you heard on the screen language which had never been heard during the Hayes Code, which literally governed what you could and could not do.

For example, in the Hayes Code it says, if a couple were married and in bed and they wanted to become affectionate, they would have to each put one foot on the floor which means you had to be Nadia Comaneci, the Olympic gymnast, in order to show affection for spouses. But Virginia Woolf had the language.

And then the next picture which burst on the scene was by the celebrated film maker, Michelangelo Antonioni. The film was called BlowUp, starring Vanessa Redgrave and David Hemmings, and you saw for the first time, for about 30 seconds, two teenyboppers naked running around on the screen. And I realized that I had to do something in order to try to find some way to find a middle ground. And I tried to think of -- I wanted to be sure that the screen was free for film makers.

I do not believe anybody -- anyone ought to

intrude on the right of a creative person to compose a song, tell a story, do a visual image the way he or she chooses to do it. The First Amendment says I have a right to speak my mind, but it also says you have a right not to listen or to watch.

And so, I thought we also had an obligation to parents, to make sure that we gave parents advance cautionary warnings so they could make their own judgments about what movies they wanted their children to see and not to see. I raised three children, my wife and I, under that precept. Not my neighbor or my government telling me how to conduct the lives of our children, but my wife and myself.

And so, on November 1st, 1968, in partnership with the National Association of Theater Owners, we unveiled the voluntary motion picture rating system. It is unconstitutional for the Government, under the cloak of all of its strength, to have any kind of compulsory rating systems of any kind. So, we made ours voluntary which gives us legal strength. No one is compelled to do anything. Therefore, if you don't want to rate your film, you don't have to. But about 98 percent of the films are rated.

This rating system started in -- it will be 35 years old on November 1st, 35 years old. I don't believe

anything lasts that long in this brutal and explosive
marketplace, unless it is providing some kind of a
benefit to the people that it aims to serve, in this
case, parents of America.

So, what we have today, after all these years, are five categories and we give reasons for the ratings. It's usually in ads a fourth of a page larger. We have the reasons for the ratings at filmratings.com, which is — the theater owners of America put out various little folders as you come in. We have what we call point-of-sale displays about the rating system, and let me just show you something. I hope I can show you one chart. That's not it.

I need one chart that shows every year since 19
-- there we go. Let me just -- I want you to see -- I
think you can hear me now. I want you to know, this is
1969. This line is people who have never heard of the
ratings system. At one time, it was almost 40 percent.
Today, only 2 percent of all the people in America have
not heard of the ratings system. Ninety-eight percent
recognition. Unbelievable.

This is the line that says, I don't think the ratings system is worth it, and here is 21 percent of the people believe that. On the other hand, this is what's -- by the way, this is for -- actually it's for

parents with children under 13. This survey is 2,600 people under rigorous market research protocol, randomly sampled socioeconomic levels, and you can see at the top, of all the parents in America with children under 13, you have here -- for the last -- I think for the last 20 years, it's been in the 70 level. Now, it's 76 percent of all parents with children under 13 say this ratings system is very useful to fairly useful in helping me decide what pictures my children ought to see.

I just believe that if someone is to condemn something in the marketplace, whatever it is, there ought to be some substantive evidence behind your declarations. I said, the Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey has conducted these surveys and it will be 35 -- well, 34 years because we didn't conduct it in the first year. We started one year after the system was in effect.

So, what I put before you is as follows: We're trying to help parents make their own judgments about what movies they want their children to see or not to see. We give them advance cautionary warnings. And when we say an R picture, we say this picture should not -- you should not bring your young children and they can't get in unless they're accompanied by a parent or a guardian. You say, well, they slip in. The Federal

Trade Commission, just a week ago, complimented and lauded the National Association of Theater Owners, of the 36,000 screens in this country, and they said, you're doing a good job. I think about 65 percent in their secret surveys, or 66 percent, something like that, are really enforcing this ratings system.

There is no law passed by man or woman that is perfect. We have drug laws. People violate them every day. We have speeding laws. People violate them every day. And the newspapers are full of the sordid stories of the avarice of corporate chieftains, who lied and cheated their stockholders and their employees, and I think they all ought to be put not in jail, but under the jail.

So that nothing you do -- nothing you do is perfect. With the possible exception of my three nearly perfect children, I don't know that anything even approaches perfection.

So, I think what we're doing, I'm quite proud of. I think we're fulfilling our obligation to the parents of America and they are responding with large levels of approval. And so, as we approach the 35th anniversary of this ratings system, I feel like we've done something good for America.

MS. ENGLE: Mr. Bainwol.

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

MR. BAINWOL: Thank you, Mary, and good morning to everyone. I appreciate the opportunity to participate this morning in this important workshop on behalf of a creative industry that has long sought to balance the goal of providing parents with information with the basic right of artists to express themselves. I will admit that finding this balance can be very, very difficult.

I'll also be listening today -- I'm a parent,
I'm a dad. My wife and I have three kids. And it's a
complicated world in which we raise them, so I'll talk
some and I'll listen a lot.

Let me quickly set the context for my remarks because the labeling issue really can't be evaluated without looking at how kids get their music. That really has changed in recent years. Let's look at that first slide. It's a then and now slide. Why don't you just digest it as I talk for a second?

It used to be that kids got their music by buying physical copies at stores, and occasionally, they might even tape it from the radio. Thankfully, kids are still buying music and mostly large stores, like chains like Best Buy and Wal*Mart and Target. But there's no question that shipments are way down and there's also no question that it's among kids that the purchase of CDs is actually declining.

So, how do they get their music? They get it from their friends and they get it from the internet.

Increasingly kids will get music from one or more of the new internet sites that have popped up. A dynamic competition has taken off right now and that's great news.

For instance, over the last five months, Apple iTunes has sold something like 14 million downloads. There's a new and legitimate Napster that's in the news today. Other sites include Music Now, Rhapsody, Music Watch, Music Match, buymusic.com and AOL's MusicNet, more on the way from great American brand names like Wal*Mart, Amazon, Dell and Microsoft.

But for now, as a practical matter, the music kids get most often comes not from stores and not from these great new legitimate sites. Rather, kids are getting their music by downloading from P2P networks by Kazaa and Grokster, iMesh, Morpheus and Blubster. Lots of downloads, some say 2.6 billion -- billion with a B -- downloads per month. At a zero price point, it turns out that demand is pretty high, especially for kids.

According to an independent analysis by
Palisades, 99 percent of the audio files downloaded are
either copyrighted works illegally downloaded or
pornographic. Ninety-nine percent. Forget for the

moment, though, the lesson that gets learned from theft of intellectual property on the internet and forget, for a moment, also, the computer security and privacy issues that arise from going onto these P2P networks. Let's focus instead only on content questions and three issues pop up.

First, there is no labeling on Kazaa or the other P2P networks, no parental advisory, nothing. With billions of downloads occurring each month, that blows a gaping hole through the labeling regime that we're talking about today. Some say it's almost irrelevant.

Second, there is no point of sale and, therefore, no one or nothing poses a barrier to the acquisition of the product. No parent, no clerk, no retail establishment thinking about a community standard, nothing.

And third, in the P2P world, anyone can attach anything to any file by any artist, and they do that in a big way and they deceive kids in that fashion. As the GAO observed this spring in their stunning report, when you type in Britney Spears or Pokemon or the Olsen Twins, more than half of the product you get is pornographic.

Let's look at slide two and as we call it up, why don't you digest that a bit? I apologize. It's pretty graphic. This was a search that was done last

Friday afternoon at 4:56 in the afternoon, so it's contemporary. This has not been doctored in any way other than to make some of the language a little less offensive. It demonstrates very powerfully how our artists are being highjacked, their reputations are being highjacked and they're being used to lure kids.

I'd also like to point out that this is music that in the physical world would not be stickered. So, it's really a huge problem.

Let's call up slide three. Slide three compares the online world, which is how kids are getting music -- and in the green zone you'll see the legitimate sites. In the red zone, you'll see the illegitimate sites like Kazaa. And look at the vertical columns. Column one is, is there a parent filter; column two, is there a parental advisory; column three, are the edited versions of the music readily labeled for the parent; and column four, is the language that's used in the advisories.

And I'd simply just -- if you'd look at the nos and yeses, the implication is fairly obvious. What does it mean? It means that if you deem labeling advisable and if one is concerned about parents having an opportunity to make a choice about what their kids are exposed to, then these multi-million dollar P2P

businesses must be brought under the policy, regulatory and legal microscope. They've got to be. The folks who make money by driving advertising with a zero cost structure have an obligation to match their fancy words with deeds.

It also means as my industry, the music industry, continues to refine, enhance and improve how we administer the parental advisory system, we are missing an enormous piece of the puzzle.

In contrast to P2P businesses, for almost two decades, the music industry has helped parents make the right judgments for the kids. The voluntary parental advisory program was established in 1985, about 20 years after Jack did his, but nevertheless almost 20 years ago, and it's been refined and enhanced a number of times in 1990, in 1995, in 2000, and again in 2002.

Throughout the years, the motivation underlying this program has been to provide a clear heads-up, a heads-up to all consumers that a recording contains explicit content. By most accounts, the program works very well, much like the movie industry's. For artists, for consumers, and for parents, with some 35,000 albums released each year, about a half a million songs, that's an enormous accomplishment.

Yet, we live in a dynamic world. We know that.

The current program is not written in stone and it
shouldn't be written in stone. We do need to refine it.

We certainly will continue to listen carefully to
parents, to the FTC, at workshops like this to make sure
that what we're doing is appropriate in a world that's
increasingly moving to a digitally-centered distribution
model.

Accordingly, I'm proud to announce that the RIAA will be revising our parental advisory again in three ways. First, we'll encourage parental control filters. Our revised guidelines will encourage online download sites to provide parents with the option to filter effectively or prevent the download of works with explicit content. Two of the current services do that now. I spoke to Steve Jobbs yesterday with Apple iTunes. They are moving in that direction. We think everybody should do that as a matter of course.

Two, we will reinforce the importance of consistent descriptors for the download sites. As you can see from that chart, in the fourth column there's a variety of language that's being used, and we think it would be useful to harmonize that. So, we've already called for that. We will tighten that language.

And, three, we're going to work closely with the FTC and our partners in the entertainment industry to

- improve the parental guide website. It's a great resource for parents. It can be strengthened and improved and we intend to do that.
- In the interest of time, I'll leave it there,
 and again, I appreciate the opportunity, Mary, to make a
 statement. Thank you.
- 7 MS. ENGLE: Ms. Vance.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. VANCE: Thank you, Mary. Before I start my
opening remarks, I just want to make a couple of comments
as a follow-up to the Congressmen's comments earlier
today.

First of all, all the games that were shown this morning carry prominent labels with rating symbols and content descriptors. Every ad for those games carries the same. The average age of a gamer today is 29. There are going to be games created for a more mature market.

Eighty-three percent, according to the FTC, of all video game purchases are made by or with adults.

It's absolutely critical that those adults understand what the ESRB does and I'm here to talk today about what we do.

So, as many of you already know, the ESRB has been in business for nearly a decade. It was created in 1994 with one central mission: To provide consumers with

the information they need to make informed purchase decisions when it comes to video and computer games.

When creating the rating system, ESRB founders worked closely with child development experts and conducted numerous consumer focus groups. They heard loud and clear that parents wanted both an age-based rating system and, equally, if not more importantly, they wanted objective and detailed information about what's in the game. Having this kind of detail empowers parents to make informed purchase decisions based on their personal preferences and their expertise as a parent of their own child's readiness for different kinds of content.

Based on that feedback, ESRB created a rating system with two equally important parts. First, rating symbols, which provide general guidance about age appropriateness. Second, content descriptors, short, standardized phrases that alert parents to content elements that may be of interest or concern. Content descriptors also provide insight into why a game received a particular rating.

The ESRB uses five age rating categories.

Early Childhood means the game may be suitable for ages three and older and is specifically designed for young children.

Everyone means the game may be suitable for

ages six and older. E-rated games may contain minimal cartoon-like violence or comic mischief and are generally appropriate for a wide range of audiences.

Teen means that content may be suitable for ages 13 and older and may contain violent content, limited amounts of strong language or suggestive themes.

Mature means that content may be suitable for ages 17 and older and may contain sexual themes, intense violence or strong language.

And, finally, Adults Only means that the product is intended for ages 18 and over.

It's worth noting that the ratings do not say that a game should or should not be played by anyone, only that the content may be suitable for particular ages. ESRB's job is to give consumers reliable and useful information, but ultimately it's up to parents to decide what games are best for their families.

In 2002, of the 1,229 games rated by the ESRB, almost two-thirds were rated E. T ratings were assigned to slightly over one quarter and M ratings were assigned to less than 10 percent.

As I mentioned earlier, these rating symbols are only half of the system. The other half is content descriptions, 30 different standardized phrases that alert consumers to content elements. Content descriptors

range from edu-tainment, which describes educational content in an entertainment setting, to intense violence, which indicates the presence of graphic and realistic depictions of physical conflict.

Recently, the ESRB took several proactive steps to ensure that consumers are using the rating system effectively. One step was to add several new content descriptors to give consumers greater insight into the specific type of violence in a product, be it cartoon violence, fantasy violence or intense violence.

A second action was to increase the visibility of the content descriptors on the back of every game box, by repeating the rating symbols that's on the front of the box and placing it next to the content descriptors in an authoritative seal. All games shipping to stores today carry the new seal.

Another step the ESRB took to ensure that consumers understand the meaning of the rating symbols was to add the age 17+ to the Mature rating symbol and 18+ to Adults Only.

Something else that is critical to a complete understanding of the ESRB rating system is that raters operate completely independently. Game publishers who submit their products to ESRB do not assign ratings to their products; ESRB raters do. Raters have no contact

with publishers and apply ratings independently of each other. Having been in this job for a year, I can tell you with total candor that we call 'em as we see 'em without regard to a publisher's desires. Our customers are consumers of computer and video games, not publishers, and it's consumer needs we serve.

Furthermore, it's important to know that parents overwhelmingly agree with the ratings that are applied. Each year, ESRB commissions Peter Hart Research, a nationally-renowned independent opinion research firm, to conduct market tests on randomly selected video games. In a nutshell, we show parents clips of actual game footage and ask what rating they would apply. Then, we compare their responses to the actual rating assigned by the ESRB. Each year, the research has shown that the majority of parents agreed with the ESRB, and when they disagree, they're just as likely to think we're being too strict as they think we're being too lenient.

ESRB ratings will never achieve 100 percent agreement, considering the breadth of opinions, beliefs and personal taste of the American public. However, it's clear that ESRB ratings are well within the American mainstream, and that's exactly where we want to be.

Other opinion polls conducted by Hart Research

show that American parents not only agree with specific

ESRB ratings, but 90 percent of them say the ESRB rating

system provides the kind of information they need.

Seventy-five percent say it's an effective tool that

helps parents shield their children from inappropriate

game content.

In my final few minutes, I want to move away from the rating system itself and talk about some of the other mission critical activities of the ESRB.

As the FTC has noted in its recent reports, we diligently enforce an advertising code of conduct, which includes not just ensuring that rating symbols and content descriptors are properly applied to packaging, but the industry's advertising and marketing practices are responsible. Responsible means several things.

First of all, it means that the rating information is visible and legible in all advertising materials. Secondly, it means that advertising is appropriately targeted, prohibiting publishers from targeting advertisements of M-rated games to minors. And thirdly, responsible means the content of the ads must be truthful and not cause widespread offense to the average consumer.

In the event that a game publisher inappropriately labels or advertises a product, the ESRB

is empowered to force corrective actions and impose a wide range of sanctions, including levying monetary fines, relabeling packaging and ultimately revoking a rating, and this system is strictly enforced.

Finally, I want to share with you the extent of our efforts to raise consumer awareness of the rating system. ESRB faced, and continues to face, the difficult task of educating consumers about the rating system. In its past reports on entertainment industry marketing practices, the FTC has reported favorably on ESRB's public education efforts.

For example, we recruited such celebrities as Tiger Woods, Regis Philbin and Derek Jeter for PSAs, which have been distributed to TV networks and local stations across the country, as well as to retailers for in-store display. We've recently renewed this effort and look forward to getting more air time as we head into the holidays. And here's a sample of one of those spots.

Can we run the video?

(Video segment played.)

MS. VANCE: Our outreach efforts to date have yielded significant results. When ESRB launched its public education effort in 1999, fewer than half of all parents had heard of the system. Today, that awareness level has increased to almost three-quarters. But that

doesn't go far enough. Our goal going forward is not only to further increase awareness but also to make sure that parents fully understand how to use the ESRB system, both its rating symbols and content descriptors.

To that end, the ESRB has recently launched a new print public service ad campaign that will begin appearing this holiday season in consumer magazines, especially those that target parents. This public service campaign has been adapted for retail use with a broad range of point of sale, training and online materials that retailers can utilize. Here are a couple of the new in-store components.

In fact, in time for this holiday season, six major retailers will be installing all new ratings awareness signage in their stores and more will be joining them in 2004.

I'd like to add that we could use any help we can get from the FTC and consumer groups to encourage media outlets to run our PSAs and to distribute ratings awareness information. In the past, we sought to partner with groups like the American Academy of Pediatrics to no avail. I can think of no better place to distribute ratings awareness materials than pediatricians' offices across the U.S. I'm hopeful that we can build partnerships with organizations like the AAP at the

1 workshop today.

Senator Joseph Lieberman has described the ESRB as the best rating system in existence, and we at the ESRB consider that high praise. ESRB ratings are thorough, credible and trusted by American consumers, but that doesn't mean our work is done. We're always looking for ways to make the system even more helpful to parents and we're always seeking to establish new partnerships and new avenues to educate parents about the ratings.

I very much look forward to having a constructive dialogue, answering any questions, and, hopefully, building some of those partnerships here today. Thank you very much.

MS. ENGLE: Thank you to the panelists.

Because we got a late start, we've already -- we're at the time where we're supposed to break this morning, and so, there's not really time for me to ask the questions I had hoped to. But since these three panelists will all be on the second panel for a dialogue with the consumer and advocacy groups, I think there will be plenty of opportunity to discuss your systems and what changes you've made and how things are working.

So, we'll take a break now and reconvene at 10:30.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

MR. KELLY: I hope you enjoyed our short break.

We're coming back now to continue our discussion about

the rating and labeling systems by the motion picture,

movie, electronic game and music industries.

Chairman Muris opened this workshop this morning asking that we seek to agree on three common sense points. Industry should market its products consistent with their ratings and parental advisories, parents should have access to useful information on the ratings for products before they purchase them, and retailers should consider whether entertainment is rated or labeled as inappropriate for children in adopting sales policies.

This panel seeks to explore the first two points, that industry members not target children inappropriately and that parents get access to information they need before they buy products. We have a panel this afternoon, as you know, to focus on retailer efforts.

In our first panel, we heard this overview of the rating and labeling systems that have been implemented by these industries. With those presentations as a backdrop, we have asked the panelists from our first group to join us, along with representatives from seven groups, each of whom has

1	something important and interesting to say in our
2	discussion of how these systems assist parents.
3	Over the next hour-and-a-half, our discussions
4	will focus on the effectiveness of industry's programs to
5	help parents and to protect our children.
6	MR. VALENTI: May I interrupt for just a moment
7	just to say that, in the interest of full disclosure, I
8	have an 11:30 appointment. So, I'm going to have to
9	leave here before that hour-and-a-half is over.
10	MR. KELLY: Yes. Thank you. I understand
11	that, Mr. Valenti.
12	MR. VALENTI: Thank you.
13	MR. KELLY: I want to briefly introduce the
14	panelists who have joined with Mr. Valenti and Mr.
15	Bainwol and Ms. Vance, so that you get a little sense of
16	who they are and what their interests and concerns are.
17	Warren Buckleitner is the Editor of Children's
18	Software Revue, which he established in 1993. He's a
19	parent, former preschool and elementary school teacher
20	and is the author of numerous scholarly papers. He holds
21	a B.S. in Elementary Education from Central Michigan
22	University and an M.S. in Human Development. He is
23	currently a Doctoral Candidate in Educational Psychology
24	at Michigan State University.

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

David G. Kinney is President and Chief

25

Executive Officer of PSV Ratings, which offers a single content-based ratings system for film, music, games and television, as well as the internet. Mr. Kinney is a graduate of Harvard University, where he earned a B.A. in Economics.

Lara Mahaney is Director of External Affairs at Parents Television Council, where she oversees the Council's efforts to encourage the entertainment industry to act responsibly with its messages and to develop entertainment choices for the entire family. Ms. Mahaney has spoken on behalf of the Parents Television Council at numerous forums and in numerous places.

Nell Minow, the Movie Mom, is here representing Common Sense Media. Her movie reviews appear at Common Sense's website and at Yahoo. Her articles about children in media have appeared in numerous publications. Her book, the Movie Mom's Guide to Family Movies, was featured in Ann Landers' column and in its fourth printing.

Vicky Rideout is the Vice President of the
Kaiser Family Foundation and Director of the Foundation's
Programs for the Study of Entertainment, Media and
Health, where she oversees the Foundation's research
agenda on the impact of the entertainment media. Ms.
Rideout graduated with Honors from Harvard, has a

1	Master's	Degree	in	American	History	from	American
2	Universit	cy.					

Dr. David Walsh is the founder and President of the National Institute on Media and the Family. He leads the Institute's efforts to provide information about media to parents, teachers and other concerned adults to education, research and advocacy. A licensed psychologist, Dr. Walsh is on the faculty of the University of St. Thomas and the University of Minnesota.

And then there's Daphne White. Daphne is the founder and the Executive Director of the Lion and Lamb Project. A former journalist, Ms. White founded Lion and Lamb in 1995, as a national grassroots organization dedicated to stopping the marketing of violence to children. She is the author of the award-winning Parent Action Kit for parents concerned about the violence issue, and each year, Lion and Lamb puts out the Top 20 list and the Dirty Dozen list of toys.

We're going to begin our discussions by having brief presentations by each of our new panelists and then we'll take a very brief break to begin a dialogue. We're going to start with Vicky Rideout from Kaiser Family Foundation.

MS. RIDEOUT: Thanks. First of all, briefly, let me introduce you to the Kaiser Family Foundation. We

are a research organization. We're interested in health issues. We're not an advocacy group, so we have no position on ratings in general or any specific rating systems, but what we try to do is conduct research about media, about parents' views of media, about kids and about the rating systems to try to help inform parents, inform the policy-making process and so on.

And so, what I'm going to do is really just present sort of the lay of the land as far as what our research has told us about the various rating systems.

One thing I want to say is that media, obviously, are a huge presence in children's lives, so that limiting any negative impact and informing parents about their kids' media choices is, obviously, critical. Kids, as a whole, spend an average of five-and-a-half hours a day with media.

We just released a new study yesterday that looked at really little kids, and it's so interesting to me, but kids from ages like about three months old on are consumers of videos and TV products and, increasingly, of computer games and video games. Just a couple tidbits from that study, by the time they're four, five and six years old, half of all kids have played video games and 70 percent have used computers, mostly for games and little educational activities.

Parents are deeply concerned about the issue of media violence. In the study that we released yesterday, we found that they see their kids imitate behaviors from TV and videos. They are much more likely to see them imitate positive behaviors than aggressive behaviors among the very young kids. But by the time they're in the four to six age range, half of the kids have copied some kind of aggressive behavior, like kicking or hitting, from a TV show.

Many parents are making use of media ratings. More than 80 percent say they've used the movie ratings from our studies. Roughly half have used the music, video game and TV ratings and a quarter of parents say they use the TV ratings often.

A couple of years ago, which was our most recent study, only 7 percent had used the V-chip. Of those who knew they had a V-chip in their TV, who had a new TV with a V-chip and knew about it, a third of them were choosing to use the V-chip.

Most parents do find the ratings useful. About half of parents who have used them say that the ratings for movies, video games, music and TV are very useful. With regard to the TV ratings, a lot of parents don't understand them well at all, and I think that's really an issue that's going to need to be addressed. The majority

of parents of young children don't know what the child ratings mean and especially not the rating for violence in children's programming.

So, to the extent that we're concerned about the littlest kid and to the extent that we're concerned about the issue of violence, I think the issue of the FV rating -- which many people in the room may not have even heard of -- which is the one -- it's the only rating that tells you about violence in little kids' programming, the vast majority of parents do not have any idea what it means. Only 14 percent know what it means and many of them believe it means something like family viewing. So, there's work to do there.

By and large, we find that parents prefer content ratings to age-based ratings, but the reality is that at least, vis-a-vis the TV ratings, they get and understand the age-based ratings better than they do the content-based ratings. And that's just where we stand now and I think that's largely, you know, thanks to Mr. Valenti and the many years of the movie ratings.

As far as obstacles in the path of more parents making use of the ratings, I think the biggest area has to do with TV ratings and V-chip. I think that most parents don't know that their TV has a V-chip in it. If they do know, it's a little bit hard for them to find it,

it's hard for them to understand how to use it. You have to go through a lot of different screens. If you miss a particular step, it's null and void and you'd have to start the process all over again. The ratings are, compared to all the other stuff that appears on screen, are relatively invisible. So, I think those are areas where those who want to promote more use of the ratings might want to concentrate their attentions.

MR. KELLY: Daphne White from Lion and Lamb.

MS. WHITE: Hi, my name is Daphne White. I'm Executive Director of The Lion and Lamb Project. I have a lot to say so I'll try to say it very quickly. If I go too quickly, just tell me you don't understand. I'm from New York, I used to be.

So, Lion and Lamb works to stop the marketing of violent entertainment to children and we're very concerned about marketing issues. A lot of parents who are members of our organization came here today. They came today taking time from their work or taking care of their children because they're very frustrated, they feel helpless and they feel angry because really there is no one to listen to us when we feel frustrated about what's marketed to our children. Although, I have to say I was very heartened to hear Mr. Bainwol saying he's here to listen. That's good to hear.

I want to say that the issue for parents today is the marketing of violence to children, which is the title of this workshop. The issue is not industry self-regulation. The entertainment industry has been calling for self-regulation since the 1970s and you see where it's gotten us. Self-regulation has not worked. It's not working for the financial industry; it didn't work for the accounting industry; it didn't work for the energy field; it doesn't work in the field of entertainment either.

And there's a simple reason why self-regulation does not work. There's too much money at stake selling violence to children. The bottom line for these industries is the bottom line. It's not, and it's not been, the welfare of America's children. As you'll see in this afternoon's marketing panel, children are the prime demographics for music, movies and video games. These companies rely on children and teens for a good deal of their income.

Children now spend \$33 billion a year -- that's just children under 12 -- on all products. And teens spend \$155 billion a year. And as you'll hear on the afternoon panel, a lot of what they spend their money on is entertainment products, video games, movies and music.

So, because of this, I will critique in one

second the rating system, but I believe that the rating system, as they are now constituted, completely controlled and paid for by the industry groups, for the industry groups. Just to talk about the rating systems and how we can make minor adjustments here and there is like rearranging the chairs on the Titanic. It's not going to get us there. We need a total overhaul. We need people who really understand children and child development making these decisions.

So, I support Congressman Wolf's call for some action on the part of the Federal Trade Commission to do some regulating and legislating, because otherwise, Kill Bill will soon be shown alongside The Transformers as afterschool children's programming because that's what's been happening with ratings creep.

So, let's look at some big issues of how the ratings are failing parents, and then I'll go to a quick critique. The rating systems are not transparent. Only these industries know what R means, where the line is between PG-13 and PG, where the line is between Teen and Mature. The criteria is secret. We don't know how they arrive at these decisions and these are made by industry, not child advocates.

So, let me do a really quick critique -- if I could have the first slide now, please -- of the video

game rating system which has been touted as the best of the rating systems. Let's look at that really quickly. The first slide is the same as you've seen before, that Patricia Vance showed, that's the basic E, T and M. So, we'll skip over that because she already explained that.

So, let's look at these violence descriptors. That's supposed to help us understand more. She said there are 30 different descriptors. About nine or ten of them describe violence, animated blood, blood, blood and gore, fantasy violence. What does it mean? Next slide, please.

So, we have descriptors describing the descriptors. Now, I'm wondering how many of you think Column A matches Column B or can you tell? How many of you think we have these in the right order? How many of you think we have these messed up? How many of you can't tell the difference?

Having three kinds of blood descriptors is like the Eskimos having 30 words for snow. You can see that blood is really important in video games. So, let's continue to the next slide.

There's also discontinued descriptors on their website. I think it's interesting, some of them were actually honest enough, the ones they don't use anymore, to say unsafe or violent situations, to say blood or the

1	mutilation of body parts. There's mutilation, there's
2	decapitation. You'll see a longer version of the video
3	Congressman Wolf showed. You will see people's heads
4	being chopped off with axes. None of that is visible in
5	these descriptors, which are supposed to be reliable and
6	helpful. They're very vague and don't say much. Okay,
7	let's move on to the next one.
8	What would you think is more violent? Here's
9	The Hulk. It's a video game based on a PG-13 movie.
10	There's an E-rated version for Everyone. The descriptor
11	says violence. Okay. The Teen-rated version says mild
12	violence. I don't know about you, but I'm a little
13	confused. Not only why is there one called E for
14	Everyone of a PG-13 product, but the ratings seem to be a
15	bit mixed up. This is, by the way, off the ESRB website.

Another confusing thing is the R-rated movies for which there are companion Teen-rated video games.

The Matrix, The Terminator are just two examples.

We did not scramble these. Next one, please.

So, there's more violence in these games. I'll run through this really quick. There's an issue of ratings creep. You can do the next slide.

Mature-rated games are the fastest-growing segments. Even though only 8 percent are rated mature, something like 30 percent of all games sold now for

consoles are mature. So, the ratings is different than
what is popular. Next slide.

Ninety-five percent of teenage boys play video games. When the industry says 83 percent or whatever are purchased by adults, let's think of the population. More than 80 percent of the population is adults. But teens are a huge demographic in who plays games. Next slide.

Forty percent of those who play Mature-rated games are under 18. Again, our concern is the marketing of these violent games to children, not the fact that a lot of women play solitaire on their computers, which is what the industry mucks up the figures with. And children under 18 comprise less than 20 percent of the U.S. population. Next slide.

The same -- this is an older slide from movies, but it shows you that with movies, as they go along, the death toll rises. These are actual corpses. This isn't some kind of vague definition of violence. George Gerbin (phonetic) who went and counted the number of dead bodies in these movies, they go up. Current movies, they go up. Video games, they go up.

Kill Bill, which is now rated R; Texas Chainsaw Massacre, rated R, would have been X or NC-17 just a few years ago. And we actually have released a list of rotten ratings today to show problems with the rating

1 system.

Is there another slide? Okay, that's just a picture from Postal 2, which you'll see more of later.

So, I will offer some recommendations in the last panel of the day about a uniform labeling system.

But as Congressman Wolf said, labeling is just the beginning. We need regulation, legislation and possibly more lawsuits because these ratings are not working and we cannot count on industry to do any better than they've done in 30 years. Thank you very much.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Daphne. I didn't know we were going to have a quiz.

Dr. David Walsh from the National Institute on Media and the Family.

DR. WALSH: Thank you. I'd like to start by giving you a little bit of an overview of the work that we do because even though whenever I come to Washington it's about policy and advocacy issues, most of the work that we do is actually on another key variable in this discussion that's come up a number of times today.

What you see up on the screen is the mission, and I just want to make the point that we are not an anti-media group. We believe that the media are powerful, probably more powerful than most people realize, and I also think more powerful than most parents

realize. And so, what we try to do is to maximize the benefits while minimizing the harm.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the reason for that has to do -- if you'd go to the next slide, please -- with the power of media. I think whoever tells the stories defines the culture, and I don't think that's new. I think it's been true for thousands of years. But for this generation of children, more so than any other before it, the dominant storytellers are now on the screen, and so, that has a very, very large impact on the behavior of children particularly with the growing role of media in children's lives. Screen time, because of the evolution of new screens, screen time is up 25 percent since 1990, not because kids are watching more television. actually watching a little bit less, but they're playing more video games, internet, computer, et cetera. screen time is now a major role in their lives.

And the reason that that becomes very, very important is because we can't expect the companies that produce the stories to have children's welfare as a priority. Their priority is profit. With some exceptions, the overwhelming priority is profit.

Lester Thoreau, the MIT economist, wrote not too long ago that values are not and will not be inculcated in either the present or the future by

parents, churches or other social institutions. They will be inculcated by visual electronic media.

Now, I don't necessarily agree with Professor Thoreau. I think that presents the challenge, because it is parents and teachers and pediatricians and doctors who have children's welfare as a priority. We can't expect media companies to have that as a priority because they don't. They have profits as a priority. So, it becomes very, very important.

When we start to take a look at some of the concerns, if you could advance to the next slide, what brings hearings in the Nation's Capitol, as we are doing today, has to do with media violence. But the work that we do extends well beyond that because we have other concerns as well and one of them, which is a growing, pardon the pun, concern is the overweight and obesity issue and it is very, very clear that one of the major reasons for the epidemic of children's overweight and obesity is the increasing amount of screen time.

Media violence -- and the real impact of that, I think, is not so much the violent behavior. Most parents are not afraid that their kids are going to play a violent video game and then go get a gun. I think the real impact of the media violence is that what it's done is created a culture of disrespect. For every kid that

brings a gun to school, there are millions of kids who aren't doing it. But they're calling each other a name, putting each other down, et cetera.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then the other concern, leave no child behind, a tremendous concern about literacy and academic performance. And, again, it is very, very clear based on the research that the impact of media -- too much media and the wrong kind have a negative impact on those.

So, a large part of our work -- if you'd go to the next slide -- has to do with working with parents. We agree with what many of the speakers have already said today, that one of the major components of this is we have to get the message out to parents. Most parents, the overwhelming majority, want to do the best job that they can for their kids. They are not aware of the power of these powerful teachers. Yesterday, the Kaiser Family Foundation's report that 25 percent of children younger than two years old have televisions in their bedrooms in spite of the American Academy of Pediatrics recommendation that children younger than two not see any television because there are so many important things that are happening in their development. So, our mission is to really help parents address that question, when you're not teaching your children, who is?

And then if you go to the next two slides, what

we're trying to do is build awareness, knowledge and action and trying to get parents to start to become aware. If you'd go to the last slide. Or things like this, if you believe Sesame Street taught your four-year-old something, then you better believe MTV is teaching your 14-year-old something. And so, we have to help parents become aware because all of the systems that we're going to be talking about -- and we are critical of some of the systems and we'll be talking about those specifically. But I really think that we really have to do a much better job and I think we need to partner with the industries themselves, not just giving the information, but also motivating parents to use it.

Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Nell Minow, Common Sense Media.

MS. MINOW: Thank you very much. You know what I love about this event today is that I love the way everybody introduces themselves by talking about their children, and I think that that's just great. I'm going to -- of course, I have two wonderful children, but I'm going to begin by talking about my dad.

My dad, Newton Minow, was the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and in 1961, he told the National Association of Broadcasters that television was a vast wasteland. So, I grew up in a very media-

sensitive house. And my father now says that the media is more like a toxic waste dump, and that provides a greater challenge than he had raising my sisters and me, you know, worried about whether we should watch I Dream of Jeannie than, you know, today's parents wondering whether their kids should be watching Fear Factor or Joe Millionaire.

I, like Jack Valenti, am the world's biggest fan of the First Amendment. I'm delighted to be here using my First Amendment right to express my views. And so, I really want to make it clear that we're not talking about any infringement of the First Amendment. I think that the MPAA has been a wonderful leader in this area, but I think it could do a better job, and I want to talk a little bit about the movie rating system since I'm a movie critic and write about these issues and that's my area of expertise.

I think it is a mistake to have the system completely controlled by the industry and they have always felt that they wanted to have just a parent representative on the group and not have experts in developmental issues. I think it's time to rethink that as well. And there's really no accountability. If you're not happy with a rating, as I have been very unhappy with some of the ratings, there's really nowhere

1 you can go about it.

But I think my primary concern is that the descriptors, which are a big advance over where they used to be, are still sort of Delphic to the point of being intentionally obfuscatory, sort of the butterfly ballot of the rating system. My all-time favorite rating was for the Majestic which was rated PG for mild thematic elements. Now, you know, you're going to need a Ph.D. in semiotics to figure that one out.

I think that the ratings board watches so many movies that they get a little numb, in the title of a movie I liked very much, Dazed and Confused. After you see a movie like Kill Bill, everything else ratchets down. And we have a PG-rated Star Wars where a child picks up a helmet and finds his father's severed head in it. But because you don't see any blood -- blood is a very big issue in ratings -- it's still a PG. And because a lot of the people killed are robots -- if I can say the people killed -- a lot of the entities annihilated are robots, you stick with a PG.

Last week, I'm proud to say that in America the number one movie, the biggest opening in October ever, was Scary Movie 3, a truly dreadful movie, but you know who went to this. It was teenagers. It was rated PG-13. The website screenit.com has 13 pages of parental

concerns about that movie, including references to bestiality, pedophile priests, tossing a dead body around until the limbs come off, having a child slammed by a car, bestiality jokes and humorous gang shooting.

In the recent PG-13 S.W.A.T., one concern I had, again not very bloody, but a lot of things blown up, you had suicide portrayed as an honorable response to having made a terrible mistake. That's an issue that really is very important to me in terms of what we communicate to kids.

You know, the MPAA rating system just gives a get out of jail free card to comedy and allows a lot of things through PG-13 that would be an R in a drama. And there's something wrong with a world in which Billy Elliott and Kill Bill both get R ratings.

The Center for Media and Public Affairs, on whose board I serve, in their last survey of the most violent films, 1998, 5 out of the top 10 and 9 out of the top 20 were PG-13. So, I think we could do a better job of giving parents the information they need about violence.

Parents need better information, consistent across all platforms. We've got a survey at Common Sense Media that says that. Parents say we want to understand the ratings better. I think we have heard some very

interesting things about the different ways that the different media approach ratings and we can find some solution that is across the board that provides clear and understandable information.

When my son was five he once said to me, how old is your grandmother. I said, well, she's 90 years old, honey, why. He said, I bet she can see any movie she wants. I'm not advocating that we have a PG-80 rating, but the idea -- maybe Kill Bill would qualify. But I do think that parents need a better system so that they can make the informed choice about what's right for them, their values, their children, their family, and I would call on the FTC to convene a group under the Advisory Committee Act with representatives from all of these groups to see if we can't do a better job.

Thank you.

Oh, I forgot to show this. This is my visual. This is the Common Sense Media approach, which we would be happy to donate to the cause. But it just shows you that you can have a visual symbol that provides a lot of information that would apply whether you're talking about movies, television, videos, video games, records, whatever.

24 Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Nell. We'll probably

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

1 put up that symbol a little bit later.

2 Lara Mahaney from Parents Television Council.

MS. MAHANEY: Hi, what we want to talk about today is a study that the PTC did. What we did is we watch everything on the prime time broadcast networks and we log for sex, violence, bad language, that type of thing, but then we also log who's advertising. So, we recently did a study of the M-rated video games and the R-rated movies on between 8:00 and 10:00 at night.

Now, when we refer to the family hour, that's the first hour of prime time or 8:00.

Three years after the FTC 2000 report was published, one has to wonder if anything has really changed at all. Advertisements for the Eight Mile DVD, which was rated R, ran repeatedly on Fox's American Idol, which at the time was the highest rated show on television among children ages 2 to 17. The PTC study revealed that rather than getting better, several of the networks are actually getting worse, putting more advertisements for adult-rated entertainment during the first hour of prime time when children are most likely to be watching them.

The PTC's most recent analysis shows that Fox is, by far, the worst network. Sixty-three percent of the ads for M-rated video games and 36 percent of all ads

for R-rated movies that aired during the family hour ran on that network. Two out of every three ads for M-rated video games and nearly one out of every three ads for R-rated films that aired during the second hour of prime time aired on Fox. These are just a few of our findings.

Fox, WB and UPN continue to be the only networks to air ads for M-rated video games during the family hour or the 8:00 hour. Fifty-six percent of video games advertised on UPN and 43 percent of games advertised on FOX during the family hour were for M-rated video games. We have our study outside, so if some of these numbers are confusing, you can look it up after that.

When it comes to movies, not only are NBC, Fox and UPN still airing the most ads for R-rated films during the family hour, they've gotten worse. We had a study, also, in 2002 and it showed actually those three networks went up about 5 to 8 percent. On a good note, only 9 percent of ABC's family hour movie ads were for R-rated films. Ninety-one percent of all movie ads that aired on ABC during the family hour were for films rated G, PG or PG-13.

Another problem that we've noticed with films in particular is that they'll run ads and say, not yet rated, and I know there are sometimes where there may be

a hard distinction between a PG or an R-rated film, but for example, Texas Chainsaw Massacre was running ads with not yet rated. I'm not sure that anybody would have wondered that that was going to be an R-rated film, especially if they knew about the first two.

We would say it is intellectually dishonest for the entertainment industry to say they're not marketing adult fare to teens when they use subversive tactics to ensure their ads are reaching younger audiences, tactics like placing ads for the Eight Mile DVD on Fox's American Idol and partnering with Teen People to give away free copies of the DVD or creating T-rated video games, like Enter the Matrix, to interest teens in the R-rated film trilogy.

We would go ahead and say that the burden doesn't fall only on the internet industry. It does fall on parents, and to reflect that, there's a theater chain in Peoria that announced that their plans to get around restrictions on admitting minors to R-rated movies without an adult by selling R cards. So, instead of having to go to an R-rated movie with your kid, all you have to do is buy the R card and then give it to them and they can go on their own. And I can give you some more examples that we found.

But American Idol, again, the highest-rated

show for 2 to 17-year-olds, had films like Identity, kind of a horror film, Old School and Final Destination. is a popular entertainment vehicle for M-rated video games, but also films like Jackass, which was R-rated, and then also, too, during the baseball playoffs, Kill Bill was being advertised. And what was even disturbing about that was the fact Quentin Tarantino, the director, said that 12-year-olds should be taken to see this movie and that your parents, if they're cool, they'll take you to see it.

Now, I don't think that was the position of Miramax, but, you know, I think there is a responsibility from those within the entertainment industry. They do really well about talking about smoking and its effects and how people do what they see in the movies. But they aren't doing it when it comes to sex, violence or language.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Lara. Warren Buckleitner from Children's Software Revue.

MR. BUCKLEITNER: Thank you. I thought I was going to be last, so it's a nice surprise. I'm glad to be alive today. I drove down with my nephew from New Jersey, who has played all the way through Grand Theft Auto, and we hit some traffic and around Maryland he said, Uncle Warren, do you want me to get you there. I

said -- so, I was torn. I had a decision I had to make.

I said, you know, it's getting tight, go ahead, hit it,

and I saw some driving that I couldn't believe.

If you want to talk to him, he's back there, and I'm embarrassing him. But he has played all the way through Grand Theft Auto. I played the first level and he told me that -- some things about the content that's inside Grand Theft Auto that every parent should know that you can't tell if you go to Amazon.com. Type Toysrus.com, go to Amazon, it jumps right in there. Scroll through the games, click on the Adventure category. One of the options is this really cool car thing. There's a message there that says, not for children under 17. I'm a kid under 17. I'm really interested now. There are no ESRB descriptors on the Amazon.com Toys "R" Us entry from Grand Theft Auto.

Now, talking to my nephew, I didn't get to the level where you actually can purchase a pornography studio. That's one of the things you can do. And there's a video that shows some actual scenes. Now, it's nothing you can actually see, and we've looked for that; however, the themes of prostitution and pornography and the F word are very big in that game.

Now, we publish a publication on children's interactive media. We have a column in here called

Parents Video Game Advisor. We started after working for Boys Life Magazine. So, we watch and listen a lot to real kids and what they do, okay? They're playing Grand Theft Auto.

My question is, why do Toys "R" Us, a company that's got the word "toy" in its name, sell something that I doubt the executives or buyers would want for their own children?

Secondly, we look at the ESRB ratings. They do a great job. We have yet to be surprised, after 10 years of looking at video games, if it's an E or a T, it's spot on. The descriptors are far more useful. Parents don't know what Mature means. I've had parents of second graders come in and say, yeah, my kid's really mature. Parents are also desensitized to violence, like Star Wars gets a T rating. I don't know why because it's got so much shooting. Parents don't worry about that stuff.

So, those big symbols don't really jive with what parents need to know, but the descriptors are good. However, they're on the back and I think those things should be right up in front at the point of sale so parents can make a better choice.

If you go into Blockbuster, they've actually stickered over, in our store in Flemington, New Jersey, some of those descriptors.

Anyway, I'm glad to be alive today, and if
you'd like to speak to a kid who's played through Grand

Theft Auto, he's back there. I don't think that this
media makes bad kids. I think that we, as adults,

classically underestimate the ability of children to make
decisions. So, I don't see the research linkage and I
look forward to listening to everybody today.

Thank you.

9 MR. KELLY: We'll now hear from David G. Kinney 10 from PSV Ratings.

MR. KINNEY: Thank you, Dick Kelly. It's an honor to be here among so many concerned citizens and people who truly care about the impact that media is having on our children and, hopefully, plan on working together to take positive actions to protect our children.

I am David Kinney. I'm the founder and President of PSV Ratings and I want to emphasize that our guiding principles are that we respect the right of artists, producers, directors, performers to express themselves in any way they choose. We also respect the rights of parents and other child caregivers to make informed decisions before they purchase or rent any entertainment media.

We do not believe that freedom of expression

should be curtailed in any way, but we do believe that freedom of expression has to be balanced with freedom of information.

Can I have the first slide? So, as such, we are a private sector solution to the dilemma that families confront as they attempt to determine what is appropriate content for their children to consume. Our mission is to provide parents and all consumers with objective facts, not subjective judgments, about media content so that they determine appropriateness based upon their own individual standards of suitability.

We are a content, not an age-based system. Our system does not use subjective measures to assess the media we audit. In fact, we train our auditors to report the factual incidences of profanity, sex and violence and that information is analyzed by a proprietary technology designed specifically to ensure objectivity. Next slide, please.

In spring of 2003, we commissioned a focus group study of parents across the United States. Our goal was to conduct qualitative research with as diverse a group of parents as possible about the impact of media on their children and their sentiments about existing ratings systems. Parents in the focus groups were carefully selected to ensure diversity by location, the

age groups of their children. We ensured that we had a variety of household incomes, different race and ethnic groups, and a mixture of education levels. Next, please.

Our objectives were, again, to obtain parental views of the impact of media on their children, that is to say all media, including movies, television, music and video games, and we wanted to know parents' satisfaction levels with established industry rating systems and the demand for alternative rating systems. Next, please.

What we found was that parents with children less than six years of age were less concerned about the impact of media on their children than the 6 to 15-year-old group because they thought their children had not yet begun to show an interest in the type of content that would cause them concern. As per the Kaiser Family Foundation Forum yesterday, evidently, they should be concerned.

Parents with children ages 6 to 15 have very serious concerns about media for three primary reasons. Children mimic what they see and hear in the media.

Parents find that many scenes frighten their younger children and parents disagree with many of the values being portrayed in movies, music and other media.

Parents with teens over 15 years of age feel they have less influence over what their children watch

in media and that they can less effectively monitor their children as they age. Thus, they had the least interest in alternative rating systems. Next, please.

Relative to parents' input about the existing industry rating systems, parents say they are confused about the multiple rating systems for major media.

Parents are frustrated with needing to learn all the different symbols for each system and what they signify.

Parents say the industry standards are useful but inadequate. They get them "in the ballpark," but they need and want more information about the actual content of the media.

Parents expressed the sentiment that most often the best source of the actual information they need comes from other parents who have viewed the media and can tell them specifically what is in it. Next, please.

So, what is the demand for alternative rating systems? Well, the majority of parents said they would be interested in an alternative rating system that provided greater detail about the content of media products, and that was across the board for all media. They would consider such an alternative rating system to be a valuable resource. Parents said they would voluntarily make an extra effort to access an alternative rating system if it provided them with more content

information than the current systems do. Next, please.

Given that parents said they were willing to make extra effort to find alternative ratings, we wanted to know when and where they would access them. The majority of parents, roughly two-thirds, wanted to see these ratings in advance. They did not want to get stuck at a store or at a movie theater and have their child ask them on the spot if they could have a certain media product. They wanted advance information so they could study the content issues and make their decision about what to purchase.

Approximately one-third of the parents told us they simply do not have time to do this advance research and these parents specified that they would only be able to utilize the information at the point of sale.

So, in conclusion, our research demonstrated for us that parents do want to decide for themselves what content is appropriate for their children. They want to be the gatekeepers of content for the children. They want more facts and information about the content. They want a universal rating system that simplifies their choices and clearly there is a demand for alternative rating systems that serve the needs of parents by filling the void in the marketplace for the information they seek.

1 Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you very much. Because Mr.

Valenti has to leave, he wanted to make a few comments

and he's also going to stay for just a few minutes for

questions from the panelists before he goes.

Mr. Valenti.

MR. VALENTI: First, I want to make one overarching opening comment. There's an old phrase for Texas that says, any jackass can kick a barn down, it takes a darn good carpenter to build one. The movie industry is such a fat, inviting target and you can imagine in the 35 years of this rating system, I've heard just about every comment you can possibly imagine. So, nothing I've heard today is new.

Let me make some comments. Number one -- I made some notes during this, so I want to be sure I get it right. We're not dealing here with Euclidian geometry. This is not Boyle's Law of Gases where all the equations are pristine and pure and they always come out exact. We're dealing with a vapory air of subjectivity and everybody in this room will admit it.

When I look at a picture, I may say, this is a piece of junk and you say, that's an Ellsworth Kelly that's worth \$300,000. I may hear a song that I find just dreadful and you say, I love it. I love hip-hop,

but I can't understand what they're saying, so I don't know how to deal with that. Everyone looks at life through their own lens. Sometimes that lens is apocalyptic, sometimes it is golden and glowing, but we're all looking at the same thing. And that's what we're dealing with here.

In the beginning of this rating system, I hired, at some expense, a number of child behavioral experts and social scientists from some fine universities on the East Coast and West Coast, and I said, please do for me, here are these categories, give me specific demarcation lines. What is too much violence? What is enough? William Blake said, enough is when it's more than enough, and that's how he said it.

They labored for maybe six months on this, and when they came back, they had to agree they failed because they could not specify. In the end what we were doing was walking down an ill-lit corridor and coming to a fork in the road and you can barely see it. Which fork do you take? And that's the way these ratings are determined.

The rating people and the movie system are neither gods nor fools, they're parents. I don't want child behavioral experts because they failed me in the beginning. I want somebody to look at a film through the

eyes of a parent, just plain, ordinary parents, so they ask themselves a question, is the rating I'm about to put on this movie or to vote for one that most parents in America would judge to be accurate.

Now, you're dealing again with subjectivity.

How do you know that? With all due respect, a focus group, you can't extrapolate from a focus group. Every market research scientist will tell you that. You can only extrapolate from strict market research protocols.

So, what you get from one focus group may not be what you can from another and you cannot project the rest of the community on that. God, I've tried them all.

The Supreme Court, the highest court in this land, at this very hour cannot define what pornography is. Isn't that awful? And they say, you have to -- it violates the community standards. Well, what the hell is that? Again, you're dealing with wispy definitions. You can't do that.

And by the way, with all the cries for federal legislation, any time the Federal Government tries to interfere and designate anything that's protected by the First Amendment, it's unconstitutional. We know that on the face of it. What the Government can do is pass resolutions and that sort of thing, but they can't go beyond that.

By the way, I laud all these additional rating systems that you've heard about. We ask parents to look at every source of information. We're not the Delphic Oracle at all. Of course we don't -- as a matter of fact, I will tell you quite honestly, infrequently, I disagree with a rating every now and then and I think, I think they blew it that time, I don't agree with that rating. But what do I know? I'm just one individual. I'm looking at it through my own eyes.

So, if the Supreme Court can't define it, how is anybody else going to define it? Again, you come back -- I hate to keep using these words, but that's what it is, Nell, it's subjectivity. I love Nell Minow and I adore her father. I think he's one of the great icons of this country. But what Nell has given you is Nell Minow's opinion which summons respect from all of us. But it is not the final opinion. That comes from parents. They make their own judgments about that.

I can only offer, from the rating system, these surveys. Anecdotal evidence is fine. Focus groups are fine. Politicians use them a lot. Why? Because it costs a lot less than a big survey. And I've used them before in other things, not the rating system, however. We take surveys of 2,600 people across this country, strict, rigorous market research protocols, random

samplings, socioeconomic levels, so that when you get a survey like that, the error of probability is plus or minus 3 percent.

Now, if somebody can offer me other things like that, I'd be glad to look at it. But these parents are saying, we find this rating system for the movies very useful to fairly useful in helping me decide the movies of my children. Now, I guess maybe you can come up with another survey, maybe this one is wrong, I don't know. But under the market research protocols, I have to say, I think it's right, and a 98 percent recognition factor. As I said earlier, how can anything last 35 years unless it's delivering some kind of a benefit? It has to be. Otherwise, it would have decayed earlier than this.

Now, the TV ratings -- by the way, somebody said we need advance information. We give advance cautionary warnings, for goodness sakes. Now, if a parent doesn't read it, if a parent chooses to take a child in willy-nilly to an R-rated movie, you can't blame the rating system.

Now, on TV ratings, I disagree with whoever said that TV ratings -- I think the TV ratings are not good. Do you know why? What I wanted to have as chairman of a group with the National Association of Broadcasting and the Cable Association, I wanted to have

a simple rating system. Anything that is mired in
complexity will fail. Many people can't program their
VCRs. Why? It's too god-darn complicated, which is why
I love my Tivo, it's so simple to use.

So, I'm saying to you, I said I wanted a simple rating system. But we were beset by a lot of child advocacy groups and the Psychiatric Association, the Psychological Association and you name it, seven to ten groups, and we met with them relentlessly and constantly and exhaustively. And what came out, in my judgment, was a rating system that was just burdened with complexity, riven with complications and, of course, you don't know what FV means. I don't even know what it means myself and I was part of the group that designed it.

So, I think the TV ratings do fail because they're too complicated. One of the reasons why the movie rating system has lasted is its simplicity. You give away things with simplicity, but you also entice people to use them.

For those of you who are looking at your watch, I'm almost through.

Nobody mentioned -- we're talking about movies and television and video games. Nobody mentioned the intrusions on a young person's life. I think a child learns to put a moral core in his breast from family,

church and school. And out of that comes -- nobody
mentioned -- child abuse, sexual abuse in the home, drug
abuse, alcohol abuse, one-parent, no-parent households,
latchkey children, and peer pressures. Nobody mentioned
that. That's what forms the platform from which springs
a child's future life. And if we ignore that and we
spend all our time worrying about the media except those
tentacles that rip into a child and rip his moral core
apart.

Finally, if parents in America knew what was on Kazaa and Morpheus, where any nine or ten-year-old with a click of a mouse can bring it down, is the most squalid, repulsive, unwholesome pornography you will ever see. I thought I knew all about pornography in watching some of those horrible films, but this stored me so unpleasantly, I had to avert my eyes. This is on Kazaa right now. You can bring it down. Ten-year-olds. Well, who's doing anything about that? Well, we're worrying about who sees Kill Bill or something. What every parent ought to do is go on your child's computer and call up Kazaa and bring in German school girls and some of this other stuff. I mean, it will turn your stomach and you will wonder, why on earth didn't you see this before.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Valenti, stay for just a couple minutes of questions.

- 1 MR. VALENTI: Well, I did. I went on too long.
- I'm going to be late for my next appointment.
- 3 MR. KELLY: Can you stay for just a couple, Mr.
- 4 Valenti?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 5 MR. VALENTI: Yes.
- 6 MR. KELLY: And I think certainly all these
 7 groups -- I think one of the interests here is to try to
 8 turn some of those parents who find the MPAA system
 9 somewhat useful into saying it's very useful. I think
 10 that's at least part of this focus.
- 11 Who has a question? Go ahead, Dave.
- MR. KINNEY: I just wanted to say that I was
 specifically asked to present focus group research here
 today. I put a million dollars of my own money into the
 development of the company that I have, specifically
 because I saw a void in the marketplace and a demand for
 the information.

I believe, as you do, Mr. Valenti, that the values should come from family, church and school, but there are thousands of studies that prove conclusively that children today are brought up by the media. And, again, in no way -- every single person -- I mean, I'm only at a point now where I get to speak to Congressional and Senate aides. But in every instance, I have presented us as a robust supplement to the MPAA. I've

never said anything negative about the MPAA system. I said in my remarks today that parents do find it useful.

I simply am saying that the reason we're all here is because parents need more information, and it's not just for the MPAA system, it's across the board. Parents need to have the information they need to determine for themselves what's suitable for their children.

I may have a 13-year-old that I choose to raise differently than you raise your 13-year-old. Morever, I may have two 13-year-old twins that have different sensitivities to sex, violence or anything else. What we're advocating as far as PSV Ratings is concerned, that parents be given the objective information they need. Our traffic light symbol is merely a guide to a chart that references a series of rules in our database. But, again, we just simply tell them here's what's in the movie. We make no judgment whatsoever about the movie or the MPAA rating system or anything else.

So, I just wanted to clarify that, that in no way were my remarks meant to attack any of the systems, simply to suggest that parents need more information.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Questions? Daphne?

MS. WHITE: I've got a question for Mr.

Valenti. Mr. Valenti, I heard you try to describe the

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

rating system and how difficult they are to do and how there are fog and wispy definitions. I don't understand how parents are supposed to understand or trust a system that has no criteria. I thought this panel was about the rating systems, how they work, what the criteria are. I didn't hear a single criteria. I don't know what to expect when I take my son to see a PG-13 movie anymore.

I went to see S.W.A.T. recently with my son.

It was heavily advertised. I walked in there -- how many of you have seen S.W.A.T.? Anybody seen that movie?

That's another issue. Parents, you know, think they see R-rated movies which are romantic comedies and they think PG-13 is better than that. PG-13 is a whole different category with tons of violence. S.W.A.T. had non-stop machine gun fire from beginning to end almost. It was a fine movie, a fine R-rated movie. I did not think it was PG-13.

I went to see Matchstick Men, PG-13, took my son. They had pole dancing in there.

I went to see Kill Bill, which clearly is an NC-17 movie. I haven't had the pleasure of seeing Texas Chainsaw Massacre yet, although it's on my homework list.

I don't know what the criteria are. I do not know what to expect. And PG movies, PG-13 or R, you haven't explained it to me. Yes, it's subjective. But I

1	think if you say your system is accountable, you owe it
2	to explain to parents what are the criteria you use to
3	come up with these ratings. Just telling us it's wispy
4	and since the Supreme Court can't do it, the MPAA is
5	doing it you keep saying it's lasted for 30 years. I
6	think that's because of the force of your personality and
7	the size of your checkbook.
8	But I'm interested in hearing criteria so that
9	I and other parents can understand your system.
10	MR. VALENTI: Well, if I just said if you
11	could write it down for me, I'd be overjoyed.
12	MS. WHITE: I'm not the one with the rating
13	system, you are. You need to write it down for me.
14	MR. VALENTI: No, I'm saying to you that if
15	you'd write down for me what you think the criteria ought
16	to be. Social scientists can't do it. It's easy to say
17	it, but it's hard to put down because there are 100 ways
18	to show violence.
19	MS. WHITE: What about labeling? Would you be
20	averse to labeling decapitation
21	MR. VALENTI: We do label
22	MS. WHITE: Not the kind of labeling that we
23	see in Kill Bill and these movies.
24	MR. VALENTI: If you'd let me answer your

question, I'd be glad to. The answer is, every newspaper

25

ad has the reasons for the rating. Filmratings.com will give you the ratings for thousands of movies and tell you more about it. I cannot put a bayonet to your back and force you to read those reasons, nor can I force you to go to filmratings.com.

By the way, go to all these other -- your rating system, I think it's terrific. What Nell Minow says, read what she says. Read what all the others have said. We urge parents to do that. We don't think that we are the final repositories of all wisdom. We do the very best we can.

And, by the way, I have a survey that 34 times -- 34 years we've done this with an accredited market research organization. I'm giving you the playback of what parents said. Right now, the highly useful to fairly useful is divided about 50/50. I'd like to make it 75/25. We're doing the best we can. But what parents are telling us is they trust it and they use it. Some sparingly use it, some heavily use it. But each person makes those decisions. We do label these things. We're telling you now the reasons for the ratings. I don't know what else more you can do.

You can't -- oh, by the way, I've written every major newspaper in the country saying, when you review a movie, put down at the bottom of your review, for family

1	viewers, here's what's in this movie, and you can do a
2	whole paragraph on it. We can't do it. We don't have
3	the space for it, but you can do it. I think the New
4	York Times does it, the L.A. Times does it, another
5	source of wisdom about movie ratings.
6	MR. KELLY: We have time for one more question

MR. KELLY: We have time for one more question from a panelist we haven't heard from. Warren?

MR. BUCKLEITNER: Way down on the end. Thank you for this opportunity. Again, I never met you and enjoyed what you had to say.

I agree with the complexity of this whole thing and the opinions --

MR. VALENTI: That's your good luck, by the way.

MR. BUCKLEITNER: Yeah, it is. I'm just glad to be alive, frankly. The subjectivity issue is huge. And one obvious solution that I think might work for all of us is to turn the monster on itself with the internet. I know on Amazon.com you can read end user reviews of all these things and if we can gather that information of parents who have just been to a movie -- and what I like about Amazon, there's nuts there, people you agree with, people you don't agree with, left, right, everybody. And you can kind of see and you can say, oh, they're affiliated with the industry or they're --

MS. MINOW: Common Sense Media does that. We
do that for all of our movie reviews. We enable parents
and kids to put their reviews on and to respond to the
MPAA and to what I have to say and for exactly that
reason.

MR. BUCKLEITNER: Yeah. So, it's giving people a voice, and I think the internet can do that. But maybe it's making more conduits so that that gets to the point of sale or gets to the decision points that might help us all.

MR. VALENTI: I think that's terrific, but keep in mind these ratings are done long before they go into the marketplace because the distributors have to know the ratings so they can put the information on there. So, this is long before the Amazon.com people see it. But before you go to a movie, why not go to Amazon.com? You don't have to trust our ratings, go to .com, go to your ratings, read Nell's. All the people up here, they are sources of information and we urge parents to look at that information and take it to heart.

MR. KINNEY: Is there any possibility, though, that those of us who do this, the biggest difficulty is getting screeners of these movies in order to provide the information in advance, and I know that's a piracy thing that we --

1	MR. KELLY: I don't know that we have enough
2	time to respond to the screener question.
3	MR. KINNEY: Between that and the fact of
4	that
5	MR. VALENTI: Oh, you drove a stiletto in my
6	heart.
7	MR. KINNEY: Between that and the fact that the
8	National Association of Theater Owners basically only
9	recognizes the MPAA system, it does make it difficult,
10	and that's why we've tried to contact we're trying to
11	work with everybody in a collaborative way just so that
12	we can provide this information. But it again, we've
13	tried to call your office and we'll continue to do that,
14	but we're just trying to get information so we can
15	provide information.
16	MR. VALENTI: Well, I will tell you this, don't
17	wait for those screeners. I will tell you why. Every
18	year for the last 12 years, the motion picture companies
19	have sent out screeners to just about every person in the
20	known Western World, several hundred thousand, 68 titles
21	were sent out last year.
22	Now, we have a sophisticated anti-piracy
23	department in the MPAA and they came to me and showed me

department in the MPAA and they came to me and showed me that of those 68 titles, 34 were pirated, wound up in Asia and in Russia, stamped onto counterfeit DVDs and

24

25

hurled around the world. None of those people who
received those screenings are doing the piracy. But they
did like I do. You give them to relatives, you give them
to friends and they give them to friends and they give
them to friends and somewhere along in that daisy chain,
the pirates pounced on it.

So, right now, first I banned all screeners and we're going to send screeners to the 55 members of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. But they must now sign a paper -- I just signed mine yesterday. I signed my signature and I pledged they will stay in my home, I will not let them out. I recognize that these screeners are going to be watermarked and identified, and if a screener is pirated and traced back to me, I will be immediately expelled from the Academy, which doesn't sound like much to you, but in Hollywood, being expelled from the Academy is like going for 20 years to Sing-Sing. I mean, it is a severe penalty. And that's why we can't send our screeners.

MR. KINNEY: I'd be happy to send our auditors to our screening room and you can make sure they don't have any recording devices.

MR. KELLY: I just want to permit one last 10-second question from Vicky Rideout.

MS. RIDEOUT: I thought since I'm from a health

organization, I'll just throw out the tobacco question.

2 I'm just wondering if you were convinced that -- and I

know you had a lot of skepticism about the research, but

4 if you were convinced that seeing a lot of movies with a

5 lot of attractive characters smoking did increase the

6 likelihood of young people smoking, would it then make

7 sense to you to give such movies an R rating?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VALENTI: Two things. First, we rate for illegal drugs. Anything that's illegal, we rate for. So far, the Government has not seen fit to declare tobacco, which kills more people than any drug, an illegal drug. They don't do it. Meanwhile, last week, myself and Van Stephenson and others of my association, we met with seven Attorney Generals of seven states, including a doctor from the Dartmouth Medical Group which gave us a survey. We had over a two-hour meeting with those Attorney Generals and now we're going to have a follow-up meeting in Hollywood, where I'm setting up a roundtable with directors and writers and producers, as well as the production executives in the movie companies, so that we can have a roundtable to talk about this.

We have not included smoking in the ratings for the simple reason that I offered before. Once you start rating for legal material, you're going to have to rate for a lot. Environmentalists, Society for the Prevention

- of Cruelty for animals and the list goes on, and they are legitimate catalogs.
- So, I'm saying to the Attorney Generals that,

 at this moment, we're not rating for tobacco. We don't

 rate for alcohol because they're not illegal. Anything

 that's illegal in this country and it's used in a movie,

 we rate for it.
- 8 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Violence is legal,
 9 profanity is legal and you rate for those.
- 10 MR. VALENTI: I didn't hear you. I'm sorry.
- MS. RIDEOUT: She's saying that violence is legal, profanity is legal, sexual content is legal and those are categories that you rate for.
- MR. VALENTI: I'm not aware that guns are
 illegal. Where are they illegal? There are certain
 states, but I can go to Virginia right now and buy all
 the guns I want, Maryland, too.
- MS. RIDEOUT: I think she's saying that you do
 rate, if I understand you correctly, that you rate movies
 based on content.
- MR. VALENTI: Sure. Murder is illegal and we rate for murder.
- MS. RIDEOUT: I think others acts of violence or sexual content or saying obscene words factor into your ratings and those don't necessarily have to rise to

1 the standard of being illegal.

MR. VALENTI: But that's behavior and that's not a substance. There's a big difference. By the way, Professor Graebener of the University of Pennsylvania, somebody mentioned his research. He's a wonderful man and I like him a lot. But under his methodology of a violent act, the most violent program on television or movies was the Three Stooges because they were slapping and every time they slapped he counted that an act of violence. When you add up what happens in the Three Stooges, the most violent piece of visual narrative you could possibly imagine. I'll let you ponder that for a moment.

MR. KELLY: We need to move on with the program. Mr. Valenti will be back this afternoon for our last panel. Right now, I'm sure the RIAA and the ESRB have been very happy with the discussion so far. We're going to take a two-minute in place stretch break and then come back for some discussion about the other two rating systems. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. KELLY: Let me tell you what we're going to do because, obviously, we're already a little behind schedule here. We're going to continue the panel discussion for about 15 more minutes and then open it up

1	for about 10 minutes of questions from the audience. So,
2	that means we should be able to convene and break for
3	lunch by 12:15 and that is the goal and desire.
4	We, obviously, had several areas we wanted to
5	discuss, but I think for the interest of time, I sort of
6	want to ask the panelists to focus discussion on the
7	basic issues about parent views of the rating and
8	labeling systems. I want to talk about the research that
9	some of us have already mentioned in our remarks that has
10	been done, what that research suggests about parents'
11	likes and dislikes of the various rating and labeling
12	systems. Obviously, we have still with us the
13	Entertainment Software Rating Board and the RIAA. So, if
14	we could focus those discussions on those points, at
15	least initially, that would be quite useful.
16	But since we are making a transcript of this
17	proceeding, any comment that you want to make or question
18	or concern that you want to raise about the MPAA is
19	certainly fair game as well.
20	I'd ask if you have a question or a comment, if
21	you would just lift the card to the side, then I'll
22	recognize you.
23	Nell Minow?
24	MS. MINOW: Thank you. I would like to just
25	mention a couple of statistics from the survey that

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

Common Sense Media did since Jack talked about his survey and mentioned that his statistic includes people who are sort of somewhat satisfied and very satisfied. We tried to be a little more specific.

What we found is that 78 percent of the parents that we polled said that they would like to have one uniform system across all media and that while people did feel that they were getting something out of the current ratings, that they could be better, and I think that that's what I would really like everyone to talk to today, and that they generally preferred not -- we had 70 percent who said that they would rather have some more independent source along the lines of what the software people have rather than the industry doing its own ratings.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Bainwol, any reaction? Any comment on that?

MR. BAINWOL: No, but I do have one general comment. I have been a professional in this field for two months, but I've been a parent for 11 years, and this discussion today, to me, has been very illuminating. I have spent a great deal of time reflecting on our particular industry approach to this question and what we do, obviously, is not age-based and it's not contentbased generally. It is a heads-up, it's a warning. And

I think the simplicity of that actually has some value.

This discussion today clearly demonstrates that the second you get into gradations, you run into challenges of interpretation that really are vexing. I think what the movies do, in terms of the rating system, clearly has value, but I had my own experience this week where we watched a movie and my wife and I watched it in the context of the decision about whether or not our kids were going to watch the same movie, and it was PG-13 so we thought perhaps that might work. We watched it and we didn't agree with the assessment of the rating. Had it simply said, be really, really careful on this one, we probably would have been just as informed and maybe better informed.

In the context of music, we say explicit, and if a parent wants to exercise responsibility here, you see explicit, you don't buy the music. It's an easy call and that's something that I think really does reside with the parent.

MR. KELLY: One question I have for you. One of the things we're going to be talking about this afternoon in the retail area is store practices. The question of the age-based -- the fact that your system isn't age-based. Could you just talk very briefly about why you sort of made that judgment not to have an age-

based system for the recording industry?

MR. BAINWOL: Well, again, this judgment was reached back in '85 when the system was launched, and I think when you think about media, you have to reflect on their differences and what's being communicated. If you think of a spectrum, on one hand you have books and poetry, on the other hand you have multimedia with images and words and music and context, and clearly the more information you have with music, videos, context established, it is easier to do those kinds of things, where more like books, more like poetry, it's very, very hard.

Different people of different ages and different communities, different family backgrounds, will view music and hear the same thing in a very different way. The industry reached the conclusion that the simplest thing to do and the most effective thing to do was to say, yellow light, watch out, this is explicit, you make the call.

MR. KELLY: I'm going to ask -- Dr. Walsh has a question, and while Dr. Walsh is asking his question and getting a response, if we could cue up the video that Daphne White wants to play, I'd appreciate it.

DR. WALSH: It's actually not a question, Dick.

I'd like to comment on some of the research that we've

done on the accuracy of the ratings. Comments have been made about the usefulness of the ratings and I think there's a difference between market studies and also an attempt to really try to identify the accuracy of the ratings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We did a study which was peer-reviewed and published in Pediatrics, in which we asked parents to take a look at specific media products. And when we talk about overall levels of agreement that mask some of the areas of disagreement -- and if you take a look at overall ratings agreement across all of the different media, the statistics that Jack and others have talked about, parents will say that's fairly useful, when you ask them specifically about media products. disagreement comes is in that particular area between teenagers and the -- parents never disagree with a strict rating. If a movie is rated R, then practically 100 percent of parents will say that's appropriately rated. If a video game is rated M, 100 percent of parents will say it's appropriate. So, that masks some of the gradations.

When you get into specific things, by and large, parents disagreement has to do with that the rating was too lax. And so, I think that's an overall kind of finding when you ask parents -- not in a market

study, but in trying to make it as scientific as possible.

Secondly, I'd like to make some comments because MPAA is gone and I'd like to preface this by saying that I think that the ESRB rating system has been the most responsive to trying to listen to parent input and they've made changes and they -- I really think that they are making a very good faith effort. I was in a two-and-a-half-hour phone call with Pat and her colleagues this spring trying to improve that system. So, what I'm going to say now needs to be in that context.

I think one of the specific things that the ESRB should look at is the AO rating. As far as I can tell, they don't use it. And so, if a rating is never used, then it's not useful. And if you look at the descriptor of AO, it's hard for me to understand -- and I think many parents don't understand -- why a game like Grand Theft Auto Vice City would not get an AO rating. Now, my belief is because that has a commercial impact. Major retailers will not carry an AO game. Major retailers will not carry an NC-17 video by and large. And so, when the ratings verge into commercial impact, that's where I think they get inaccurate.

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

MR. KELLY: Why don't we cue Ms. White's video

and then ask Pat to respond? Go ahead.

MS. WHITE: This video highlights some of what Dr. Walsh said. Several videos on this videotape rated M, we also believe should have been rated Adults Only, and I was asked to warn you that some of this is going to be pretty explicit. I think it's interesting that when I show this to an adult audience, everyone is very squeamish. There's going to be some pornographic content, some -- all kinds of content, so be warned. Some of this is the same, but a lot of it's new.

(Video segment played.)

MR. KELLY: To refocus the discussion here, but to pick up on what Mr. Bainwol said and I know Ms. White is raising, it is this basic issue of ratings accuracy and at what level does certain content in a video game or in a movie or even content that might justify a parental advisory level, at what level does that content need to be? And I guess we're also hearing here from some panelists the basic concern or question whether when you're making those judgments whether those judgments are accurate and useful to parents.

MS. VANCE: There's a lot to respond to, a lot of comments in the last half-hour and I'm, hopefully, going to be able to respond to most of them.

Bottom line is, we do apply the AO rating from

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

time to time. It doesn't happen often, but we do. It is always at the option of the publisher. If they want to make changes to a product and resubmit it to raters to get a different rating, they can certainly do so, and certainly there are commercial ramifications for doing that.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That being said, unfortunately, we live in a violent society and our society has a fairly high threshold for violence, and it's proven out in our research when we go out and we test. We've tested 3,200 games in 10 different markets in this country and, as David Walsh himself says, the M-rated games that you see up there, regardless of whether or not, Daphne, you would bring it home or I would bring it home, that is acceptable as a Mature-rated product for ages 17 and up. Those products all carry lots of descriptors and, ultimately, it's got to be a parent's responsibility whether or not they want to bring that product home. Ιt is not ours. It's not Daphne's. It's not anybody's on this panel.

So, I come back to, you know, accuracy is subjective. It's based on what your personal opinion is. Jack's talked about it and others have talked about it. We encourage consumers to go out and get information from as wide a variety of sources as possible and be as

informed as possible. We're not the only source that they should be using.

One of the reasons why the TV rating system has been criticized is because it's too difficult to understand. It's alphabet soup. People don't know what those descriptors are. So, I beg to differ, I think most people know what blood and gore is or blood or violence, and certainly, the way that we apply content descriptors is appropriate for the rating category and for the age in which we apply it. So, I don't think there's a lot of confusion about what we do.

But, ultimately, it's got to be simple, it's got to be standardized and we do it in what we believe, and the research proves out to be a pretty consistent, effective way that is certainly well within the American mainstream.

You know, there were lots of other comments made which I can try to respond to, but I think that's basically it.

DR. WALSH: I'd just like to respond to one thing, Pat. I think that most parents are not aware that there is an AO rating, and so, I think if you'd ask parents if that should get an M rating, I think most parents would say yes because your own data showed you

didn't rate anything AO out of all of the games that you rated in 2002. And so, what my experience is is that parents have no idea there's an AO rating. If you were to ask parents whether a game like Grand Theft Auto Vice City should be M or AO, you might get a different answer.

What I would suggest --

MS. VANCE: We do ask. We provide all five rating categories, we ask them what category they would put it in, and as our research indicated, they are as likely to rate it less restrictively as they are more restrictively, but the majority rate it how we rate it. So, we do offer them an opportunity to apply an AO if they want.

DR. WALSH: That was true in our study, too.

The majority -- that was the study that we published in

Pediatrics. The majority agreed. However, there's a

sizeable, it was out to 35 percent, that would agree that

certain things were too loosely rated.

MR. KELLY: Lara?

MS. MAHANEY: Two quick comments for just the folks from the video game industry and even I wish Mr. Valenti were here, but we know that parents -- it's up to them to help their kids out. But I think there should be an equal amount of pressure applied to retailers -- I know you guys are going to address this later on today --

to not sell those products to kids or to a five-year-old, that type of thing. And I know some retailers have a register prompt, but they're not even enforcing their own register prompt. So, if there could be more from your associations and from the industry itself.

And then also, too, when it just comes to advertising to kids, reviewing where they're placing their products. We don't have a study on music, but we do with the video games. I think most parents would say, it's unreasonable to be advertising, un-American, I don't want the R-rated films. I don't think it's too much for parents to say, don't market it to my kid. So, those are just something I hope that you guys can take away from this.

MS. VANCE: There's no one in this room that has worked more this year with retailers to try to get ratings awareness information, where the product is displayed, to train store associates, and to make sure the policies are being enforced and the rating system is being enforced. I've met with every major retailer this year. As I said in my presentation, we have six major retailers relaunching a completely new rating awareness program utilizing our training materials, updating their websites, et cetera. So, I think we are trying and we're doing a lot.

Is it ever going to be perfect? No. It can't be perfect because ultimately what it comes down to is a store associate who has potentially 13, 14 people waiting in line to get through. And are there going to be some who might not use the system? Certainly. But I think the retailers are trying and putting a great effort into it and I would certainly want to pose those types of questions to the panel later.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That being said, on the targeting side -- you know, it's up to what you define as targeting. Our rules are fairly strict. You cannot put M-rated game advertising in media vehicles, if it's television that has an audience of 35 percent or more kids and in print it's 45 percent. So, using vehicles -- like American Idol, I know what the demos are, but I'll tell you, the largest vehicle -- the program that has reached the most teens or under 18 viewers this past year was the Superbowl. But that's 15 percent of the viewers. The same thing with the Grammys. It's 15 percent. Those are the vehicles that you're going to be reaching mass numbers of teens. Survivor, you know, if you look at the top five shows, Survivor is number two and four. You know, Survivor is less than 15 percent certainly.

So, where do you go? Where do you set the guidelines and how do you define targeting? Because the

reality is, we're not targeting messages to kids. Kids
are exposed to a variety of media and they may be exposed
to an ad, but the ad's not being targeted to them.

MS. MAHANEY: Well, I think the litmus test for 35 percent is way too high because you're right when it comes to prime time ratings. No show really meets that. But, again, it comes back to what Daphne had to say, that 80 percent of the population are adults. But, also, too, when you look at Survivor, it does 21 million every week. Well, one million of those are kids from 2 to 17. That's a pretty significant number when it is one of the highest-rated shows that kids are watching. So, I recognize that it's debatable all day long, but I think those are simple steps people could take.

I mean, how many people watched the World Series? The World Series is a huge audience for teens. Eight percent of the audience was under 18. How do you measure it? We're trying hard and we do a great job in terms of monitoring and going after publishers who are inappropriately target marketing their product. But, you know, at a certain point you say, look, we live in a society that has a variety of different media outlets, most of which don't target kids and publishers should be able to use those media vehicles to promote product.

MR. BAINWOL: I'd like to add just one notion.

The question of retailers, at least there is a point of sale, there's a transaction and there's a capacity to question what's going on, and that's a good thing. This issue is very complex. But on the music side, most kids are getting their music in a forum in which there is no retailer and there is no block, there is no filter, there's no nothing. And in terms of the core question that this workshop is designed to address, there is a mammoth gap there and that is a huge problem.

MR. KELLY: On the question of where you draw the line in terms of setting standards for where you can advertise or not, the Commission, in its reports, has asked all three industries to look at that, for the RIAA to consider adopting some standard and the other two industries to look at the levels they have. It's been a consistent.

So, everybody knows what we're doing here, we're going to go to the remaining questions from the panel and then open it up to the audience.

David?

MR. KINNEY: I'll be very brief. I just simply want to say that, obviously, the industry, each one, is doing their best and they consistently improve. Being a capitalist country, a market-driven country, though, part of the way it's going to be fulfilled is through the

private sector. And I don't want these remarks to be self-serving, so let me say be it Common Sense Media, PSV Ratings, ScreenIt, Kids in Mind, all of the other people out there who are trying to do something. I think part of what we need is to have the access.

And as a businessman, I respect the concerns about piracy. But, again, even if it were that we had to go to a screening room somewhere with our auditors or whatever, the whole idea here is access. We've got freedom of expression and freedom of information and there's not a balance here and that's simply, I think, the major issue.

MR. KELLY: Warren, you have the last question from the panel and then we'll open it up to the audience.

MR. BUCKLEITNER: Thank you. I think we all care about children and we all care about what they see, and the stuff we saw on the screen, we don't want our kids to have. I think we would agree with that pretty much across the board. The reality is what we all have to be driven by.

The reality is that kids are getting access to this stuff a lot of times because of confusion. It may not be that you go out and buy it for your children and discover it later on, it could be they're at a friend's house. It could be my daughter who's watching over a

friend's house, their teenager's playing it, they're looking over their shoulder.

The ESRB rating system, I think, is the least worst system out there. I think that -- if you've ever tried to review a video game, and I have, it's really, really hard. Harry Potter came out -- or Finding Nemo. There are seven different platforms that you got to consider made by different studios. The GameBoy Advance version is made by one in the UK. The GameCube is made by another one. It's very difficult and expensive to accurately get your head around all of that information. ESRB has yet to surprise us. Their ratings and descriptors are always good.

But when I was on Amazon and I clicked on the ESRB icon, it just went to this generic thing. That didn't help me as a consumer. We have to explore ways -- and I don't know what that way is -- but we have to explore ways to get the -- I believe it was the fourth user review on Grand Theft Auto that was the most useful to me. One guy said, it's a great way if you're stressed out, go play it, you'll feel great after you finish. Another guy said, keep this one away from the kids. And that's what I -- I'd like to see the ESRB reviewer notes, like what are they really thinking when they see it. We all take notes when we review. That's the stuff that I

1 think helps people make decisions.

The last thing I'll leave with is it's good to look at other industries. I think the wine industry has given us a good lesson because they have those little review things right on the shelves and you can tell if it goes good with fish or whatever. I think we could do more with, you know, sending a PDF review of different opinions, putting it where consumers are -- when they need the help.

MR. KELLY: Leave it to Warren to bring up food just before lunch. Before we open it up to questions from the audience -- and what we'll do is people can come up there to ask questions -- I certainly want to thank the panel very much for being part of this today and for all of you making the trips you had to make to be here to join in this discussion. So, thank you very much.

Does anyone have some questions for the panelists? If you'd just say your name and then your question, please. Try to make it questions rather than long comments, please. Thank you.

MS. KERR: Hi, Jennifer Kerr with the
Associated Press. This is for Daphne White and maybe
Nell. If you could just tell me -- obviously, you don't
think that self-regulation works. What should be the
plan of action going forward? And, specifically, I'm

interested in knowing, do you think the Government's

doing enough and what would you like to see the

Government do from here on in?

MS. WHITE: Well, the Government is not doing anything right now really. I mean, they're holding this workshop, they've done reports. But as far as, you know, helping parents, I don't think that anything is being done at the moment. Everyone is hiding behind this cloak of the First Amendment. But if you looked at some -- to us, to parents, it's a matter of marketing. It's what is being marketed to children. That's what has to be regulated, not the content. So, we're not opposed to any of these video games being made or marketed to adults only.

The sense I get from the panel this morning, both from Patricia Vance and from Jack Valenti, basically, is I feel like they're kind of throwing up their hands and basically saying, don't use our ratings, just go on the web and find whatever you want there, just use anything. I mean, I don't see any standards, I don't see any guidelines, I don't see any definitions from any of them about what's in these.

I think parents need labeling. I think one thing the Government can do without any First Amendment infringement is come up with labels so that if a parent

goes to get a game like Postal 2, it would -- right now it says, blood and gore, mature humor, strong language, use of drugs, violence. Does that cover for you what we saw? Does that even give you a hint? That's rather mild language, I think. It's very generic and bland. I would like it to say decapitation, racism, chopping off of people's head with axes, urinating on people's corpses, blowing dead people up, you know, just like you said with wine or food labels.

And the same -- you know, music, it should be easier for parents to find out what is in music content. I applaud what you say about the web, but my staff has been going on the website and looking at websites of legitimate artists for the members of your association, Eminem, 50-Cent, people like that, there's pornography and worse right on the lyrics that you sanction. So, I don't think you have to go looking on Amazon.

Parents, unfortunately, live kind of in a different culture than kids do. My husband drives my son to the car pool every morning and hears unbelievable stuff on drive time on the radio that is bought and paid for by radio stations. So, I think clear labeling is a start, but I think there has to be some regulation of the marketing of these products.

I think Patricia Vance mentioned about retail

and how hard it is to deal with clerks and get them to enforce it, but we manage as a country to do fine with alcohol, pornography and tobacco. We have the same minimum wage clerks, we have high turnover, we have the same retail situation, but there are fines in place for that. And Congressman Baca's bill would impose fines on people who market this adult only stuff -- or what should be adult only stuff to kids. That would take care of it at the retail level.

MS. MINOW: I think each of the people we've heard from today has had different strengths in their rating systems, the MPAA, the RIAA, the ESRB, and what I would love to see, as I said, is some across the platform system that would be consistent enough so that it would be meaningful to parents and that would take the best of each of the systems.

What Government can do is very, very limited here and should be very limited here. But I think the Government can do what it's doing right now, which is haul everybody in here and embarrass them if they don't do a better job, and I hope we come back next year and do it again and again and again and again until it gets better.

MR. KELLY: I mean, the focus of the Commission has been to study this area, to issue reports, to provide

facts, to provide forums, to provide opportunities for discussion and, perhaps, generate some thought upon the self-regulatory bodies about making improvements.

MS. MINOW: I would love to make an argument.

I am a lawyer, by the way, and I would love to make an argument that, say, calling Scary Movie 3 a PG-13 is de facto deceptive advertising.

MS. WHITE: And I would say that having as many different rating systems as we do with all these different alphabet soups, there's the V-chip, there's the ESRB, there's the movie rating, RIAA doesn't even have any for music, I would also say that's unfair and deceptive and I really do wish the FTC would start looking at it in some kind of holistic way to make sense.

MR. DAVIS: Good morning. My name is Alderman Joe Davis. I'm officially here representing the City of Milwaukee. I'm a member of the Milwaukee Common Council. Our senator, Herb Kohl, was co-sponsor of a piece of legislation within the Senate that's currently pending in Congress, and I also have a meeting scheduled with Senator Feingold tomorrow to brief him on what this conference was all about.

My concern is this: I love this country, I was born in this country. I think this country has a lot of

things to offer to our children. But on the flip side, what I'm concerned about is, I worked for Hughes Aircraft out of El Segundo, California and I worked in their labs that had simulators, flight simulators for Navy pilots and also Marine pilots, and what I'm starting to see is I'm starting to see these video games becoming simulators for these kids, and I think it's a matter of national security because I think that we're breeding urban terrorism. I think we're breeding terrorism in our urban areas, in our communities and I think it's very unsafe.

I represent about 40,000 people, so I would put it to the panelists, how do we address this problem whereas these children are emulating these things in these entertainment games and they're carrying them out very exact to what the game is actually designed to do? How do we, as local elected officials, deal with that problem dealing with the fiscal constraints that this country has, particularly in Iraq, at the federal level and at the state level and at the local level?

MS. VANCE: Well, I'll echo some of Jack
Valenti's comments. At the end of the day -- you know,
we can't replace good parenting. We're here to provide
information so consumers can make educated purchase
decisions.

1	And I'd echo what he says that, you know, there
2	are many, many factors that play into whether or not a
3	human being might commit a criminal act. Although you
4	may intuitively believe that there is some kind of causal
5	link, the reality is that, you know, according to the
6	Surgeon General, according to the State of Washington,
7	according to the Government of Australia, there are
8	plenty of authoritative sources that say, when you look
9	at that long list, video games aren't the top reasons for
10	those types of acts. It's an easy-out, but it's
11	certainly not you know, our job is merely just to
12	provide the information, make sure that advertising is
13	responsible, make sure that there's information available
14	to consumers so that they can make an educated purchase
15	decision. That's our job.
16	MR. KELLY: We're going to take a break now.
17	Let's take one hour for lunch. If I understand
18	correctly, you will need to go back through security when
19	you come back from lunch. So, don't take your badges
20	off, your name tags, or at least put them back on. We'll
21	try to be back in here to start our next panel at 1:25.
22	We're going to continue in that panel with some more

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)

marketing discussion. Thank you very much.

23

24

25

Т	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	AFTERNOON SESSION
24	(1:34 p.m.)
25	MR. KELLY: I hope you all found a place to

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

have lunch and get it down. We got back in an hour and minutes. Not too bad.

We are back here this afternoon to discuss an area of growing importance to the entertainment industry and to parents, the cross-marketing of movies, music and electronic games.

Just yesterday, what is billed as the First
Annual New Orleans Experience, experts in the field of
film, music, video games and advertising spent two days
in panel discussions focused on the intertwined future of
these four industries. Promoted as a convergence
festival, panels discussed video games and traditional
media properties, music and video games marketing
alliance, and sorry, MPAA, is film dead.

Sponsored by the New Orleans Media Experience, the goal of conference was to facilitate the intersection of the film, music, advertising and video games industries for these increasingly interrelated businesses. The cost of that experience, by the way, in New Orleans, was \$395 for the week plus travel. But that includes an opportunity to play some games and view some movies. But, of course, your cost here today for being here is free. And instead of two days, we're going to try over the next, I think, about 45 minutes, to discuss some of the very same issues that I imagine were talked

1 about in New Orleans.

But from a different perspective and a slightly different goal, our focus is to discuss the impact of such cross promotions on parents and whether those effects suggest the need for increased attention by industry self-regulatory bodies.

We continue to be joined by a distinguished group of panelists, many of whom you met this morning. Mitch Bainwol will be here in a minute, I imagine, from the Recording Industry Association of America. Patricia Vance is here from the Entertainment Software Rating Board. Dr. Walsh is here from the National Institute of Media and the Family and Daphne White from The Lion and Lamb Project.

Substituting for Mr. Valenti is Fritz Attaway, who is an Executive Vice President of MPAA, has been at MPAA for several decades and have served as Executive VP for five years.

But we have two brand new members to you today that I'd like to briefly introduce. Michele Erskine is Vice President of the Solutions Research Group. SRG is a research-based consulting firm with three key practice areas, media and entertainment, marketing research and youth. Ms. Erskine has been consulted on youth marketing issues by companies such as Coke and Frito Lay and by

1 government organizations, such as Health Canada.

Then we have Pete Snyder. Pete Snyder is the founder and CEO of New Media Strategies, based here in D.C. Using technology to tap into the power of the internet, NMS helps leading corporations and causes promote and protect their brands and bottom lines. Mr. Snyder is a former political media consultant and pollster and has served as a marketing and political expert on a number of news programs.

I want to begin with a short presentation that will simply remind us about how big the teen and 'tween markets are to these industries.

These are pretty self-explanatory, but it shows you the size of the teen population in the United States. And teens spent \$170 billion in 2002 and the cost, at least in one of these studies, an average of \$101 per week. Next.

9.5 billion box office revenues in 2003 for the industry. Teens represent about 16 percent of that total, though they only represent, I believe, about 11 percent of the population. Moviegoers are more likely to be teens than any other group and teens see an average of just over two movies per month. Now, maybe we all have kids and maybe that's a wrong statistic, maybe it's a lot more.

1	For the video game industry, we had \$60.9
2	billion in sales in 2002. A recent survey said that 92
3	percent of children and teens 2 to 17, obviously, like
4	video games and play them. Thirty-eight percent of game
5	players are under 18 and, according to this one survey,
6	45 percent of children age eight plus have a video game
7	player in their bedroom.
8	The music industry, \$13 billion plus in sales.
9	Keep going. Here we're getting go back one if you
10	can. Stop. What that's showing is obviously just
11	statistics of the degree to which music purchasers are
12	teenagers, and in some sense, particularly younger teens
13	8.5 percent were age 10 to 14.
14	I'd like to turn to Michele Erskine for a
15	presentation. She'll talk a little bit more about this
16	teen and 'tween market. Michele.
17	MS. ERSKINE: Thank you. Thank you for
18	bringing me in. I appreciate being invited down to the
19	U.S. I'm here as a youth marketing researcher. I'm
20	going to try to contain my comments within that context,
21	but as so many others who have spoken, I am also a
22	parent, so I'll reference that a little bit.
23	The difference in perspective that I may be
24	able to offer here is because of my work, I'm more

familiar with pop culture than most moms. I'm an active

25

gamer myself. I go to concerts and all these wonderful things that our kids are into and it gives me an interesting perspective that certainly my friends like to try and capitalize on in dealing with their children.

I'll take you through a couple of slides. Go to the next one. Everyone knows what we're talking about. Teen media and entertainment is -- their behavior is different from adults. It's also different from adults experienced as teens. Because of that, marketers who are adults are very uncomfortable with the world of teens, and that makes them -- I won't say prone -- but they're sensitive to the idea that this is an elusive market that they're uncomfortable with and that they want to reach because, as we just saw, there's a lot of money in this market and there are a number of them with products that they want to sell to kids, teens and 'tweens.

Now, I will say within that -- and, certainly, I've been asked the question before, you know, how can you live with yourself, you're helping these people sell things to your children. My bias and my response to that is, as soon as I gave my son an allowance that made him a consumer and I want him to make mistakes buying pop before he makes mistakes buying cars. That doesn't mean that I think that everything is fair game.

There's significant interest, significant enough that there are companies that are devoted to youth research, youth marketing, youth promotions and guerilla tactics in reaching in youth because the traditional media are not working. Kids aren't using traditional media as much as their parents and as teens used to.

Because the traditional media are not dominant, they're looking at innovative new media and marketing strategies. There are a lot of people out there helping them do that, including myself, frankly.

Next slide, please. Here we go. Some stats. I can only show you Canadian statistics from my own company, but I did, in preparing for coming here, fact check this against some of the U.S. statistics and it's fairly comparable. I mean, it's the trend that we're looking at.

In the first column you'll see time spent daily by the total population, 12 plus, with traditional media. First, reading newspapers, an hour, 32 minutes; listening to radio, two hours, 28 minutes; watching TV, two hours, two minutes; listening to prerecorded music, an hour and 65; and then you look at 12 to 14-year-olds and 15 to 19-year-olds and you'll see that the totals are somewhat less, particularly for watching TV, it's a little less. So, you see quite a bit of media about the fact that kids

aren't watching as much. It's a lot in the trade press.

Now, underneath that you'll see that that's because -- it's not that they're consuming less media, they're consuming it differently. So, they're more likely to be watching DVDs and videos, they're far more likely to be using the internet and they're far more likely to be playing video games. But I certainly heard recognition this morning that kids are playing video games. I don't think I have to argue that point. That's been made abundantly clear. They're also key users of music and they're more likely to be going to the movies. I think we have agreement there.

Go on to the next, please. Let me get to -- I think what this panel's dealing with is the chicken and the egg, I call it, what comes first anymore, and frankly, I'm confused often as well when my son comes home with things like these beans that are so popular right now. I don't know where that came from.

What comes first? The toy, the show, the movie, the fast food premium, the trading cards, the magazine, the video game? I don't know. It can be any of those. It can start as a toy, it can start as a game, it can start as a show, and then it is taken into the other media or other ways of extending that brand or that product for consumption by kids. This is standard

marketing practice, standard to take a layered approach to try and communicate with kids, and that's what we'll talk about here.

The thing that I didn't hear this morning that I was a little concerned about as a parent and as a youth expert is the point of distinction in recognizing -- and I showed that in the slide before -- these industries are not all the same and it's not their fault. For the same reason that marketers are confused about how to reach kids because they're not watching traditional TV as much, parents are confused because the one thing that they don't do as well as their kids is play video games. A lot of them just aren't comfortable doing it.

Now, I do play video games so my son sort of relies on -- I think it's a good thing to let them know that you do play games even if you don't. He certainly thinks I'm better at it than I am. But it is very difficult to go through a game and see all of the contents. You become very reliant on the rating. The parents are reliant on the rating.

I can go to the movies with him and I will choose sometimes to disregard what the rating for a movie is. For instance, Billy Elliott, that was an amazing movie and I chose to take him to it, but explained to him that the profanity and some of the other stuff was not

appropriate for him. It's very difficult to do that with a game. I can't get through all the levels and he knows that. Even though I'm not half bad, he knows that I suck when it comes to video games, and so, I have to rely more on other information.

Within that, I would say it's not the rating system. There somehow needs to be recognition that parents aren't as able to look at what their kids are playing on games as they are with movies and some of the other industries. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Dean, you want to come forward, Dean Garfield? Dean's going to sit in for Mitch Bainwol. Dean is from the RIAA.

Leslie, could you put up the convergence slide, please, the multi products slide? Thank you.

The reason why we put together this slide was, again, to focus our discussion and to highlight the wide variety of cross promotions that are out there. These are, obviously, just some recent examples. And the question or the issue that is presented is that we have a variety of products arguably being marketed to different age groups, tied under a similar brand name. So, you might have a movie that may have an R rating, a video game that has a teen rating, you might have a music soundtrack with or without a parental advisory on it.

You might have an action figure perhaps labeled for
eight-year-olds, perhaps labeled for 17, perhaps labeled
for four. It varies. But the issue that's presented
there is what does all of this cross-marketing mean for
parents and for the self-regulatory groups.

I've asked Pete Snyder to talk just a little bit about some surveys and studies he's done online about a potential value of some of these tie-ins.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Dick. I'm happy to be here today. Just as Michele talked about her background as an expert in kids marketing, but also with the background of a parent, my background -- I'm speaking today as an expert in marketing trends and crossover marketing trends in the entertainment industry, but also, as Dick alluded to, in my past life, I was a Republican media consultant and pollster and a little bit more right of center. So, that's kind of the spectrum that I see things in. It doesn't impact the work that I'm doing, nor do I want that to impact my statements here.

But I get the question from time to time, Pete, you worked in Republican politics and you're conservative, how the hell are you working with Hollywood and video games? And I tell people, oh, they don't know; otherwise, they'd run me out of town. But just all kind of kidding aside on that, as Fritz can vouch and as you

can pick up People magazine, we all know that marriages in Hollywood don't really last that long. But one marriage and one union that's really growing stronger every day is the video game industry and Hollywood. And why is that?

Well, Hollywood had one of its biggest years ever last year, its biggest year in the history of the industry, and the video game nearly doubled those revenues. There's massive, huge growth going on -- growing on. Video games is one of the most explosive markets in our economy. Game makers put out and produce probably about 10 to 12 times more titles than your average Hollywood studio. So, what's really happening here is the market's being saturated with an ocean of really unknown titles out there in video games. It's little wonder that the brand names, like skateboard icon Tony Hawk or Hollywood franchise tie-ins like the Matrix or Spiderman or James Bond, tend to be the biggest sellers for video games.

Earlier this spring, my company, New Video
Strategies, conducted a survey of 450 video game
consumers on the internet and really found that 67
percent of video game consumers were more likely to buy a
video game due to the Hollywood tie-in than one that
didn't have a tie-in. And, you know, that seems to make

sense for the sheer factor of why does Crest sell more toothpaste than the smaller brands out there? Well, Crest is a known quantity. The Matrix is a known quantity, the Hulk is a known quantity, Spiderman is a known quantity and video games. So, some of the smaller titles don't get gobbled up as quickly.

And this marriage is really becoming -- what started out with the power in Hollywood is really becoming a marriage of equals, each side wanting what the other one has, meaning the film industry definitely wants -- your average consumer goes and spends probably an hour and 51 minutes watching a particular film but the video game industry has consumers playing for 40 to 60 hours on a particular title or a franchise. That's huge.

The gaming industry, on the other hand, wants to have the power of those brands and the glitz of Hollywood. So, that's really kind of what's going on on the side.

My company also did a study just recently -just last week after Dick tapped me for this panel and we
looked at 350 teens and 'tweens on the internet, and we
found that 55 percent of these teens and 'tweens are more
likely to buy an M, if they can buy it, a Mature-rated
video game than not. There's no surprise there. Getting
and having what we desire has been -- or trying to get

what is forbidden has been around since Adam and Eve. I mean, there's really no shock in the fact that 55 percent of teens and 'tweens want to have or would be more likely to buy a video game based on the M rating.

But what is really interesting and what we find firsthand in working with different game producers is you might have a Matrix, which is rated R, but the video game producers will edit and curb out a lot of that violence and a lot of the content there so that it can be marketed under a T for Teen category.

So, while my study is showing that 55 percent of teens and 'tweens, if they could buy these things are more likely to, the industry, itself, chooses not to go down that path, chooses to edit out a good amount of the violence and profanity, and we can debate and discuss exactly what that is and who should be setting the line. But the industry chooses to go the other path and to edit the stuff out and make it teen.

I can speak from firsthand experience working with different studios and different game producers -- and, again, I say this with my background as a conservative Republican consultant before this industry -- we've never had an experience where X, Y or Z studio wants my company to market in areas that they shouldn't be. Let's say for an R-rated film, marketing

to teens or going into 'tween online communities and marketing these things. The studios do a pretty good job of making sure that they're not crossing the line.

Are lines crossed? Of course they are sometimes. But we've never had firsthand experience with game producers or film studios actively trying to cross those lines.

What we also did in this most recent survey is we looked at the behavior of parents and where the parents are spending their time with their kids and we gave the choices out there of books, of video games, of watching TV, and we found -- this should be no surprise either -- a bit of a digital divide. That parents were 40 percent much less likely to spend time with their kids playing video games or watching video games than they were reading or watching TV. For parents, this is an explosive industry. You need to be able to understand what your kids are doing there. Parents need to be able to -- whether you're not a good gamer like Michele may be, you need to at least watch and see what's happening out there.

Thank you.

MR. KELLY: In looking at this slide, one of the interesting things when you look at some of the promotions that occur between the products, you do find

situations where a video game might have a trailer for a movie or the DVD sale of the movie might have a coupon for the game or merchandise, that's an action figure might be marketed as official movie merchandise. So, you see at least the beginnings of some interconnections where there seems to be some effort in an overall part of setting out promotions where one product is helping the other.

With that point, let me turn to Daphne White and Dr. Walsh to sort of talk about why this kind of situation might be of concern to parents. Why don't we start with Dr. Walsh and then we'll go to Daphne who has a presentation.

DR. WALSH: I think, generally speaking, all of the decisions that are going to be made in terms of cross-marketing and how to do that are going to be made for business reasons. How to cross-merchandise or cross-market a program is, of course, going to be made. How can we maximize the profits on this particular product, whatever it is? And child welfare or the impact on child development is not going to be part of that calculus in most instances.

Because of the power of marketing and because of the power of advertising, products that are cross-marketed that are really cross-marketed in very different

ways are, I think, inevitably going to create an interest among kids for products that may not be appropriate for them. And so, the kid who really enjoys playing -- to use the example, really enjoys playing Enter the Matrix video game is much more likely to be interested - well, I want to go see that movie.

So, because there is nothing in those -- in that decision-making process to figure out, okay, how can we market this in a way that's going to be appropriate for children. I don't think that that's the major motivator that's going on in these discussions. They're all business discussions. How can we maximize the profit? You know, so to use a television example, you know, the World Wrestling -- WWE now -- World Wrestling Entertainment, when they license their logo and image onto t-shirts that come in baby sizes, they are doing that for one reason. How can we make as much money as possible off this brand?

And so, since child welfare is not part of that calculus, then I think it becomes all the more important to ask industries -- I think there needs to be some pressure from the outside to make that at least part of the reasoning process or we're going to get more and more examples like that. I think everyone agrees that what the speakers so far have said, it's just going to keep

1 accelerating.

As media convergence takes place, there's going to be more and more cross-merchandising. I mean, I was at a conference seven years ago when marketers were predicting that every media product from the concept stage will include all the cross-marketing opportunities. And the more cross-marketing opportunities there are, then the more likely that project is going to get green-lighted.

So, somewhere in this, or else we're just going to have more of the same, there has to be some way to inject the issue as to what is the impact on kids in all of this, and that's what I think is missing and we need to figure out how to get that into the calculation.

MR. KELLY: Before we turn to the selfregulatory groups to talk about this issue, Daphne White
has some comments as well.

MS. WHITE: Thank you. As we've started to get an idea from the two marketing experts who spoke before, cross-marketing and branding are absolutely huge. This marriage is very strong, as you suggested.

What really disappoints me today, though, I have to say, is that none of the companies who are actually doing the cross-marketing and branding, such as people who are actually selling the Matrix rated T to

teens and selling the Hulk and toys for age four and up were willing to come and speak to us today. This would have been a unique opportunity for them to use their First Amendment rights to explain to parents and to the Federal Trade Commission why they do it, how they do it, how they make their choices. They choose not to come, and I can only think of one reason why they didn't want to come, which is they don't want parents to understand.

So, I am a mother, I'm a parent, I'm an advocate. I'm not a marketing expert, but I've had to teach myself a lot so I can help explain why it's so hard for parents, so I can understand it and help others.

So, if I could have the first slide, please?

The first thing I learned about was actually a toy fair a few years ago, and it's an expression that I think the toy industry or one of the marketing industries came up with, which is KAGOY, kids are growing older younger.

The reason -- one of the reasons children are growing up so fast in this country where eight-year-old girls are being sold thong underwear and four-year-old boys are being sold Transformer and Hulk and things, which are supposedly for teens and adults, is because of the marketing and the cross-marketing. Every day, more adult level violence is being sold to younger children.

Last week, Quentin Tarantino, as someone

mentioned before, suggested that 11 and 12-year-olds should see Kill Bill, which would have been rated X a few years ago, and Jack Valenti seconded it saying -- this is a Jack Valenti quote -- "I think even an impressionable child would go in and say they've seen worse on Wiley E. Coyote than they saw in Kill Bill." That's what KAGOY is all about and that's what parents are up against.

So, we believe that there is a pervasive and aggressive marketing of violent products to children still three years after the landmark FTC report. I think things are getting worse, not better, and I hope the FTC will continue to conduct really aggressive investigations and speak to the specific marketers who are marketing and cross-marketing these products. Next slide.

So, children are leaving traditional toys at younger ages in favor of electronic entertainment. As you saw in the video earlier, these products are getting more violent. That's a picture from Postal 2, which we saw before. Next slide.

Another reason it's difficult for parents to deal with this media is because the lines between entertainment and education are blurring, as one of the marketers said before. This is a very dangerous trend when we're selling entertainment products as educational. Next slide.

This is just one example of this educational entertainment product that's cross-marketed to kids.

This is actually the back of this box, which we scanned it. It's by Toy Biz, which actually now owns Marvel, the comic book company, which sold the licensing rights for the PG-13 movie, this toy is for ages three and up, marketing and branding the Hulk, which is an adult product. Let me show you how this works, by the way, just to help your toddler get their aggression out. It says here, try me, squeeze my tummy. Squeezing doesn't help, you got to punch him. So, that's what this toy is.

But on the back, if you read the copy here, they've got this really adorable copy about easily excited by sunny days, weekends and ice cream trucks, Bruce Banner turns into a green playing machine known as the Hulk. The Hulk -- this is my favorite -- likes to jump, lift things and has a unique ability to heal quickly. As any of you know who actually know the Hulk brand, this is a character who suffers from episodes of rage and unleashes his inner beast. You can see that on some of the other toys I have with me.

So, this is the kind of stuff that's marketed down to children as young as three based on a PG-13 movie, which a few years ago might have been rated R. That's what parents are dealing with every day in the toy

store, and I'm going to get to some other places where they are marketing this. Next slide, please.

So, another thing I just learned this weekend from the New York Times Sunday Magazine about branding and the amazing power that brands have -- because I think one of the other panelists said, oh, the video game industry is so responsible, they tone down the violence to make it acceptable, it's all about brand. So, I don't know how many of you read this article, but they talked about -- this researcher -- the whole article is about neuroscience and measuring people's responses in the brain.

Basically, he found that Pepsi stimulates more pleasure in the brain when you actually measure pleasure, but people say they like Coke better. So, what he did was he gave people Pepsi to drink and told them they're drinking Coke and they liked the Pepsi better if they thought it was Coke. When he reversed it, when he gave them Coke and said it's Pepsi, they liked the Pepsi less. So, he -- if you want to get the whole thing, you have to read the article. But he -- the researcher was amazed by the power of Coke's brand to override our taste buds and our brain chemistry. That is how powerful it is and that is what we're doing to kids. Next slide, please.

So, Hollywood, the video game industry, the

music industry, all these entertainment industries are very aware of the power of branding, licensing, advertising. I mean, that's how we pick presidents and congressmen in this country. It's all based on ads and messages that we see for 30 seconds on TV, but these products take hours of kids' time.

This is just a slide to show how production costs are going down while marketing costs are going up. So, for them to -- for these companies to say that marketing to kids is a parent's issue is a little disingenuous when they keep putting more and more money into it. They would not be spending more money, they wouldn't be increasing their marketing dollars if they didn't have to. Obviously, marketing works and marketing to young children works even more easily because they're not aware consumers. Next slide, please.

This is an example of what parents are up against in the branding. Promotional partners for X-Men II, rated PG-13, include an ice cream. We put in a quote from a marketer who said it's a really broad audience from kids to adults. I don't think by kids he meant 13 and up. I think he meant little kids.

Kraft Tang -- I mean, when you go to the ice cream store, when you go to the grocery store -- can I have the next slide, please -- this is more promotional

partners for just one PG-13 rated violent movie, Ritz
Bitz, Chocolate Cream Oreos -- I'm getting hungry -Chips A'Hoy, Cheese Nips, and even Wal*Mart. Imagine
going with your child to Wal*Mart and saying, no, you
can't have the X-Men videotape or game, even though
they're doing promotions, you can't have the food.
There's just so much parents have to say no to all the
time. It's really not an even kind of situation. Next
slide.

This is another quote about the importance of licensing, again, from the video game industry that often markets these adult-rated products to children with the "violence" taken out. They're selling the brand and the product, Doug Lowenstein told Variety magazine, which is an industry magazine. He's the head of the video game trade association now called ESA. Licenses are indeed the single most important driver of a title's success. So, again, they're selling the brand, the Pepsi or the Coke to our kids, not -- it's not kind of how much violence is or isn't in a game and we talked about how much -- in the earlier panel, how much violence gets in anyway. Next slide.

This is another example of Matrix, which was an R-rated movie. When it came out, the first Matrix, it was one of the most violent movies I had ever seen.

There was a lot of talk about how violent it was. They are marketing that -- the second one, also, with action figures, a video game rated T for Teen, and I don't know how many of you noticed in the videotape I showed earlier how interconnected the movie scenes were with the game play. It was just very seamless, you couldn't tell when the movie ends, when you were playing a game, and they took a mature rated -- R-rated movie and took the violence out and made it okay for teens.

Anyway, they were selling drinks, cell phones, MTV, DVDs, it just goes on and on. So, that's why it's really hard for parents to "just say no." I mean, the Just Say No campaign did not work with drugs. Everybody laughed at it. But all of a sudden when it comes to media products, we're told to just say no. I mean, parents are not told to supervise their kids buying alcohol or cigarettes at retail. We have laws about that and we need the same kind of laws with this kind of branding going on. Next slide.

I think this is the last slide. Again, it's an example of cross-marketing. The three examples at the bottom, Hulk, Spiderman, Pirates of the Caribbean and X-Men were PG-13 movies. They came out with E for Everyone, games for six-year-olds to get six-year-olds into the product, and then the action figures like the

1 Hulk that I showed you were for three and four-year-olds.

So, branding is powerful. They're branding
these products, they're marketing them down and then they
tell parents just say no. That's the issue for parents.

Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Let's turn to the self-regulatory groups. I wanted to first go to the Entertainment Software Rating Board because the ESRB in their ad code of conduct does have provisions that seek to deal with some of these cross promotions. Ms. Vance, do you want to talk about that?

MS. VANCE: Sure. As I mentioned earlier today, we do have a very strict advertising code of conduct which not just regulates or provides guidelines in terms of where rating symbols or content descriptors need to appear, what size, what the location is, et cetera, in both packaging and advertising, but where those ads can be targeted and where those games can be marketed. So, we do it in several ways.

We are very clear about targeting media vehicles that reach predominantly a youth audience, and as I indicated earlier today, our guidelines restrict advertising M-rated games in television media that attract 35 percent or more of minors, as well as in print, it's 45 percent. Those guidelines are strictly

1 enforced.

That being said, we also want to make sure that game publishers don't cross-promote M-rated games on T or E product, and you can't put a demo of an M-rated game on a T or an E product, you can't cross-market those products to a young audience. If you want to create, say, a sampler disk or an ad that includes a number of different games, that ad cannot be targeted at a young audience, and we do -- we monitor everything very closely. So, we're very careful about where we can cross-promote, particularly, M-rated games, but also to a certain extent, T-rated games.

MR. KELLY: Fritz, do you want to talk a little bit about whether MPAA looks at this issue in its 12-point program?

MR. ATTAWAY: One of the 12 points in our 12point program is that the studios will review its
marketing and advertising practices in order to further
the goal of not inappropriately specifically targeting
children in its advertising of films. And I believe that
each studio does exactly that with respect to all of its
advertising and marketing. If merchandising is part of
the promotional activities for a motion picture, I have
to assume that each studio is reviewing what it does to
ensure compliance with our guideline. I'm not aware of

any specific instance where someone has raised an issue in that regard.

I am -- I was interested in the illustrations that I saw up here on the screen of Hulk, Spiderman, X-men -- there is one more that I'm not remembering. But all of those are based on preexisting figures. Now, the Hulk I remember was a TV show, which I assume would -- if it were rated, would have been rated G for general audiences. Spiderman, I've been reading in the comics my entire life.

I don't understand why the presumption is that action figures based on Spiderman entice children to see the movie any more than the comic strip does, which came out long before the movie did. I think there's a lot of jumping to erroneous conclusions when it comes to marketing these action figures, particularly when they relate to figures or characters that were brought into the market long before these films were ever conceived.

MS. WHITE: Can I say something about that?

MR. KELLY: Yes, you've got 45 seconds left.

MS. WHITE: Okay, sure. I just want to say that those action figures were going nowhere before they made movies about them. There's a whole book that just came out called Comic Book Wars about Toy Biz, the company that makes the toys, and Marvel, and the Toy Biz

bought Marvel specifically so they could make movies
because everybody had forgotten the comic books, nobody
was reading them.

They needed the movies to sell the action figures. You didn't see those in the stores before the movies came out. The action figures are tied to the movies, which have high degrees of violence in them.

They're no longer tied to the comic books you read as a child. It's been a long time.

MR. KELLY: One of the things we've noticed in our monitoring of practices by industry members, particularly in the video game industry and increasingly so in the movie industry, that there are a number of studios and game companies that in their licensing arrangements have put requirements in, especially if it's being based upon an R-rated movie or an M-rated video game, which do attempt to restrict the distribution of those products. They may say, for example, they should be not distributed to toy stores or they should be put in separate areas of the toy store away from the other toys, and they may also require labeling, which says that this product is based upon a mature-rated video game or this product is intended for someone 17 and over.

So, we've seen a number of examples in the market that are developing in both areas, but we haven't

noticed those examples for the PG-13 product or necessarily for the teen product, which is certainly one of the questions of whether -- and there were some examples placed up here of where, in connection with the PG-13 product -- and it may well be the case with the teen product, I don't know -- that there are some products that are being associated under the brand that are intended for very young audiences.

Why don't we turn a little bit to the RIAA. In terms of the licensing issue in particular, have you noticed anything, Dean, in how music recording artists are dealing with the licensing issue? We have, for example, seen a great increase in the extent to which music groups are showing up in video games, for example, and we've always seen the connection to movie soundtracks.

MR. GARFIELD: I think this issue is very new, and so, I think it will largely be driven by license relationships and the negotiation between the various entities involved. Our guidelines do not speak to this. But I think there are two presumptions, one of which was already raised, that underlie a lot of the discussion thus far today.

One is that the media is all the same, and as Michele pointed out, it's not. There isn't necessarily a

consistency between a movie that happens to have a soundtrack. They may be completely different.

The second presumption, which I think underlies a lot of the discussion, is that there's some attempt to target to deceive parents in luring them into purchasing a game or buying a CD. And as it relates to the music industry, there is none of that. I mean, our albums are clearly labeled. They're labeled in advertising and we try to make sure that that's done in a clear and consistent way.

MR. KELLY: Go ahead and we'll -- we can open up for questions now.

MS. VANCE: I just want to follow up a little on what Dean said. I agree that -- you know, there's an underlying theme that there's some kind of conspiracy. The reality is these movie products, these comic book products, super heroes or whatever, they're licenses and they go to the highest bidder and then those companies go out and create products based on the license. And in the case of video games, those products come to the ESRB, we rate them. We typically don't have a clue what the movie rating is at the time we get the game. It never would play into how we rate a game because we have to rate based on the content that we see and that gets submitted.

The idea that these companies edit down the

1	product is kind of outrageous. The companies are
2	creating a game that's going to sell. In the case of the
3	Matrix, there was no footage from the movie in the
4	Matrix. The selling point of the Matrix is that they
5	created all this original footage for the video game.
6	You know, it didn't it wasn't about editing the movie
7	down for the video game, it was about creating a video
8	game in its own right that would stand on its own.
9	Yes, it's based on a license. It helps.
LO	Brands help in terms of sales in many cases.
L1	So, I guess I would just like to say that I
L2	think this is an issue and I think that we need to get
L3	our arms around solutions, but, you know, I think it's
L4	not about this theme what seems to be, you know, kind

of a conspiracy theory. It's not that at all.

MR. KELLY: Dr. Walsh has his card up. Again, if you want to participate in the discussion, if you'd put your card up, then I'll be able to recognize you. Okay.

MS. VANCE: One more point. When it comes to movie licenses used in video games, most of the time the games come out with the same rating, similar ratings.

You know, if it's a PG-13 movie, typically it's a T-rated product. In cases when he differs, we have rated it more restrictively as frequently as less restrictively.

The Matrix is an example that we rated it less, but I have many examples where we've rated it more, you know, more restrictively than the movie. So, again, it doesn't kind of play into the -- you know, there's this nasty conspiracy.

DR. WALSH: I'd like to actually follow up exactly what Pat just said. I also have no belief that there's no conspiracy. I don't think there's anything conspiratorial about it. I think the entire motivation is what I said earlier. It's to maximize profits. And so, I don't think anybody's about to subvert.

I do think that there is -- if we work towards solutions, I think that there's a solution and I think the solution is -- I'm both a critic and a fan of the video game industry because I think that the video game industry has been the most responsive and I think what Pat suggested earlier, that the policy of ESRB is that there's no down-marketing of a video game, should be something that should be adopted across all the entertainment platforms because that's the way it would work.

So that you, as part of your code of conduct, which I think is the model for all the entertainment sectors, your code of advertising conduct is that if you make an M-rated video game, you cannot market a product

1	that is aimed at kids. So, you can't have Duke Nuke'Em
2	action figures. I think that that standard, which
3	already exists, should be voluntarily accepted by all of
4	the other media sectors. I think that would go a long
5	way to solving the dilemma.

MR. KELLY: Daphne, you want to go ahead and then Pete?

MS. WHITE: Sure. I just want to say I never used the word "conspiracy," Pat. I don't think there's a conspiracy. I think the word is "convergence." Dick talked about the conflicts. He showed a slide. It's about convergence and it's about the highest bidder. There is a marriage between Hollywood and the video game industry. As one of the speakers said, branded products sell better. Everybody knows that. Brand is important.

To say that your raters had no idea that the Matrix was rated R or that the Terminator is rated R is a little hard for me to believe. I don't know. Maybe your raters are in this box that Jack Valenti talks about that you should keep your kids in where they won't see any media. There was film footage shot from the Matrix movie for the video games so that people could -- who played the game could get to scenes which weren't in the movie. It was very closely tied to the movie.

The scenes, which even we showed, are almost

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

indistinguishable from a chase scene that was in the movie. It was the same actors, the same director. It took you places the movie didn't, let you do things the movie didn't. So, it was even more -- there was even more violence in it. You saw the screen at the end that said how many people you shot, how many you killed, what your accuracy was, things you couldn't do in the movie. And at the end of this video game, there is a trailer, a promotion which I think is against your guidelines, for the next Matrix movie which is rated R.

Nuke'Em, which has earlier on come out in an E-rated version or in a T or Resident Evil -- I can list a bunch which have been cross-rated, you know, down, either by platform, like it was rated Mature for the console, but T for the handheld. That shouldn't happen. You're marketing a brand. To pretend that this isn't about branding is to live in some kind of a dream world. It's about branding, and if you have a Mature-rated brand, everything should go with that brand.

MS. VANCE: Our focus is --

MS. WHITE: Otherwise, it's deceptive to

parents.

MS. VANCE: Our focus is just accurately rating the products that get published. If Duke Nuke'Em, the

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

version that's created for the handheld is not as violent and not as graphic and realistic as the console product then it should be accurately rated for consumers. The idea that you kind of disregard the content in a product and just use the -- you know, the original license's ratings is just, I think, a disservice to consumers, and I wouldn't do it.

MS. WHITE: Well, I think there should be a middle ground between disregarding brands, which is what you're doing -- and maybe you think I'm disregarding content, but there's got to be a middle ground where you cannot sell an adult-rated brand. It's like they take R-rated movies and put them on TV at 8:00. I saw Scream, which was a very scary R-rated movie on Fox TV at 8:00, during the family hour, and they said, oh, it's less scary. I never saw the original, but the one I saw on TV was quite incredibly nightmare-provoking for me. You know, and they do this on airplanes, too. They'll take a movie, take out a few scenes and they'll say, oh, it's acceptable now. It's the same product.

Duke Nuke'Em, as you know, has prostitutes in it, has strip bars. I don't care what you take out of it, it's a brand. If it's no longer Duke Nuke'Em, call it something else. That's what I'm saying. If it's a game, it's not the Matrix, it's some other thing, call it

1	something else. Don't call it the Matrix anymore. If
2	you're selling the Matrix brand or the Duke Nuke'Em brand
3	or the Resident Evil brand, it's the brand. And that's
4	why I showed that slide about the neurons in the brain
5	and how, you know, branding can override what even people
6	like.

MR. KELLY: I was gratified to hear Dr. Walsh talk about possible solutions as well. So, Pete, you have a comment.

MR. SNYDER: I just wanted to take exception to just two things that Daphne said. Daphne White had some very good comments. First and foremost, I market films and video games and you said that no one who markets those or no one who maybe produces them are here, but I'm on this panel and I'm proud of the work that we do and we've never had an instance where we worked with a studio or a video game producer where we were crossing those lines or marketing down.

Secondly, you also said that action figures didn't exist before the movies. I used to play with the Hulk action figure.

MS. WHITE: I said they weren't moving recently before the movies.

MR. SNYDER: They existed and I used to play with them and for my fourth grade Halloween, I went as

- the Hulk with the blow-up muscles, and they were around.

 It's been a part of our culture. Again, I think you've

 added some very good points that were on mark, but I take

 exception with one saying that people who work in the

 industry aren't here and, secondly, that those things

 didn't exist pre-movies. They've been part of our
- MS. WHITE: Well, I apologize, I'm sorry. You

 are here and I wasn't sure who was going to be here as of

 yesterday. So, I apologize for that.

culture for 50 years.

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- As far as the action figures, yeah, they were here, but it was a different time. They were comic books. It was a different product. What you and the person from the MPAA are remembering are the comic books and -- I recommend this book to all of you called Comic Book Wars.
- MR. SNYDER: I've read it. It's about Mick Andrews Forbes and Ron Perlman, the gist of it.
- MS. WHITE: And why they bought the movie company and the rights to the comic books.
- MR. KELLY: All right, let's move on to the next question. Michele?
- MS. ERSKINE: Just a couple of comments. One
 was a lot of the marketers I work with who are looking
 for cross-marketing opportunities sort of self-monitor

themselves. And even though I'll tell them, it's not a recommendation that they link with some of these people, but they'll say, well, who are the hot artists, who are the hot bands. And Eminem is a good example of this, incredibly hot with teens. But a lot of marketers know that they can't link with Eminem and I think Eminem doesn't necessarily want to be sponsored by Kraft either. So, these things are happening and they're aware of the power of these opportunities.

And a lot of the brands with powerful franchises do exert strong control with how these brands are used in licensed product or brand extensions. These tend to be the ones of a vested interest and serve long term protecting their franchise. And I find that they're the ones that exert the most control.

Just as a final thought, the one instance I could think of where I was given pause to think about what was going on and disturbed was a game called Halo, which is a Mature-rated game. It's been rated. I know it's not appropriate for my nine-year-old, but it's stocked in the shop with everything else, at least in the retailer that we go to, and right beside it are some action figures. And so, my nine-year-old said, well, it has action figures, why can't I have it. And I don't know how you get around that. But somehow it needs to be

1 addressed.

2 MR. KELLY: Let's have a question from Fritz or 3 a comment and then we're going to wrap up.

MR. ATTAWAY: Actually, Dick, it's a question to you, and the question is, I'm a little confused about — as to what we're discussing has to do with your inquiry, which is the marketing of violent entertainment to children. If the charge is that action figures and other merchandise are being marketed to entice children to see movies and other content that are rated as inappropriate for children, then I can see that that's an appropriate subject for this panel.

But my experience has been that most of this merchandise and action figures are marketed for purposes of selling the merchandise, not getting people to watch the movie or buy the video game. And in that instance, it's not a matter of marketing inappropriate material to children. I think an action figure of an X-Man is certainly as benign as marketing a toy pistol to a child, and I would argue a lot more benign actually.

Haven't we strayed kind of far afield from the subject of your inquiry?

MR. KELLY: Well, I don't think we've strayed far afield. I think what we're seeing in the developments in this area is some beginnings of

interaction between the marketing of these products. So, you have merchandise that's the official movie merchandise. What does that mean in terms of, is that any inkling that people should be looking at the movie?

We have coupons in one industry's product to buy something in another industry's product. We have trailers on games encouraging people to go to a movie. There is this interconnection that has occurred. The ESRB, in fact, has provisions that deal with some of this. Individual industry members have adopted provisions, as well, in both the movie and the video game industries to begin to address the issue and there have been some changes in the marketplace where it is now, at least, common for action figures that are based upon R-rated movies or M-rated products to be labeled as appropriate for 17-year-old people.

So, it seemed like an appropriate issue to raise, and particularly, because it is a growing and developing area and it is an area that is potentially of concern to parents.

With that, we're going to try to get back on schedule. So, I want to greatly thank the panelists for this discussion. I realize we've only touched the surface of this issue. We, obviously, can return to it perhaps a little bit in the Next Steps panel. Thank you

1	very much and thank you all for being part of this.
2	(Applause.)
3	(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
4	MR. EICHORN: Why don't we go ahead and get
5	started? My name is Mark Eichorn and I'll be the
6	moderator for this panel. I actually do not have
7	children, so maybe I'm the silent minority here. I may
8	not be qualified as a speaker, but hopefully I can
9	moderate. But you all will decide that.
10	We heard this morning from the associations
11	that developed the rating systems and labeling systems
12	and it's up to the retailers, the job of enforcing those
13	systems and so, we're going to be talking about that for
14	the next hour and 15 minutes or so.
15	We've got a great group of panelists. I'll go
16	ahead and introduce each of them really very briefly.
17	Their bios are provided in your materials in more detail.
18	At this end on the right, Sean Bersell has
19	directed the government affairs programs of the VSDA, the
20	Video Software Dealers Association, since 1999. That's
21	the trade association for video retailers in the home
22	video industry. And, currently, he's Vice President of
23	Public Affairs for VSDA.
24	Jim Donio is next to him. He's currently the
25	Executive Vice President of the National Association of

Recording Merchandisers, a position that he has held since June of 2000. He's responsible for overseeing NARM's day-to-day operations and managing the professional staff headquartered in Marlton, New Jersey.

John Fithian is President of the National
Association of Theatre Owners, or NATO. As President of
NATO, Mr. Fithian serves as the Chief Public Spokesperson
for theater owners before public officials and the press.

Hal Halpin is next to me. He's the founder and President of the Interactive Entertainment Merchants
Association, the video and computer game industries retail trade association. The IEMA member companies account for over 80 percent of the sector's business.

Next to me is Jule Polonetsky on the left. He joined America Online as Vice President for Integrity and Assurance in May of 1992. He oversees the integrity of the user experience, consumer protection, online safety, accessibility, community standards and policy areas. He's also responsible for setting internal standards and practices for all of the AOL brands in several areas, including parental controls.

Next to Jules is Jonathan Potter -- actually no, Beverly Porway is next to Jules. She's Regulatory and Litigation Counsel at Toys "R" Us, Incorporated, parent company of Babies "R" Us, Kids "R" Us,

Imaginarium, Geoffrey and several internet sites,

including toysrus.com. She has been with Toys "R" Us

since 1997 and she's responsible for providing legal

counseling on advertising, marketing, regulatory and

operational standards and practices.

Jonathan Potter is Executive Director of the Digital Media Association. He's responsible for DMA's public policy and industry advocacy activities in the United States and internationally.

And, finally, Raymond L. Smith is Senior Vice President, Human Resources Counsel for the Legal Entertainment Group and is responsible for the company's general litigation, security, risk management, human resources, training and payroll functions. He's the company rating compliance officer and member of the NATO Board of Directors and various committees.

I really want to thank all the panelists for coming and especially the individual retailers for coming this afternoon.

To begin, we'll start with some statements from the retailer trade associations, but I wanted to just highlight briefly some results of the Mystery Shopper Survey that we conducted in 2003 and that we released a couple of weeks ago. This was the third in a series of the surveys that we've conducted and we send 13 to 16-

year-olds unaccompanied to theaters and stores around the country and have them try to purchase product at stores and theaters. Then we report on the practices.

This time we looked at 899 theaters and stores around the country and we found that on the purchase question, whether the teens were able to purchase, 69 percent of the teenage shoppers were able to buy M-rated electronic games, 83 percent were able to buy explicitlabeled recordings, 36 percent were successful in purchasing R-rated movie tickets, and 81 percent were successful in buying R-rated DVDs. That's an industry we surveyed for the first time in this survey.

These results indicate that from a statistical standpoint, each of the industries had improved since our last survey in 2001, though, obviously, there's still room for improvement in each category, even if you're not going for a perfection standard. Just based on what Mitch Bainwol mentioned earlier today that kids, for example, can get anything they want from file sharing, but five out of six of them can buy it from a music store clerk or get a DVD from a clerk.

We also asked a couple of questions about whether the stores provided rating information and whether they asked age, whether the shopper was asked their age. For each of those questions, we found that

- things were moving in the right direction, as well.
- 2 Although, in most cases, the changes weren't significant.
- But, basically, there was improvement in all the
- 4 industries from last time, especially in the purchase
- 5 area.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that, I think we'll go ahead and turn to the statements. Sean, would you begin?

MR. BERSELL: Great, thank you. I'm here on behalf of the Video Software Viewers Association and we're the international trade association of video stores in the home video industry, and I want to talk with you about what the home video industry is doing to educate parents about the rating systems for movies and video games, and how video stores are voluntarily enforcing those ratings.

We have a strong history in the home video industry, both through VSDA and through our member retailers, of helping parents control their children's access to entertainment and we're pleased that the previous Federal Trade Commission reports have acknowledged that.

We've heard several times today that you cannot replace good parenting. I would agree with that. We in the home video industry, however, understand that we have a role to play in helping parents make good decisions

about the entertainment that they bring into their homes for their children.

So, for the past 16 years, VSDA and video retailers have proactively helped parents make well-informed choices regarding the movies and video games rented and sold to their children. I'd like to emphasize that practically every video rental company has an effective ratings education and voluntary ratings enforcement program in place in its stores. These programs include VSDA's model program called Pledge to Parents, which is used by Movie Gallery and many independent retailers, and the very similar company-specific plans used by Hollywood Video, Blockbuster and others.

And regardless of what these programs are called, they share common elements. The first is ratings education in the store, putting materials in the store regarding the rating system to educate parents. The hallmark is a policy of these retailers not to rent or sell R-rated videos or M-rated video games to anyone under 17 without parental consent and, also, not to rent or sell NC-17 movies or Adults Only video games to anyone under 18. I should add that a number of retailers have stricter guidelines or allow parents to impose their own restrictions for their children. These restrictions are

actively enforced by video stores through their point-ofsale systems.

As I mentioned, video stores also educate parents through in-store signage, posters, brochures, shelf talkers, kiosks and the like. Placement of these may vary within particular stores, but they're all prominently displayed so that they can be noticed and used by parents. And some retailers even add their own descriptors and advisories.

These programs apply both to videos and to video games. They apply to rental, they apply to sale, they apply to the websites and they apply to members and non-members. And video store employees are trained on ratings education and enforcement and it's part of the culture of video retailers and it's something that is constantly reinforced to their employees.

We at VSDA are satisfied that these programs, which we call parental empowerment programs, are working well, and nothing in any of the FTC reports that have been issued thus far suggest otherwise. We believe that there's no better place than in a home video store for parents to control the content of the movies and video games to which their children have access.

Now, there's always room for improvement, and in 2001, we at VSDA saw the need to institutionalize our

periodic reminders to retailers regarding the use of ratings education and voluntary ratings enforcement in their stores. We also saw the need to educate consumers about these rating systems and how they can be used in video stores. So, in 2001, we instituted something called Ratings Awareness Month, and now, every June, we declare June to be Ratings Awareness Month and we undertake public education campaigns through the media to educate parents, and we also use that opportunity to educate retailers and remind retailers about the need to have these programs active in their stores.

We've also been responsive to the prior FTC recommendations on this topic. At the suggestion of the FTC, we adopted advertising and marketing guidelines for our member retailers, and we've taken a look at the usage of that by our members and those spot checks indicate that those are being complied with.

I would just like to end with one thought, and that is that video rental stores are family-friendly neighborhood institutions. They and their employees are part of the communities in which they're located. They often know their customers by name. They know what's acceptable and what is not acceptable in their communities. They take pride in the entertainment they bring into people's homes and they rely on repeat

business. In a sense, they put their reputations and their livelihoods on the line every time they rent or sell a video or a video game. And I can assure you, they would not deliberately put their businesses at risk by providing to children videos and video games that their parents don't want them to have.

Thank you.

MR. EICHORN: Thank you, Sean. Jim.

MR. DONIO: Thanks. I wanted to say thanks to Dick Kelly and to the FTC staff for inviting us to participate today and also to say that we welcome the continued information that's shared with us about how we're doing and how our sister industries and organizations are doing to help improve as much as we can.

NARM is a not-for-profit trade association. We've been around for going on 50 years now serving the music retailing community. Our members represent about 80 percent of the industry, including retailers, wholesalers, distributors, suppliers of products and services, as well as individual industry professionals and educators.

To echo what Mitch Bainwol said this morning, we've always been supportive of balance and think that that's an important ingredient in all the discussions

today, the balance between the artist's right to free expression, the parent's right to be aware of entertainment with explicit content, and the retailer's right to handle this explicit content according to how each believes they can best meet the needs of their company and the communities in which they have their businesses.

I certainly applaud the refinements that Mitch announced this morning and the efforts with regard to anti-piracy because of the lack of information on the illegal sites, but I would add that while online and the online businesses are growing, to be sure, music stores are still here and they're alive and well.

NARM has long supported this program and has worked closely with the RIAA to improve and standardize the parental advisory logo and to make posters and counter cards available, such as this card, for use in stores. And they are available to our member retailers free of charge.

NARM continues to support this program because it is a useful tool and that's very important. Parents need to determine what music is appropriate for their children.

To be clear and to reiterate what Mitch said this morning, the parental advisory program is not a

ratings program, it's not age-based and it's not an indicator that a recording that displays the logo is inappropriate for a minor. Retailers may add their own rules, their own guidelines and choose to employ and adopt the program in a variety of ways, which I'll speak about in a minute. And even with all the diverse approaches, the common thread among all NARM members is that they support this program.

Retailers, as I said, display the counter cards and the posters. They're designed to promote and explain that this is a notice that parental discretion is advised. But retailers know that there's no such thing as a typical consumer. Therefore, stores stock thousands of titles to please as many different musical tastes as possible.

And let me review some of the ways that retailers use the program. Some stores choose simply not to stock the parental advisory product. Some stores let their parental advisory speak for itself. Some retailers do add an age-based sales policy on their own. Some retailers do check IDs when they suspect that a customer may be too young or may not have parental permission to buy a certain recording. Some retailers incorporate a prompt to check ID in a store's POS system that appears on the computer screen when the clerk scans the barcode.

Some retailers choose not to interfere at all with the parenting decisions and sell entertainment products without regard to age.

Retailers stock product and create sales policies from music displaying a parental advisory label based on market considerations and the composition of the customer base and the community in which the store is located. This variety of approaches by retailers means that parents can and should choose to shop at stores that best meet their family's needs.

Retailers do a lot in terms of training, as well, with their employees. They incorporate information about the parental advisory program in new employee training manuals so they can inform parents about what it means and they also make it part of the formal orientation session with new employees. Most retailers inform employees that if a parent calls or returns to the store with a complaint about their child buying a labeled CD, they are to be offered a refund with no questions asked.

In addition to the retailers' initiatives, NARM also posts information, which is available to all visitors to our site, about the program. And we provide a link to the RIAA site for additional information about the logo, the specs, the usage and who and how to

determine what gets the label, and also a link to the parentalguide.org site.

Store clerks talk about the parental advisory label and music displaying the logo with parents and explain, in certain cases, that the recording could have strong language or lyrics about drugs or sex or violence. Clerks inform consumers that, in many cases, there is an edited version of the same recording available, and this promotes choice.

Some retailers instruct their clerks to provide parents, also, with a telephone number of the corporate headquarters in the event they have other questions or they have a problem with the CD or the store's sales policy that they want to pursue further.

Clerks also encourage parents to talk with their children about the parental advisory and to teach them about the subjects which come up in the lyrics.

We have really received no reports of retailers getting complaints from consumers about the parental advisory or store sales policy. Feedback is certainly always welcomed, but most of the studies that we have done indicate that parents are satisfied with this program and they find that it's helpful.

Children mature at different ages. Not all families have the same concerns. Some are more concerned

with offensive language; others are more concerned with sexual content; still others are concerned with violence. We all know that children like to test limits, whether they're imposed by parents or retailers, and sales policies are no substitute for parenting and no single sales policy can meet the needs of all parents. Over the years we've learned that parents, too, use the parental advisory in a variety of ways. Ultimately, we hope that parents discuss lyrics with

their children and use the purchase of a specific title as an opportunity to better understand a child's attraction to a certain kind of music. We believe that the majority of parents feel that the best arbiters of what their children should listen to are the parents and not retailers and not the government.

Thanks.

MR. EICHORN: Thank you. John Fithian.

MR. FITHIAN: Thanks, Mark. I represent the National Association of Theatre Owners, which is the world's largest trade organization for the operators of motion picture cinemas.

Randy Smith, who is on this panel as well, represents Regal Entertainment Group, one of our members. We also have three other members in the audience. So, afterwards, if you want to talk to individual theater

owners and operators about what they do with the ratings compliance methods, we have several of our members here today to help you out.

I want to start by thanking the Federal Trade Commission. I think that today's dialogue has been extremely useful and not just the panel presentations, which have been very useful, but also the individual conversations in the hallway. In contact with the various advocacy groups, I have learned a great deal about suggestions that our industry can incorporate and we look forward to incorporating those. I encourage all the representatives of the advocacy groups not to discontinue the dialogue today, but to follow up with us as we hope to follow up with you so that we can continue to make progress as we use and modify our rating systems.

I also want to thank the FTC for its history of respecting an important balance, a balance between encouraging all of us in the industry to use and improve our voluntary rating systems, while at the same time respecting the voluntary nature of those systems. And I'm delighted today that with a very few exceptions, what panelists across the day have not been calling for is legislation, legislation which would be violently unconstitutional, legislation like that that we saw in 1999 in the wake of Columbine. The focus has changed

towards a more productive, more constitutional focus and we're delighted to participate in that balance.

NATO has been participating in the movie rating system from its inception. I want to thank Jack Valenti and his team at the MPAA for involving us as partners, as we have been for the past 35 years. But I also want to emphasize the importance of another partnership and that's a partnership that we all need to improve and that's the partnership with America's parents. Our ratings enforcement numbers are good. Our ratings enforcement numbers are improving, as the most recently released survey shows. But we can never have truly satisfactory ratings enforcement numbers unless we have a true partnership with America's parents and we've had some good discussion today about how to improve that.

I would even suggest that at future FTC workshops, we focus more on having parents' groups talk about how they can help educate their members and how we can help supply them with information to educate their members because like another speaker earlier today, we, too, have reached out to some of these groups and have not found a satisfactory partnership yet in finding ways to educate America's parents.

So, let's talk about what theater owners are doing to enforce our rating system, and, first, I want to

emphasize that number that Mark described at the beginning because we're kind of proud of it. Our ratings enforcement number now is 64 percent. That means that 64 percent of these kids that attempted to buy tickets to R-rated movies were denied those tickets. To me, that's the most important question that the FTC asks, whether or not we do that by asking them their age, asking for ID or just spotting the fact that they are too young, a secondary question is not as important to me. The question that's fundamental to me is how many of them actually were able to buy the tickets to R-rated movies and we shut out 64 percent of them. That's up from 52 percent in the previous survey.

We're not satisfied. Even though we're at twothirds, we hope to get a lot higher and we continue to implement new mechanisms every year to continue to drive those enforcement numbers up.

Somebody earlier today said, it's all about the money. It's not all about the money. When you turn away 64 percent of kids attempting to buy tickets to movies, it means that we are turning away hundreds of millions of dollars a year to enforce our voluntary rating system.

So, I beg to differ. America's theater owners consider this effort not just important for our business, but important for the communities in which we operate and we

will continue to turn away a whole lot of money by
denying kids access to these movies.

Some of the specific methods that we take that has produced this improvement in our ratings numbers I want to highlight. If we can go to the PowerPoint presentation, I'll use some visual back-up for some of these points.

Some of the materials that NATO produces are going to be shown here, but certainly not all of them. This is an order form that we regularly distribute to our members allowing them to obtain for free educational materials to use at their locations. This one shows one example of a ratings poster and one example of an ID required placard to be posted in their theaters. Next slide, please.

This is available outside -- or was earlier, I don't know if all the copies are still there or not. But this is an explanation of the rating system itself, which we make available free of charge to all of our members to use not just to educate their own staff members, but to have available for America's parents if they want to learn more about the rating system. Next slide.

Anyone who joins NATO learns of the policies that NATO has adopted across the industry, and probably the most important policy that we've adopted is the ID

check, which we announced as a national policy in 1999.

2 This means that any time any one of our members believes

a potential patron at the box office to be too young to

buy a ticket for an R-rated movie, they are instructed to

5 ask for that person's ID, and we reinforce this policy in

a number of ways. This is just one way. When we send

7 out the membership stickers to our members to be

8 displayed in box office windows, we combine it with a

9 reminder about the carding program. Next slide.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It may be difficult to read from the back, but I'll explain what this is. I think it's very important -- and this has been discussed earlier today -- not just to give the ratings, but to give explanations for the ratings. I also welcome the constructive suggestions today on how to improve the language to explain the ratings. I'm sure Jack and I will be discussing that.

We currently take all the explanations for the movie ratings and distribute them in a number of ways. This is a publication that we send to all of our members in our magazine. It's all available online for our members. There are additional updates on a regular basis so that they know for the movies currently playing in their cinemas not just what the rating is, but why the film was rated that way. That way, our box office

attendants can be conversant in the various films if they get asked questions by parents in the course of selling tickets. Next slide, please.

We produced a training tape which is too long to show today, but it's extremely informative for our members on how to train their box office attendants and other employees how to enforce the rating system and I brought a copy of it here today. I'll give it to the Federal Trade Commission for their record. But it gives them real case examples, what to do when you see two people coming to the box office who appear to be of a certain age, how to ask for an ID, how to post information in the theater complex that explains the ID check so that patrons are not surprised when they get to the front of the line. All those types of questions are answered in our training video, again, distributed to members upon request free of charge. Next slide.

This is just to show that we do this also online in addition to in-person. All the materials are available to our members online. They can go online, order them and seek additional copies.

And then very quickly we'll just run through the last four slides. These are individual posters explaining the rating system which we encourage all of our members to post at their theater complexes and which

we have an increasing rate of participation in this part of the program as well. Okay, go ahead to the last slide, please.

And, again, the placard. Many of our companies have their own placards with their company brand name included so that they can reinforce the fact that their particular theater complex uses an ID check program and we encourage and applaud that. Nonetheless, we still distribute a generic placard for all of our members who don't have the resources to develop their own.

One important part of our program that's difficult to show in slides is our ratings compliance officer program. We decided as part of our 12-point initiative that each of our companies should appoint a senior managerial employee who has, as part of their job description, enforcement of the ratings. Randy is the Compliance Officer for Regal. We have other compliance officers in the audience, and these are very active jobs.

Twice a year, we bring together all the compliance officers from around the country into one location so that we can share information about what's working and what's not in ratings compliance. In addition to that, we have an email distribution system so that additional suggestions or ideas or reports that come up during the course of the year are fed back to our

compliance officers electronically.

When the media calls and says, we did a sting operation in City X and three of our kids got in and six didn't, we ask for identification of who did and who didn't and we contact the compliance officers for those companies so they can follow up with the locations reported.

Similarly, when the Federal Trade Commission completes its surveys -- and we will do it again with the raw data from this survey -- from their mystery shoppers, we take each individual piece of that data, each mystery shopper that visited every one of our theaters, we identify the time of the visit and the location and take that back to our theater companies who work with the managers within their organizations. All of our companies have policies on this, all of our companies train their own employees. It doesn't mean that every single one of our theater managers or employees follow those policies.

So, any time we get raw data about sitespecific location action, either from the media or from
the Federal Trade Commission or from our own experience,
we take it back to our members. And, again, thank you
for the opportunity to participate today.

MR. EICHORN: Thanks. Hal Halpin.

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

MR. HALPIN: Thanks, Mark. First, I'd like to thank the FTC for giving me the opportunity to discuss the initiatives that IEMA member retailers have made with regards to enforcement and education of the ESRB rating system. The Interactive Entertainment Merchants

Association is the non-profit trade association of major retailers of computer and video game products in the United States. Member companies of the IEMA collectively account for almost 90 percent of the \$10 billion annual interactive entertainment business in North America.

The IEMA and its members have taken some important and tangible steps toward educating parents and employees about the rating system and toward restricting minor's access to Mature-rated games. Many of our member companies range from Wal*Mart to Blockbuster, Toys "R" Us to Electronics Boutique and Target to Circuit City, just to name a few, have adopted the store policies restricting the sale of mature games at the point of sale.

Furthermore, our retail members have committed themselves to educating both employees and consumers about the games rating system through in-store initiatives in conjunction with the Entertainment Software Ratings Board, the video game rating system.

Since parents are involved in over 80 percent

of game purchases, we believe that the role of the 1 retailer should be to provide them with the necessary tools to make informed decisions about the appropriateness of the video game for their child. partnering with the ESRB, we have been actively involved 5 in improving in-store education of the rating system by 7 updating and increasing in-store signage at the store level.

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These consumer educational efforts, which will include various in-store displays and materials explaining the ESRB rating system, will vary from retailer to retailer based upon in-store layouts and other factors. Ultimately, the parental empowerment program is in place to educate consumers about video game ratings, allow parents to make intelligent entertainment choices for their families, placing the power to police children's video game playing where it belongs, with the parents.

Additionally, several of our retail members will or are already using other channels to promote the ESRB rating system which include ratings, information on their own advertisements, in-store merchandising and on their websites.

Some of our retail members have made other extraordinary efforts, such as incorporating the rating system into sales associate training and national managers conferences aimed at better educating staff about the ratings.

I'd like to conclude by stating that the IEMA and its members remain committed to working cooperatively with the FTC, members of Congress and the entire community to make sure that adults have the information they need to make informed choices for our children.

I understand that some have raised concerns about retailers' role in keeping age-inappropriate entertainment out of children's hands. Let me assure you that we are taking proactive steps to educate parents, consumers and employees about the rating system and the need to enforce the rating system to stem minor's access to M-rated games. In fact, we will launch a new initiative before the busy holiday shopping season to strengthen educational enforcement efforts. We look forward to announcing the details in the near future.

Our goal is to have greater awareness among consumers reflected in the FTC's annual report card. In just one year's time, we have seen a 10 percent drop in sales of M-rated games to minors. We recognize that this is not enough, but it is a step forward and we must continue to build upon this success.

We commend the FTC for doing an annual audit.

It is rightly the responsibility of a federal agency. We must now all join together, industry, parents, adults who shop for and take children to the stores, government officials and everyone else concerned about this issue, to make it a joint goal to increase education and awareness. Thanks, Mark.

MR. EICHORN: Jonathan.

MR. POTTER: Thank you, Mark. I'm pleased to be here today on behalf of America's leading online music and media services. The Digital Media Association was founded in 1998 to support the development of a healthy, competitive commercial marketplace for digitally performed and distributed entertainment. DMA's goal is to ensure that consumers and creators both benefit from the digital revolution. Our members develop and utilize technological advances to enable innovative efficient business models that reduce costs, enhance consumer value and optimize royalties and other benefits for creators.

DMA companies include Amazon.com, America
Online, Apple, Microsoft, Napster, Real Networks, and
Yahoo, as well as smaller companies such as Live 385,
Music Match and Music Now that have survived the dot-com
meltdown and have successfully captured a share of the
online music market. Each of these companies has a
direct relationship to consumers who are exploring,

enjoying and acquiring music and related product. Many are also offering consumers music videos and other forms of entertainment video services. These services suggest that DMA companies are similar to the record stores, video stores and movie theaters represented by my colleagues on this panel.

However, DMA companies generally have no physical interaction with our customers, so we cannot demand picture ID before sale or ensure that underage consumers are accompanied by an adult. In that regard, our companies address the same challenges of online service providers, such as Yahoo, AOL, Microsoft and Earthlink.

For several years, these companies have successfully provided parents with education, tools and information about how to affect and monitor their kids behavior online. These services do a terrific job promoting parental involvement and empowerment opportunities. Parents, however, ultimately decide whether and how to utilize these opportunities.

Online media companies are in the same position and must also help America's parents make smart decisions with and on behalf of their kids. An additional challenge facing online media companies is the relative youth of our industry. Technology is still being

developed, business models continue to change rapidly and consumer adoption is just beginning.

The good news is that in the last several months, our member services have gained a strong toehold with American consumers who have expressed enthusiasm for today's offerings and the continuing adaptations being developed. Morever, there's a clear difference that parents will recognize and appreciate between our member companies' managed offerings and so-called competitors that provide unmanaged networks and do not filter or label content for violence or pornography or ensure payment of royalties to creators.

Although DMA, as an industry organization, has not previously focused on the issues we are addressing today, our members companies, independently, have been quite focused and have incorporated several tools to empower parents. Several of our companies are also internet service providers, and to the extent that music and media services are tightly intertwined with the provision of internet service that these companies offer, notably companies like America Online and Microsoft, they provide tools that assist parents in establishing restrictions on the content that child may access.

For example, AOL Radio has a modified interface and channel selection and separate programming for kids

and for young teens and mature teens. They provide only edited versions of a song. The process is seamless to a young subscriber because the parent has already determined the appropriate level of filtering when first signing up for the service.

As you can appreciate, the process is not as simple when the music and media service is offered by an independent competitor that is reaching consumers through an open browser. Nevertheless, some independent services are working hard to help parents make wise choices with their kids.

Napster, for example, is relaunching today and has included several layers of parental options. When initially signing up for the Napster service, a subscriber has the option of excluding all songs that are from albums labeled with parental advisories by the recording industry. This filter will exclude songs that otherwise would be performed on Napster radio or that would be downloaded in response to a user-directed search.

A more sophisticated option is also offered. Subscribers can set up a separate password overlaying the option to exclude such songs so children using the account can be shielded from parental advisory albums, though a parent will not be.

Based on conversations with our member companies in preparation for today's workshop, it is my understanding that all are indicating to consumers when a song made available for on-demand listening or for download is from an album carrying a parental advisory.

As DMA companies continue to support parents' ability to make good choices, we look forward to keeping the Commission apprised of our progress. In particular, we note three areas that may require additional attention and, perhaps, collaboration with our partner industries.

First, we should strive for parental advisories that better match new models for content distribution. Current parental advisory designations for sound recordings are made only on a whole album basis. In effect, if one track on a CD warrants the parental advisory, all tracks get it because the CD package is labeled. One significant consumer advantage of the online music market is the opportunity to hear and acquire individual songs rather than only whole albums. Therefore, we in the recording industry need to be able to convey parental advisory warnings on a more granular, song-specific basis which has not traditionally been done.

This enhancement to the current advisory labeling system will require time and resources, but is

necessary to maintain the marketplace utility of important consumer information. Our concern is that if a child demonstrates that a parental advisory labeled song does not contain content consistent with the parental advisory, the parent may lose faith in the labeling system and stop filtering the child's online music access. In that home, regrettably, the value of the advisory labeling system will be eliminated.

Second, the recording industry has never extended the parental advisory designation and labeling system to music videos. If, in the future, music videos are rated, it is likely that online and offline stores and services would share this information with parents and enable parents to limit their kids' access to unsuitable content.

Third, online music providers often get their music and editorial material from third parties. These industry participants must be included in the discussion as they are critical participants in a successful parental empowerment system.

Finally, as you've heard earlier today, it is important to note that our company's greatest competition comes not from one another, but from unmanaged, unfiltered, black market networks whose greatest strength is generally that they are free and that make available

virtually unlimited quantities and selection of any kind of content whatsoever to anyone that joins that network.

As studies have recently shown, a staggering percentage of that content is inappropriate and there is no way to prevent any user, no matter how young, from accessing such content deliberately or inadvertently. We urge you, parents, advocacy groups and the FTC, to help us educate America's parents that free is definitely not better when the content being made available to children is unfiltered, unlabeled and inappropriate.

In closing, I thank the Commission for inviting DMA to participate in this important workshop. We appreciate the years of experience that other industries can share with us as the online media industries implement our commitment to empower America's parents.

MR. EICHORN: Thank you, Jonathan. I'd like to start phase two of the panel now, which is the discussion part, and I'll try to direct questions to one or two people, but anyone on the panel is welcome to chime in. If you want to put your table tent up, that would help me. But, otherwise, just yell at me if I don't see you.

I first want to talk about enforcement and what you all have learned from your experiences. Enforcement measures that particularly work or maybe that don't work, including the cash register system, Beverly, I'd wish

you'd address, and, Randy, if you'd talk about your enforcement experience in the theaters.

But, Beverly, why don't you start?

MS. PORWAY: I also want to thank Mark and the FTC for inviting Toys "R" Us to participate. I understand in some of the past workshops, retailers haven't had as much of a voice and we've relied on some of our partners in groups that are represented here, and we're very happy to be here and to talk about what we've been doing to try and help out with the sale of mature video games.

As a company, we're deeply committed to strong values and to family values, and that's why we've adopted certain very strict policies that are black-and-white policies that we actually enforce in our stores and we do in our stores. And the first one, as Mark mentioned, is our register prompt system, which is a point-of-purchase system that's intended to automatically detect the rating of a game through the barcode. If the game being purchased is an M-rated game, our cashiers are instructed and trained to ask two questions. If the person looks like they're under the age of 25 -- and we use 25 because some of our cashiers are 16 themselves. So, if we say 17, which is really the age, a 16-year-old may not be able to recognize whether somebody is 17. So, we've

raised the bar and we've told them that we want to use the age of 25.

They're to ask for identification. If the individual does not have identification, we won't sell the game to them. And we've recently, within the last year, adopted a zero tolerance policy with regard to that process.

We also ask, if mom buys the game, if they know whether or not it's an M-rated game and we explain what an M-rated game is because there are many times that mom and dad will come in and their kids will say, oh, I want to buy Vice City, and mom goes out to buy it and then when we explain, well, do you know this is an M-rated game, this contains violence, et cetera, many times mom won't buy the game.

We've found that it's a very successful program. It's been working well for us and we've taken it one step further. We post, and I have -- I, unfortunately didn't do a PowerPoint, but I do have an example of the cards that we post in our stores that describe the policy, that specifically states, it's the policy of Toys "R" Us not to sell M-rated video games to individuals under the age of 17. We have the ESRB rating M here. Cashiers may ask for proof of age if a guest appears to be under the age of 17 and we reserve the

right to refuse to sell that game if a guest cannot produce legitimate identification.

So, we have the cashier system, which will ring it up. We let people know up front, and on the back end, we train our employees on the system. We have them -- as part of the enforcement, we have them sign an acknowledgment that says they know about the M-rated system, they know about the proof of purchase system.

In the event they don't comply with it and we find out through either, you know, one of the FTC's actions that they don't comply with it, they acknowledge that we may take disciplinary action against them. We also post, in our breakrooms, the policy and we periodically distribute from our operations team, reminding everybody that we do have a zero tolerance policy and what we do to employees and what we can do in reminding them of what our policy is.

MR. EICHORN: Thank you. I did want to add that based on an analysis that we've done of the mystery shopper data, we're continuing to do these analyses, but one that we have done shows that the companies that have policies to restrict sale -- Toys "R" Us is one of them in the game industry -- of the six that we looked at that we know have policies, they did about 20 percent better than the others on these type of questions, the age

purchase question and as to whether the shopper noticed rating information.

Anyway, Randy, do you want to talk about the theaters?

MR. SMITH: Sure. You know, carrying the theme today, I am also a parent and, fortunately for all of you, I don't have time to tell you what each of my children have done to put these gray hairs on my head. But in addition to that, I'm a firm believer and advocate of the First Amendment and I'm also a firm believer of regulating what children see and do. The only difference with some of the panelists earlier is that I truly believe that that's my wife and I's sole responsibility when it comes to my children.

That being said, with respect to the theater industry, we certainly are pleased to be here today and welcome the opportunity to talk about what we've done, because we consider what we've done to have taken on a method on our part as well as our trade association to respect and fill our role with respect to the youths of America.

What the theater industry does and particularly what Regal does is kind of a three-fold or four-fold attack on this issue. First, we take the time to identify that any advertising in our theaters is age-

appropriate to the film being shown. We also take the time to ascertain that the trailers being shown during any particular film are appropriate with respect to the content and who they're being marketed to with respect to the feature film being shown on that particular day.

The third thing we do is we make certain that the individuals coming to see these films are actually age-appropriate, meaning that we make certain that they follow the rating. If they are not 17 or older, they do not get into R-rated movies unless they have a parent or adult guardian attend the movie with them.

The fourth thing we recently began doing is monitoring and making certain that we have certain types of video games in our facility or conversely certain types of video games are not in our facility. And the reason we take these efforts is we are in the family entertainment business and we intend to maintain that image and we intend to fulfill our obligations with respect to these ratings.

Now, how we do that specifically is that we have designed certain policies and procedures to ensure that these things are monitored and controlled.

Primarily, we begin with an education process and that requires a two-fold approach. We have to educate our public and we have to educate our employees. We educate

the public, primarily, by posting the information at the 1 box office so that if you walk up to one of our facilities and want to buy a ticket to Kill Bill and you see it's an R-rated film, you can look immediately over to the side to see what that R rating means. 5

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As a member of the public, you certainly have the right to decide what you want to see. That's your First Amendment right and we respect that, but we want them to understand, at least primarily up front, what they're saying. We also advertise the ratings in our newspaper ads; we also advertise the ratings on our web There is a plethora of information out there for pages. the general public if they want to know what they're The individuals that were here on some of going to see. the earlier panels also have some wonderful information. If you want it, you should go out and look at it before you go see these films.

The second approach we take is educating our employees and we went through a very sensitive process of training our box office personnel with respect to the ratings compliance and what our policies and procedures are, as well as our ushers who are the people that are basically monitoring and roaming the facility to make certain that these procedures are being complied with. And that's very important in our business because the

children of America are very creative and sometimes

they'll come in and they'll buy a ticket for a G movie

and then they go into that movie and they promptly jump

over to the R-rated movie they wanted to go see because

they couldn't buy the ticket. So, our ushers are trained

to watch for that.

In addition to that, some of our box office personnel, when you have a minor come up to the facility, many times they'll think that they look old enough to buy one of these tickets, so they'll come up and they'll say I want a ticket to Kill Bill and they'll promptly be carded and be denied a ticket. So, they'll buy another ticket. Well, typically what we do in a situation like that is when that minor purchases a ticket, we flag the ticket. There is a mark that's put on the ticket specifically to notify the usher that this person needs to be monitored while they're in the facility because a large percentage of time these individuals will then promptly leave the auditorium they were in, go to the restroom and mistakenly go into that R-rated movie afterwards.

So, the policies and the procedures and the enforcement and the education are very important. The last portion of this is the accountability, and we have a very strict policy with respect to this. We hold our

patrons accountable and we hold our employees

accountable. If an individual sneaks into one of our

facilities or buys a ticket and then sneaks into an

auditorium they shouldn't be in, then they are removed

from the facility, and that's how we hold the public

accountable.

We also hold the public accountable by requiring adults to attend the movies with their minors. They cannot simply purchase the ticket and allow their children to go into our facilities. They must attend with them.

As far as our employees, it's quite simple. They violate the policy, they're disciplined, and sometimes to the extent of termination.

I was telling a story to John at lunchtime. It's a challenge every day. We've had an employee once making money on the side selling tickets to minors because they knew that they couldn't purchase them. We had an individual who was, I guess, running a business out of some of our Southern California theaters because she was going from theater to theater standing in front of a box office buying tickets for minors and I assume she's getting a fee for that because she keeps popping up and we keep denying her access to our facilities after that. But these are things you live and learn from.

1	The final comment I would make is I agree with
2	John, this is not all about the almighty dollar, at least
3	not with the theater business, certainly not with Regal
4	Entertainment. We lose hundreds of thousands, if not
5	millions, of dollars by denying access to this 60 plus
6	percent portion of the population trying to get into
7	these movies. We lose hundreds of thousands, if not
8	millions, of dollars on some of these video games we have
9	now moved out of our facilities.

I wanted to read a comment from an individual - I'm not going to tell you who -- but we receive
comments from people periodically in the mail. This
individual writes, in March of last year, yeah, you guys
need to make it easier to get into R-rated movies. If
you want to make more money, try lowering the age or make
it easier for a minor to get in. I think it's stupid
you're so strict in letting people under 17 into R
movies. No other theater is that strict. I doubt that's
the truth. Honestly, if you ever wondered why you went
bankrupt, that's it.

So, we're doing what we can and we certainly honor our responsibility to do it and we'll keep doing it. There's always room for improvement.

MR. EICHORN: Thanks, Randy. Jonathan talked briefly about the ways that the online world may be

different and present different opportunities and challenges. So, Jules, I'll ask you to talk about what AOL is doing.

MR. POLONETSKY: Well, I certainly hope that the strict policies that I'm going to describe don't put us in bankruptcy. I think that what parents expect from an online service is the opportunity to use tools to make sure that their kids are having a trustworthy experience, and so, we work very closely with the various labels and standards bodies that describe their practices here today to make sure that those guidelines are part of what we promote, but in addition, that our parents have the tools so that they can use those guidelines to make sure that their kids are encountering the kind of media that they want them to encounter.

So, let me start with music, perhaps. AOL Music Net is completely integrated with AOL's porno controls. So, when a parent opens up an account with a credit card and creates screen names, accounts for their kids or their teens, we ask how old is the user that you're creating an account for, and then depending on the age, we put them in an appropriate experience.

So, if I open up an account for a kid, for instance, I actually don't have access to Music Net.

Now, if I open up an account for a younger or mature

teen, I'm going to get a different version of Music Net than the general adult access. Music Net will include, as someone mentioned, both the parental advisory label of a song, as well as a radio version, if it's available. The teen version, however, shows only the radio edited versions of those albums. We layer on top of that as well a dirty word filter for the teen who wants to try to be creative and just seek songs that have some profanity. So, there's some limit to access for that as well.

Radio@AOL, as Jonathan mentioned, is different for every level of the service. Kids actually have their own live radio show, and so, edited versions of songs are not played there at all. Certainly, the parental advisory, non-edited are not played. But if there is a song that has an edited version, for the youngest children, we'll actually assume that that's not necessarily appropriate as well. The teen radio, again, has its own version that will only play edited songs.

Our Music Search, which is another feature of the service outside Music Net, which is a premium service, always has parental advisory labels. If you click on the parental advisory label, you're taken to RIAA's site where you can find out any further information.

In addition, any of the advertisers -- so far

I've talked about the music that will play or that will stream or that will allow a user to download. The advertisers in areas of the service have to follow those same rules as well. So, an album with a PA label cannot be advertised in the teen's channel or, frankly, it can't be advertised anywhere on the service if the promotion appears to be geared towards a teen.

When it comes to games, we work very closely with the ESRB and any of our games have to have labels and, again, depending on the area of the service, any game that's promoted or that exists in the teen's channel of our service has got to be rated appropriately, either teen, everyone or early childhood by ESRB. If you're in the kids' area of the service, again, you've got to follow the appropriate guidelines as well.

What we're actually working on now, as well, is ensuring that in addition to including the rating, a user can easily set a mouse over and have the rating information displayed and instantly available and then obviously clicking through to the ESRB site for more information as well.

When it comes to movies, similarly, we'll only allow appropriately rated movies to be promoted in the teen's channel. So, PG-13, PG and G-rated movies are allowed in teens, and similarly with regard to the kids

only area.

We don't allow access to file-sharing sites
because of the uncertainties about what can be downloaded
and what's appropriate or what isn't appropriate. And
so, one of the things I just want to flag is that,
although we do an awful lot on the service to remind
parents that it's their responsibility and they've got to
take charge and they've got to have the computer in an
area of the home where they can be involved, but we also
recognize that parents are looking to us to give them
some of the tools so that they can have a little bit of
extra help, and in the areas where we've got the industry
standards that we can look to, it's been incredibly
useful to leverage off those so that we can make
decisions about what's either on the service or what
advertisers can promote onto the service.

MR. EICHORN: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. PORWAY: I just wanted to add that I know this morning there was a little bit of discussion about toysrus.com and I want to just kind of clarify whether or not we have content descriptors and what we have on our website, because we do, in fact, have content descriptors. What we have is special messaging. The way that our site works is that when you go to home page or R Zone, which is where the video games are sold, on the

left-hand bar the first thing you'll see under Help Desk is ESRB rating guide. You click on that and you go right over to a page that's within toysrus.com that lists the ratings on all video games with the descriptors that ESRB has recommended. It tells you what early childhood is and goes through each one and what they are.

We also have a special place on our website called Kid Zone -- Kid Safe Zone, where mom wants to go and not see any M-rated games or any T-rated games, there are only E and early childhood games. You can click on that and go there.

Every time you go to a game, you can click right back to the ESRB site. If you do go to a Mature-rated game -- for example, if you click on to Grand Theft Auto III, it will -- all mature and violent games will have a special message, for example, warning: violent content, mature themes make this game inappropriate for anyone under 17. Mob bosses need favors, gangs want you dead. It specifically says what the game is about.

Narrative driven, non-linear game play, hundreds of characters, 50 plus vehicles. It describes it so that you can't -- you know what's on the game. The other thing is that you cannot buy without a credit card on this website, so you have to be over the age of 18 to purchase anything on the toysrus.com website. But we

still go ahead and we describe exactly what's on the games and what's out there and we have a special area also for five to seven and three to four and exactly what's on the video games.

So, we also try to give as much information as you can on a website without having the interaction of being live and giving the information that we can, that mom needs to choose what she needs to choose for the family.

MR. EICHORN: Well, you've raised a point about special areas and maybe you can discuss it further in the brick-and-mortar context. Again, I know that the IEMA has encouraged retailers to move M-rated games up out of reach of smaller kids. But, Beverly, if you want to discuss what Toys "R" Us has been doing.

MS. PORWAY: If you've ever been -- Toys "R" Us has recently gone through a major change and we've redone our stores, and all of the video games are now located in an area that we call R Zone. To get in and out of R Zone, there's an electronic security device.

Within R Zone itself you'll find the M-rated posting I showed you before. You will find all the ESRB ratings. You will also find brochures that describe the ESRB. All of our advertising has the ESRB, and within R Zone, the M-rated games are right now -- we've instructed

our stores -- they're placed high up so that a younger child can't get to them. That's not working as well as we would like it to be, so we're now moving towards, and we've actually done it in about 80 of our some 700 U.S. stores, we're taking all the M games and we're moving them behind the counter, so that somebody can't even get to them, so that a younger child has to actually ask the cashier, I want that game, and the cashier is going to go, no, you're kidding, you can't have that.

So, we're keeping them away, we're pulling them out of full view. We keep it in a totally separate area so that if you want to get that game, you have to go into that area and you have to ask for it and it's going to be behind the counter, in hoping that that's another step that we can take so that we can keep these games out of the hands of kids who shouldn't have them.

MR. EICHORN: We're trying to keep on track here with the panel and we have probably about like four minutes left. So, if anyone wants to ask questions, I'll allow that for the next few minutes. Nell, go ahead.

MS. MINOW: Thank you, Mark. I have a question for Sean.

MR. BERSELL: Sure.

MS. MINOW: Sean, that was a terrific -- all of you, congratulations. That was tremendously constructive

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

and wonderful presentations, but particularly for you,

Sean. Two issues that I have had with video stores, one

is very often the clerks, who are young, will be showing

videos on the monitors in the store and they're sometimes

PG-13 or even R-rated videos. Is there any kind of a

policy on that?

And the other one is the more complicated issue of the unrated video and the unrated material. Very often, Disney or someone will come out with a video that will have all kinds of fabulous extras on DVD and they'll say this material is unrated. That doesn't mean there's anything inappropriate, it just means it hasn't got a rating. And then, on the other hand, there is this other category of American Pie and Old School, where they intentionally add material that would not have qualified for an R rating as a marketing device. How do the video stores deal with those two issues?

MR. BERSELL: Okay, on the first, generally, retailers will have policies regarding what can be shown in the store. Many retailers contract with third-party providers to develop in-store previews. Those are developed with the broad audience in mind and shouldn't have any inappropriate content in it.

Regarding people showing an actual movie in the store, the retailers that I've talked to have established

guidelines about times of day, like don't show an R
before 9:00 in the evening in the store. You may walk
into a store at 10:00 at night when presumably it's an
adult customer in there and see an R movie. That's
possible. But the retailers that I'm aware of have
policies in that regard.

The question about the DVDs, DVDs are rated based on the rating of the movie originally and there may be additional content in it. The boxes say the additional content is not rated. Video retailers can only go by the rating that is provided and we enforce that rating that's provided on the product. It would be unrealistic for each video retailer to review every DVD that comes in for all the content on them. Some of these have 24 hours worth of content on them. So, we go by the rating that's provided by the MPAA and we'll enforce that rating.

And then the unrated, there are many retailers who -- including the major retailers, who will not bring unrated product into their store, in addition to not bringing in NC-17. So, there is -- as I say, the major retailers will not carry that unrated version. Other retailers will bring that in, but they will treat it as if it is NC-17.

MS. MINOW: Thank you very much.

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

1 MR. EICHORN: John.

MR. FITHIAN: We also have to deal with unrated movies occasionally. A small percentage of movies released to America's theaters are unrated. I have a suggestion to our colleague industries. Just treat them like a restricted product. People don't have to comply with the rating system on the production side. If they don't want to go through the MPAA's ratings, they don't have to.

What our policy is for our membership is, if we get sent unrated movies, fine, we'll play them, we treat it like an NC-17. So, no kids can be allowed in.

And, secondly, the policy of video stores of banning -- some videos of banning NC-17s is a problem for us because what it does is encourage producers of movies to avoid NC-17 like the plague and that rating needs to be used. There are producers and film makers that make movies that are wonderful but appropriate for adults only and NC-17 isn't being used enough, and part of the reason is a lot of video stores won't carry NC-17 product. This may sound counterintuitive, but please carry the NC-17 product and then enforce the age restrictions on it.

We'll enforce them at the theaters. Producers will be encouraged to use the appropriate ratings for their movies.

1	MR. BERSELL: You're not going to be surprised
2	if I disagree with you on that, that a retailer should
3	carry any product that they don't feel comfortable
4	carrying. If they have a policy and their brand is we're
5	family-friendly, if they don't want to bring in NC-17, I
6	don't think we should be telling them that they have to
7	carry that product.

MR. FITHIAN: I can't regulate my members either. All I'm saying to you is help educate them that their policy is actually counterintuitive for family friendliness, because if stores and retailers will not use the NC-17 rating, then producers and movies will not make movies for the NC-17, and this is part of the reason why we have a way too wide swath of R-rated movies, and Billy Elliott and Kill Bill end up in the same rating because NC-17 is viewed as unviable.

We're working with Directors Guild and others to get that rating used again. And part of this is an educational process, and I'll, hopefully, help educate your retailers that not carrying NC-17s is actually counterproductive on a family-friendly basis.

MR. EICHORN: Okay. Dr. Walsh, one last question.

DR. WALSH: Do we have time for one more?

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

1 MR. EICHORN: One quick question.

DR. WALSH: I'm not going to be nearly as kind as Nell who complimented the entire panel, not the panelists, but the policies, because I think although there's a lot of variation across the various industries, in some of the categories that we're talking about, the retail is the weak link in the chain.

If we listened to just what everyone said, this is great news. But if you look at these statistics, these are not good. I mean, 81 percent of the time, four out of five times a kid can buy an inappropriately rated DVD, music recording, electronic game.

As Dick knows, we do our own secret shopper survey and we do it in the video game industry and we'll include that on our video game report card next month.

We were not nearly as generous as the FTC was. We sent a seven-year-old in who looked like he was five, and in a store with a policy, with a cash register prompt, the seven-year-old couldn't even see above the counter and the clerk helped him count out the money to buy Grand Theft Auto Vice City. Now, that's an extreme example, but our results aren't much better. I think that the -- I think -- and it was not a Toys "R" Us.

But I think on the retail, in terms of buying hard product, there's a lot of progress to be made and I

think that the retailers should look to the theater

owners as a way to do this because their results are so

much better, and I think the reason is, is I heard them

describe what they were doing. They take their

enforcement much more seriously. So, I think there's a

lot of room for improvement in this regard.

MR. HALPIN: Can I respond to that?

MR. EICHORN: Sure.

MR. HALPIN: We believe that there isn't a lot of room for improvement and a 10 percent per year increase in the results that we've seen is significant and tangible.

One of the major differences -- and I've had a similar conversation with two senators that you're familiar with -- when they compare us to NATO and they say, well, if they can do it, why is it that your members can't just as easily, you need to keep in mind that we -- our members sell thousands of SKUs normally. I mean, they don't sell just one product, and so, therefore, the people who are getting trained need to understand this rating system. That's why we're working so closely with the ESRB in that process.

It takes a longer time, but if you'll notice, you'll see the trend over the last four years has been very positive.

1	MR. FITHIAN: And, also, in defense of our
2	fellow industries, we've been doing this for 35 years and
3	we've had a rating system since the '60s and a lot of our
4	policies have been in place for quite a while. I'm very
5	encouraged to see that every single industry had
6	improvements in their rating enforcement over the course
7	of the last year and that's the trajectory. We'll all
8	continue to work to improve what we're doing. But we've
9	been doing it for 35 years and some of these industries
10	didn't exist 10 years ago.
11	MR. EICHORN: On that note, I want to thank all
12	the panelists for a great panel, and please, if you're on
13	the Next Steps panel, please come on up.
14	(Applause.)
15	(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
16	MS. ENGLE: Good afternoon. The final panel of
17	the day is something we've entitled Next Steps, and we're
18	hoping to look towards the future a little bit on where
19	we can go from here. Most of the panelists have been

First, Doug Lowenstein. Doug is President of the Entertainment Software Association and he's held that position since its inception in 1994.

introduced previously, so I won't introduce them. But I

wanted to briefly introduce the two new panelists.

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Dr. Michael Rich, Dr. Rich is Assistant

1	Professor of Pediatrics at Harvard Medical School, an
2	Assistant Professor in Society Human Development and
3	Health at the Harvard School of Public Health. Dr. Rich
4	is a member of the American Academy of Pediatrics Public
5	Education Committee. He is also Director and co-founder
6	on the Center on Media and Child Health at Children's
7	Hospital in Boston, which is committed to improving the
8	understanding of the effects of communications and
9	entertainment media on child and adolescent health. Dr.
10	Rich came to medicine after a 12-year career as a film
11	maker.
12	And Dr. Rich, I believe, has a PowerPoint
13	presentation that he'd like to make before we get
14	started.
15	DR. RICH: Thank you, Mary. If I could have
16	the first slide.
17	As Mary said, I'm here representing not only
18	the Center on Media and Child Health, which is trying to
19	use the tools of evidence-based medicine in public

In addition, and perhaps with the most longevity, I'm here to represent the American Academy of

of children and adolescents.

health, rigorous objective scientific studies to better

characterize and respond to the effects of media, both

positive and negative on the physical and mental health

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Pediatrics, which is 57,000 pediatricians across the U.S.

2 -- probably most of your kids' doctors -- that has been

3 concerned about the issue of media and its effects on

4 kids for over 25 years.

I have to say, having done this a number of times, I really want to applaud the spirit that has been shown here today. I think this has been the most collegial, the most respectful and collaborative discussion we've had to date, and I'm also heartened by the technology that we've heard about that can allow the focused delivery of media content to appropriate audiences.

One thing I've been concerned about, actually, though, is a sense of fatalism about some of what we've heard, a sense that the folks in the industry are doing everything they can and the feeling that other people feel that it's not good enough. I think that from my perspective I can possibly offer a ray of hope. Next slide.

I have to say I think I've got the best job in the world. I get to keep healthy kids healthy. Very little of my work is involved with pulling kids from the brink of death. But it's a tougher job than it appears. It is really one of education, one of educating children and parents about the risks inherent in that. I have the

wrong number up here. I got informed that we are now 2,000 more members than I thought. But I and my pediatric colleagues do take care of the single parented kids, the latchkey kids, the kids who are physically and sexually abused. We're the ones who see them first in the emergency departments of this country, sometimes in police stations and incarceration centers.

The fact that we are concerned about media effects on these kids' health is neither inconsistent with our care for those kids, nor is it a distraction from them. Indeed, I think it is the kids who have limited or no parents who, in many ways, are most vulnerable to the effects of media because that expands to fill the available space in terms of role model setting, et cetera.

And I also agree with what has been said here, that our First Amendment right should be preserved at all costs. It is the core to our freedom and that that includes our right to choose what we listen to here and play as far as games, and that is the mark of a humane and compassionate society, which I think we also are.

In order to do this, as with the case of nutrition or immunizations or anything else we talk about in our day-to-day practice, we must be guided by science, not opinion, not values or ethics, but science, in making

the recommendations to you and to other parents about what is best for your kids. You have the choice and the responsibility ultimately to make those choices. Our job is to put the tools at our disposal and the knowledge we have to your service in making that choice.

I think that it is true what has been said here earlier that taste is subjective and, in fact, values and appropriate values are also subjective. But the physical and mental health outcomes that may be found in relationship to use of some of these materials are objective. They are quantifiable and they're very real. I, and many of my colleagues, have picked up the pieces, and importantly, we have tools to deal with this and to understand this better. Next slide.

I'm going to do a swoop back in history very quickly and look at child and adolescent morbidity and mortality, the things that kill kids and the things that make them sick into their adult life. A hundred years ago the things that were killing kids were infectious disease, birth defects and cancer. We could not cure them, we did not have the tools, and we found the cure for them in the prevention, by dealing with crowded housing, poor sanitation and pollution, social tools for public health.

Fast forward 100 years and the leading killers

and injuries to kids are unintended injuries, homicide
and suicide. The leading morbidities that they carry
into their adult life are substance use, sexual risktaking and nutrition. These are all outcomes of health
risk behaviors.

In trying to struggle with these, we are a cat trying to catch our tail and we have to understand that these health risk behaviors are learned and we need to learn from history and look to an environmental source.

Next.

So, we're investigating the epidemiology. We look at the issue of exposure, how are we infected, the effects, what happens to us, the mechanism, how does it work on us to change us, and what can we do to intervene. Next.

A study done at the turn of millennium by the Kaiser Family Foundation showed that, no surprise, essentially 100 percent of American homes have television. What it also showed was that more homes in the U.S. have five or more TVs than have one TV. It also showed that 32 percent of two to seven-year-olds and 65 percent of eight to 18-year-olds have TVs in their bedrooms. Those numbers, based on the study released by Kaiser yesterday, have gone up.

It showed that the average eight to 18-year-old

in this country used media for six hours and 32 minutes every day and that they multi-tasked, that they were using multiple media simultaneously, and when you roll those out in terms of cumulative effect, it was seven hours and 57 minutes of exposure. Next.

I know it sounds like you're getting a test at the end of it. I just want to give you some key research that's out there and this is very solid legitimate research that has been studied over the years. These are tests -- there were people who went into a classroom in Western Canada, a small town, a town that did not have television, and looked at the aggressive behavior between first and second graders. The town introduced cable TV, they came back two years later and measured 160 percent increase in aggressive behavior between kids in the same community with the same groups of kids, obviously siblings because it was two years later, but no other factors were changed and everything was controlled for concerning that.

There is a study that was done in New York. I will jump over the studies in South Africa in the interest of time. In New York, that followed kids from the ages of 18 to 30, and bottom line is, with all other social factors controlled for, that they found that the highest levels of violence through the life span were

those that had the cumulative, most exposure to television. Next, please.

Two more studies in the last year basically showed the same thing, and this is not just early childhood exposure. This is exposure into adolescence.

Next.

So, one of the things we have at our disposal is to try to figure out what we can do, what science can tell us in this case and how we can base this on measurable health outcomes. One of the problems has been, quite frankly, that this research has been done in at least nine major academic disciplines, none of whom read each other's literature. There is no cross communication or there is very little.

So, one of the things that we're trying to do right now is to collect the literature and to review it for scientific rigor and validity. We have, at present, over 5,100 papers that deal with this issue and this comprehensive library of the existing research is going to be mounted on the web, hopefully, by the end of this year for everyone to access and to use in their decision-making. The website is under construction, but that is its URL right there. Next slide.

I will be the first to admit that the research is of variable quality. That means that there is some

stuff there that is not that good. That also means there's some stuff there that's very good.

The science is not perfect and it is not complete, but my reality and that of my pediatric colleagues is that every day we are faced with a two-year-old or an eight-year-old or a 15-year-old and their parents who are saying, you've got to give us your best assessment of the risk and benefit to my children. We have to make decisions every day on things like tobacco use, on things like safety belts and car seats as to what the best possible outcome we can determine is for this child. There's a need for standardization of measures and there's a need for a lot more research.

However, the overwhelming trend in the research to date indicates that there are three major effects of exposure to violence in media. That is, increased aggression and violent behavior, which we've heard about already; the mean world syndrome, the concept that media inflates the prevalence of violence in the world and makes kids afraid. Kids have sleep disturbances and nightmares. We have even seen kids with post traumatic stress disorder as if they were Vietnam vets simply from media exposure.

And, finally, desensitization, that is something that affects us all. And I think one of the

things we heard earlier today is these ratings are the ones parents give because we have a "high threshold in society for violence." From my perspective as someone who takes care of children, that's not a defense for the steady lowering of our restrictiveness on ratings. It is, in fact, an indictment of us as a society and an acknowledgment that desensitization has occurred. It really has occurred. Next slide, please.

So, how real are these health effects of media exposure? And the best way to do it in, you know, sort of colloquial terms is, what is the strength of the correlation between exposure and health risks and how does it compare to other known health risks that I and your pediatricians probably talk about every day. Next.

Let me show you the size of the correlation between calcium intake and bone mass. Drink your milk. Next.

Between passive smoke and lung cancer. Next.

Between lead exposure, eating of paint chips and lower IQs. Next.

Between condom non-use and HIV acquisition.

22 Next.

And between media exposure and aggressive behavior. This is a meta analysis of hundreds of studies. This is not a single study. This is shown time

and time again in varying ways with varying methodologies. And this was done with television, portrayals that are watched by kids. Video games are not included in it. And early research in video game violence indicates that children who not just watch violence, but who become active players in it and become people who are rewarded for violent behavior are rehearsing behavioral scripts. They are learning to do things.

And the questioner from the Milwaukee City
Council who came before and who talked about this as a
simulator, a violence simulator and a violence practicer,
is right on from our experience as child developmental
experts.

We have decided, as a society, that we want objective, valid information as to what is in the food that we feed our children's bodies. We want to pick up the can and read the content labels and we want to trust that that is a scientific and objective report of what we're feeding our kids' bodies. We do not have the same thing for what we feed our kids' minds. We need to know what we're feeding them in an objective and quantifiable way. And we need to know what the outcomes of that exposure are likely to be in our best guess.

We can't tell you that if you smoke that

cigarette you will get lung cancer, but we can tell you
what your chances are. We can do the same with media.

Next.

So, finally, how do we deal with this in our next steps? First of all, I think we would all agree in the spirit of collaboration we've had today that parents and children need the tools to protect their health and safety. Just like we talk about car seats and seatbelts and bicycle helmets and not smoking.

I think we need to take a step back and instead of tinkering and fixing little things about systems that have been around for a long time, in some cases, and less long in others, to step back and say, let's apply scientific measurement tools to these and see how well they work, see how well they're going.

I applaud the industries' desire to create these systems and to improve them and work them, and the American Academy of Pediatrics, in fact, has a brochure that we give to our constituency, our pediatricians to put in their office waiting rooms that educate people about the rating systems so they can use them. We also recognize, however, that they are an imperfect system and that's something I think we've talked about here today in three ways.

One is that parents do, as we have heard, find

them both confusing and overwhelming. There's just too much, it's not clean and they don't understand them.

Also, I would argue that both kids and parents are sophisticated consumers to the point where they distrust industry ratings because they lack objectivity from somebody who serves to profit from them. I don't think that you would like it if I recommended to you a certain medication for your child's pneumonia based on studies done by that pharmaceutical company. We need to have the equivalent of double-blind, randomly-controlled trials to understand what these media are doing to us.

And, finally, there are validity studies, one of them done by Dr. David Walsh who's on this panel, that reveal significant deficiencies in these rating systems when they are measured against scientific tools.

Finally, you know, I think that we need to work together, industry, consumers, doctors, children and children's advocates and parents toward an objective, content-based media labeling on the outside of the can, just as we do for our beef stew. And I'm really encouraged by the spirit of today and I think that this is a new level in collaboration and I hope that we will move forward from here for the benefit of all of our children. Thank you.

MS. ENGLE: Thank you, Dr. Rich. I'd like to

focus the discussion now on what we can do moving forward and, in particular, I think one thing everybody is pretty much agreed on today is that parents need more information, that parental involvement in this area is essential. And so, I thought it would be most helpful if we could talk about what's known about how parents get information in this area and how we can improve that.

Dr. Rich mentioned the need for scientific measurements here, and I think, actually, that's something that's lacking. We, the FTC, have advocated for greater information in advertising and on labels. That's something that we advocate across the board, no matter what it is, to provide people with information when they're seeing ads and at the point of purchase. And so, that's a recommendation we made in our report to have more rating information in ads and it's something we're seeing as happening more.

Another thing was to provide parents with information. The industry established a website called parentalguide.org in 2000 and I'd be interested in knowing -- hearing from the industry members about what they know about if parents are accessing that or if that's something that parents are aware of. So, could any of you speak to that?

Parentalguide.org is a joint project of the

four, music, movies, television and --

MR. LOWENSTEIN: Mary, I actually -- I don't know the numbers on parentalguide.com, but I'd certainly be more than happy on behalf of our industry to work with the other industries and consumer groups and the FTC to look for creative ways to drive traffic to that site. I think it has a lot of good information on it. And no matter what the numbers are, I think we can all agree that the more we can drive people to places where they can get information, the better.

I think another thing that I'd like to see happen, at least from our industry, is we've heard a lot about common sense rating systems and about David Walsh's group. I think from ESA's standpoint, we would certainly encourage ESRB to put a link on its website to other rating system websites so that people can not just get the ESRB ratings, but if they're interested in getting more depth and more information, that they can find it that way.

I think the hallmark of what we've tried to do as an industry over the 10 years that I've been part of this industry is to continue to find ways to meet that balance between giving people reliable and credible information, and we remain committed to that. I'll never say the job is ever done. I also would reject the

1 suggestion, though, that we have our heads in the sand.

We've made a lot of changes in this industry over 10

years, we've changed a lot in our rating system. We

4 haven't taken every piece of advice we've been given, but

5 we've certainly taken a lot of them and we remain open to

6 all the advice and all the input.

David, earlier, alluded to his conversations with the ESRB people on the rating review. They didn't just talk to David, they talked to about 40 people. When the system was originally set up, it was actually set up by an expert in child psychology and child development. So, suffice it to say that looking for ways to get information out is something I'm personally committed to and I think our industry is as well.

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Rich, you mentioned that AAP has put together a brochure on the rating systems. Do you have any information about whether parents are using that or find it helpful to them or where they're getting information or where they see -- where parents see the information deficit as being?

DR. RICH: Yes. Actually, that is just one piece of a much larger initiative called Media Matters that the AAP instituted in 1997, which has a multipronged approach. It is one of educating our member pediatricians in issues around media, encouraging them to

include it as part of their anticipatory guidance with parents and their children as to what to expect in this coming year or coming period that the child will be going through to make sure that it is placed in perspective and relationship to the other health risks to the kids.

I think that to be perfectly honest it has had variable application among pediatricians. I think when I talk to people about it, I have found that some people say, yeah, I was amazed my pediatrician brought that up or suggested that. But other people have said, no, it's never been brought up. So, I think that we have more work to do, quite frankly, in educating our pediatricians, many of whom feel very time-pressured, you know, when they're seeing a kid's one year visit and they're limited to as little as seven minutes by an HMO to catch up on your seven-year-old. And it's hard.

We added on a lot when we added car seats and immunizations, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. We do a lot in that period of time, however long that may be.

But I think that the other side of that is for those parents for whom a pediatrician has said, this is important, pay attention to this, it carries a lot of weight and it makes a big difference. So, we have stayed the course with that and continued and expanded it as much as we could because we realize how important an

issue it is, that it's truly an environmental health
issue now that we're in the information age. These kids
are saturated in media and we are seeing the outcomes,
unfortunately, in the emergency departments.

MS. ENGLE: Is it your sense, Dr. Rich, that parents have -- I mean, the title of your program was Media Matters -- that parents have a sense that it does matter. I mean, I was actually really shocked by the statistics that came out yesterday from the Kaiser Family Foundation that a quarter of kids under the age of two have a television in their bedroom. You're talking about babies and toddlers in diapers. So, I'm wondering if -- you know, hopefully they're watching Baby Mozart in there.

DR. RICH: Don't bet on it.

MS. ENGLE: Given the amount of time that kids are spending with media, do you have a sense of whether parents are concerned about this issue that they think -- you know, whether they are even trying to monitor their kids' involvement and not being successful or they're not even really monitoring it?

DR. RICH: I think that if I were to characterize the general feeling among parents in this country that I've talked to, both in my own practice and in related practices, but also in talks that I give about

this, it's that there is this vague and growing sense of unease about what is this doing to my kid's head, what is this doing to my child, why is my child fat.

But I think that they haven't yet formed a sense of a good way to respond to it, an effective way to parent their kids and to respond to that sense of unease and what they should do about it. That's why I think we need to bring the voice that we bring to bear on urinary tract infections and motor vehicle collisions and HIV to bear on this issue, to say, we do have the science, we have child development and child health experts, we have the social science tools to measure these things.

Can we apply them in a way that we can give you the data and we can give you the interventions that you, as an individual parent, and you in your communities can use to change this for your kids and replace that sense of unease with a sense of active response?

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Walsh.

DR. WALSH: I'd like to just comment on that as well. As Doug mentioned, he's been in this field for 10 years and that's about how long I've been specifically focused on the impact of media on children. I think over those 10 years, I think I've learned a lot and I have -- our organization has taken a major step back over the past year-and-a-half to refocus our efforts and I think

that something is needed before parent education and I

think -- and it's related to what Dr. Rich just said -- I

think it's parent motivation.

I don't think enough parents really do take this seriously enough because they don't realize how powerful it is. And I think every study that comes out almost reinforces that.

As I was talking with Doug before the panel started, I think part of our role is to always kind of keep heat on the industry. But I really believe that a major part of our effort now is going to be directed at parents because we have to motivate parents -- parents aren't going to use the rating systems if they don't think they're important. And so, a large part of our effort is what I mentioned earlier, this media-wise movement, which is really to build awareness first.

Until parents understand the impact of the information that Dr. Rich had on that slide, they're not going to be motivated to take it as seriously as putting their kids in a seatbelt or some of those other things.

And so, I think going forward, I think that we have a lot of work to do and that's where, I think, we're going to put a lot of our -- have been putting a lot of efforts.

And if there is an opportunity to partner with various sectors of the industry itself to try to build that level

of awareness, I think that could be a powerful thing.

MR. LOWENSTEIN: Mary, if I could just add a couple points. First of all, I really appreciate your keeping the heat on the industry. It is so cold in this room that we've. . .

The second comment I'd make is, we heard the statistics several times today. The FTC found that 83 percent of the time parents are involved in the purchase and rental of games for their children. That's important to understand because what it tells you is the chances are, if a child has Grand Theft Auto, if a 12-year-old has it, mom and dad gave it to him. Now, you can't indict the industry for that.

You may not like the game, I may not like the game, that's not the point. The point is people are making decisions at the point of sale, they're ignoring information that's available to them. Maybe they're not aware of all the information. But I completely agree, we need to pound on that, and we will work with your organization and Dr. Rich to do that in any reasonable way we can.

I think that, you know, you had a six-point set of principles that I've read about parents and their habits, what they ought to be doing, how much time kids should watch TV, play video games. I didn't see anything

on that that we couldn't agree with. So, you know, I
think there is room to collaborate on these things, even
if we can -- you know, we might disagree at the margins
on some of these issues.

MS. WHITE: I just want to add, Doug, that I would also like to put some more heat on you. I'm cold as well, but I'll send some your way whenever you'd like.

I want to say that I'm disappointed at the secret shopper survey. In the past two years, it only went down 10 percent, I believe. Five percent a year less kids are able to buy a Mature-rated video at retail. At this rate, you know, it's going to be 13 years before we get to zero. I don't think that's acceptable.

So, what I would like to ask you is, I do agree parents have to be responsible, but they're often not at retail with their children. I would like to know why you have been suing every different municipality -- we had someone from Milwaukee earlier, there's people here from the New York City Council. I'd like to know why you have been suing every city that has wanted to help parents just like with -- and with cigarettes and alcohol, we don't expect parents to be there at retail and stop their kids from doing a purchase, it's done at the store. So, I'm wondering if you're willing to work with us on that?

MR. LOWENSTEIN: Sure. I'll be happy to

respond to that, Daphne. First of all, I agree, the numbers are not where they should be. That's very disappointing to me. We've made that clear to the retailers that we think that they need to re-double and re-triple their efforts. I agree 10 percent improvement a year is better than no improvement --

MS. WHITE: In two years.

MR. LOWENSTEIN: In two years is better than no improvement, but it's certainly not what it needs to be. And I can tell you that we have continued our efforts to encourage retailers to take more seriously their policies and their responsibilities in that area.

With respect to the lawsuits, it's really a simple matter. You know, the frustrating part about this to me is we really do agree on the objective of having retailers not sell games, but it is absolutely crystal clear that the laws are unconstitutional. That's what the courts keep ruling. Now, I believe in the Constitution. Jack made a very powerful presentation this morning on the First Amendment. I can't say it as eloquently, but it is an issue to me that if we start tolerating the enactment of laws that regulate the sale of content, that's a slippery slope. I don't believe it. It's not healthy, not only for our industry, I don't believe it's healthy for the country.

I would much prefer to get retail enforcement up through voluntary means. We're going to work at it, we're going to keep working at it, doing what we can. I'll work with you at it. But we will continue to litigate against laws that we believe infringe on the First Amendment because I don't think they're healthy for this country. Leave aside whether they're healthy for this industry. I think they're bad policy and I think we need to exalt the First Amendment, not run it over.

MS. ENGLE: And, actually, I mean, I almost hesitate to raise the point, but setting aside even the First Amendment and so forth, you know, restrictions -- legal restrictions on purchases is not a panacea. I mean, I can understand how it could help. But it's not going to solve the problem. In the alcohol industry, 20 percent of the alcohol in this country is consumed by underage people even though there are age restrictions there, obviously, that are legally enforced. So, that's not going to solve the problem.

MS. WHITE: It's a start. I mean, there's a lot of -- we have to take a lot of different tactics. Obviously, there's the online sales. But I feel like we've got to take some strong steps somehow and I think the industry is sounding very reasonable and keeps saying, let's self-regulate, but the media industry, TV

in particular, has been talking about self-regulation for 30 years and it's been a very slippery slope into the gutter, if I might say so, and the other industries are following.

So, I just don't -- I mean, if there was more serious improvement, if it was more than 5 percent a year, you know, I'd say, let's go for it. But it's been a long time and they keep saying that. One other thing I'd like to say is whenever -- I've seen cases. When it's a choice between the First Amendment or a trademark or copyright infringement, industry always protects copyright and trademark first. First Amendment drops a little bit if it's a money issue. I really don't think these people are paid to protect the First Amendment. This is not the ACLU they're working for. I mean, it's the -- they're just hiding behind the First Amendment.

And I used to be a journalist, I support it, too. I think it's very important. I'm using my First Amendment rights here and I'm very grateful for that. But I don't really believe that's what all these people are protecting.

MS. ENGLE: Well, Daphne, as the head of a grassroots organization, what's your experience been in terms of what's motivating parents and how to get parents

motivated to pay more attention to these issues and use the information that's available? Because I think there is -- certainly, there's information that's available. It could be improved, more information could be made available and we don't want search costs to be too high. I mean, not everyone has access to the internet and you don't necessarily want to have to go online every time to figure out if you want to take your child to this movie or allow them to see it.

But, in your experience, what's motivating parents?

MS. WHITE: Well, I mean, I would say the parents that I deal with, which are obviously the subgroup -- I deal with parents who are very concerned. I think they just feel overwhelmed and frustrated by the amount of violence that's marketed to kids and there's really no one to talk to or no one to complain to. I mean, if a movie director or producer doesn't like the rating they got, they can go to the MPAA ratings board and appeal it and shave a few seconds off here and there, get a change.

I don't know if the same is true with video game ratings or not, if you have appeals process. But parents have nowhere to go, no one to talk to. So, the ones I deal with feel very frustrated. It's not also

just the rating, it's what's being marketed. You know, whatever the rating is, there's not that many choices. For example, a game like Grand Theft Auto Vice City, for people who like to play video games, is a very innovative, very creative, offered a lot of things that other games didn't. But parents don't have another game to take their children to to say, look, this game has the same engine, can do the same creative things, but you're not beating people over the head and killing prostitutes.

I mean, unfortunately, it's the violent things that teenage boys want, and when the industry talks about the average age of players, half of players are women, women are playing mahjong, they're playing other games other than the violence. It's the violence that's marketed to kids. So, that's what I hear is the

There's just not that many choices that are hyped that

are marketed to kids.

frustration.

MR. LOWENSTEIN: Mary, just a very brief data point. To suggest that the only games the industry is making and marketing are violent games is pure bull. If you look at the numbers, 90 percent of the top 20 best-selling computer games in 2002 were rated E or T, 80 percent of the top 20 selling console games were rated E or T, 60 percent of all games in 2002 were rated E, 23

1 percent were rated Teen.

There are sports games in which huge advertising budgets are put behind, skateboarding games. There are Mario games, there are Pokemon games. I mean, the volume of benign content out there is massive. Sims, SimCity, games that teach, games that challenge. There are plenty of choices out there and it's just simply not accurate to say that the industry doesn't promote anything but violent entertainment.

MS. VANCE: Just one more data point. We've actually had a 1-800 number, as well as a consumer online hotline available on our website for some time. We welcome consumer complaints, we encourage feedback from consumers, whether it's positive or negative on every single video game that gets rated or every computer game that gets rated. That 800 number has been available for years and our consumer online hotline has been available for at least a year. So, there's plenty of places that consumers can go if they're motivated.

MS. ENGLE: Dr. Walsh, I was wondering if you had any thoughts about -- I was intrigued to hear you say you're changing your focus in motivating parents to get them to care more and I was wondering --

DR. WALSH: I think part of what we're trying to do is increase motivation because I think, as I said

earlier, even though part of our role is to keep the heat
on the industries, I think that the industries have
responded. Could they respond more? Sure, absolutely.
But I think there has been a lot of movement in recent
years.

And now, I think another major effort -- and I think it's a very, very big challenge -- is to motivate parents, not to give them the information because they won't use it unless they think it's important, and I think we have to motivate parents. Part of what we're trying to do is use some of the same techniques and things that media knows how to do to get people's attention. We've been adopted by a professional advertising agency to help get the message out, and it's not just violence, it's every other serious problem, like obesity. So, they're creating a series of messages like See Jane Not Run.

You know, because we have -- there are a lot of reasons for parents to pay attention to media besides the topic of our conversation today. And some of them are very, very serious health issues that Dr. Rich probably knows a lot more about than I do. And I think that we have to really get the word out. I mean, that's what we're really going to focus on. And we'll continue to do things, but we're really going to focus on trying to

create the media-wise movement, watch what your kids watch.

MS. ENGLE: Any other comments?

DR. RICH: I'd like to second what Dr. Walsh just said. I think we have proven time and time again as a society that we can wrestle with complex problems, with lots of gray areas, lots of confounders, lots of issues that play, and come up with a consensus response that is, first of all, you know, not perfect for everybody but better than what we had and is always dynamic, is always changing. So, I think that the frustration we are expressing and hearing today is partly part of that process.

While making absolutely no parallels in terms of the severity of the danger, I want to remind us all that in the space of a generation, we have completely changed our attitude toward tobacco, and that has been a public education, public motivation campaign that has happened from the top down, from the bottom up, from the inside out, and we -- you know, the attitude of kids toward tobacco today compared to the attitude of kids toward tobacco in 1960 is probably 180 degrees different.

So, I want to offer a sense of hope that we can deal with this, we can deal with this all together.

We're dealing with an industry that is not producing a

For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301)870-8025

product that is, when used as directed, fatal to people the way the tobacco industry is doing. We're dealing with an industry that has also been responsible for giving us experiences we could never have in real life. Very good experiences, very educational, very life-enhancing experiences.

And I think that one of the things that attracted me and I think some of the other people on this panel who are concerned about the power of media is that we love media, that it is something that we love and care about and also respect as a very, very powerful tool, that when used thoughtlessly can hurt, but when used thoughtfully can make us better than ourselves. And I think that that is the task, I think, ahead of us now is to educate and get this information out there that science has taught us, that experience has taught us and come up with a common solution that works so that we can all find where our compassion, our humanity, our ability to care for our children can be best expressed.

MR. VALENTI: I want to pay tribute to the National Association of Theatre Owners whose President, John Fithian, is in this audience. I think they have done so splendidly in a very difficult task of being able to bar our children from seeing certain movies. It's not easy to do and it's costly. And I think the Federal

Trade Commission, quite properly, I think a week ago,

praised them for the work they've done. And I want to

salute John Fithian who's been a leader in that and he's

a full partner in the rating system. So, I salute you,

John. It's been a great job. You've done an

6 extraordinary job.

MS. ENGLE: And he's a fellow UVA law grad.

MR. VALENTI: And I want to point out, I think Dr. Rich is right on relying on surveys, we certainly do. And I think the studies that you've had are compelling and persuasive and they intrude in on us. We've done the same thing, Dr. Rich, and the voice we most admire and the voice we listen to with the greatest interest and attention is the voice of the parent.

So, we have, as you were probably here this morning and I won't bore you with that same slide in which for the last 34 years -- Dr. Walsh, you've been in the rating business, I guess, 10 years, so has Doug, and I've been in it longer than Methuselah, for God's sake, but I must say that we rely on the rating system. We rely on the polling that we do, 2,600 people, as I said earlier this morning, nationwide, strict market research protocols. And the parents are responding. Parents with children under 13 like this rating system, trust it and we have a 98 percent recognition of the rating system.

My final point, I think it's an absolute piece of insanity for parents to take five, six, seven, eight-year-olds to see R-rated movies. I just don't understand how they do it. They must be either dumb asses or they don't care. And I guess that's a -- and, certainly, I wouldn't take a child into a theater under five. You've got 1,000 wonderful video cassettes and DVDs for children to watch. God, I don't understand why you want to take them to a theater when you've got the most wholesome kind of things for children to watch. If that's what you want to do, you ought to be reading to them or have them in front of a television set.

But I had a personal experience, Dr. Rich. A friend of mine -- more than an acquaintance, I think, I went into an R-rated movie in a theater -- I go to the theater at least once or twice a week because I want to see a film the way it ought to be seen so you have an epic viewing experience you can't duplicate in your own home. But this was a pretty tough R-rated movie.

And I saw this friend with his seven-year-old son in there and I went up to him and I said, Jim, you know, I don't want to intrude, but I think you ought not be taking your seven-year-old son. He turned on me like a jaguar springing out of a tree as if he -- he said, I don't need you to tell me how I conduct the life of my

child, and I backed off. What are you going to do with a parent like that?

We give parents information ahead of time, advance cautionary warnings and we say, please, please read this. And I have said many times, all of the other rating systems out there, look at them, examine them, digest them, then make your own judgments. But you can't force parents to do that. And so, when you say, Dr. Walsh, you want to move in on the parental area, I think that's the one vulnerable part there. I don't know what we can do besides warning parents. If a bottle has an X on there and a skull and bones and they leave it open for their child, what the hell are you going to do?

So, we do the best we can. I think this rating system has held up for 35 years, I said, on November 1st, and it has to be providing some benefit to people or it wouldn't be around, and these surveys, on which Dr. Rich and I rely, wouldn't illuminate their reaction to it.

DR. WALSH: Mary, can I respond to Mr. Valenti?

MS. ENGLE: Certainly.

DR. WALSH: Because I think what you just said I certainly understand, parents don't want to be told. And I'd like to respond to maybe what we can do with a story of my own. I was doing a parent workshop down in Florida -- this was about three months ago -- and there

was a young couple that came in and I just saw them come in and they sat in the back. Then afterward they came up -- this was an hour-and-a-half workshop and the young woman introduced her husband and she had dragged him there and she said that. She said, I brought my husband here. And I didn't know what this was all about, so she said, the reason is is because he's been playing Grand Theft Auto Vice City with our three-year-old on his lap.

And so, I just looked at him and I said, did anything I said make sense tonight? And he looked at me and he said, I am so ashamed of myself. He said, I had no idea what the impact was. And I say that because I think that's where we have to go back to. We can't just give parents the information, they have to be motivated to use it, and I think we have a job to teach parents the power of this and I would invite the professionals in the media industry, because that's what you're so good at. You are very, very good at shaping attitudes and values.

And so, I think maybe one of the greatest things that could come out of this is that if we work together that, among other things, we try to help parents understand these are powerful teachers. Just as I wouldn't let somebody come in and spend 40 hours a week teaching my kids a set of values that I didn't agree with, well, that's what's happening and we need to have

1 parents understand that.

MR. LOWENSTEIN: I do think it's worth pointing out a couple things because these issues are really complex and I don't pretend to understand them all. I know that there is -- I was at a conference in Australia about a month ago and there were three scientists, no affiliation with the video game industry, who were roundly critical of some of the research that purports to show adverse effects.

The point I want to make here is, it's interesting, if you look at video games, for example, which is what I know best, all the games we're talking about here are sold all over the world, and it is of note that the incidence of violent crime, the incidence of murder, the incidence of gun violence in this country dwarfs those in other countries by a factor of 10, 20, 30 times. So, there are deeper issues.

I'm not saying we shouldn't be concerned about the games, I'm not saying there might not be impacts. But, you know, we had a gentleman in here this morning whose son drove him down who apparently was an avid Grand Theft Auto player, and my hunch is -- or his nephew -- is a very well-adjusted, very responsible, very bright young man. So, let's at least, as we have these discussions, not start from the premise automatically that they are

fundamentally destructive and harmful and destroying and decaying the youth of this country because there are a lot of wonderful young people that I know who play some of these games, whether it would be my choice that they play them or not. I'm sure there are wonderful young people who see R-rated movies and listen to rap music who are leading very healthy, productive, responsible lives.

MS. WHITE: Well, I agree that this country has the highest rate of violence of any country in the world, which is one reason I started this organization. I was shocked when I started. We have more people killed by gun violence in this country now per year than were killed at the height of the Vietnam War in Vietnam. So, we have a very high violence rate.

My concern, as a mother, is what do we want to do about it as a culture, and there are many reasons for this violence. It's not just video games, it's not just movies, it's not just television, it's not just action figures, it's not just arcade games, it's not just music. It's all of it plus many other things like a lot of other issues. This is one. The media can make it worse.

So, what I would like to work together on is I do agree with everyone on the panel that parents need to be more responsible, but I would also like to hear more specifics from industry about how they're going to be

more responsible in marketing. We've talked a lot about ratings and ratings information, but we have -- I would like to also know more specifically and some of the theaters, like Regal, I think, is doing a very good job, Toys "R" Us sounds like they're doing a good job. But, overall, the fact is this stuff is still being marketed to kids. It has an impact, as Dr. Rich said, and I think we all have to work together to be responsible rather than always pointing the finger at the other sector.

MR. VALENTI: Let me make a point about marketing to children. We presented to the Federal Trade Commission three years ago a 12-point set of initiatives which we have adhered to and I think they do a good assay of this every year and they have been very complimentary of the movie industry and what we're doing.

But the whole idea that violence is something that you can monitor -- for example, I'll put to you three films, High Noon, Saving Private Ryan and Scarface. How would you judge these? There is murder, there's killing in all three. How would you deal with it? I happen to think that Saving Private Ryan should have been made a G-rated movie instead of R so that every young child in America could see the brutality and the inhumanity and the sordidness of war. As a former combat pilot, I know something about it. That's why I think war

is such a desperate last resort that ought never be
adhered to. But it's rated R. And I went on television
saying, take your kids to this picture.

Scarface, one of the most violent films, and yet it's the decline and sordid fall of a gang boss. If anybody wants to make Al Pacino a role model in that film, they need serious medical attention. That's all I can tell you. Because that's a film that's so anti-drug and, yet, you got an R rating, how do you deal with that?

This is not easy. As I said earlier, this is not physics, this is not geometry. This is something that's very vapory and we have to deal with it, because all three of those films have killing. So, if you were going to say you cannot show any killing in this film, then High Noon has to be R -- they all have to be R and, yet, maybe they shouldn't be R because they teach lessons to children.

So, I'm saying to you that this is complexity wrapped in contradictions and inserted into complications. It's not easy to deal with.

MS. ENGLE: Well, I think I would echo that last comment. It's not easy to deal with. We're approaching 5:00, so we need to wrap things up. I wanted to thank all of our panelists and participants today for coming. I think it's been a very helpful and

1	enlightening discussion. I'm hopeful that we can do as
2	has been suggested and come together where we do have
3	common ground in finding ways to motivate and educate
4	parents.
5	I want to remind everybody that we will be
6	holding the public comment period open for comments for
7	30 days. You can submit comments to violenceworkshop@
8	ftc.gov. And as a responsible parent who has to go pick
9	up a child from day care, it's time to adjourn. Thank
10	you very much.
11	(Whereupon, at 5:00 p.m., the workshop was
12	concluded.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION OF REPORTER
2	
3	MATTER NUMBER: <u>P994511</u>
4	CASE TITLE: ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY SELF-REGULATION
5	DATE: OCTOBER 29, 2003
6	
7	I HEREBY CERTIFY that the transcript contained
8	herein is a full and accurate transcript of the notes
9	taken by me at the hearing on the above cause before the
10	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION to the best of my knowledge and
11	belief.
12	
13	DATED: NOVEMBER 5, 2003
14	
15	
16	DAN WILSON
17	
18	CERTIFICATION OF PROOFREADER
19	
20	I HEREBY CERTIFY that I proofread the transcript for
21	accuracy in spelling, hyphenation, punctuation and
22	format.
23	
24	
25	ELIZABETH M. FARRELL