



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 8, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MARCH, 1977

## Obscenity & Violence in the Mails, Movies & TV

Now that the publisher of *Hustler* Magazine has been convicted of criminal obscenity in a state court, the next question that should be asked is, why has the Federal Government allowed this obscene magazine to enjoy Second Class mail privileges?

By a visit to your local newsstand, you can verify for yourself that there are at least a dozen outrageously obscene magazines to which the U.S. Post Office has granted the benefit of a special permit to mail at the very low Second Class rate. Another dozen obscene magazines have their application for a Second Class permit now pending, such as *Screw* Magazine.

Take along a magnifying glass when you go on your newsstand inspection tour, because the notice of these Second Class permits is hidden in print almost too small to read.

A Second Class mail permit is one of the most valuable economic assets a publication can own. Second Class mail rates are only a fraction of the price of First or Third Class mail rates.

Depending on the magazine's circulation, a Second Class permit can be worth thousands of dollars a month because of the savings in postage costs. The privilege to mail at Second Class rates is often the difference between whether a magazine operates at a financial profit or at a loss.

The postage costs saved by the holders of Second Class mail permits are paid by the American taxpayers. The purpose of this subsidy is to promote education, public information, and news.

According to Federal law, Second Class mail permits are limited to periodicals that are "published for the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to literature, the sciences, arts, or a special industry." Obscene magazines simply do not meet either the letter or the spirit of these standards.

Prior to 1955, obscene magazines never held Second Class mail permits. In that year, an influential Washington lawyer named Abe Fortas succeeded in getting a Second Class mailing permit for his client, an indecent magazine named *Rogue*.

According to testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, an FBI agent named Homer Young was told by William Hamling, publisher of *Rogue*, that he had hired Abe Fortas as a lawyer because Fortas "could fix anything no matter what administration was in power." This disclosure was one of the events that preceded Fortas' resignation from the U.S. Supreme Court.

Once Fortas succeeded in getting a Second Class

permit for *Rogue*, one obscene magazine after another claimed its equal right to have its pornography subsidized by the American taxpayers.

Dreary and depressing statistics are available that show the tremendous increase in sex crimes, including rape, prostitution, and child abuse during the last decade. Areas where so-called adult bookstores and porno movie houses are concentrated, such as the Boston Combat Zone, have been the scene of vicious murders.

It is bad enough for obscene magazines to be allowed to pollute the moral climate of our cities. It is intolerable that the American taxpayers are forced to subsidize obscenity traffic through Second Class mail permits.

It is time that we have a Congressional and a media investigation of how many obscene magazines now have this valuable permit, and why these permits were not revoked by the Post Office when the obscene nature of the publications became obvious. The investigation should also inquire why obscene magazines are openly sold in Washington, D.C., and never prosecuted by the Federal Government.

### TV Family Hour

A Federal judge in Los Angeles in November 1976 provided new grist for the mills of those who think that the Federal courts are the principal cause for the flood of pornography that has inundated newsstands, movies and television during the last several years. The judge ruled that the television "family hour" is an unconstitutional violation of the First Amendment guarantee of free speech.

The "family hour" is a voluntary agreement by the three television networks to abstain from showing objectionable programs of violence and illicit sex from 7:00 to 9:00 P.M. because so many children watch during those hours. The effect of this decision is to accord a higher constitutional value to the rights of the pornography profiteers who want to make killing, robbing, maiming, and sleazy sex a spectator sport, than to the rights of children to enjoy decent family entertainment, or to the rights of parents to train their children in obedience to the laws of God and country.

This is an indefensible decision. Television scriptwriters have no more "right" to have their scripts aired on television between 7:00 and 9:00 P.M., or at any other time, than any author has a "right" to have his books bought in the bookstores. The customer determines what is worthy of being bought, not the author or

performer.

Neither the networks, nor the advertisers, nor the viewing public wants violence and illicit sex aired in family viewing times; yet this Federal judge exalted the right of the scriptwriters to inflict their pornographic programming and violence-inciting subject matter on the entire country.

If the networks do not engage in responsible self-regulation, the American public may come to the same conclusion reached by Malcolm Muggeridge: "The corruption of our children is absolutely appalling. On television they see the family ridiculed, marital fidelity ridiculed, and a crass materialism constantly being preached. . . . Parents would do well to never let their children watch television."

## Effects of Violence

The negative effect of violence on children can no longer be disputed. Dr. Michael B. Rothenberg, a child psychologist writing in the American Medical Association Journal, is one of the many experts who have concluded that a concentrated viewing of violence produces increased aggressive behavior in the young and a desensitization to violence.

Dr. Rothenberg pointed out that the average American child, by the time he finishes school, "will have witnessed 18,000 murders and countless highly detailed incidents of robbery, arson, bombing, forgery, smuggling, beating and torture averaging approximately one per minute in the standard television cartoon for children under the age of ten." He said that "there is an average of six times more violence during one hour of children's television than there is in one hour of adult television."

Dr. Rothenberg said that the time is long past due for an organized cry of protest from parents and also from the medical profession to what he called "a national scandal," because "to be silent is to acquiesce, and it is clear that if we truly care about our children, we cannot be silent."

Professor Anne R. Somers, writing in the New England Journal of Medicine, was correct when she said that television is a mold, not a mirror of social values, and that "for a considerable proportion of American children and youth, violence has become a major health problem." She identified a major cause as "television's massive daily diet of symbolic crime and violence in 'entertainment' programs."

Convicted murderer Michael Edward Drabing of Lincoln, Illinois, testified at his trial in December 1976 that he drew his inspiration for the hideous hunting knife slaying of three members of the Lloyd Schneider family of rural Lincoln from watching the first television broadcast of "Helter Skelter" the preceding March. That was the film depicting the gruesome murders committed by the Charles Manson cult. Drabing testified that "they [the Manson family] killed all those rich people, and I saw if you killed them that erases the problem. It was the final piece of the puzzle."

After seeing this TV program, Drabing said he bought the book and read it at least four times. Then in August 1976, Drabing invaded the home of Schneider, a wealthy hog farmer, and stabbed the three family members more than 100 times.

At the recent national PTA hearings on television violence, Dr. Keith Reisinger, professor of pediatrics and psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh, said that "the message shown [on television] is that violence

pays. Television continuously instructs us that we can easily resolve problems by use of force."

Allegheny County Judge Patrick Tamillia testified that he had seen evidence that many children in juvenile court believe that violence pays. He said, "Kids don't cry any more. . . . The hardness of heart is just incomprehensible. They are looking at all that violence on TV where there is really no remorse shown. . . . So when they do something wrong and hurt somebody else, they don't feel they've done it to a human being."

Speaking for the American Medical Association, Dr. Frank J. Jirka said the AMA had concluded that TV violence is "an environmental hazard that threatens the life of America." He said that "the weight of scientific evidence indicates there is a relationship between violence and aggressive behavior among some youthful offenders."

## Movie Violence

Violence in the movies is to the urban concentration of teenagers, minorities and unemployed what a lighted cigarette is to a parched forest. Just as the safety of the people allows us to prohibit a smoker from tossing his lighted cigarette butt out the car window, the safety of city dwellers requires that we stop the movie violence which panders to impressionable teenagers with sadism, senseless brutality, and unconscionable cruelty.

In one of his last official acts, the late Mayor Richard Daley persuaded the Chicago City Council to pass an ordinance by a vote of 45 to 2 prohibiting the admission of those under age 18 to movies which are obscene or extremely violent, including such acts as "cuttings, stabbings, floggings, eye gouging, brutal kicking, and dismemberment."

The City Council heard evidence that the average teenager in Chicago sees at least 11,000 murders on television before he is 18. This conditioning to brutality is then inflamed by gory violence in the movies, with blood oozing in living color.

Alderman Adeline P. Keane pinpointed the issue clearly when, in urging passage of the ordinance, she said: "Kids are mimics, and they mimic whatever they see . . . when they see this violence, they are liable to act it out."

Particularly offensive are the movies of excessive violence which cater especially to the blacks and are called "black exploitation" films. A sixth grade teacher who testified before the City Council called them "blaxploitation" films because they glorify criminals, "pimps, hustlers, and nonworkers," thereby providing wrong role-models.

Mayor Daley and the City Council were condemned by the pornography profiteers who want a broad interpretation of the First Amendment to override every other moral and constitutional value. The First Amendment, however, does not and should not include the right to obscenity, blasphemy, disturbing the peace, or incitement to crime -- and that is exactly what these films do.

One of the specious arguments made against the new Chicago ordinance is that we should leave it to the movie industry to police itself. At the annual Film Festival in Cannes, France, during the last week of May 1976, films of violence received all the prizes, despite a strong condemnation from American playwright Tennessee Williams, who was president of the jury. Wil-

liams condemned films which "take a voluptuous pleasure in spilling blood and in lingering on terrible cruelties as though one were at a Roman circus." He said that "watching violence on the screen is a brutalizing experience for the spectator."

The film selected for the top trophy at the Cannes Film Festival was "Taxi Driver." After seeing this very movie, a Chicago youth went out and shot up a North-west Side convent.

The same rights that permit us to restrict teenage drinking, drug use, driving, and marriage permit us to prohibit movies which incite teenagers to criminal violence. The Chicago ordinance should be imitated in other big cities which suffer the problem of escalating teenage crime.

## Porno Shop Decision

Although many people have mistakenly been led to believe otherwise during the last decade, the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights are not and were never intended to be absolute. They all have limits defined by the U.S. Supreme Court. The only right that is absolute is the right to believe.

The First Amendment right to freedom of speech and press, for example, is not, was never intended to be, and should not be an absolute right to say or print anything you want. Your right to free speech and press ends where the rights of others begin. You have no right to utter obscenities, blasphemies, profanities, libels, or slanders because those acts interfere with the rights of others. You have no right to commit a public nuisance, a public indecency, or a public disturbing of the peace. In Oliver Wendell Holmes' famous phrase, you have no right to cry "Fire" in a crowded theatre.

One of the unfortunate legacies of the Earl Warren Court was the overturning of the law on obscenity that Americans had respected for 178 years. By ruling FOR obscenity dealers in 36 out of 38 cases in 1967, 1968, and 1969, the Warren Court enshrined the pornographer's right to commit his public nuisance above the right of all the rest of the people to live in an orderly and decent community.

In many of these cases, the Supreme Court did not issue any opinion supporting its decision or even reveal which of the Justices approved the decision. The Court just handed down anonymous *per curiam* decisions that reversed the convictions of smut peddlers found guilty by local juries, and thereby stripped the communities of all legal power to defend themselves against obscenity. The result of permitting the smut peddlers to clothe themselves in radical new interpretations of the First Amendment was a torrent of pornography.

One of the major changes that Chief Justice Burger made was to reaffirm the law on obscenity that had existed prior to the Warren Court. In 1973 Burger wrote the opinion specifically holding that "obscene material is not protected by the First Amendment," that it can be regulated by the states, and that the courts will honor community standards rather than enforce a national standard.

The Supreme Court has finally realized that civilized cities must have additional means of protecting their citizens against the public display of moral garbage. The Supreme Court now recognizes that pornography is an "admittedly serious problem," that cities must be permitted to try "to preserve the quality of urban life," and therefore must be allowed "a

reasonable opportunity to experiment with solutions."

In a 1976 decision, the Burger Supreme Court ruled that big cities can deal with the pornography problem by zoning laws which either disperse X-rated movie theaters and so-called "adult" bookstores, as Detroit does, or concentrate such objectionable businesses in one area, as Boston does in what is called its Combat Zone. At any rate, it is for the city to decide, not the Federal courts.

This decision won't eliminate the porno plague, but it is a big step in the right direction. It should encourage city councils and local law enforcement officials to go into action against public nuisances such as porno shops and movies and massage parlors. Even the *New York Times*, which has been a leading critic of all efforts to curb obscenity, drew the line when the porno shops invaded Times Square in New York City!

## What You Can Do About TV

1. Make sure that your children do not watch programs of violence and immorality.
2. Check your weekly newspaper TV guide every Sunday to be alert to objectionable programs. (Many communities have been successful in stopping programs from being aired.)
3. When an objectionable program is aired:
  - a) Write all the commercial sponsors. In your letter, mention some of that firm's products which your family uses. Express appropriate shock at the fact that the company spent advertising money to bring a program of sex or violence into your home (especially during prime time when children are watching).
  - b) Write or call the local station that aired the program, even if it is a network program.
  - c) Call your friends and get them to do likewise.
4. Make sure that someone in your local group has a copy of "Television Sponsors Product Directory." Available from Everglades Publishing Co., P.O. Box 22, Everglades, Fla. 33929, \$4.95.
5. Set up a TV Monitoring Committee in your community so that someone in your group will be watching TV at all times.
6. Don't be discouraged when the sponsors write back and say they have no control over what programs their advertising spots appear on.
  - (a) That isn't true. (b) It is a cop-out -- a voluntary abdication of their moral and community responsibility. (c) Your letter is having a good effect anyway. Just write more letters.

## What Else You Can Do

7. Write your Congressmen and Senators to demand that the Post Office cancel the Second Class Mail privileges of all obscene magazines.
8. Ask your Mayor and Police Chief to enforce your state and local laws against movies that feature obscenity or excessive violence, as well as against "adult" porno shops.
9. If your state laws and local ordinances against criminal obscenity are not strong enough, ask your state legislators or city councilmen to pass new legislation.

## Noah's Ark

The twentieth century has seen many attacks challenging the historical accuracy of the Bible. However scientific advance may actually provide modern proof of Biblical revelations. Scientists' examinations of the expeditions to Mount Ararat appear to have confirmed one of the great events of the Scriptures: the landing of Noah's Ark.

Some 14,000 feet high up on Mount Ararat in eastern Turkey is a giant wooden ship, portions of which have been seen by about 200 people in the last century. How did it get there? There is no nearby source of timber. No trees grow on this mountain or within a hundred miles of the ship. It is not logical that any ancient civilization would build an immense rectangular wooden vessel, thought to be 450 feet long, 75 feet wide, and 45 feet high, near the top of a high, barren mountain peak.

Mount Ararat is inaccessible for many reasons. Not only is it an icy and difficult mountain to climb, but it is located in a restricted military zone close to the Turkish-Russian border, just 40 miles from a Soviet missile base.

The Turkish minister of the interior has banned most of the expeditions that have tried to climb Mount Ararat in the last six years to examine the ark. The Russians are very suspicious and will not let any American airplanes or helicopters fly over Mount Ararat, being convinced that they would be part of a CIA spy plot.

A few expeditions have reached the ark on foot and brought back pieces of wood that scientists tell us date from the time of Noah. Scholars generally agree that the Great Flood occurred about 5,000 years ago.

The French archaeologist Fernand Navarra made several expeditions up Mount Ararat beginning in 1952, when he found a large mass of dark wood imbedded in the glacier about 13,000 feet high.

In 1955 and 1968, Navarra brought back timbers found in the ice of Mount Ararat. They were examined by Nobel Prize winner Dr. Melvin A. Cook, who concluded that the wood was of the right age.

Among the five pieces of planking that Navarra brought back in 1969 was a five-foot beam that had been hand-hewn and squared, and had mortise and tenon joints. The beam matched the wood recovered from the ark by James Bryce in 1876.

The Center of Forestry Research and Analysis in Paris confirmed that the wood was white oak and had an age of about 4,500 years. It is a type of white oak that grows only in the Mediterranean region where Noah is believed to have built the ark. Other wood experts also estimate the age of the wood to be about 5,000 years.

In 1973 Thomas B. Turner of the McDonnell-Douglas Company in St. Louis told of an Earth Resources Technology Satellite (ERTS) photograph that possibly showed Noah's Ark in the same quadrant on Mount Ararat where previous ground explorers had found the hand-hewn timbers.

The search for Noah's Ark continues to be a fascination to many people, including Dr. John Montgomery who has climbed Mount Ararat many times. He and Tom Crotser, who has photographed the gunwale planking of the Ark's bow in the ice near the top of Mount Ararat, are convinced that civilization was saved, just as the Bible teaches, by Noah and his Ark at the time of the Great Flood.

## The Holy Shroud

The single most impressive relic of Christianity is called the Holy Shroud. It is now and has been for 400 years in the Cathedral at Turin, Italy. It is a beautifully made linen cloth fourteen feet, three inches long and three feet, seven inches wide. It bears the front and back images of a muscular man six feet tall.

The image of the face and body on the Shroud is that of a handsome, very well-built, but much tortured man in his thirties. The face has a forked beard which was distinctive to Jewish men at the time of the Crucifixion.

The images on the Shroud are made by blood and perspiration. They show in clear detail the horrible effects of the Roman crucifixion. French surgeon Pierre Barbet found that more than 50 strokes with the Roman flagrum, a leather whip with balls of metal designed to tear the skin, were inflicted on the back.

The head shows a crown of thorns. Bruise marks are on the face including a fracture of the posterior of the nose cartilage. On both wrists there are nail marks which pierced the sensory nerve trunks. There is a spear thrust wound on the front side of the chest, and nail marks through the feet.

The Shroud images are negatives, similar to the negative image on photographic film. Before the discovery of photography in the 19th century, no one understood a negative image. The images on the Shroud are clearly natural and experts all agree that they could not have been painted.

Compare all the unique things that happened to the body of the man whose image is on the Shroud with the same things that happened to Jesus. The crown of thorns and the scourging in a crucifixion case were not customary Roman procedures. The Shroud conforms to the description of the garment furnished by Joseph of Arimethea.

A seven-year investigation by scientists that ended last year concluded that "we have not found anything to contradict the belief that the Shroud is the Shroud of Jesus." This evidence gives the lie to the current blasphemous book alleging that the death of Christ was a hoax to support a false claim of immortality.

The life of Jesus, His many miracles, His Resurrection from the dead, and His promise of everlasting life are beautifully described in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. These separately written accounts provide historical evidence of the supernatural greatness of Jesus.

So, Christ's birth on Christmas, death by crucifixion on Good Friday, and Resurrection on Easter Sunday do not have to be taken on faith alone. We have, first, the prophecies in the Old Testament, then the eye-witness testimony in the New Testament, and now the scientific examination of the robe wrapped around Christ in His tomb. All this evidence confirms and corroborates; none of it contradicts.

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.