

[Start] [★03:59.930] [👂] [★35.672] Banning★the depiction of violence from the media is not a viable solution to the dilemma of how to deal with violence in the first place. Indeed, violence existed long before the media could be conceived of and thus there is no apparent relationship to the extent to which people undergo influence of the depiction of violence and more violent behaviour in real life. Violence should rather be treated as a phenomenon that is inherent to all human beings and not per se dangerous or unwanted, as it may be necessary to resort to it in order to defend a settlement or the life and property of an individual. The only real problem here is excessive use of violence and the use of violence in an un★inappropriate context, and that is, among other things, a matter of socialisation, assessment of one's environment and a healthy and good upbringing. Indeed, the issue about censorship is that with the first link, the chain is forged that binds us all. I-E. the★first appearance of censorship, even if under the noble aim to abolish violence from television nationwide would necessarily entail further cases of censorship, such as sex, crime, may be political parties and their workings and thus would undermine the freedom of the media to an extent that would equal the situation in a police state or authoritarian dictatorship. Indeed, the problem that might develop from excessive censorship is that the upbringing of children may even be fairly problematic, as the media, as a one★is the great★source of information, would not reflect the actual situation in the world and thus would estrange the people★★★★★.★👂👂 [★15.843] The discussion of whether to ban violence from the media is★one that is★★★★★i★👂👂, in many★cases, conducted in a shallow manner★👂. It does certainly not reflect all the issues that go along with violence and/or the depiction of violence in★modern-day society.★★★Thus,★★banning violence★, or rather is its depiction, is a short-sighted attempt to mould the world to some questionable ideal of★★little value. The questions that must be raised before this issue★can be contemplated★are firstly that of violence and its usefulness, or lack thereof,★★★and the true impact and influence of its depiction in the media. Finally, the suitability★of censorship measures must be discussed★★, not only focused on the issue of violence, but rather in a general manner★★★★★.★👂👂.★👂👂★★★★★WHe👂👂hen it comes to violence, modern★👂👂👂👂👂there seems to be a consensus in modern-day society that it is unwanted, unnecessary👂ry and should be abolished★★.★Nations and individuals are often willing to go to great lengths to★a★h👂chieve this,★disregarding the true impact and function of violence.★★Violent behaviour👂ur arose long before the★media could be conceived of★f★and long before★★people👂👂👂👂ple started👂👂ted★★★★covering the walls of caves with paintings.★★★★It follows that violence arises★★↑→👂↓without any intervention👂by the media, but rather★the opposite is true: the media picks up on the existence of violence★★★and use it as a means to attract "customers"★.★Violence as such★did, however, serve to★face dangers of👂👂👂that our★★👂👂👂were bountiful in man's environment [★11.442]. Men👂often had to resort to violence to protect themselves, their community or their property★★★★; in a way, thus, violence secured our existence as a species.★The true problem is that violence does not necessarily occur in the right★contexts★★★r can be made use of excessively★★; but these problems are only remotely linked to★👂👂👂d to violence itself, but rather★with conditions of upbringing, socialisation★★★★, assessment of threats in one's environment👂👂men★★★★t and other👂👂t her★factors.★★★★Thus👂, other👂se←←←←←👂h→→→→→are issues that need be discussed first before violence, and its depiction, should be added

ressed. [32.419] The way to simply ban violence from public life by suppressing it's depiction and banning violence from the media altogether will eventually backfire, in particular if seen before the background of a liberal, democratic society. First, if violence is banned from the media altogether, which would also include news coverage, what would follow is a warped, distorted fictitious world that bears no resemblance to the world we live in. The complete lack of violence in the media would either alienate people from the media or their own lives and drives, and would thus be harmful to with regard to coming to a clear perception of the world. Secondly, once censorship has become a suitable tool to deal with unwanted information, it is only a matter of time until censorship is expanded to coverage of differences in group, and perchance unwanted, political views, sexuality, crime and many other areas. It is one thing not to overtax people with the depiction of violence, if it is, however, a horrible and entirely different thing to envisage a make-believe world where everything that may seem disagreeable or uncomfortable is being denied and suppressed. Banning violence thus is the first step to denying citizens free access to information on a larger scale and thus our democracy would slowly develop into an oligarchy, where a few people decide what the majority may know. We might even have to face yet another authoritarian dictatorship, a type of media fascism of the 21st century. [11.137] [12.358] It thus stands to reason that it is both impossible and not desirable to ban violence from the media, as it is an integral part of human character and survival and also it would severely restrict the media and thus lead us into dark times of ignorance again. Therefore, the matter is not if violence is addressed in the media; it is on us to decide to what extent we will expose ourselves to it and what type of reality we are adapted to our environment. well [12.667] [14.315] [49.621] [17.920] [16.809] [24.469] [34.975] to determine [Stop]