

# THE MEDIA COALITION INC

139 FULTON STREET • SUITE 302 • NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10038 • TELEPHONE: 212-587-4025

FACSIMILE: 212-587-2436 • E-MAIL: MEDIACOALITION@MEDIACOALITION.ORG

WEBSITE: WWW.MEDIACOALITION.ORG

## DAVID HOROWITZ

*Executive Director*

## Memo in Opposition to Arkansas House Bill 1852

The members of The Media Coalition believe that Arkansas House Bill 1852 threatens the distribution of First Amendment-protected material in Arkansas. Media Coalition members represent most of the publishers, booksellers, librarians, periodical wholesalers and distributors, recording, movie and video game manufacturers, and recording and video retailers in Arkansas and the rest of the United States.

H.B. 1852 bars display to minors of any videogames that contain scenes or depictions of “graphic violence.” A person is not considered to have displayed such videogames to minors in stores over 1000 square feet if they are segregated in an adults-only area or for stores with 1000 square feet or less the videogames are located in a way that keeps them from minors. A violation would be subject to a fine of up to \$1,000. H.B. 1852 would also require the Attorney General to create a rating system for videogames that includes a determination of what videogames contain depictions of “graphic violence.” “Graphic violence” is defined as depictions of decapitation, bloodshedding (sic), or dismemberment.

Speech is presumed to be protected by the First Amendment unless it falls into a few very narrow classes. As the Supreme Court said in Free Speech Coalition v. Ashcroft, “As a general principle, the First Amendment bars the government from dictating what we see or read or speak or hear. The freedom of speech has its limits; it does not embrace certain categories of speech, including defamation, incitement, obscenity and pornography produced with children.” 535 U.S.1382, 1389 (2002). None of the types of speech cited by the court includes speech with violent content alone. Violent content in otherwise constitutionally protected material is not a permissible subject of government regulation for adults or minors. Every court that has addressed this issue has held that speech with violent content, without exception, is constitutionally protected. Interactive Digital Software Ass’n v. St. Louis County, 329 F.3d 954 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) enjoined enforcement of a county ordinance that barred the sale or rental to minors of video games with violent content. American Amusement Machine Ass’n v. Kendrick, 244 F.3d 572 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 462 (2001) enjoined enforcement of a city ordinance that limited minors’ access to violent video games. Video Software Dealers Ass’n v. Maleng, 325 F. Supp. 2d 118 (W.D. Wash. 20004) barred enforcement of a state law that barred dissemination to minors of video games that included violence against “peace officers.” Bookfriends v. Taft, 233 F.Supp. 932 (S.D. Ohio, W.

The Media Coalition is a trade association that defends the First Amendment rights of publishers, booksellers, librarians, periodical wholesalers and distributors, recording, motion picture and video games producers, and recording and video retailers in the United States.

American Booksellers  
Foundation for Free  
Expression

Association of American  
Publishers, Inc.

Comic Book Legal  
Defense Fund

Entertainment Software  
Association

Freedom to Read  
Foundation

Interactive Electronic  
Merchants Association

Magazine Publishers of  
America, Inc.

Motion Picture  
Association of America,  
Inc.

National Association of  
Recording Merchandisers

Publishers Marketing  
Association

Recording Industry of  
America, Inc.

Video Software Dealers  
Association

*Chair*  
Judith Krug  
Freedom to Read  
Foundation

*Immediate Past Chair*  
Chris Finan  
American Booksellers  
Foundation for  
Free Expression

*Treasurer*  
Gail Markels  
Entertainment Software  
Association

*General Counsel*  
Michael A. Bamberger  
Sonnenschein Nath &  
Rosenthal LLP

Div. 2002) deemed speech with violent content as fully protected by the First Amendment and enjoined enforcement of Ohio's "harmful to juveniles" law that would have criminalized dissemination to a minor of speech with violent content. Davis-Kidd Booksellers, Inc. v. McWherter, 886 S.W. 2d 705 (Tenn. 1993) struck down a restriction on the sale to minors of material containing "excess violence." Video Software Dealers Assn. v. Webster, 968 F.2d 684 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) held that "unlike obscenity, violent expression is protected by the First Amendment." State v. Johnson, 343 So. 2d 705, 710 (La. 1977) declared that prohibiting the sale of violent materials to minors exceeded the limits placed on regulation of obscene materials by the U.S. Supreme Court. Sovereign News Co. v. Falke, 448 F. Supp. 306, 400 (N.D. Ohio 1977), while remanded on other grounds, overturned a statute defining as "harmful to minors" material describing or representing "extreme or bizarre violence."

Generally, the case law makes clear that government restriction on access to First Amendment protected material by adults or older minors in the interest of protecting younger minors would be "to burn down the house to roast the pig." Butler v. Michigan, 352 U.S. 380, 383 (1957). Although the courts have ruled that some limitation on the display of material "harmful to minors," as defined by the Supreme Court in Ginsberg v. New York, 390 U.S. 629 (1968), is permissible, they have also ruled that these limitations may not unreasonably hinder the access of adults. See also, Virginia v. American Booksellers Assn., Inc., 488 U.S. 905 (1988), on remand 882 F. 2d. 125 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989). These cases make clear that the state's authority to require a retailer to restrict access to First Amendment protected material based on its content is predicated on two principles. First, the content is illegal for someone, generally minors under the test laid out by the Supreme Court for sexually explicit material in Ginsberg v. New York. Second, that minors may be able to browse or peruse the material that is illegal as to them in a store. As is clear from the case law, material with violent content is not illegal for minors and, therefore, is not subject to restriction or regulation including display in a segregated manner.

Because it threatens the distribution of constitutionally protected works, H.B. 1852 will be vulnerable to a legal challenge if it is enacted. If the law is overturned, the state could be ordered to pay the plaintiffs' attorneys' fees. In one case brought in Arkansas by the members of Media Coalition, the state agreed to pay more than \$60,000 in legal fees to the plaintiffs.

The members of Media Coalition strongly urge you to defend the First Amendment rights of all the citizens of Arkansas and defeat this bill.