School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1378619

Technical Report of The Commission on Obscenity and Pornography

Volume V

SOCIETAL CONTROL MECHANISMS

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/technicalreport0005unit

This technical report has not been reviewed or approved by the full Commission.

HQ
471
U5
v.5

U.S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

Technical Report of The Commission on Obscenity and Pornography

, v. 5

Volume V

SOCIETAL CONTROL MECHANISMS

COMMISSION MEMBERS

William B. Lockhart, Chairman

Fredrick H. Wagman, Vice Chairman

Edward E. Elson

Thomas D. Gill

Edward D. Greenwood

Morton A. Hill

G. William Jones

Charles H. Keating, Jr.

Kenneth B. Keating (Resigned June, 1969)

Joseph T. Klapper

Otto N. Larsen

Irving Lehrman

Freeman Lewis

Winfrey C. Link

Morris A. Lipton

Thomas C. Lynch

Barbara Scott

Cathryn A. Spelts

Marvin E. Wolfgang

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $3.25
Stock Number 5256–0006

STAFF MEMBERS

W. Cody Wilson
Executive Director
and
Director of Research

Paul Bender
General Counsel

Virginia P. Banister
Administrative Officer

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Anthony F. Abell
Jane M. Friedman
Karen I. Green
Bernard Horowitz
Sylvia H. Jacobs
Weldon T. Johnson
Lenore R. Kupperstein
John J. Sampson
Bobbie Jack Wallin

SUPPORT STAFF

Jane L. Bitting
Joyce Y. Bott
Alfred S. Carter
Kathy I. Deister
Claudia P. Gaskins
Dorothy A. Gooding
Carol A. Mitchell
Muriel L. Montgomery
Dianne O. Sergeant
Anna M. Zerega

Foreword

The members of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography take special satisfaction in making available these Technical Reports of research undertaken at the Commission's request and under the direction of its staff.

These reports are an important part of the Commission's response to the directive from Congress to study and report on (*a*) constitutional and definitional problems relating to obscenity controls, (*b*) traffic in and distribution of obscene and pornographic materials, and (*c*) effects of such materials, particularly on youth, and their relationship to crime and other antisocial conduct.

Most of the Technical Reports are original work because, outside of the legal field, very little research on the questions assigned to the Commission had been undertaken by anyone prior to the funding of the Commission in the summer of 1968. At appropriate points in these volumes, reference is made to reports of earlier research, as well as to research projects undertaken independently of the Commission during the two years of its effective life. Primarily, however, the Commission found it necessary to rely on the original research reported here.

Although attention will initially focus on the findings and recommendations of the Commission and its four panels, the research reflected in these Technical Reports will have greater long-range importance. The findings by the Commission and its panels are necessarily limited and hurried distillations, and its recommendations are inevitably tempered by the give and take of seeking to reach a group judgment on a highly controversial subject. The research reported here, however, was subject to no such limitations and is being made available primarily for two purposes:

(1) We expect and invite critical examination and appraisal of these reports, for we have only begun the task of interpreting the wealth of information they contain.

(2) We hope that the Commission-sponsored research will stimulate and point the way to further scientific inquiry in this difficult and baffling field. There are still many unanswered questions, and these will require further research with more refined techniques and instruments.

For the Commission, I wish to express deep appreciation to all the individuals and teams whose research is reported here. We are most grateful both for their willingness to pioneer in this unexplored and controversial field and for their shouldering of the burden on such short notice and with such restrictive time schedules.

I also wish to express for the Commission our admiration and thanks to Dr. W. Cody Wilson, our executive director, and his excellent staff. Only through their valiant and effective efforts in planning and implementing this vast array of highly diverse research projects, all focusing on specific tasks assigned to the Commission, was it possible for us to bring our work to a timely completion.

WILLIAM B. LOCKHART
Chairman

General Preface

Many of the papers in these volumes share two characteristics: a focus on empirical description and a lack of refinement in presentation. Each of these characteristics is a product of both circumstance and deliberate policy.

The emphasis on empirical description reflects in part the nature of existing knowledge at the beginning of the Commission's work. Few empirical observations had been reported in the literature, and these were not sufficient to provide even a tentative description of the phenomena of concern to the Commission, nor to form the basis for research at a higher level of conceptualization.

The emphasis on empirical description also reflects the nature of the task assigned to the Commission. The policy questions posed by the Congress required primarily empirical description for guidance.

The overall research strategy and the specific research projects were guided, however, by ideas and concepts from more theoretically developed areas of the behavioral sciences such as socialization, personality, and social structure. Hopefully, the data compiled for purposes of empirical description of the phenomena of obscenity and pornography will be relevant to theoretical issues in these other areas.

Some of the empirical descriptions may appear to many social scientists as demonstrations of the obvious. This is often the case *after* an empirical description has been provided. Yet, it is never certain that "obvious" concepts and relations are valid until they have been tested empirically. As it turned out, there were a few surprises to a few people.

The policy implications of the findings of this research program may very well stir controversy and debate. Because of their crucial importance for policy discussion and decision, the Commission has presented the basic empirical observations with a minimum of complex statistical manipulation and conceptual analysis. The lack of refinement in presentation of several of the research reports is due in part to the Commission's desire to keep very close to the raw data.

Most of the researchers had less than nine months in which to establish a research team, arrange a research setting, develop measuring instruments, secure subjects, collect the data, reduce the data, and write a report. In several instances we are presenting, literally, the first draft of a report.

The Commission staff has refrained from all but very minor editing of these reports. The observations and interpretations are entirely the authors'. To insure that ideological standards were not imposed on the results of the reports, the Commission and its staff have also foregone the prerogative of imposing generally accepted standards of scientific reporting. To the same end we have also published all of the research that has been undertaken for us.

Nevertheless, most of the reports in these volumes quite satisfactorily reflect current standards, not only for conducting research but also for reporting on its results.

We trust that many of the authors will soon present to the behavioral science community reports based on these data but directed to more theoretical and conceptual issues and reflecting a higher degree of refinement of both data and presentation than has been possible here.

This series of volumes of Technical Reports is a joint effort of the Congress, the Commission, the Commission staff, the research teams headed by the authors of the several papers, and the many people who participated in the studies: Congress posed the general problems, authorized the Commission to contract with competent agencies to conduct research, and provided the necessary funds. The Commission specified the kinds of information that it required and worked closely with the staff in designing an appropriate research program. The Commission staff specified the details of the research program and, under the direction and guidance of the Commission, implemented it—partly by undertaking research directly, but more often by contracting with outside agencies to conduct research. The authors of the papers accepted responsibility for developing concrete research arrangements, collecting and analyzing data, and writing reports, all under tremendous time pressure. Several thousand people cooperated in collecting the data and devoted uncounted hours of time providing the information in these volumes.

On behalf of the Commission, its staff, the authors of the papers, and the people who read these volumes and make use of the contents, I express deep appreciation to the Members of Congress who initiated and make possible the gathering of this information, and to the people who participated in the various studies and contributed the basic information.

W. CODY WILSON
Executive Director
and Director of Research

Contents

	Page
Foreword	v
General preface	vii
Introduction to Volume V	1
Law enforcement	3
Gravity of the pornography situation and problems of control: A survey of prosecuting attorneys. *W. Cody Wilson, Jane Friedman, and Bernard Horowitz*	5
Regulation of obscenity by Federal agencies. *Jane Friedman*	15
Problems in arrests and prosecutions for obscenity and pornography: Response of police and prosecutors. *Alexander B. Smith and Bernard Locke*	35
Traffic in sex-oriented materials and criminality and organized crime: The relationship. *M. Marvin Finkelstein*	61
Citizen action groups	81
Collective dynamics of ad hoc antipornography organizations. *Louis A. Zurcher and R. George Kirkpatrick*	83
Participants in ad hoc antipornography organizations: Some individual characteristics. *Louis A. Zurcher and Robert G. Cushing*	143
Industry self-regulation	217
Classification by the motion picture industry. *Richard S. Randall*	219
Sex education	293
Sex education programs in the public schools of the United States. *Quality Educational Development, Inc.*	295
The positive and constructive approach to pornography in general sex education, in the home, and in sexological counseling. *John Money*	339
Effects of erotic stimuli used in National Sex Forum training courses in human sexuality. *Glide Foundation*	354
Pornography and youth: A survey of sex educators and counselors. *W. Cody Wilson and Sylvia Jacobs*	369

Introduction to Volume V

Volume V presents a variety of studies of societal response to the "threat" of the presence of explicit sexual materials. These responses are considered under four general headings: law enforcement, citizen action groups, industry self-regulation, and sex education.

Law enforcement covers several levels. Wilson and his associates present the results of a mail survey of a stratified random sample of prosecuting attorneys throughout the United States. Friedman describes the law enforcement policy regarding obscenity of various Federal agencies, based on interviews with people in these agencies. Smith and Locke describe the response of local law enforcement officers to the issues of obscenity based on extensive interviews in 17 major cities. Finkelstein tries to assemble and evaluate the evidence regarding the relationship between the pornography industry and "organized crime."

The Commission was unable to find previous studies of ad hoc citizens' groups created to fight pornography although it has the impression that they are not particularly rare. Zurcher and Kirkpatrick compare two such organizations and analyze the dynamics of their development and functioning. The paper is based on detailed "natural histories" of the two organizations, which in turn are based on personal observation, intensive interview, and examination of organization records. These source documents are too bulky to publish, but they are available in the Commission's files in the U.S. Archives and from the author. Zurcher and Cushing describe the characteristics of members of the two organizations and compare these with individuals in the same community who oppose the organizations and others who are more neutral on the issue. The data were collected using a structured questionnaire.

A large portion of the movie industry cooperated in instituting a new movie rating system soon after the Commission began its work. Since the rating system to a large extent reflected concern about the sexual content of movies, the new program offered an excellent opportunity to examine a case of industry self-regulation in an area closely related to the Commission's interests. Randall's paper presents data relevant to the functioning of the movie rating system and an analysis of its effectiveness.

Sex education has been proposed as a positive response to the "threat" of widespread distribution of explicit sexual materials in a society. The Commission wanted very much to evaluate the effectiveness of sex education in the schools, but the attack which was launched on schools for their sex education programs by extremist political groups about the same time that the Commission began its

work created an atmosphere that made it impossible to secure the cooperation of a suitable research site.

The QED paper is an overview of the status of sex education in the schools today. Money's paper describes the rationale and content of a recent program developed to train medical students in the area of sex. The Glide Foundation's paper presents a description of the rationale and content of a newly developed program for training professionals in such areas as social work, counseling, religion, and education to deal with sex, and a description of some of the trainees' responses to the program. Wilson and Jacobs present the results of a mail survey of sex educators regarding their perceptions of adolescents' experience with explicit sexual materials, and the possible relationship between sex education and interest in pornography, or the consequences of exposure to such material.

W. CODY WILSON
Executive Director and
Director of Research

Law Enforcement

Gravity of the Pornography Situation and Problems of Control

A Survey of Prosecuting Attorneys

W. Cody Wilson
Jane Friedman
Bernard Horowitz

Congress, in creating the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, found that such materials were a matter of national concern. They asserted that the Federal Government had a responsibility to investigate the gravity of the situation and to determine whether more effective methods should be devised to control the transmission of such materials. The Commission was directed to consider, with representatives of State and local governments, the carrying out of this assignment.

The Commission staff reviewed the existing literature, and although it found innumerable articles in the legal and general literature and hearings before Congressional Committees concerning the issue of obscenity, it was not able to find even one systematic study of law enforcement officers' perceptions of the problem of pornography and the control of obscenity.

The Commission staff, working under the guidance of the Commission's Legal Panel, designed and carried out a national survey of prosecuting attorneys for the purpose of remedying this lack of data.

METHOD

The sample for the survey was drawn in the following manner: An alphabetical listing of counties within each State was developed by reference to the 1969

World Almanac. This listing included the population of the county according to the 1960 census. The counties were divided into four groups based on the 1960 population:

1. Population greater than 500,000
2. Population between 100,000 and 500,000
3. Population between 20,000 and 100,000
4. Population less than 20,000.

Each county with a population of over 500,000 was selected into the sample, providing a sampling ratio of one in one.

Starting with a random number, every other county with a population of 100,000 to 500,000 (a sampling ratio of one in two) was selected into the sample.

Starting with a random number, every 10th county with a population of 20,000 to 100,000 (a sampling ratio of one in ten) was selected into the sampling.

Again, starting with a random number, every 15th county with a population of less than 20,000 (a sampling ratio of one in fifteen) was selected into the sample.

These sampling ratios provided approximately equal-sized samples in the three smaller population categories—about twice the sample sizes of the largest population category. The size of the samples were: over 500,000 population, 59; between 100,000 and 500,000 population, 724; between 20,000 and 100,000 population, 123; and less than 20,000 population, 120.

In consultation with the Legal Panel, the staff prepared a draft of a questionnaire which inquired into several different areas: (*a*) perception of obscenity as a problem; (*b*) difficulties of enforcement of obscenity laws; (*c*) the role of the police in the enforcement of obscenity laws; and (*d*) the community context of the issue of obscenity. This questionnaire was pretested and revised several times.

The questionnaire, along with an accompanying letter under the signatures of the Director of the Commission, the Chairman of the Commission, and the Chairman of the Legal Panel, was mailed with a self-addressed stamped envelope to the district attorneys of the counties included in the sample early in the summer of 1969. The letter provided a brief description of the origin and purpose of the Commission and solicited the district attorneys' cooperation in supplying the Commission with data about the obscenity issue at the local level. Thirty days after the first mailing, a second mailing was made to those district attorneys who had not yet responded. This mailing contained another letter emphasizing the importance of the data, which only the district attorneys could provide, another copy of the questionnaire, and another self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Replies were received from 69.3% of the sample (see Table 1). The rate of return was fairly similar for all four subsamples, ranging from 66.7% for the 20,000 to 100,000 population counties to 72.5% for the 100,000 to 500,000 population counties.

A similar questionnaire with a similar covering letter was mailed to the municipal attorneys of the county seats of the counties in the three larger population categories. Returns from this questionnaire were 65%. Of the municipal attorneys in the cities in the county seats of counties with populations over 500,000, 66% responded; 70% of the municipal attorneys in the county seats of counties with 100,000 to 500,000 population responded; but only 54% of the

Table 1

PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS IN VARIOUS SUBSAMPLES AND RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRE

Population of County	Number in Sample	Number Responding	Percent Responding
District Attorneys			
500,000	59	42	71.2
100,000-499,999	124	90	72.5
20,000-99,999	123	82	66.7
20,000	120	81	67.5
Total	426	295	69.3
Municipal Attorneys			
500,000	59	39	66.1
100,000-499,999	124	87	70.2
20,000-99,999	123	67	54.5
Total	306	193	63.1

municipal attorneys of the county seats of the counties of 20,000 to 100,000 population responded.

Although most of the items on the questionnaire were precoded, a few were open-ended. These latter questions were coded by the legal staff of the Commission. The responses to the questionnaire were punched onto cards and analyzed by computer, using the facilities of a private data analysis firm.

RESULTS

District attorneys

Overall. The responses to the questionnaire did not vary by geographical region. The States were divided into four geographical regions: Northeast, South, North Central, and West. The number of responses to some of the items did vary among these four regions, but this was attributable to the size of the communities in those regions. When the size of community was constant, all regional differences disappeared.

The responses to the questionnaire items were very highly correlated with community size. Variations among different-sized communities were so great that single estimates of responses to a given question for the total United States would be meaningless. Therefore, the estimated number or proportion of district attorneys throughout the United States who did respond to a given item in a particular way will not be presented. Rather, these numbers or proportions will be reported for each of the four population categories.

Perception of obscenity as a problem. The response to the question "Are the volume of traffic and pattern of distribution in obscenity and pornographic materials within your jurisdiction sufficient to constitute a matter of serious concern to your community?" was very highly correlated to the size of the community. The larger the community, the more likely was the district attorney to report that these materials do constitute a matter of serious concern to his

Table 2

CONCERN BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Q: Are the volume of traffic and patterns of distribution in obscene and pornographic materials within your jurisdiction sufficient to constitute a matter of serious concern to your community?

Size of county	Number responding	
	Yes	No
500,000	39	3
100,000-499,999	57	33
20,000-99,999	27	55
20,000	13	68
Total	136	159

community (see Table 2). The district attorneys were also asked to name the factor responsible for the concern or lack of it. Only three were mentioned with any frequency: 28% of those who reported a serious community concern attributed this to unsolicited exposure; 36% feared that the materials would fall into the hands of minors; and of those reporting that the material was not a serious community concern, 31% indicated that theirs was a small rural community with little traffic in erotica.

The district attorneys were asked if the seriousness of the problem had changed in the past two years. The responses fell into two catagories: "no" (it has remained essentially the same); and "yes" (it is more serious now). The response to this item was also highly correlated to the size of the community (see Table 3). The larger communities reported that the problem had grown, while the smaller community tended to report that it has remained essentially the same.

The response to the question of whether the problem had become more serious was also highly related to the response to the question "Does it now constitute a matter of serious concern to the community?" Those who felt that obscenity and pornography are a matter of serious concern also tended to report that the seriousness of the problem had changed in the last two years, while those who reported that it was not now a problem tended to report that the situation has remained essentially the same for the past two years (see Table 4).

Further analysis reveals that perception of change in the problem is not related to the size of the community when the perception of the matter as a serious concern is held constant. However, when the size of the community is held constant, it may be inferred that there is a relationship between the two. It is not known from these data which is the prior perception, but, on the basis of other observations, it would seem that the matter is viewed as a serious concern when perceived to be changing in an unfavorable direction.

The district attorneys reported that they spent little time on the issue of obscenity. Only three district attorneys in the entire sample reported devoting as much as 5% of thier office's total activity to obscenity and pornography. Only five district attorneys reported that their offices spend as much as three man-months a year on obscenity and pornography. Only 17 (5%) of the district attorneys reported spending as much as one man-month a year on obscenity and pornography.

Table 3

CHANGE IN SERIOUSNESS BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Q: Has the seriousness of the problem changed in the past two years?

Size of county	No Response	Number Responding	
		No: remained same	Yes: more serious now
500,000	0	4	38
100,000-499,999	3	39	48
20,000-99,999	7	50	25
20,000	12	57	12
Total	22	150	123

Table 4

CONCERN BY CHANGE IN SERIOUSNESS

Matter of serious concern	Has seriousness changed	
	No: remained same	Yes: more serious now
Yes	29	106
No	121	17

The district attorneys were asked how many legal actions their offices had instituted against the distribution of obscenity and pornography between 1966 and 1968. The response to this item is again highly related to the size of the community (see Table 5). The larger communities are more likely to have taken action than the smaller communities. This relationship holds when the district attorney's perception of obscenity and pornography as a serious community concern is held constant.

The number of legal actions instituted is also related to perception of obscenity and pornography as a matter of serious concern to the community (see Table 6).

Those district attorneys who perceived the matter to be a serious concern in their community were more likely to institute legal action against obscenity. This relationship holds even when the size of the community is held constant.

The district attorneys were asked to indicate whether various categories of materials were actually a cause of concern in their community. The district attorneys reported 146 different cases which were prosecuted. In these prosecutions, the materials involved were: 21 (14%) theater films, 19 (13%) other films (not the showing of films in commercial theaters, but, for example, the sale of erotic home movies), 35 (24%) books, 43 (29%) heterosexual magazines, 20 (14%) photographs, and 8 (06%) other categories, including underground newspapers, homosexual magazines, records, devices, and advertisements.

Of 122 cases of prosecution reported by the district attorneys in which the type of activities involved were described, 51 (42%) involved store sales to adults, 20 (16%) involved display to adults, 7 (06%) involved clandestine sales, 9 (07%) involved sale or display to minors, and 16 (13%) involved miscellaneous activities.

Table 5

NUMBER OF LEGAL ACTIONS BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Size of community	Number of Legal Actions, 1966-68 None	One or more	NA
500,000	1	41	0
100,000-499,999	26	60	4
20,000-99,999	61	17	4
20,000	78	0	3
Total	166	118	11

Table 6

NUMBER OF LEGAL ACTION BY CONCERN

Matter of serious concern	Number of legal actions, 1966-68 None	One or more	NA
Yes	44	90	2
No	122	28	9
Total	166	118	11

Table 7

KIND OF MATERIAL THAT IS CAUSE OF CONCERN BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Kind of material	Size of Community 500,000 Item cause of concern No.	%	100,000-499,999 Item cause of concern No.	%	20,000-99,999 Item cause of concern No.	%	20,000 Item cause of concern No.	%
Erotic films shown in theaters	32	78	36	40	18	22	3	04
Erotic paperback books	31	76	45	50	17	21	11	14
Magazines featuring models with genitals or pubic hair exposed	32	78	32	36	8	10	2	02
Homosexual magazines	26	63	25	28	6	07	3	04
Girlie magazines	24	58	32	36	16	20	8	10
Nudist magazines	21	51	26	29	11	13	6	07
Erotic films for sale or rental	15	37	14	16	6	07	7	09
Underground newspapers	15	37	9	10	3	04	2	02
Sexual devices	11	27	9	10	3	04	5	06
Films shown in arcades or peepshows	10	24	2	02	1	01	0	00
Sex tabloid newspapers	10	24	10	11	3	04	0	00
Still photographs or playing cards	9	22	9	10	2	02	2	02
Other books (marriage manuals, medical books, etc.)	6	15	9	10	5	06	5	06
Erotic literary novels	5	12	15	17	6	07	4	05
Erotic phonograph records	5	12	2	02	0	00	1	01
Stag films shown in clubs, etc.	2	05	5	06	7	09	3	04
Other	6	15	4	04	1	01	0	00

Table 8

METHODS OF DISTRIBUTION THAT ARE CAUSE OF CONCERN BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

	Size of community							
	500,000		100,000-499,999		20,000-99,999		20,000	
	Method cause of concern		Method cause of concern		Method cause of concern		Method cause of concern	
Methods of distribution	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Receipt of advertising material by minors through mail	29	71	30	33	13	16	12	15
Unsolicited mail	26	63	33	37	16	20	13	16
Store sales to adults	25	61	32	36	14	17	6	07
Store sales to minors	23	56	36	40	16	20	7	09
Sales through the mails	23	56	37	41	18	22	13	16
Open displays in magazine or news stands	22	54	29	32	19	23	5	06
Open displays in bookstores	23	56	22	24	10	12	2	02
Movie marquees and displays	17	41	13	14	9	11	1	01
Undercover sales to minors	9	22	17	19	4	05	4	05
Repeated violations by same seller after conviction	8	20	3	03	1	01	0	00
Broadcasts on television	2	05	3	03	3	04	1	01
Broadcasts on radio	1	02	0	00	0	00	0	00
Other	3	07	0	00	2	02	0	00

Enforcement problems

General. The reporting of problems in enforcing obscenity statutes was related both to the size of the community and the concern about the problem expressed by the district attorney. The larger the community, the more likely were reports of enforcement problems, which were in turn related to concern about the matter. Each of these variables was related to enforcement problems when the other was held constant, but perception of the matter as being of serious concern was more highly related to enforcement problems than was community size.

The district attorneys were asked, "Have you experienced any special difficulties in enforcing existing obscenity legislation?" The response to this question was again highly related to the size of the community, with the larger communities indicating that they did experience difficulty (see Table 9). This relationship also holds when the perception of the matter as being of serious concern is held constant. Experiencing difficulties in enforcing obscenity legislation was also related to perception of community concern (see Table 10). This relationship holds when the size of the community is held constant.

The district attorneys were asked to describe the difficulties they had encountered. Forty-nine district attorneys (17%) indicated difficulties with definitional problems, 34 (12%) cited poorly drafted legislation, 15 (5%) cited Federal Court decisions, 11 (04%) mentioned search and seizure problems, and 9 (3%) reported difficulties in obtaining experts to testify on community standards and lack of social value.

The district attorneys also reported on the consequences of 122 prosecutions

Table 9

DIFFICULTIES IN ENFORCEMENT BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Q: Have you experienced any special difficulties in enforcing existing obscenity legislation?

Size of community	Difficulties in enforcement		
	Yes	No	NA
500,000	36	5	1
100,000-499,999	52	25	13
20,000-99,999	18	47	17
20,000	8	52	21
Total	114	129	52

Table 10

DIFFICULTIES IN ENFORCEMENT BY CONCERN

Matter of serious concern	Difficulties in enforcement		
	Yes	No	NA
Yes	91	28	17
No	23	101	35
Total	114	129	52

Table 11

FEEL STATE OBSCENITY LAWS NEED CHANGE BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Q: Do you feel that existing obscenity legislation in your jurisdiction needs to be changed in some way?

Size of community	Feel obscenity law needs change		
	Yes	No	NA
500,000	23	17	2
100,000-499,999	49	29	12
20,000-99,999	30	42	10
20,000	15	45	21
Total	117	133	45

that they had initiated. Of these, 53 cases (43%) resulted in convictions, 31 (25%) were still pending, 4 (03%) resulted in convictions overturned on appeal, 11 (09%) were dismissed, 6 (05%) resulted in an acquittal, 6 (05%) resulted in an injunction on a civil decree, and 11 (09%) were reported as having miscellaneous outcomes. The district attorneys were also asked whether they felt that the existing obscenity legislation in their jurisdiction needed to be changed in some way. The response to this question was related to the size of the community, with the district attorneys from larger communities favoring such change (see Table 11). This relationship holds when the district attorney's perception of community concern is held constant, but the relationship is not a large one when this factor is

Table 12

FEEL STATE OBSCENITY LAW NEEDS CHANGE BY CONCERN

Matter of concern	Feel obscenity law needs change		
	Yes	No	NA
Yes	80	44	12
No	37	89	33
Total	117	133	45

Table 13

COMPONENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL TEST PERCEIVED AS OBSTACLE BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

	Size of community							
	500,000		100,000-499,999		20,000-99,999		20,000	
	Report component an obstacle		Report component an obstacle		Report component an obstacle		Report component an obstacle	
Component of Constitutional Test	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Whether to the average person	3	07	6	07	2	02	0	00
or the deviant group to which the material is disseminated	2	05	9	10	2	02	0	00
The dominant theme of the material taken as a whole	7	17	23	26	8	10	4	05
appeals to the prurient interest	7	17	21	23	6	07	4	05
and is patently offensive	4	10	10	11	5	06	1	01
by contemporary community standards	18	44	24	27	8	10	3	04
and is utterly without redeeming social value	30	73	38	42	12	15	5	06
The requirement of scienter	16	39	18	20	5	06	1	01
Other	2	05	3	03	2	02	0	00
None of these components have been a serious obstacle to enforcement	3	07	5	06	18	22	5	06

Table 14

HOW CONSTITUTIONAL OBSTACLES ARE MANIFESTED BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Type of manifestation of obstacle	Size of community: 500,000 — Report manifestation No.	%	100,000-499,999 — Report manifestation No.	%	20,000-99,999 — Report manifestation No.	%	20,000 — Report manifestation No.	%
Decision not to prosecute or dismissal by prosecutor for inability to prove requisite components	27	66	44	49	23	28	5	06
Directed verdicts or other judicial action terminating prosecution for failure to prove requisite components	14	34	11	12	6	07	0	00
Reversal of conviction	11	27	6	07	3	04	0	00
Acquittals by jury or judge	7	17	10	11	7	09	0	00
Other	4	10	10	11	4	05	1	01

removed.

Feeling that the local laws should be changed is also related to perception of community concern. If obscenity is perceived to be of serious concern, there is a tendency to feel that the obscenity laws should be changed (see Table 12). This relationship remains, even when the size of community is held constant.

The district attorneys were asked to describe the changes which they would suggest. Thirty-seven (12%) wanted more workable definitions, 25 (8%) wanted statutes covering sales to minors, and 18 (6%) felt that the State statutes should be brought into conformance with Supreme Court rulings.

The district attorneys were also asked to provide their suggestions for overcoming these constitutional obstacles to enforcement. Thirty-six (12%) suggested clarifying standards and supplying explicit definitions, 16 (5%) suggested replacing national standards with local standards, 14 (5%) suggested leaving questions of obscenity to a jury and limiting judicial review, and 13 (5%) suggested the elimination of the social value standard.

Finally, the district attorneys were asked if they would recommend any changes in Federal statutes regarding obscenity. Only a minority of respondents would recommend such a change. Recommending such a change was not related to the size of the community in which the district attorney lived, but it was related to his perception of community concern over the matter. Those who perceived the matter to be of serious concern tended to recommend changes in Federal statutes. Twenty-three district attorneys (8%) recommended strengthening mail statutes, 11 (4%) recommended more precise definitions, and 8 (3%) recommended a Federal minors statute.

Regulation of Obscenity by Federal Agencies

JANE FRIEDMAN
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography

POST OFFICE

The Post Office regulates the dissemination of obscene materials in at least six distinct ways:

(1) Postal inspectors cooperate with U.S. attorneys and local district attorneys in the prosecution of cases arising from Federal and State obscenity statutes.

(2) As an alternative to prosecution, the Postal Inspection Service often "suppresses" or "discontinues" obscene mail.

(3) The Department asserts and sometimes exercises the power to deny second class rates to suspect publications.

(4) Postal officials occasionally stop obscene mail in transit, usually at the point of entry, by declaring it "nonmailable," thereby denying the use of the mails for the distribution of publications which violate the obscenity standard as it is interpreted by the Post Office.

(5) The Department at times stops the delivery of mail to persons who use the mails to sell condemned matter. This device is known as the "mail-block" and is authorized by 39 U.S.C. 4006.

(6) Through its use of the Anti-Pandering Act (39 U.S.C. 4009), the Department assists postal patrons who object to receiving advertisements for matter which they deem to be erotically arousing or sexually provocative.

A description of each of these regulatory methods follows.

Cooperation with Federal and State prosecuting attorneys

In 1968, there were 263 convictions in Federal and State courts for violations of postal obscenity laws. In each of these 263 cases, most or all of the investigatory work was done by the Postal Inspection Service of the U.S. Post Office Department.

Postal inspectors discover obscene material in at least four ways:

Complaints from the public. In fiscal 1968 alone, there were 148,134 complaints to the Department from members of the public.[1] However, very few of these complaints involved hard-core pornography, since this material is usually sent only to those who order it. As one official observed, ". . . these people are hardly likely to register a complaint with the Postal Inspection Service."[2] Therefore, the Service employs three other devices to uncover sources and consumers of hard-core pornography—mail covers, seizures, and purchase of materials under pseudonymns.

Mail covers. This involves the recording of information appearing on the outside of all envelopes intended for a specified addressee.[3] This information, which includes the postmark and return address of each correspondent, is given by the local postmaster to the Chief Postal Inspector or an inspector in charge of one of the Post Office's 15 regional offices.[4] For example, if the inspector in charge of the New York regional office ordered a mail cover on Cybertype Corporation, the return address and postmark on each envelope addressed to Cybertype Corporation would be recorded by the postmaster in New York, and the information thus collected would be given to the inspector in charge of the New York regional office. The mail cover can remain in force for 120 days, or for a longer period if approved by the Chief Postal Inspector.[5] A former Chief Inspector has stated that the Postal Inspection Service feels that it has a duty to inform appropriate persons whenever it observes mail being delivered to a pornography dealer from a "teacher, or scoutmaster, or anyone in a similarly sensitive position."[6]

Seizures. 18 U.S.C. 3061 empowers postal inspectors to arrest persons who are suspected of having violated the postal laws and, upon service of a warrant, to make searches which are incidental thereto. Lawful seizure of materials from one dealer often yields information about other dealers and, even more often, about

---

1. Personal interview with M.T. Kauten, Chief, Mailability Section, Fraud and Mailability Division, Postal Inspection Service, January 31, 1969.

2. Ibid.

3. See, generally, *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Invasions of Privacy* (Gov't. Agencies) 89th Congress, 1st Session, 68 (1965).

4. The pertinent regulation provides as follows:

"The Chief Postal Inspector or his designee may order mail covers under the following circumstances:

"1. Where he has reason to believe the subject or subjects of the mail cover are engaged in any activity violative of any postal statute." Postal Manual, Section 861.4. See also Section 861.5 giving the same power to "all Postal Inspectors in Charge, and not more than three designees."

5. The pertinent regulations provide:

"Excepting mail covers ordered on subjects engaged in any activity against the National security, or *activity violative of any Postal law*, no mail cover order shall remain in force and effect for more than 30 days." *Postal Manual* Section 861.64.

"No mail cover shall remain in force longer than 120 days unless personally approved for further extension by the Chief Postal Inspector." *Postal Manual* Section 861.65.

6. Personal interview with Chief Inspector Montague, January 21, 1969.

private parties. Again, if these private parties hold "sensitive positions," the Postal Inspection Service will report the information to the appropriate officials.[7]

Purchase under pseudonymns. The Post Office employs this procedure to obtain a large percentage of its prosecutable material.[8] The inspector, using a fictitious name and return address, writes a few letters requesting material. If a postal inspector answers two magazine ads for materials, he may, in return, receive as many as 500 unsolicited pieces of mail.[9] When an inspector receives material he considers obscene, the process of determining the original source of the material begins. This is usually a difficult task, since the return address is usually a post office box, and the box is often discontinued before the inspector makes his inquiry. If the box is still in use, however, the inspector will instruct the postmaster to aid him in establishing the identity of the person who comes to pick up the mail.[10]

At some point in the investigation, the postal inspector will consult with the U.S. attorney who has jurisdiction over the area from which the material was mailed or to which it was delivered. Until 1958, there was only one possible Federal venue for each case—the jurisdiction in which the dealer operated. This made prosecution difficult, for more than half of the dealers operate from the Los Angeles area,[11] where community standards presumably have not been conducive to the obtaining of convictions.[12]

To remedy this, Congress in 1958 altered the wording of the basic Federal statute so that a dealer could be prosecuted not only where the material was mailed, but also in any place where it was delivered.

18 U.S.C. 1461 now provides, in pertinent part:

> Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing or delivery of [obscene materials], shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned more than ten years, or both, for each offense thereafter.[13]

---

7. Ibid.

8. For a general description of this procedure see Roberts, *The Smut Rakers,* 66 et seq. (Dow Jones & Co., 1966).

9. An excellent example of this "snowball effect" can be found in a study by the Maryland Crime Investigating Commission which was begun during the summer of 1959. A copy of an erotic magazine for men was obtained by an investigator from a Baltimore bookstand and five ads, chosen at random, were "answered." (Four ads were for "art studies" and one ad purported to be from a "lonesome model.") The ads were answered in the name of a volunteer. Although only two of these replies reached their destinations, the Crime Commission Agent received, during the ensuing eight and one-half years, a total of 554 unsolicited pieces of mail—mainly sex-oriented advertisements. (See letter dated February 23, 1968, from Alvin J.T. Zumbrun, Executive Director of Maryland Crime Investigating Commission, to Senator Thomas J. Dodd.)

10. Kauten interview, op. cit., footnote 1.

11. Kauten interview, op. cit., footnote 1.

12. See, for example, *U.S.* v. *Frew,* 187 F. Supp. 500 (E.D. Mich. 1960) ("What the community of Los Angeles may have found not obscene may meet a different standard in Michigan.").

13. The drastic broadening of venue was accomplished by substituting the verb "uses" for the verb "deposits" in the text of the statute, thereby bringing the offense under the general venue provision of 18 U.S.C. 3237 which provides: "Any offense involving the *use* of the

If the U.S. attorneys at the places of mailing or delivery are not interested in prosecuting the case, the matter is turned over to State or local attorneys who can prosecute under State and local laws.[14] This is generally true for three types of cases. First, there are cases where the Justice Department[15] feels that the materials involved do not meet the obscenity standard as set forth in recent decisions. Second, there are cases involving private correspondence between consenting adults.[16] Finally, there are the underground newspapers which the Justice Department finds "offensive" but not, as yet, obscene.[17]

The Inspection Service feels duty-bound to turn all three categories of cases over to local authorities, for it deems the materials to be "contraband per se," and the "consensual" element irrelevant.[18] Thus, of the 263 postal obscenity convictions obtained in fiscal 1968, more than one-half were brought in State courts by State and local prosecuting attorneys.[19] The cost to the Postal Inspection Service in fiscal 1968 for participating in these cases (both State and Federal) and investigating others which did not culminate in convictions, was $741,750.[20]

Suppressions and discontinuances

Many times neither Federal nor local authorities are willing to prosecute a case "jacketed" by the Inspection Service. At this point, two options are open to the inspector who has investigated the matter. He can either "give up, and resign himself to the fact that his time and the public's money have been wasted,"[21] or he can employ a procedure called "suppression," or, more recently, "discontinuance." An inspector suppresses mail when he notifies the sender that what he is dispatching is illegal. The sender agrees to refrain from further activity of this type in return for the inspector's promise that no criminal prosecution will be instituted. Often the mailer's promise is accompanied by a receipt showing that his post office box has been discontinued—thus giving rise to the term "discontinuance." In fiscal 1968, there were 2,685 successful "suppressions,"[22] as compared to 263 criminal convictions. Most of these 2,685 cases involved small commercial operators.[23] There are conflicting reports as to whether or not the figure also encompasses cases involving private correspondence between consent-

---

mails . . . may be . . . prosecuted in any district from, through, or into which such . . . mail matter moves" (emphasis supplied).

14. Montague interview, op. cit., footnote 6.

15. The U.S. attorneys are employees and local arms of the U.S. Department of Justice. There is one U.S. attorney (and usually several assistants) in each Federal district.

16. In *United States* v. *Redmond* 384 U.S. 264 (1965) the Solicitor General of the United States stated in the government's brief that it was the policy of the Federal Government to refrain from prosecuting cases involving private correspondence between consenting adults.

17. Personal interview with Charles Miller, Division Head, Fraud and Mailability Division, U.S. Postal Inspection Service, January 31, 1969.

18. Ibid.

19. Kauten interview, op. cit., footnote 1.

20. Personal written communication from M.T. Kauten, dated February 7, 1969.

21. Kauten interview, op. cit., footnote 1.

22. Ibid.

23. Telephone conversation with M.T. Kauten, February 17, 1969.

ing adults.[24] It is not known how many *unsuccessful* attempts at suppression were made in fiscal 1968 or during previous years, since the Inspection Service does not keep figures of this type.[25] Since a suppression can be attempted by an individual field inspector without clearance from the inspector in charge or the Washington Office,[26] figures on unsuccessful attempts at suppression would, indeed, be difficult to obtain.

The constitutionality of this procedure has apparently never been tested in the courts.

Denial of second-class mailing privileges

Section 132.2 of the Postal Manual provides:

> Only newspapers and other periodical publications may be mailed at second-class rates. The copies may not contain obscene . . . material that would cause them to be nonmailable . . .

The exercise of the power to deny second-class mailing privileges to "nonmailable" publications was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1921 in the case of *Milwaukee Publishing Company* v. *Burleson* 255 U.S. 407. That case involved the *Milwaukee Leader*, a small, left-wing, pacifist journal which postal officials deemed nonmailable under the Espionage Act. Although there was no statute authorizing it to do so, the Post Office cut off the *Leader's* second-class mailing privilege. The Post Office lawyers argued that the power to do so was implied, automatically, from the very existence of criminal statutes declaring seditious materials to be nonmailable. Certainly, they argued, if the *Milwaukee Leader's* introduction into the mails violated criminal law, the periodical must forfeit its privilege to enjoy a low rate at the expense of the taxpayer. The Supreme Court upheld this contention, holding that once a publisher puts out nonmailable matter—be it seditious or obscene—he must forfeit his privilege to enjoy the second-class rate. The Post Office, at its discretion, may revoke the privilege and refuse to reinstate it until the publication conforms with the mailability laws. Justice Holmes registered a strong dissent in which Justice Brandeis concurred:

> The question of the rate has nothing to do with the question of whether the matter is mailable, and I am satisfied with that the Postmaster can not determine in advance that a certain newspaper is going to be nonmailable and on that ground deny to it not the use of the mails but the rate of postage that the statute says shall be charged.

Justice Brandeis further warned that the Postmaster General should not be given the power to become a "universal censor of publications."

Something akin to the Holmes-Brandeis view was adopted by the Court in 1946 in the case of *Hannegan* v. *Esquire Magazine* 347 U.S. 146. In that case, the Post

---

24. On one occasion the Chief of the Mailability Section told this author that "suppression" was an effective method for reaching private correspondence. During a subsequent telephone conversation, however, he stated that "suppressions" were not used for this purpose.

25. Telephone conversation with M.T. Kauten, op. cit., footnote 23.

26. Kauten interview, op. cit., footnote 1.

Office denied a second-class permit to *Esquire* on the ground that the publication was vulgar, indecent, and morally improper, and made no contribution "to the public good and the public welfare." The Supreme Court held that the Postmaster General had exceeded the limits of his power. Deprivation of the lower postal rate constituted an economic embargo. The effect of the postal ruling was censorship.

It is not clear whether the *Esquire* decision overruled the *Milwaukee Publishing* case. Nothing conclusive was said about the power to revoke the second-class privilege of periodicals which were, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, nonmailable on the grounds of obscenity. But the Court did emphasize the important legal status of the second-class mailing privilege. So long as a periodical met certain technical qualifications, the power to deny the rate was circumscribed by the First Amendment.

In spite of the doubts cast by the Supreme Court, the power to deny or revoke the second-class permit remains today a very potent weapon in the hands of the Post Office. By merely threatening to deny an application for the lower rate, postal officials can usually bring a publication "into line" with what it deems to be the standards of the obscenity laws.[27]

A controversy between the Post Office and a former underground newspaper, *The Washington Free Press*, reflects some of the effects of the Post Office's use of the mailing privilege power for the purposes of obscenity regulation.[28] The *Free Press* applied for a second-class privilege, but the application was denied by the city postmaster on the ground that the publication was obscene. A number of conferences between postal and *Free Press* officials ensued, after which the city postmaster sent several issues of the *Free Press* to the Post Office Qualifications and Special Services Division. That division found the publication to be not obscene and hence mailable, and the city postmaster was so informed. The city postmaster then denied the application for the second-class rate on the grounds of technical insufficiencies. Finally, after a delay of several more months, the second-class permit was issued.[29]

Some postal officials feel that the denial of mailing privileges is the only truly effective method of control over many borderline publications.[30] If second-class rates are to be allowed as a matter of course as soon as the technical requirements for the permit are met, the Post Office will be forced to rely on the prosecutorial discretion of the U.S. attorneys and, ultimately, the Department of Justice. And, as mentioned above, there is a great deal of conflict between these two Departments as to what types of materials are, and are not, obscene.

---

27. Personal interview with Mr. Henry S. Holley, Director of Administrative Services, Postal Service Center, Washington, D.C., February 7, 1969.

28. Ibid.

29. There is some evidence that second-class permits are used by members of the industry as indices of acceptability. That is, when a distributor or retailer indicates that he may be unwilling to carry certain marginal materials, the publisher will often point to the publication's second-class permit as evidence that the material has been cleared by the Post Office. (Oral remarks of Commissioner Elson, meeting of Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, February 13, 1969.)

30. Holley interview, op. cit., footnote 27.

Declarations of nonmailability

In this case, the Post Office simply halts allegedly obscene mail in transit, usually at the point of entry, thereby denying the use of the mails for the distribution of publications which violate the obscenity standard as construed by the Post Office.[31]

If the local postmaster, at the point of entry, believes a publication to be obscene, he forwards it to the Mailability Division of the Office of General Counsel. If the General Counsel deems the mailing to be not obscene, he sends it back to the local postmaster, who then deposits it in the mails. If, on the other hand, the General Counsel agrees that the mailing violates the obscenity standard, he notifies the sender that the publication is being withheld from the mails. If the mailer does not contest this decision, the matter ends, and the publication is, presumably, destroyed.

If, however, the mailer requests review of the General Counsel's determination, an adversary hearing is held before the judicial officer of the Post Office Department.

If the judicial officer affirms the decision of the General Counsel, the mailer can then, if he has the resources and the tenacity, file a complaint in Federal District Court, thereby obtaining judicial review of the administrative decision.

The Supreme Court has cast grave doubts on the power of the Post Office to employ the above-described procedure. In *Manual Enterprises* v. *Day* 370 U.S. 478 (1962), a case in which certain materials were found to be not obscene, Justice Brennan (joined by Justices Douglas and Warren) wrote a concurring opinion in which he found that the Post Office simply did not have the statutory authority to declare publications nonmailable, and thus to remove them from the mails. He further noted that if there were such a statute, it would probably be unconstitutional; for,

> The suggestion that Congress may constitutionally authorize any process other than a fully judicial one raises the gravest doubts. (370 U.S. at 519)

With the advent of the *Manual Enterprises* decision, the General Counsel of the Post Office announced his official position to be that:

> The Department to this day eschews administrative action against domestic mailers under . . . 18 U.S. Code 1461, in favor of preparing appropriate cases for trial under Section 1461, in cooperation with the Justice Department.[32]

This position was reiterated to this Commission's staff members on January 27, 1969, by William Lawrence, the Department's Assistant General Counsel in charge of the Mailability Division.[33] Four days later, however, this author interviewed three staff attorneys in the Mailability Division. One of them showed her a large box of materials which had recently been picked up at the point of entry by a

---

31. For a very thorough description and analysis of this procedure, see Paul, "The Post Office and Non-Mailability of Obscenity: An Historical Note," 8 *UCLA Law Review* 44 (1961).

32. See Timothy J. May, *Post Office Department Administrative Action against Obscenity: An Anti-Pollutant for Our Nation's Mailstream* (unpublished, 1968).

33. Personal interview with William Lawrence, Assistant General Counsel, Mailability Division, Post Office Department, January 27, 1969.

postmaster in California and sent to the General Counsel in Washington for an opinion as to whether the materials violated the obscenity standards.

When questioned about the seeming contradiction between the use of this procedure and the official statements of the General Counsel and his assistant, the staff attorney responded substantially as follows:

> Justice Brennan's opinion in *Manual Enterprises* was not a majority opinion, but a concurring one. Furthermore, in most of the cases which come up, the General Counsel finds the material to be not obscene, and sends it back to the local postmaster to be dispatched in the mails. All that is lost to the mailer is a few days' time, and he probably is never even cognizant of the fact that his materials were removed from the mails. In only five or 10 cases this past year did the General Counsel find that certain materials were obscene and nonmailable. And, not in a single one of these cases did the mailer even ask for a hearing before the Department's judicial officer.[34]

Thus, the extent of use of the nonmailability procedure as a method of obscenity regulation, and also the statutory authority for this procedure and its utlimate constitutionality, remain open questions at this time.

"Unlawful" orders and the mail-block statute

39 U.S.C. 4006 (74 Stat. 655) authorizes the Postmaster General, upon satisfactory evidence that the mails are being used to solicit or obtain remittances for obscene matter, or that obscene matter is being deposited in the mails, to order mail addressed to the violator to be marked "unlawful" and returned to the sender.

This statute was extensively employed under the tenure of Arthur Summerfield as Postmaster General. However, the policy of his immediate successor, J. Edward Day, led away from Section 4006 proceedings aimed at domestic mailers and toward increasing criminal prosecutions.[35] Even under the Day administration however, and particularly during that of this successors, it was the position of the Department that:

> The strong desire to protect freedom of expression in this country, which desire undoubtedly underlay the Supreme Court's adverse attitude toward administrative action, does not apply to such action against expression by foreign mailers. Consequently, Section 4006 is regularly applied to mailings emanating from oversea enterprises.[36]

The following procedure is thus employed vis-a-vis foreign mailers of allegedly obscene materials:[37]

> When there is reason to believe that a piece of sealed mail of foreign origin contains obscene matter, the Bureau of Customs notifies the Postal Exchange Office of first receipt. The Exchange Office then endorses the cover with the

---

34. Personal interview with John Ventresco, staff attorney, Office of General Counsel, Mailability Division, January 31, 1969.

35. See: Day, J.E. "Mailing lists and pornography," 52 *American Bar Association Journal* 1103 (1966).

36. Op. cit., footnote 32.

37. Ibid.

legend, "Supposed to Contain Matter Prohibited Importation."[38] The piece is then forwarded to the post office of destination, which will notify the addressee that it is being held there, and request his authorization to open it. If he gives authorization, the opening is arranged to take place in his presence or, if he fails to appear, in the presence of two postal employees. If he denies authorization, the item is endorsed "Unlawful" and returned unopened to its origin.

Where opening of the sealed mail item is authorized, and examination reveals contents which the postal officials deem not obscene, the item is transferred forthwith to the addressee. If, on the other hand, the postal officials believe the contents to be obscene, a sample thereof is sent to the Mailability Division of the General Counsel's Office.[39] Whenever the contents of the sample are deemed to be obscene by the General Counsel, he sends the evidence to the Department's judicial officer, together with the recommendation that an appropriate order be issued pursuant to Section 4006. If the judicial officer is convinced that the matter is obscene, he will issue a "foreign unlawful order." The order forbids certification of postal money orders drawn to the order of the foreign mailer, and provides for refund to the remitter of such money order.

The foreign unlawful order further directs that the exterior of all correspondence to the foreign mailer be marked "Unlawful." Such mail is then transmitted to the postmaster of the office from which it originated for return to the original sender. When there is no indication of the sender's identity, the marked mail is sent to the appropriate dead letter branch for a disposition as dead mail.

During the years 1961-67, the foregoing procedure was not used in cases involving domestic mailers. In 1968, however, the Post Office revived the practice of proceeding administratively under Section 4006 against domestic producers of erotica. Subsequently, a three-judge Federal District Court held the statute unconstitutional,[40] and the matter is presently on appeal to the Supreme Court.

Assisting postal patrons through the administration of the Anti-Pandering Act, 39 U.S.C. 4009

The Post Office Department is empowered by the Anti-Pandering Act, 39 U.S.C. 4009, to assist postal patrons who object to receiving advertisements for matter which they deem to be erotically arousing or sexually provocative.

Section (b) of that statute provides as follows:

> Upon receipt of a notice from an addressee that he has received [an advertisement for matter which he, in his sole discretion believes to be erotically arousing or sexually provocative] . . . the Postmaster General shall issue an order, if requested by the addressee, to the sender thereof directing the sender and his agents or assigns to refrain from further mailings to the named addressees.

Within 30 days after the receipt of the order (which is called a "prohibitory order"), the sender must delete the name of the designated addressee from all

---

38. 19 U.S.C. 1305 (a) (46 Stat. 688) prohibits importation of any obscene matter into the United States from any foreign country.

39. Part 262 of the Postal Manual contains the regulation for the described proceedings.

40. *United States* v. *The Book Bin,* USDC N.D., Ga., Civ. No. 12812 (September 9, 1969).

mailing lists that he controls, and must thereafter refrain from making any further mailings to the named addressees.

If the addressee receives a second mailing *of any type* from the sender, the Postmaster General can serve a complaint on the sender. Upon request of the sender, an administrative hearing may then be held.

If, after the hearing (or without a hearing if one is not requested), the Postmaster General determines that the prohibitory order has been violated, he is authorized to request the Attorney General to apply to the appropriate U.S. District Court for an order directing compliance.

If the Attorney General makes the application, and the U.S. District Court enters the order, "failure to observe such order may be punished by the Court as contempt thereof."[41]

Furthermore, upon request of any addressee, the prohibitory order of the Postmaster General must include the names of any of the addressee's children who are under the age of 19.[42]

One obvious problem with the Anti-Pandering Law is its potential for abuse. The postal patron can invoke the aid of the Post Office, and ultimately the courts, in having his name deleted from the lists of all mailers who send out unsolicited mail, since the Act leaves the matter of erotic arousal and/or sexual provocation to the "sole discretion" of the individual postal patron.

With the exception of two "saturation" mailers, the industry appears to be responsive to the receipt of prohibitory orders. Of 325,000 prohibitory orders issued between April 14, 1968 (the effective date of the Act) and December 31, 1969, there have been only 2,000 cases of noncompliance. The offenders in virtually all 2,000 cases were the two producers mentioned above.

There are two "unsolicited mailing" problems to which the Anti-Pandering Act is not addressed: A postal patron cannot invoke the Act until he has received one mailing from the mailer against whom the prohibitory order is desired, and a prohibitory order against one mailer does not prevent other mailers from sending similar unsolicited mail to the objecting recipient.

The Supreme Court of the United States upheld the constitutionality of this statute in 1970.[43]

CUSTOMS BUREAU

The United States Customs Bureau has had the authority to bar obscene matter from American shores since the Tariff Act of 1842. This authority, which has been renewed in each subsequent tariff law, is set forth in Section 305 of the Tariff Act of 1930,[44] which is still in effect today. The law provides that:

> All persons are prohibited from importing into the United States from any foreign country . . . any obscene book, pamphlet, paper, writing, advertisement, circular, print, picture, drawing, or other representation, figure, or image on or of paper or other material.

---

41. U.S.C. 4009 (e).
42. U.S.C. 4009 (g).
43. *Rowan* v. *United States Post Office Department* 397 U.S. 728 (May 4, 1970).
44. 19 U.S.C. 1305.

History of the Act

The Tariff Act of 1930 represents a compromise solution to a very heated censorship controversy in Congress during the late 1920's.

Prior to 1930, a customs official could confiscate anything which he deemed obscene, and the matter would rarely find its way into court. Only if the importer was sufficiently wealthy and persistent would the case be brought into court. Individual dock inspectors used their power to exclude such authors as Aristophanes, Defoe, Petronius, Rabelais, Coccaccio, Balzac, Rousseau, Casanova, and Voltaire.[45]

Seizures of this type caused agitation for reform by both libertarian and literary forces. However, the confiscations were defended by various decent literature groups and by their spokesman, Senator Reed Smoot of Utah, on the ground that the aforementioned books and others would have a deleterious effect on children. Senator Smoot went so far as to say, "I would rather have a child . . . use opium than read these books."[46] He further contended that customs inspectors were qualified to make these seizures because of their "knowledge of the world."[47]

The Senatorial spokesman for the opposition, Bronson Cutting, ridiculed this latter contention from the floor of Congress, remarking that:

> The knowledge of the world which is requisite to enable a man to hold the office of customs inspector . . . is exactly the knowledge which it takes to get from your home on the Bowery to the pier on the Hudson River, and then to open travelers' trunks, remove the contents from the trunks, and after thoroughly confusing it, to replace it in such order as may be possible under the circumstances.[48]

The passage of the Tariff Act of 1930 did not represent a clear-cut victory for either side. The forces represented by Senator Smoot professed satisfaction since the ban on importing obscene articles had been retained in the law, while the civil libertarian forces hailed the law as "a progressive step."[49]

The claim of victory by the civil libertarians was based on two considerations. First, the 1930 law gave the Secretary of Treasury discretionary power to admit into this country classics and books of literary or scientific merit. Second, and even more important, the 1930 law shifted the final exclusionary authority from customs officials to the courts.

Classics and books of literary or scientific merit

The vesting of discretionary authority in the Secretary of the Treasury resulted in the voluntary lifting of the customs ban on Voltaire, Rabelais, Boccaccio, and many others.[50] However, in 1933, the Bureau seized a postcard containing a

---

45. Alec Craig, *Suppressed Books* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1966), pp. 132-133.
46. 72 *Cong. Record* 5418 (March 17, 1930).
47. Ibid.
48. 72 *Cong. Record* 5492 (March 18, 1930).
49. Paul S. Boyer, *Purity in Print* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968), p. 235.
50. Craig, op. cit., footnote 45, p. 133.

photograph of Michaelangelo's nude frescoes in the Sistine Chapel.[51] Again the literary and libertarian community became outraged.

In the following year, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau decided to utilize even more fully the discretionary power vested in him under Section 305. "Find me a lawyer who has read a book," he reportedly told an aide.[52] This unlikely combination was discovered in Huntington Cairns, a young Baltimore attorney, who subsequently served until the mid-1960's as "Special Legal Advisor" to the Treasury Department, with responsibility for deciding whether questioned books should be admitted or challenged.[53] Upon taking the position, Cairns inquired of a customs employee on what grounds he excluded books from entry. The clerk replied, "Well, if I see a book with a naked woman in it, a photograph, I hold it up."[54] The same clerk also ascertained that James Joyce's *Ulysses* was obscene after learning that it was priced at $15.00.[55]

During Cairns' tenure as Special Legal Advisor, most works of literary or artistic merit were freely cleared.[56] However, in 1969, the Customs Bureau reversed this trend by blocking the importation by two psychologists of a collection of erotic art which included several masterpieces by well-known artists. The Justice Department subsequently brought an action to "libel" or condemn the material.[57] The court, however, dismissed the action on the ground that the paintings had redeeming social value.[58] The matter is presently on appeal.[59]

Whether a book is one of "scientific" merit, and thus entitled to discretionary entry, depends not so much on the substance of the book or material as on the usage to which it is put. *United States* v. *31 Photographs,*[60] which arose in 1957, illustrates this approach. In this case, the Kinsey Institute attempted to import a quantity of photographs, books, and other items for scientific study and research. The Customs Bureau refused to permit the import. Pursuant to the procedure provided in the Tariff Act,[61] the U.S. attorney in New York filed a libel requesting the Federal Court to declare the material obscene and forfeit it to the government for destruction. The government argued that the material was of such nature that to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme taken as a whole would appeal to prurient interest.

The Kinsey Institute did not deny that the material would normally be regarded as obscene or even hard-core pornography, but maintained that the material was needed for scientific study. The Institute filed an affidavit, executed by the Director of Federal Prisons, to the effect that the Institute had made

---

51. Ibid.

52. Don Whitehead, *Border Guard, The Story of the United States Customs Service* (N. Y. 1963), p. 237.

53. Boyer, op. cit., footnote 49, p. 238.

54. Whitehead, op. cit., footnote 52, p. 238.

55. Ibid.

56. See Paul and Schwartz, *Federal Censorship: Obscenity in the Mail* (1961), p. 68; Boyer, op. cit., footnote 49, p. 238.

57. This procedure of "libel" or condemnation is described in the text accompanying footnotes 69-71, infra.

58. *United States* v. *Ten Erotic Paintings* (USDC D. Md., Civil No. 21453).

59. *United States* v. *Ten Erotic Paintings* (4th Cir. Doc. No. 14,566).

60. 156 F. Supp. 350 (SDNY 1957). See note, 34 Ind. L.J. 426 (1959).

61. This procedure is described in the text accompanying footnotes 69-71, infra.

important and significant contributions to the study of sexual adjustment among prison inmates. Other affidavits indicated that the material was needed for further study of sexual conduct.

The court noted that the material would ordinarily be regarded as obscene, but that it would have no "appeal to [the] prurient interest" of the scientists at the Institute. It therefore ordered the material released to the Institute and denied the government's request for a confiscation order.

The role of the courts

As has been previously mentioned, under the *theory* of the Tariff Act, all material seized at port is to be referred to courts for their decision. The *practice* has been different; the role of the courts has been rather a passive one.

The procedure with respect to all articles, except movies and first-class (sealed) mail, is as follows:

A random sample of approximately 3% of all packages arriving at a port are set aside for examination by the dock inspector.[62] Of course, if the return address or some other feature of a package arouses suspicion, it, too, is set aside for examination.[63]

If the dock inspector feels that the article is obscene, or even questionable, he will turn it over to a superior for a determination as to its obscenity. Usually, the superior to whom the matter is referred is the district director whose district includes the port at which the article arrived.[64] However, in some districts, the matter is referred to customs officials who have through the years accumulated experience and, ostensibly, expertise[65] in the area of obscenity. In New York, for example, the ultimate administrative decision is made by Mr. Fishman, Director of Imports Compliance Division, and, in his absence, by his principal aide, Miss Eleanor Suske. In Baltimore, the ultimate decision is made by a group of customs officials called the Obscene Literature Committee.[66]

If the district director, or the person or group acting in his stead, decides to seize the material at issue, he sends a form letter to the importer advising him that the named article is considered obscene and asking him to assent forthwith to its seizure by returning an enclosed form.

The closing paragraph of this letter reads as follows:

> If we have not heard from you within one week from the date of this letter, this office will be obliged to seize the materials, as provided for in Section 305. Upon seizure the materials immediately will be referred to the United States Attorney for forfeiture.[67]

---

62. Interview with Mr. Irving Fishman, Director of Imports Compliance Division at New York (April 14, 1969).

63. Ibid.

64. Personal interview with Mr. Reins, Deputy Director of Customs, January 28, 1969.

65. The artistic expertise of some of the persons serving in this capacity is at least open to question. A deposition taken of Mr. Fishman in the case of *United States* v. *I Am Curious Yellow* contains testimony to the effect that he rarely attends movies, except for the ones which he must judge in his professional capacity.

66. See *United States* v. *392 Copies,* 253 F. Supp. 485 at 488.

67. Customs Form II-RC-35, 3-67.

In most cases, the importer returns the form, thereby obviating the need for referral to the U.S. attorney and subsequent court proceedings.[68]

In most other cases, he simply does not respond at all.[69] In those cases, the seized article is stored in a warehouse, and, several times a year, the local U.S. attorney files, in Federal Court, a petition to "libel" (condemn) the material. The petition is captioned, for example, *United States* v. *392 Obscene Materials,* listing what is to be seized in such general terms as "350 magazines entitled 'Exclusive'," "forty photographs," and "two 8 mm. films." Personal notice of this pending action is not sent to the importer unless he has previously indicated that he intends to contest the seizure. Ordinarily, the only "notice" given of the pending action is the insertion of an advertisement in either a legal or general circulation newspaper that an action entitled *United States* v. *392 Obscene Materials* has been initiated.[70] When the case is called for hearing in court, the U.S. attorney explains briefly to the judge that the material has been seized, that there are no adverse claimants, that the articles are obscene, and that they should, therefore, be condemned. The subsequent signing of a judicial decree is usually a mere formality. Customarily, neither the judge nor the U.S. attorney sees the material confiscated by "judicial" action.[71]

Thus, in the vast majority of cases, the part played by the courts is either passive or nonexistent, and the decisions made at the administrative level are final. Hence, the Washington Office, in an attempt to insure fairness and uniformity, has formulated three guidelines to be followed by the various dock inspectors, district directors, and other involved officials throughout the country.[72] The first of these guidelines has already been mentioned—the individual dock inspector does not have the authority to seize and detain materials. All questionable cases must be reviewed by the district director or some person or group acting in his stead.

The second guideline is a procedural one. If an administrative decision is made to seize the materials, and if the importer refuses to consent to forfeiture, the U.S. attorney should be immediately contacted and a "libel" action immediately filed.[73]

---

68. Personal interview with Miss Eleanor Suske (aide to Mr. Fishman), April 14, 1969. See also Paul and Schwartz, op. cit., footnote 56, p. 68.

69. Ibid.

70. See, for example, *United States* v. *Three Parcels of Magazines* (USDC D. Md. Civil No. 17154, 1966) in which Judge Watkins' Order of March 18, 1966, reads as follows:

> A libel having been filed in the above case praying forfeiture of the captioned goods, it is hereby ORDERED this 18th day of March, 1966, that the United States Marshal for the District of Maryland, *in addition to his monition in rem, give notice of the seizure and these forfeiture proceedings by advertisement published in The Sun,* a newspaper published in Baltimore City, not earlier than March 23, 1966, nor later than March 28, 1966, giving notice to all interested parties that they must appear on or before April 8, 1966, to show cause, if any they have, why the forfeiture should not be decreed. [emphasis supplied]

71. Suske interview, op. cit., footnote 68. See also Paul and Schwartz, op. cit., footnote 56, , p. 68.

72. Reins interview.

73. This requirement is the result of court decisions which hold that when customs officials detain the materials for an "unreasonable" length of time, the materials must be released to the importer. See, for example, *United States* v. *One Book Entitled the Adventures of Father Silas,*

The third guideline is that time and manpower should be spent on commercial importations, and that private, noncommercial importations should be tolerated. This guideline, however, is not followed–even by the Washington Office, which promulgated it. This fact was revealed in a letter sent to a member of this staff by an official of the Washington Office. It accompanied an exhibit of 20 different types of magazines which had been seized by Customs over a period of several years, and states,

> Magazines of the Number 20 genre of course continue to be detained and seized–so far these have been *noncommercial* importations, uncontested.[74] [emphasis supplied]

While the Washington headquarters does issue guidelines from time to time, it does not publish a list of books, pamphlets, or other publications which are officially proscribed.[75] While the absence of a list does help the Customs Bureau stave off the charge that it has censorial powers,[76] it does raise a practical problem. That is, the customs machinery is geared to inspections on a wide variety of grounds.[77] As the volume of material increases and the courts continue to emphasize the promptness with which decisions must be made, it becomes more difficult to judge borderline materials. This is particularly true in those ports where the customs officials have not had sufficient experience to understand the applicable law and the procedures.[78]

In rare cases, an importer will protest upon notification that his book has been seized. The protest is in the form of a letter or call to the district director or other appropriate official such as Mr. Fishman. These objections seldom change any minds, and usually the importer drops the matter at this point.[79] In a very small percentage of cases, the importer will go further and carry his fight to the courts by contesting the libel case. Litigation is usually discouraged, however, by the factors of time and expense. This is especially true in the case of noncommercial importations.

---

249 F. Supp. 911 (SDNY 1966; *United States* v. *56 Cartoons* containing 19,500 copies of magazine entitled *Hellenic Sun,* 373 F2d 635 (4th Cir 1967); rev'd on other grounds sub. nom. *Potomac News Co.* v. *United States* 389 U.S. 47 (1967). Cf. *Freedman* v. *Maryland* 380 U.S. 51.

However, in light of the fact that, at some ports, libel actions are filed only "several times a year" (Suske interview), it is obvious that this requirement is not taken too seriously. Furthermore, in light of the fact (discussed above) that the role of the courts is generally a passive one, this procedural reform is probably not a significant one.

74. Letter dated February 24, 1969, from Paul McCarthy, Assistant Director, Division of Entry Procedures and Penalties, Restricted Merchandise Section, to Dr. Horowitz of the staff.

75. Reins interview, op. cit., footnote 64. Such a list did exist, however, until the early 1960's. See Roberts, *The Smut Raker* (Silver Spring, Md.: The National Observer, Inc., 1966), p. 76.

76. Roberts, op. cit., footnote 75.

77. For a catalog of possible grounds of refusal of clearance, see generally, 19 C.F.R. parts 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. E.g., liability for duties, packing, and stamping trademarks and copyrights; measurement and testing.

78. In *United States* v. *1000 Copies of a Magazine Entitled "Solis"* 254 F. Supp. 595, 6 (D. Md., 1966) the Court found that in some ports the officials simply do not understand the applicable law and/or the applicable procedures.

79. Suske interview, op. cit., footnote 68.

If the importer does decide to litigate, either he or the government is entitled, upon demand, to a trial by jury. And, in cases which are actively litigated, there is usually independent judicial scrutiny of the items at issue.

Motion pictures

Movies are handled in a special way. Usually, commercial enterainment films come through the New York port, by air freight. With rare exceptions,[80] all are screened for obscene content by a customs film reviewer, who then prepares a brief memo describing the film and recommending either clearance or detention.[81]

If the film is detained by the reviewer, the next and usually key decision is made by Mr. Fishman. After looking at the whole film or inspecting the allegedly objectionable parts, he decides whether the film is obscene. If he decides to seize, the importer is then notified of the decision. While two leading authors have stated that the Bureau often will give permission to the importer to cut out ("physically and in the presence of customs officials") the allegedly obscene portions of the film,[82] an assistant to Mr. Fishman flatly denied this allegation:

That would be censorship, and we're not censors. Either the whole movie is let

---

80. The "exceptions" occur in those cases in which the importer is willing to sign an affidavit to the effect that the movie does not contain any obscene matter (Customs Form 3291). Most importers, however, are unwilling to sign such an affidavit, since usually they are not aware of the exact contents of the movie; and the filing of a false affidavit could result in a perjury prosecution.

81. Perhaps the best way to describe what the Bureau does is to give a specific case history which two leading authors have drawn from records. When the movie *Adorable Creatures* was imported for commercial exhibition in the United States, a customs film reviewer in New York studied it and wrote this memo:

> Picture begins with a wedding; as the couple gets into the car, the bridegroom tells the bride she is the only one he has ever loved. A voice in the background reminds him of his past romantic escapades, and the balance of the picture flashes back to his life before marriage. His first conquest was a married woman with two children. His next love was a young woman with whom he went on a trip to the mountains to ski. He was hurt in an accident, and the girl continued skiing without him. She met a former girl friend and they compared notes as to their present romantic interests. The girl friend is there with the father of a former beau; she says it's more lucrative that way. They each exaggerate about the merits of their respective male companions. They finally exchange partners and each of the girls moves into the hotel suite of the other man. The last of his romantic interludes is with a much older woman. She was enchanted with him immediately and asked a mutual friend to introduce them. Her secretary also falls in love with him, and tells the young man her employer's age; in jealous desperation the older woman has her secretary arrested for theft. The hero finally marries the girl next door.
>
> Objections: Reel 2, bedroom scene, man and woman on bed, man opens buttons on woman's dress. Reel 7, girl in bathtub, breasts exposed. Man enters her room, she asks him to get her robe, she rises in tub (girl seen nude in silhouette). Reel 8, woman in sheer negligee, man embraces her and fondles her breast.

Mr. Fishman recommended seizure; Washington (on basis of a letter from him) concurred; but the importer, after making the appropriate request, was given permission to bring the film in after the objectionable scenes has been cut. (From Paul and Schwartz, op. cit., footnote 13, p. 121.)

82. Ibid., pp. 89 and 124.

in, or the whole movie goes. Besides, the movies which are currently being seized are so bad that if we gave the importer permission to cut out the objectionable parts there wouldn't be anything left.[83]

If the importer refuses to consent to forfeiture, then the aforedescribed action to "libel" the movie is instituted by the U.S. attorney.

Because every movie entering this country through "normal" channels is screened, foreign exporters of "stag" films have found ingenious ways of disguising their products. While visiting the New York port, this author was shown a wrapped, slightly tattered newspaper from Denmark. When the wrapper was withdrawn, she discovered that an 8 mm. film was taped inside. Another author has described a cardboard roller from Holland in which "a fine quality print of an Amsterdam street scene is housed. Between the wrapping and the roller, however, is extra padding: a pornographic film."[84]

In New York, when films of this type are detected, they are not sent to the reviewers who pass on the higher quality movies. Instead, the 8 mm. stag films are run off on a projector in a room near Mr. Fishman's office. They are nearly always seized and detained.

There have been assertions that distinctions between movies and books justify tighter restraints on films. Motion pictures, it is argued, have a greater capacity for evil, in that they may have a greater "impact" and hence may be more "influential" on human behavior.[85] Also, obscenity in motion pictures is allegedly not so elusive of definition as obscenity in literature.[86] However, current authority seems to favor applying the same constitutional standards to all forms of expression, particularly when there is a threat of prior restraint.[87]

Sealed mail

Because first-class (sealed) mail cannot be opened without the consent of the addressee, customs and Post Office officials have devised a special procedure for dealing with this type of mail. The customs inspectors, who apparently have an uncanny ability to root out suspect matter by developing familiarity with the return address, wrapping, or writing appearing on the packages of offending exporters,[88] set aside all sealed items which they deem suspicious. These segregated items are then sent to the local postmaster, who has an office in the Customs House.[89] The postmaster then sends to the addressee a postcard,[90] which reads as follows:

83. Suske interview, op. cit., footnote 68.
84. Roberts, op. cit., footnote 75, p. 79.
85. Fishman interview, op. cit., footnote 59. See also *Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v. Wilson,* 343 U.S. 495, 502 (1952). Giglio, *Prior Restraint of Motion Pictures*, 69 Dick L. Rev. 379 (1965).
86. Remarks of Senator Cutting, 71 Cong. Rec. 4433 (1929). But see *United States v. I Am Curious Yellow* (2d Cir., Nov., 1968).
87. See, e.g., *United States v. I Am Curious Yellow* (2d Cir., Nov., 1968): *Freedman v. Maryland* 380 U.S. 51 (1965) (concurring opinion).
88. Fishman interview, op. cit., footnote 59. See Paul and Schwartz, op. cit., footnote 56, p. 88.
89. This is the case in New York. At other ports, the postal officials are not actually housed at Customs, but they do work very closely with customs officials.
90. POD Form 2921, August 1964.

An international mail article addressed to you is held for the reason checked on the reverse.

If you do not respond, the article/package will be disposed of according to postal regulations.

Parcel post and any "print" weighing over a pound will be subject to 10¢ per day storage charge after 10 work days (starting _____).

The reverse side of the postcard is addressed to the Postmaster, c/o The United States Customs House, and contains the following authorization (to be signed by the addressee):

I hereby authorize the opening of the sealed article in the presence of a representative of the Postmaster.

If the addressee signs the authorization, the mail is opened in the presence of a postal employee. If the article is deemed to be obscene, the same procedure as is employed with respect to other articles is followed. If the addressee refuses to authorize the opening of the article, it is returned to the sender.

On February 3, 1970, a notice appeared in the Federal Register to the effect that the Post Office Department and Customs Bureau intend to amend their regulations so as to permit the opening of sealed mail from abroad without the necessity of requesting the permission of the addressee. This regulation has not yet been officially promulgated.

Current customs activity

Today, most of the Section 305 activity of Mr. Fishman (and his counterparts in other ports) centers around the seizure and detention of magazines of Scandanavian and German origin which feature nude women in sexually provocative poses, as well as various forms of heterosexual and lesbianic activity.[91] The obscenity of several of these issues was recently litigated in the case of *United States* v. *127,295 Copies of Magazines Including "Amor"*[92] in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. In that case the court noted that:

The present importation is a far cry from the nudist magazines of the 1950's and the typical girlie magazines of 1965.

The magazines involved in the present case are lewder than any magazines heretofore considered by this Court . . . . The magazines in the present importation appeal more blatantly to the prurient interest of the average man or boy, and go further beyond the prevailing standards of candor. They have no social value. They are clearly obscene in the ordinary sense of the word . . . In a few of the magazines lesbian activities are suggested, but none of them contains any pictures of sexual intercourse. (295 F. Supp. at 1188)

Nevertheless, the court held that it could not order forfeiture and condemnation of the magazines, because

91. See letter (and exhibits) from Paul McCarthy to Dr. Horowitz of the staff, dated February 24, 1969.

92. 295 F. Supp. 1186 (D. Md., Dec. 9, 1968).

> [S]ince the magazines involved have not yet been admitted into the United States, we cannot be sure how they will be marketed–(a) whether they will be sold to juveniles, either by mail solicitation or over the counter, (b) whether they will be offered for sale in a manner so obtrusive as to make it impossible for an unwilling individual to avoid exposure to them, and (c) whether they will be offered for sale in a manner which will amount to pandering. (295 F. Supp. at 1189)

In so holding, the Maryland Court was merely reaffirming its holding of December 1967, in *United States* v. *4,000 Copies of Magazines Including "Cover Girl" and "Exciting,"*[93] in which it had held that the magazines there at issue could not be condemned without evidence of sales to juveniles, exposure on the part of unwilling individuals because of the obtrusive manner of sale, or "pandering."

The implications of the *Amor* and *Cover Girl* cases on future customs activity are far-reaching. *If* customs regulation is valid only when there is evidence of sales to juveniles, or of foisting the materials onto unwilling individuals, or of "pandering," then *all* customs regulation of obscenity might be invalid. Under the terms of Section 305, all materials are examined and detained *before* they are admitted into the United States; and, at that point, there will rarely, if ever, be evidence as to how they will be marketed. Even if other courts do not follow the Maryland case,[94] that case would still seem to seriously undermine customs activity under Section 305. According to the statutory scheme, any importer can specify the port at which he wishes his articles to be examined.[95] If a shipment arrives at the New York port, the importer is entitled to have it sent, unexamined, at his own expense, by bonded carrier to the Baltimore port for examination.[96] Since, in all future cases involving large commercial importation, it will presumably be profitable for the importer to have the shipment sent to the Baltimore port and, if the materials are confiscated, to litigate the case before the Federal District Court in Maryland, it seems clear to this writer that the Section 305 authority of the Customs Bureau has been substantially weakened.

In cases involving importations for noncommercial use, the Section 305 authority of the Bureau is even more dubious. In a very recent case,[97] a three-judge Federal District Court held that the statute as applied to an

---

93. Civil No. 18966, D. Md., December 21, 1967.

94. It is quite likely, for example, that the Second Circuit Court of Appeals would not follow the Maryland cases. For, in *U.S.* v. *I Am Curious Yellow,* decided only two weeks before the *Amor* case, the Second Circuit held that the movie was not obscene because "it cannot be said that the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to a prurient interest in sex" and "it is even more clear that 'I Am Curious' is not utterly without redeeming social value." The court did not say, or even imply, that evidence of sales to juveniles, or exposure on the part of unwilling persons, or "pandering" was a necessary prerequisite to customs regulation.

95. Telephone conversation with Paul McCarthy, Restricted Merchandise Section, April 9, 1969.

96. Ibid.

97. *U.S.* v. *Various Articles of Obscene Merchandise, Fred Cherry, Claimant,* USDC SD NY, 68-Civ-2972 (June 8, 1970).

importation for private consumption only was unconstitutional.[98] The case is on appeal to the Supreme Court.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

The FBI has exclusive authority to investigate violations of two Federal obscenity statutes—18 U.S.C. 1462 and 1465. Section 1462 prohibits the use of common carriers for the importation or interstate transportation of obscene materials. Section 1465 prohibits the interstate transportation of obscene material for sale or distribution.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover informed the Commission by letter August 19, 1969, that the FBI does "not maintain statistics as to the number of arrests, seizures, and referrals for prosecution made in connection with [its] investigations," nor has it "attempted to conduct any type of surveys or analyses with respect to the character, overall volume, or sociological impact of the materials being distributed or manufactured."

The Commission was unable to secure any additional information about the policy or procedures of the FBI regarding enforcement of obscenity statutes.

---

98. See also *United States* v. *Thirty-Seven Photographs, Milton Luros, Claimant,* USDC CD Cal. Civil No. 69-2242-F, which was a case involving importation for commercial distribution. In a somewhat confusing opinion, the three-judge court held that Section 305 was void on its face since it applied not only to commercial importations but also to importation for private consumption.

Problems in Arrests and Prosecutions for Obscenity and Pornography

Response of Police and Prosecutors

ALEXANDER B. SMITH
Professor of Sociology
BERNARD LOCKE
Professor of Psychology
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

In this country, people react in diverse ways to laws defining obscenity and pornography as crimes. Large groups of people are opposed to laws interfering with the sale of books and periodicals and the exhibition of movies or plays because they fear thought-control. Though many of these same people may even have strong feelings that certain books, periodicals, and movies are in poor taste and that they would not want to look at them, they abhor censorship because they have visions of a police state in which police, prosecutors and the courts, with a controlled press, would stifle free expression. Many other people, just as forcefully, say that they are sure that they know exactly what is obscene and pornographic, and that permitting the sale of lewd books and magazines and the exhibition of salacious motion pictures and plays leads to juvenile delinquency, adult crime, and general moral decay. They cite important public figures as authority for this point of view, and clamor for the arrest and punishment of purveyors of alleged unwholesome material so that others will be deterred from similar transgressions.

The police and prosecutors are the public officials who are the primary target of both sides of this controversy. The present survey is aimed at reporting the reactions of police and prosecutors in a representative sample of major cities scattered throughout the United States with respect to laws regulating obscenity

and pornography and some of the problems they encounter. We hope that a viable solution may be found so that police and prosecutors can function more adequately and with greater assurance in this sensitive area.

It was in the context of this controversy that the present investigation into the reactions of police and prosecutors was undertaken. Our protocols cover police and prosecutor responses to obscenity and pornography in 17 major American cities. Cities were selected along the eastern and western seaboards, along the northern and southern borders, and in the Midwest and Rocky Mountain areas in order to obtain a representative sampling of major cities.

In our interviews with the police and prosecutors, a definite outline was followed so that important areas would be covered and not overlooked. In almost all cases (except in the case of one prosecutor in a city where a Federal grand jury investigation was then in progress), the police and prosecutors were, uniformly, extremely cooperative. In a few cases the prosecutors and police were somewhat defensive. Nevertheless, they were anxious to contribute their points of view, and made it plain that their statements could be quoted, rejecting the offered protection of anonymity. What emerged was a feeling that the police and prosecutors were honestly attempting to solve a problem brought about by changes in cultural and judicial standards. This problem involved the question of what constituted artistic expression and good taste; a problem in which they were caught between differing standards of different segments of the population, and their own concept of what was "right" in light of their own reactions and the decisions of the appellate courts.

In our investigation in each city, we succeeded in interviewing the police commissioner or his representative, the head of the vice squad (if there was one), and the various police officers and supervisors down to the detective or plainclothes policemen who were charged with the police work covering obscenity and pornography. In a few cities there were "pornography experts," and in each case these policemen were interviewed. In addition, the district attorney, prosecutor, or municipal attorney delegated to prosecute this kind of arrest was also interviewed in accordance with a schedule in order to cover all relevant areas of prosecution. Finally, we visited a number of "adult" bookstores, newsstands, and "skin flicks" in each of the 17 cities.

At the suggestion of the Commission, the names of the officials who were interviewed are not given in the comments and protocols, and the names of the cities visited are designated by capital letters to preserve a certain measure of anonymity. All of the people interviewed, however, insisted that they would welcome being identified by name.

In the remainder of this section we will summarize the comments of the various subdivisions of our protocols, using the appropriate headings and making comments where needed.

The community

The police and prosecutors in 17 major cities were visited and interviewed. In order to obtain a representative sample, cities were selected along the eastern and western seaboards, along the northern and southern borders, and in the Midwest and Rocky Mountain areas. In addition, another dimension for selection was that

each of the cities give a flavor of a different region of the country.

In size, the cities varied from 350,000 people in "I" and "K," to six cities ranging from 500,000 to 750,000, to the three largest cities in the United States. "K" and "N" were the only cities to have a "small town" atmosphere.

Sources of information

In each city we interviewed the police commissioner (sometimes called police chief) or his representative, the commanding officer of the vice (or morals) squad, and the different supervisors, detectives and plainclothes policemen who were assigned to obscenity and pornography. In all cases where one of the policemen specialized in this area, he was interviewed. We observed that for the most part the police were friendly and most cooperative, although there were attempts to be somewhat defensive, particularly when superior officers were present.

With the exception of "D," where the district attorney refused to be interviewed or to permit interviews with his assistant in charge of obscenity and pornography prosecutions, the response in all the cities was cooperative and friendly. Invariably, the assistants in charge of these prosecutions were young and knowledgeable in law. Particularly bright and competent was the assistant prosecutor in "L." He was young and enthusiastic, a graduate of a national law school, and certain that with work and persistence he could achieve control of this problem by strategic selection of cases for prosecution.

In all cities, visits were made to "adult" bookshops so that the displays could be compared. Visits were also made to "skin flicks" to learn what was going on in those places.

Structure of the police obscenity unit

In most of the cities the enforcement of obscenity and pornography laws is under that part of the police structure which controls vice, gambling, liquor, and prostitution. For the most part, the supervisor of this part of the police department reports directly to the commissioner or chief.

All of the police departments recognize that because of the umbrella of the First and Fourteenth Amendments, special skills and knowledge are required in making arrests, searches, and seizing contraband. Consequently, obscenity and pornography problems are referred to the specialist or specialists in the department or to the unit handling these problems. In all cities these "experts" were interviewed, and they seemed to be quite knowledgeable in the area of their specialty. Particularly impressive were the experts in "A," "E" (where he was known as "Porno Pete"), "F," "H," "L," and "Q." In "Q" the director of Legal Services, a high ranking policeman who is also a lawyer, works very closely with the police and the prosecutor. In all of the other cities there was a close working relationship between the experts and the prosecutors.

Criteria for selection of men to police obscenity

In the small cities where the number of sworn members of the police departments is relatively small, most of the policemen are known to the

administrators. As a result, vacancies in the unit handling obscenity and pornography are filled by nomination from above. In "Q," with over 30,000 sworn personnel, recommendations to the plainclothes assignment are made by commanding officers from local precincts from a roster of men with no less than three years of patrol experience, and no more than 14 years on the force. As plainclothes policemen, they are assigned to obscenity and pornography. As in most other cities, plainclothes assignment is welcome, and in this community, it is an important way of becoming a detective, a job which carries a substantial wage differential. In many other communities, plainclothes positions are filled from police who volunteer for the assignment even though there is no pay advantage. The assignments are sought after, and rarely do the wives of men who work with obscenity or pornography object to their assignment. Some of the cities offer a small salary differential for plainclothes work, and in "H" and "N" the department auto is taken home. In "L," preference to these assignments is given to men who are in college attendance or have had some higher education. In a number of cities "honesty" and "integrity" with no prior disciplinary record is stressed.

All of the men we interviewed who were specially assigned to obscenity and pornography seemed alert, intelligent, and a cut above the modal policeman we know.

Guidelines

Only the "P" police manual contains a statement relating to obscenity and pornography. Currently, it is considered by the department to be ineffective and is in process of being revised. In the other communities, the police most frequently are charged with enforcing State laws relating to pornography. In "G," "H," and "I" there are parallel local and State laws covering obscenity and pornography. "J" and "N" have newly revised State laws based on the Supreme Court language in the *Roth* case. In those communities the police feel that they have adequate laws with which to attack the problem.

The extent of the problem

While most of the communities date the growth of the obscenity and pornography problem to 1967 with the *Redrup* decision, the police of Community A feel that the situation started to deteriorate five years ago, but agree that 1967 experienced a significant exacerbation of the problem. That year marked the change from photographs showing everything but the genitals to pictures first depicting pubic hair, then showing male and female genitals, and finally culminating in photographs of females with their legs spread to show all the minutiae of the exterior of a vagina. Depending on the community, these shots are called "spread shots," "beaver shots," "San Francisco beaver shots," or "tunnel shots." It should be noted that this last shot shows somewhat more of the vagina than the "spread shots." More recently, more than one nude figure appears in the photographs, showing everything short of actual penetration.

Most of the "adult" bookshops were set up in such a way that it was difficult to see the inside display from the street. Many of them had clearly visible signs

refusing admission to minors, warning those who are not attracted to nudes not to enter, and so forth. Inside, most of the bookshops had sections set apart for magazines showing what appeared to be male and female homosexuals, mixed black and white poses, books with racy titles, and in some cities displays of "sex gadgets."

In some of the cities there were film shorts on exhibition in back rooms and provision for selling reels at the counter. In most communities sex gadgets may be purchased across the counter.

There was almost solid agreement on the part of the police that because of the profit involved in "legal" pornography that "hard-core" was usually not sold by the owners of the bookshops. In some cases the police speculated that the "hard-core" merchandise was sold privately by the clerks. In any event, it appeared that if one became well known in an adult bookshop, he would have little difficulty in making contact to purchase "hard-core" books, magazines, and even movies.

It appeared that in many communities, children were found in possession of adult books and magazines. Uniformly, it appeared very difficult for children to purchase this material in adult bookshops because there was so much profit in selling to adults that it did not pay to take a gamble on selling to children. From the prices asked, and the volume of customers, all police agree that adult bookshops are highly profitable operations.

While "N" has only one adult bookshop and one regular bookshop with a section in the rear for "adults," all the other cities have shown a pattern of steady growth in adult bookshops, skin flick movies, and the number of legitimate drug stores and newsstands handling some "hot" merchandise. Almost all of the adult bookshops and skin flick movies are located in the central area of the city which is usually characterized by small businesses and somewhat rundown commercial establishments. They are within walking distance from the main business and shopping areas, and around noontime, middle-class customers flock to these bookshops. Rarely are black people seen in these stores. The exception was Community F which has a sizeable black middle class. Most cities reported that when attempts were made to open adult bookshops in middle class neighborhoods, unofficial community pressure was generated to such an extent that these stores had to close down.

The establishment of skin flick movies followed a similar pattern of almost invariably being located in the areas where adult bookstores were located. The customers did not appear to be as well dressed as the bookstore patrons, and a sizeable number of the audience had probably had something to drink.

Community attitudes

In most of the cities we visited the police and the prosecutors reported very little community involvement in the problem of obscenity and pornography. Particularly when the problem is confined to the inner city there has been very little community concern. Exceptions in community activity have been reported where it was learned that certain X-rated films, such as *I Am Curious (Yellow)* and *The Killing of Sister George,* were about to be shown. In those cases picket lines were thrown up, and unofficial threats of boycott made. At times these

community activities have been successful. Community G reported that a theater that advertised a future showing of *I Am Curious (Yellow)* was burned down under suspicious circumstances. At times when there have been community complaints, and the police have explained why they were unable to make arrests or obtain an injunction, the latter have unofficially advised that the community mount a boycott. Only in "H" did the police have a community relations program providing education in this area to citizen groups. Here, the police conducted this campaign on their own time.

The mass media have uniformly refused to become involved in obscenity and pornography (possibly because of their deep concern for First Amendment rights). At times the newspapers and television stations have discussed the problem from the standpoint of community education.

Except in "Q" where a Jesuit priest has headed a local anti-obscenity organization for about 10 years, clergy of all faiths have tended to avoid involvement in this problem. A number of communities reported that the clergy refused to testify in obscenity trials as witnesses who were familiar with community standards.

Only in Community Q, the largest city in America, was there a sizeable number of complaints to the police and prosecutor. Many of these were from tourists who wandered into the adult bookshop area and were shocked by the displays. The "Q" community was generally as apathetic as in other cities.

Police attitudes

Generally speaking, the police throughout the country feel that the enforcement of obscenity and pornography statutes takes a low priority as compared to crimes of violence, burglary and larceny. However, the police (as compared to most prosecutors) feel very strongly about this area of law enforcement. Many emphasize a strongly puritanical ethos, feel that pressure must be kept up because pornography is a source of corruption, and consistently indicate that so long as the laws are on the books they must be enforced. Many who say that they have very little concern about pornography in the hands of adults insist that strict legal controls on gray areas of pornography are necessary because so much of the materials sold to adults filter down to children.

Most policemen say that they get excellent cooperation from the prosecutors. However, in Community A the police feel that the prosecutors tend to set the standards for obtaining warrants at so high a level that it is almost impossible to make an arrest. They would prefer that the prosecutor be more liberal in starting prosecutions even though convictions might not be obtained. They have even expressed similar feelings toward the judges.

A number of the police have indicated that they could learn to live with laws based on *Roth*, even though they say that they are aware that the post-*Roth* decisions have changed the impact of *Roth*. They believe that they have been left to wage this battle with little help from the community, the clergy, and mass media.

In "G," "H," and "I" the police have been enjoined by an order of the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in the Fifth District from making seizures without prior adversary proceedings. Inasmuch as this requires the enactment of new laws in the

states in which "G" and "I" are located, the police in those cities feel particularly locked in.

Some police, particularly in "G," are generally pessimistic about the future. They feel that court decisions have resulted in greater and greater daring on the part of the producers of these materials and that soon it will be impossible to prosecute any such offenses successfully.

Except in a few communities, the figures on arrests for obscenity and pornography are mixed in with those for prostitution, gambling, and similar offenses, and are therefore not easily available. However, the police of almost all the communities say that because of Supreme Court decisions, arrests for gray-area pornography have gone down sharply in the last three years. In Community E, however, the arrests by the pornography unit have gone from 34 in 1968 to 93 in 1969.

Some of the police experts in pornography (not all by any means) confidently insist that there is a relationship between possession of pornography and sex offenses in some cases, and pornography and violent offenses in other cases. They do not appreciate that concomitance does not establish causality. It should be noted that no meaningful research has been done in this area; such research is long overdue.

The prosecutors' attitudes

Prosecutors generally feel some of the same frustrations that police do about their inability to gain convictions in obscenity and pornography cases, but their attitudes tend to be somewhat more philosophical about this problem. Most of the prosecutors seem content to wait until the Supreme Court comes out with a ruling, or some constitutional amendment or law is passed which will make it possible to proceed successfully against dealers in the gray areas of obscenity and pornography. However, prosecutors in "E," "L," and "Q" believe that it is possible to proceed even under the post-*Roth* decisions. The prosecutor in "L," a young, bright, vigorous lawyer, and a graduate of a national law school, has devised a strategy of attacking dealers in the gray area of pornography by choosing magazines with particularly revolting pictures, which nevertheless stop short of depicting penetration, but which have "no redeeming social value." In "Q" the prosecutor feels that if he can get a law passed, either on a State or local level, to attack the pandering aspect covered in *Ginzburg,* he can succeed in controlling the problem. In "N" the prosecutor believes that he can uphold the constitutionality of a State law prohibiting the shipping of obscene and pornographic material from out of State.

A number of prosecutors would feel comfortable with the notion of national standards for obscenity and pornography. They reason that since this country has become so unified by faster transportation and increased competence of the mass media in reaching great numbers of the population, a local standard would lose some of its effectiveness. A fair number of prosecutors, however, argue for a continuation of local community standards.

There is some disagreement, however, about the efficacy of jury trials in obscenity and pornography cases. In "A" the prosecutors feel that a jury will inevitably convict in these cases. In other jurisdictions, prosecutors feel that they

are better off with judges alone; juries can be easily hung with the actions of one impressionable juror.

While all prosecutors realize the importance of vigorously prosecuting all laws, many state that the relative importance in prosecuting obscenity and pornography is lower than trying and convicting perpetrators of violent crimes, rapists, burglars, and so forth.

Relationship to organized crime

The police and prosecutors reported strong suspicions of a relationship between the distributors of adult books and magazines and organized crime. They had no concrete evidence, but they pointed to the enormous amount off money involved, the fact that there were a relatively small number of regional distributors, that the pedigrees of some of the people involved in the sale of pornography showed involvement in other crimes, and that when arrests of booksellers were made, expensive and competent attorneys appeared on the scene. In "Q," particularly, the police were convinced of this. In some of the cities where the police and prosecutors denied the importance of the role of organized crime in obscenity and pornography businesses, they gave the impression of being somewhat defensive.

With respect to hard-core pornography, however, the reactions were different. In this area, there was almost universal agreement on the important role of organized crime. Here, too, no one could cite hard evidence.

Outside involvement in the problem

In the communities we visited, the only outside organization that appears to function on a national level is the Citizens for Decent Literature. "A" and "P" report that this organization is quite active in those cities. The other cities reported activity on a lesser scale. The writers were left with the impression that this organization has had limited impact even in the cities in which it is active.

Individual city protocols

The individual protocols for five cities representing a wide geographical distribution are presented here to provide the reader a feel for the data on which the above description was based. The protocols for the remaining 12 cities may be found in the Commission's records in the United States Archives or may be secured from the authors.

Community A

The community. Community A is a large midwestern city with a population in excess of 1,500,000 people. It is highly industrialized and its population in mix includes a large percentage of Negroes and Poles. The community is surrounded by some of the richest suburbs in the nation.

Sources of information. This report is based on extended interviews with the police commissioner, the acting director of the Obscenity Unit, the two plainclothesmen who are the staff of the Obscenity Unit, the assistant district

attorney who is assigned to obscenity and vice prosecutions, and with a minority member of the police department who is a native of the community and who has served some 20 years in the department.

Our interview information was supplemented by a "field trip" with the three members of the Obscenity Unit to one of the downtown "skin flicks" and an "adult" bookshop.

Structure of the police obscenity unit. The Obscenity Unit is one of four units that make up the Liquor License Bureau. This bureau is headed by a deputy chief inspector who reports to the commissioner through the regular chain of command. Until approximately four years ago, the Obscenity Unit was commanded by an inspector who had as his staff one lieutenant, two sergeants and 14 plainclothesmen. During the past four years the unit staff has eroded to a lieutenant, in charge, one sergeant, and two plainclothesmen. The sole reason reported for this shortage is the difficulty in obtaining warrants and/or convictions for anything other than the most "hard-core" pornography.

Criteria for selection of men to serve in the obscenity unit. The criteria for selection to the unit are five years of police work and a college background. The selections are made by the commanding officer of the Liquor License Bureau. The assignment is considered a desirable one primarily because it is plainclothes work rather than because of the specific nature of the work itself. The men assigned to this unit have no other assigned duties.

Guidelines. There are no departmental guidelines in the police manual for the Obscenity Unit other than the instruction that the members of the unit are to report all violations of the state and local statutes relating to obscenity to the commanding officer of the Liquor License Bureau.

The extent of the problem. All members of the police department who were interviewed were in agreement that the problem has been growing steadily over the past five years and that there has been a dramatic change in three directions primarily as a result of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in May, 1967 in the matter of *Redrup* v. *New York* and several related decisions. The directions involved in the charge are: (1) quantity of materials available; (2) quality of materials available; and (3) spread of the problem.

(1) *Quantity.* It is now possible to select for purchase from more than a thousand magazines, books, films, still photographs and playing cards that are openly displayed in the adult bookstores. These are replenished weekly and many new items are added each week. These are supplemented by many "underground newspapers" that have recently devoted themselves more and more to the sex market.

In addition, these stores carry open displays of a variety of sexual gadgets and implements. These include, among other things, male phalluses, electrically operated vaginal stimulations, a water-filled substitute for the vagina, and many more.

(2) *Quality.* There has been considerable deterioration from the "girlie" and "sunbather's" magazines of a decade ago. The current photographs (still and movie) have been moving closer and closer to the actual act of sexual

intercourse. Male and female sex organs are in contact with each other but there is, as yet, no actual penetration.

All forms of sexual perversion are presented: male and female homosexuality, sadism and masochism, pederasty, bondage, and so on.

The general low quality is probably illustrated by the film that we saw in one of the several theaters devoted to erotic films. Following a live, typical burlesque strip-tease, the film, without any sound track or story line, or any of the characteristic credit lines, came on "in living color." Two young women, scantily clad, got into bed together and, after some preliminary fondling of the breasts and massaging of the vaginal areas, proceeded to undress each other completely. Following a few minutes of further masturbatory massage, one mounted the other and the two went through all of the gyrations of the sexual act.

(3) *Spread.* The book stores and the erotic film houses have begun to spread from the inner city and into the suburbs of the middle and upper classes. The tendency has been to start with stocks of erotic books, magazines and papers in an existing business shop, for instance, a pharmacy, stationer, or bookshop. These have been followed by the adult bookshops and a greater tendency for the local theater to book X-rated films for showing.

Community attitudes as reported by the police. So long as the problem was confined to the inner city there was little community concern with the problem. There were few, if any, complaints from citizens, community groups, or the churches. At present, the community concern blossoms as each particular suburban community is invaded by an adult bookstore or a skin flick theater. There does not appear to be any city-wide concern over the problem. Only one of the local television stations, a CBS affiliate, did a series on the problem of pornography. The newspapers, radio stations, and other television stations have at best made brief mentions of the problem.

Where a community group has become aroused they have complained to the police and/or the public prosecutor. When advised of the difficulty in obtaining convictions under the current laws, these groups have, on occasion, sought their own remedies. Priests or nuns have, after trying to get storekeepers to remove erotic materials from their shelves, gone in and destroyed these materials. Other citizens, on learning that a local theater was about to show a film like *I Am Curious (Yellow)*, were able to persuade the theater owner to cancel the booking by the threat of picketing or a boycott.

While the police can neither encourage or condone such "illegal" activities there is little doubt that they are less than unhappy when such community action is successful in its "censorship."

Police attitudes. There is little doubt that the police are concerned about the growing spread of erotic materials. They feel a growing sense of frustration over the inability to obtain convictions against materials that would have led to certain convictions as little as five years ago. This is particularly true of the older police, men who have been in the department for 10 or more years.

They feel rather certain that these materials are filtering down to the young and believe that not only are they traumatic to them, but also that they are at the

root of many sexual offenses.

They are also convinced that pornographic materials play a role in adult offenses. They cited several cases, one involving two homicides, in which pornographic materials were found on the offender. There is a strong feeling that there is a close correlation between the use of drugs (LSD in particular) and the purchase of erotic materials.

The men of the Obscenity Unit are proud of their record insofar as hard-core pornography is concerned. Table 1, below, presents the data for the past three years.

They are considerably less impressed by their record relating to arrests involving "girlie" and "nudist" type magazines over the same period. In all, 24 arrests were made. The data for these arrests are presented in Table 2.

All of the men interviewed were universal in their agreement that the *Redrup* and related decisions of the Supreme Court had made it impossible for them to even get a warrant except for the most hard-core pornography unless a juvenile or pandering were involved. During the calendar year 1969 there has not, as yet, been a single such warrant issued.

They tend, also, to resent the lack of any Federal guidelines for the entire area of obscenity and pornography and feel that unless such guidelines are provided there is little purpose for maintaining a police unit to deal with this problem.

Although they recognize that the prosecutor's action must be guided by the decision of the Supreme Court, there is a general feeling among the police assigned to the unit that he should be willing to issue more warrants and to try more cases without "prejudging" them. It is rather apparent that they hope that

Table 1

COMMUNITY A
ARRESTS AND CONVICTIONS ON HARD-CORE PORNOGRAPHY

Year	Arrests	Warrants Issued	Convictions
1969	10	7	7
1968	15	14	14
1967	16	8	4

Table 2

COMMUNITY A
ARRESTS AND DISPOSITIONS FOR OTHER THAN HARD-CORE PORNOGRAPHY

	Disposition
Freed by judge	
10 cases	Not guilty
7 cases	Dismissed
Freed by jury	
4 cases	Guilty (2 reversed on appeal)
1 case	Not guilty
Pending	
2 cases	

by making many arrests that at least some of them would lead to convictions which would stick.

They have somewhat similar feelings toward the judges that try these cases. There is the same sense of frustration when the judge states that he feels that the material is obscene but that he has no choice but to dismiss.

The police tend to be sympathetic to the boycotting and other related activities of community groups against the infiltration of "smut" but are careful to point out that they are not permitted to either suggest such action or to take part in it.

The police who were interviewed were all firm in their conviction that all forms of pornography should lead to police action. "There are existing laws in every State of the union and it is our duty to enforce the law."

The police commissioner has not found the pornography problem as pressing or important as some of the problems he has had to deal with over the past two years. There has not been a great hue and cry from the community, which also is involved in other serious problems. He does, however, recognize the nature and extent of the problems and has given his men such support as they have required.

The prosecutor's attitudes. The assistant district attorney assigned to prosecuting obscenity offenses showed considerable concern about the spread of adult bookshops (from four in 1965 to 13 to 15 at present) and the increase in movie houses that show erotic films (from one or two in 1965 to eight at present).

His sole response to the question as to the reason for this growth was "The United States Supreme Court." He feels that the appetite for such material has always been present, but as a result of the Court decisions it now has public sanction.

While he indicated that it was difficult to correlate the volume of pornographic material with the statistics of crime, he did indicate that his own feelings were that it has a definite relationship to other crimes. "It is a conditioning kind of thing . . . it's not healthy."

He feels too that community pressures, when the community is invaded, have some influence in reducing the flow of erotic materials, but that these are not always successful over an extended period of time.

The prosecutor showed some concern over the penalties which are assigned when a conviction is won. These have never included jail sentence and consist mostly of small monetary fines.

Prior to the advent of the *Redrup* and related decisions, the prosecution of obscenity offenses was virtually a full-time job; now it takes very little of his time. He agreed with the police that under the present circumstances there was little need for a full-time assignment of prosecutor and/or police to obscenity work.

The prosecutor felt that the best solution to the current situation was to allow the States and local communities to handle the problem without Federal interference and that the matter should be taken away from the Supreme Court. He believes that his State law is readily enforceable and that there are adequate safeguards for the individual.

Relationship to organized crime. The police interviewees were careful to point out that they had no concrete evidence to establish a tie between the great flood of erotic materials and organized crime. They did point out, however, the similarity in decor in each of the new bookstores. They had similar draperies and

rugs and they all displayed their wares in a similar fashion. "It was as if all of the carpeting was cut from the same roll."

They also pointed up the fact that virtually all of this erotic material was coming from a single distributor in another State, who seemed to be a nationwide distributor.

The prosecutor was far less reticent in indicating his belief that the operation was too big " . . . not to be tied to organized crime."

Outside involvement in the problem. There is at least one organization that is playing a very active role in the problem on a national scale, the Citizens for Decent Literature, Inc. This organization publishes *The National Decency Reporter* and provides considerable "ammo for your war on pornography" in the form of films, filmshops, taxes and printed materials.

Our interviewees felt that the organized Church was not playing as strong a part in the battle against obscenity as it might.

Community C

The community. Community C is a New England city with a population of approximately 750,000 people. A large proportion of its population are of Irish Catholic origins and it has a relatively low proportion of minority group members. The latter is probably due to the fact that it has little heavy industry. The city is surrounded by many suburbs which contribute to a day-time population of more than 1,500,000. The community is noted for the large number of prestigious institutions of higher education which are located in its immediate environs.

Sources of information. This report is based on interviews with the deputy superintendent of police, the commanding officer of the Vice Control Section (a captain), four members of the Vice Control Section (including a sergeant), and the assistant district attorney in charge of prosecuting offenses involving obscenity and pornography. The interview information was supplemented by a field trip to the "combat zone" which is the common local designation for that area of the central core of the city which is inhabited by the "adult" bookshops along with other elements in the vice problem.

Structure of the police vice control section. The Vice Control Section is a section of the Criminal Investigation Division. The commanding officer of this section is a captain who reports to the deputy superintendent who is in command of the C.I.D. There are 35 men assigned to the Vice Control Section and these include one lieutenant, seven sergeants, and 24 detectives (including five undercovermen). The chain of command to the commissioner is through the deputy superintendent in charge of the C.I.D., the superintendent in command of Field Operations, the chief superintendent, and the commissioner.

The Vice Control Section has the responsibility for enforcing all of the laws relating to commercial gambling, narcotics, licensed premises, and prostitution in addition to obscenity and pornography.

Each of the 14 police precincts is authorized to make arrests relative to each of these areas but they usually seek the advice of the Vice Control Section in any matters relating to pornography because of the special knowledge that the central unit has about offenses in this area.

Guidelines. There are no specific police guidelines relating to obscenity and pornography, nor are there any local laws or ordinances.

Extent of the problem. According to the commanding officer of the Vice Control Section the problem was "virtually nonexistent" as little as two years ago but that since then it has increased "2000%." He and the other members of the unit felt this increase was due, completely, to the lack of guidelines from the Supreme Court. They believe that the State statutes are adequate for the purpose of controlling the problem but that they are no longer pertinent because of the Supreme Court decisions.

The problem in Community C consists, essentially, of the proliferation of the adult bookstores. There are currently 17 of them and they are confined mostly to the "combat zone" described above. There are no "peep shows" because places that show films must be licensed and many reasons (fire laws, etc.) can be found for not licensing them. There are no theaters similar to those found in Community A which show what were once known as "stag films."

The calibre of the books and magazines that were sold on the racks of the adult bookstores was similar to those seen in Community B and less "advanced" or "daring" than those found in Community A.

No sex gadgets were seen but they apparently are available, along with hard-core materials on an under-the-counter basis to "trusted" customers.

The bookshops differed from those in Communities A and B in that there were no window displays of erotic magazines. Because of police pressure, the owners have agreed to display the materials in such a fashion that they cannot be seen easily from the street.

There has been no attempt on the part of the store owners to infiltrate the residential areas of the city. One did open in one of the college communities and this led to some minor complaints.

Community attitudes as reported by the police. There is a great deal of police concern regarding the disinterest of the community and the sometimes hostile attacks of the news media when police action has been taken against what the police have felt to be pornographic.

The police feel that the average citizen has no idea as to what is being sold in the adult bookshops. The police believe that the citizenry think that these stores are selling the older "girlie" magazines and that there is no real reason for concern.

Where the police have attempted to take action against films like *The Killing of Sister George* or *I Am Curious (Yellow)*, this has typically resulted in long lines at the box office along with editorial cries of "police censorship." The police tend to resent rather deeply the media's antipolice attitude in this matter. "They accuse us of being dumb, uneducated fools who try to set ourselves up as knowing what does or does not have artistic merit."

In a community which is noted for its large Catholic population (as well as a predominantly Catholic police force) it is somewhat surprising that the Church has been so little involved in this problem. Just one priest who has "specialized" in working with young people who are potential suicides has complained about the fact that when young suicides are found, they frequently have pornographic materials on their person or in their rooms.

One female resident of the community has conducted a one-woman campaign against the spread of erotic materials but with little effect. There have been no community boycotts or picketing against the showing of films that there has been in other communities.

The public's attitude is best summarized by the police statement, "Police are 'losers.' The moment that you walk out to do something in this area you are a 'loser.'"

Police attitudes. Although the enforcement of the statutes relating to obscenity and pornography takes the lowest priority in the Vice Control Section, there is little doubt but that the police feel very strongly about the matter. This is perhaps best illustrated by an anecdote that was related by the district attorney. When the proprietor of a drive-in theater announced that he was going to show *I Am Curious (Yellow),* the police threatened to close him down. The proprietor's response, in essence, was "The heck you can." The evening the film was to open the policeman directing traffic in front of the drive-in so snarled traffic that no one could get into the theater. While this story may be apocryphal, it certainly reflects the general attitude of the police.

Unlike the police in Communities A and B, the police of Community C feel that there is very little connection between pornography and other offenses, including sexual offenses.

There was no data available as to the number of arrests that had been made in the past several years for offenses involving obscenity and pornography. This was also true in the prosecutor's office and represents, in our opinion, a serious gap. The prosecutions were all for felonies and the police are convinced that the courts have convicted in every instance and have assigned jail sentences of up to two years in addition to fines. Even though there have been no acquittals, no one has served time as yet and no large fines have been paid. All cases are in the process of being appealed in higher courts.

As in Communities A and B, all of those who are arrested studiously avoid trials by jury since juries are more apt to convict. However, in light of the police report that *all* prosecutions result in conviction, the question becomes a moot one.

Unlike Communities A and B, there did not appear to be police pressure on the community to take action on its own. There does not appear to have been any boycotting or picketing as there has been in the other communities.

As in the other communities there is a strong desire on the part of the police for freedom of the locality to make its own decisions in these matters within, perhaps, firmer and clearer guidelines from the Supreme Court.

The prosecutor's attitudes. The assistant district attorney who is assigned to prosecute offenses involving obscenity and pornography has been in the position for approximately two weeks, having come to the position from an extended assignment of the American Civil Liberties Union.

From his limited experience he indicated that he did not feel that the growth was of the proportions indicated by the police. He believes, along with the police, that the reason why his office receives so few complaints relating to obscenity and pornography is that such growth as has occurred has been completely contained within the "combat zone" and that the general public has very limited contact

with this area.

As with Community B, the prosecutor feels that with the growth of crimes of violence, both the police and the prosecutor's time will have to be devoted to these rather than to pornography, which must take the lowest level of priority.

The most important position taken by the prosecutor is that the *Stanley* v. *Georgia* decision (394 U.S. 557, 1969) makes it virtually impossible to obtain a conviction which will be upheld on appeal and that for this reason there is little to be gained by initiating such actions. He believes that since the right to transmit is constitutionally protected, the right to receive must be equally protected. Unless it is forced on him, a man has the constitutional right to look at, read, or listen to whatever he desires.

This appears to be a growing opinion. The prosecutor reported, for example, that the chief judge of the city court has, unofficially, let it be known that such cases are not to be brought to him since any cases upon which he might find convictions would undoubtedly be upset on appeal.

The only cases in which there is a good possibility of a conviction being sustained are those involving minors, and it appears that these are the only ones that will be prosecuted until there is some change at the Federal level.

Unlike the police, the prosecutor indicated that not all cases have led to convictions; that there have been cases which have resulted in dismissals.

Along with his counterparts in Communities A and B, the prosecutor feels that the problem would best be handled at the local level, but, unlike the others, he feels that the *Stanley* decision has provided adequate guidelines on a constitutional level.

Relationship to organized crime. As in Communities A and B there is a strong feeling that there is some relationship between the great growth of the distribution of erotic materials and organized crime. As in the other places, this feeling cannot be established on the basis of hard data. Rather, there is pointed out the tremendous profits that are being made, the pedigrees of some of those involved in the distribution and sale of these materials, and finally, the fact that when an arrest is made one of three or four nationally known and well-prepared attorneys appears on the scene.

Outside involvement in the problem. The only organization that appears to be functioning at a national level, the Citizens for Decent Literature, is known to have been active in the community, but apparently with little effect.

Community E

The community. Community E is a far western city with a population of approximately 700,000. Of these, some 200,000 are minority group members, including the largest oriental group in the United States. The community is noted for its liberalism and its regard for the arts.

Sources of information. This report is based on interviews with the deputy chief of police, the director of the Investigations Division, the inspector in charge of pornography and obscenity investigations, and the assistant district attorney in charge of prosecuting these offenses. It is also based on observations of typical "adult" bookstores and motion picture theaters devoted to the showing of sexually oriented films.

Structure of the police obscenity unit. There is but one man, an inspector (the rank is equivalent to that of detective sergeant), who is assigned on a full-time basis to the investigations relating to obscenity and pornography. This one man makes all of the investigations, discusses his findings with the district attorney and then, when indicated, borrows a man from the police photography unit to take high-speed photographs of scenes in the movie or live production which is under investigation. Based on this evidence and the recommendation of the district attorney, he then borrows another man from the Investigations Division to make the arrest. Approximately 250 man-hours of "borrowed" staff time are used for this purpose each year.

Criteria for selection of men to serve in the obscenity unit. The current one-man unit was selected for the job on the basis of his successful handling of a case involving the corruption of juveniles in which two young children were photographed while performing masturbatory activities. He has been in the position for 12 years. If additional men were to be added to the unit, he would look for college-trained people who are not too "aggressive."

Guidelines. There are no guidelines in the police manual for the operations of the Obscenity Unit. They are loosely charged to enforce the State laws relating to obscenity and pornography. There are no local ordinances dealing with the problem. There was a general feeling among those interviewed that this was an adequate framework within which to operate.

Extent of the problem. Obscenity and pornography have become a "big business" during the past 10 years. During this interval, 48 bookshops have been opened and 26 theaters are now showing sexually oriented films with four of the latter in open competition as to which will go furthest in the kind of material they will show. In addition, Community E, with its many theaters for live performances, has found itself hosting such productions as *Hair* and *Oh, Calcutta.*

The materials in each of these spheres of activity have become increasingly bolder. Sexual gadgets are also readily available, sometimes over-the-counter and sometimes under-the-counter. It is much easier to obtain hard-core pornography than in most other communities. One does not have to be an "old customer" but, rather, really needs little more than to flash the "color of his money" in order to be able to make a purchase.

The location of the bookstores and movies is fairly well localized to two circumscribed areas, the "Tenderloin" (approximately 10 blocks square) and the local "Broadway" area. One attempt was made to open a theater in an area that was inhabited largely by Mexican-Americans. The pressures exerted by this residential group were strong, but not sustained, and, as a result, they were not able to close down this theater. There have been no attempts to open such theaters in any other middle-class residential areas.

Community attitudes as reported by the police. The community, in general, tends to take a highly "liberal" attitude toward this problem. There is more apt to be a response of sympathy for the purveyor than for the policeman who arrests him. The two local newspapers take opposite positions on this problem. One editorializes against "the pigs" for harassing people who are doing their thing, while the other attacks the police for not cleaning up the problem. Both of these news media devote a fair amount of space to the discussion of this problem.

The man-on-the-street is, as in most other communities, rather indifferent and is seldom heard from. There is a citizens group, made up of businessmen and professionals, that has tried to intervene in this area, but apparently with little effect. The only time the average citizen might become concerned is when there is a possibility that his own neighborhood could be affected.

One group of 25 Protestant pastors asked the police for information, but took no public action.

While defendants have had no trouble in enlisting "liberal" clergymen to come to their defense when they are arrested for offenses relating to obscenity and pornography, the police have found it virtually impossible to enlist the aid of any clergyman in prosecuting any of these offenses even though these clergymen might "deplore" the nature of the materials that were being distributed or shown.

Other than the picketing of the Mexican-American group noted above, there has been no concerted community action of any kind.

The League for Decent Literature has visited the community and has provided it with some information as to how other communities were sometimes successful in prosecuting some of these cases. The local police group suggested to the League that it set up some kind of a clearing house for such information.

Police attitudes. It is apparent that the police are not engaged in a "holy crusade" in this problem area. This is reflected in the fact that the size of the Obscenity Unit has consisted of one full-time man over the years and has not increased in size despite the tremendous growth of the problem.

The general attitude is that there is an honest desire to enforce the State laws to the extent to which they can be enforced but that other offenses are more pressing. Although one member of the police group indicated that he wished that the district attorney would "have more guts" in prosecuting more of these cases, this was not the general feeling.

All decisions as to whether an arrest will be made (a warrant issued) are made by the district attorney after he has seen the evidence collected by the police and the police are in agreement that this is the only proper way to do it. Except for the one individual noted above, they felt that the district attorney's decisions were sound and reasonable.

There was a general consensus that obscenity and pornography in this particular community were not particularly related to other offenses nor controlled in any way by organized crime. They did indicate that the national distributors of much of the materials involved might be under the influence of organized crime because of the large sums of money involved.

The numbers of arrests and the types of offenses are summarized in Table 3 below. There were 24 arrests in 1967, but the actual breakdown is not available.

The police keep in touch with what is going on in the bookstores, movies, and theaters by regular visits to all of these. Each of the nine district stations (precinct houses) have their men visit these places almost weekly and if anything that requires attention is noted, it is reported to the Obscenity Unit. No action is taken at the local precinct level because of the many technical and legal questions involved.

In almost every instance where an arrest has been made, it has led to either a guilty plea or a conviction. However, since January, 1968 there has been no decision on a case involving a movie house because one case in on appeal to the

Table 3

COMMUNITY E
ARRESTS BY PORNOGRAPHY DETAIL WITH TYPES OF OFFENSES

Offense	1968	1969
Movie houses	5	22
Bookstores	21	46
Night clubs	3	4
Hotel room	2	1
Street corner	2	10
Photo studio	1	0
Distributors	0	2
Stage plays	0	7
Art gallery	0	1
Total	34	93

Federal Circuit Court of Appeals and all other cases are being held pending the outcome of this case.

The police feel that once the prosecutor decides that a warrant should be issued, he will prosecute the case vigorously; that they are willing to "go all the way."

The cooperation of the courts, it is felt, depends on the personal characteristics of the individual judge. It ranges from "great cooperation" to "some of them hide from us."

There is some concern over the leniency of the sentences. (This is also the concern of the prosecutor, as will be noted below.) Typically, there is a relatively small fine and rarely is a jail term imposed or served.

The police would like to see the laws related to obscenity and pornography interpreted on the basis of "local" community standards. They also feel that there is a great need for a "uniform law" that would deal with the problem at a Federal level. The definition of pornography presents the most formidable difficulty and there is almost universal agreement that there must be a nationwide (Federal) definition since so many cases may be expected to end up in the Supreme Court. It is also felt that since many of the materials cross State lines and/or are carried in the U.S. mails, Federal government must become involved. There has been some cooperation in this community with the FBI pornography unit.

The prosecutor's attitudes. The current prosecutor is relatively new to the problems of obscenity and pornography, having recently taken over the post when his predecessor was appointed to a judgeship. It is obvious, however, that he has "done his homework" and has learned a good deal about the problem.

He admits that he has a generally "liberal" attitude toward the problem but that he has "sworn to uphold the laws" and will do so. He has tended towards a rather strict construction of the current laws relating to obscenity and pornography despite this "liberal" attitude and this is confirmed by the police who have worked with him.

Many of his decisions are based on the decision of the Supreme Court of his State, according to which complete nudity without sexual activity is protected under the First Amendment. He apparently prepares his cases very carefully, devoting a considerable amount of time to them and, as result, is chagrined by the relatively mild sentences which are meted out by the judges.

Interestingly, he indicated that most defendants preferred trials by jury rather than by a judge, because they fared better with the juries, who reflected the liberal attitudes of the community. This represents a striking difference between this community and the others we have studied.

Obscenity and pornography actions take up 80% of the time of one prosecutor and 15% of another (out of a total of 38 assistant district attorneys). They feel that this is time well spent but, as indicated, are upset by the lightness of the sentences. "You work for months on a case and then the man is fined $50."

As with other prosecutors, there is a tendency to place the need for a national "standard" as the major problem. Unless national guidelines are provided, it will continue to be a great problem. It is felt, further, that prosecutions should be handled on a local level rather than on a Federal basis. If "community standards" are to be used as one of the criteria, the "community" should be the local one rather than a statewide one, since attitudes vary so widely even within a single State.

In the last four cases, convictions and/or pleas of guilty were obtained.

Relationship to organized crime. The police and prosecutor see no local ties between the purveyors of obscene and pornographic materials and organized crime. The local stores and theaters are owned by local people, who are known to the police but who, typically, have no police records. Two or three of the theaters are owned by a group in Arizona who own a chain of approximately 100 such theaters.

There is some concern that the large out-of-State and out-of-country producers and distributors may be tied to organized crime but this is only a supposition and there are no hard data to confirm this.

Outside involvement in the problem. There is, essentially, no outside involvement with this problem except for the interest of the Citizens for Decent Literature, Inc. which has had little impact in this community.

Community J

The community. This is a southern city with a population in excess of 500,000. It is noted for its great interest and participation in a wide variety of cultural activities, having one of the most outstanding cultural centers and museums in all of the South. Because of its location, it has a rather large Negro population. "J" lies within the area of jurisdiction of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and its police have also been enjoined by the Court not to seize materials without an adversary hearing.

Sources of information. This report is based on interviews with the police superintendent's deputy, the lieutenant in command of the Vice Unit, two plainclothesmen assigned to the Vice Unit, and the city solicitor. These interviews were supplemented by a visit to two of the local "adult" bookshops that are owned by the largest local distributor.

Structure of the police obscenity unit. Matters relating to obscenity and pornography are handled by the Vice Unit, which is one of four units commanded by a captain who reports directly to the superintendent of police. The Vice Unit is supervised by a lieutenant who has another lieutenant as second in command.

There are 12 detectives assigned to the unit and they are broken down to day and night watches. The title of detective is not a civil service one.

No man is assigned exclusively to obscenity and pornography. They serve in all of the areas relating to vice and they are rotated to related problems, such as gambling, on a regular basis.

Criteria for selection of men to serve in the vice unit. There are no specific criteria used by the commanding officer of the Vice Unit in selecting men for his unit. There are, typically, more volunteers for the job than there are positions. This is probably due to the fact that the men earn extra pay and are given a clothing allowance (since they work in plain clothes). Since the "J" police department is a relatively small one (about 940 men), the commanding officer will occasionally tap someone for the unit on the basis of his known prior police performance. If the man is married, his wife must be accepting of the role that her husband will have to play, particularly as it relates to prostitution. In only one instance has a wife asked that her husband be taken off such an assignment.

Guidelines. There are no specific guidelines in the police manual relating to obscenity and pornography. The only available guideline is presented by the State statute which deals with obscenity and pornography. This statute, based on the *Roth* decision, was passed by the State legislature in 1968 and became effective on July 1, 1969. This statute has been declared constitutional by the Fifth District Court of Appeals. This statute provides for an adversary hearing prior to seizure of alleged pornographic materials but not for cases involving arrests for selling these materials.

At one time, Community J had a city censor to determine what films might be shown, but this post was eliminated as a result of the various Supreme Court decisions dealing with First Amendment rights. There is still provision under State law for a State Literature Commission. However, because of the changing situation this, too, has virtually disappeared from the scene.

Since there are no police "precincts" or their equivalent, there is no problem of men in outlying units taking uniformed action on their own. All police are advised to turn over to the Vice Unit information relating to pornography.

Extent of the problem. Over the past few years there has been a dramatic increase in the number of sellers and, at the same time, a notable deterioration in the calibre of the materials which are being offered for sale.

There are, currently, 25 newsstands and stores which sell these questionable books, magazines, and underground newspapers. Most of the bookstores also have peep shows. Most of these are located in the commercial districts of the city, as are the four or five theaters that are devoted entirely to the showing of skin flicks. There are several other theaters (an accurate count could not be obtained) which devote about 65% of their time to the showing of questionable films. The adult bookstores openly carry a variety of sex gadgets.

There has been no spread of the various types of purveyors of these materials to residential areas. It is indicated that the residents in these areas would not stand for such a move and that such shops would be boycotted and therefore would be unprofitable.

Community attitudes as reported by the police. The police indicate that there are few complaints from the citizenry about this problem. They attribute this to the fact

that the public is aware that the hands of the police have been effectively tied by the various court decisions.

One television commentator tried, with little success, to stir up community action for a period of time. The newspapers have mounted no campaigns in this area, largely, it is said, because they are "liberal" in their orientation. Only one member of the clergy has carried on an extended fight against the problem, but has been unable to stir up any real public interest.

Police attitudes. The police are quick to admit that obscenity and pornography hold a very low order of priority in their everyday work. They indicate that the Vice Unit men spent less than 5% of their time on the problem prior to the court enjoinders, and that they now spend considerably less time on this aspect of their work.

Their major concern appears to be that sales not be made to minors (under age 17). On one occasion they sent a 16 year-old on a tour of the stores in order to determine whether the dealers would sell to him. Two of the stores did make sales to him despite the fact that he did not lie when he was asked his age. Convictions were obtained in both cases.

They have arrested the one major seller (who owns a chain of stores not only in Community J but in other cities as well) some 30 times in all but have never been able to obtain a conviction.

Some underground newspapers such as "Screw" are sold in "J" and the police have taken no action against them because "There are no mechanics relating to the decision as to whether to permit them or not."

However, a conviction was obtained against such a paper which used the term "Mother Fucker" in its headline. The police feel that the conviction was based on the fact that the sellers were holding it up in the streets and " . . . pushing it in people's faces."

The major police function these days is to make regular visits to the purveyors to check on the presence of minors on the premises. An inspection file is maintained in the Vice Unit.

No data were available on the number of arrests that had been made over the past few years, and the only convictions that have been obtained are those noted above.

There is a feeling expressed that these days it is better not to make arrests (except where minors are involved) since each loss of a case in the courts leads to the intensification of the problem—the producers and sellers become increasingly bolder.

A pornography arrest is not considered an important one. The police would prefer that the decision responsibility not be placed on them, but prefer, instead, grand jury indictments before an arrest is made.

As in most other communities, the police of "J" feel the need for national guidelines but are pessimistic about the possibility of getting them. They believe that the local problem should be handled by local law while the interstate transport of these materials should be dealt with at the Federal level.

It was a case in the State within which "J" is located that led the Supreme Court to decide that the *possession* of pornographic materials was not illegal.

The police in "J" have limited their advice to citizens who complain to a recommendation that they call the city solicitor, and at no time have they

suggested boycotts or other community action. They indicate that there have been no public requests for the police to speak to citizen groups on the problem of pornography.

The prosecutor's attitudes. The city solicitor indicated that, despite the fact that the State's statute relating to obscenity and pornography had been found constitutional, he and the police, in effect, could not do anything without the permission of the Federal Court. He pointed out, as have others before him, that the need for adversary hearings makes any ultimate decision an after-the-fact one; that by the time a decision has been made, and appealed, the movie has had its run or enough copies of the publication have been sold so that the dealer is ready to move on to others. This is particularly true since the punishments meted out are usually in the form of monetary fines and rarely involve imprisonment. The statute provides that all arrests for pornography be dealt with as misdemeanors. While first offense convictions call for fines up to $1,000 and one year confinement, no one has served time for such an offense.

The solicitor indicated that pornography would not be a problem if it could be kept from people under the age of 21, but that too much of it can be found in grammar schools. He indicated that the police were willing to do anything he asked of them, but that they were not taking any action on their own initiative because of the Court decisions.

The solicitor prefers to try such cases before a jury, since he feels, as do the police, that a local jury would always convict. He feels strongly that the Supreme Court and the Federal Courts, including the Federal District Courts, should not be the final arbiters of what is right locally. He recognizes the need for national guidelines but believes that these should be limited to procedural matters and should not deal with substantive issues.

Relationship to organized crime. Both the police and the city solicitor indicated that there was no real evidence to indicate that organized crime had entered into the pornography business but did point out that a few "unsavory characters" have opened adult bookstores in their community. They also pointed out that the owner of a chain of stores in the community also owned stores in other cities and that this might require more capital than one man might be expected to have.

Outside Involvement in the Problem. Neither the police nor the city solicitor knew of any outside organization which concerned itself with the problem of pornography in "J". It is possible that the only national organization of this type (Citizens for Decent Literature) has not attempted to become involved in "J" because of the different religious background of the organization, which is primarily Catholic, and Community J, which is predominantly Baptist.

Community P

The community. "P", a city of approximately 900,000 population, is located in central United States (where the Rockies begin). While it contains a large black minority group in its population, it is the Mexican-American who occupies the lowest position in the social scale.

Sources of information. This report is based on interviews with the head of the Vice Bureau, a policewoman assigned to the bureau, and the assistant district attorney who prosecutes cases involving obscenity and pornography. This was supplemented by a field trip to one of the local bookshops and to one of the theaters showing skin flicks.

Structure of the vice unit. The Vice Unit is divided into two sections. One section is devoted entirely to narcotics while the second section deals with gambling, prostitution, liquor, obscenity and pornography. There is a lieutenant in charge of the Vice Unit and there are 16 men, a sergeant and a policewoman assigned to the second section which includes obscenity and pornography. There are no "specialists" in obscenity and pornography at this time (there used to be one) and all members of the unit are rotated through this area of activity.

Criteria for selection of men to serve in the vice unit. The lieutenant in charge of the unit has the authority to select anyone he wants for the unit. They have to be honest and good policemen, aggressive, and known to the lieutenant. This is possible because the department is relatively small (1,016 sworn men). The men are usually young and frequently they have just come out of the academy. Typically, the men are kept in the division for only one year. If they do an excellent job they may be assigned to the narcotics section for a six-month probationary period after which they are appointed as a regular detective. There is a $50 pay differential (for the purchase of civilian clothing) but no personal use of a motor vehicle.

Guidelines. There is a statement in the police manual relating to obscenity and pornography. However, the lieutenant describes it as " . . . a simple, not too effective statement, filled with contradictions . . . " He is in the process of rewriting this statement.

The statutes relating to obscenity and pornography are both civil and criminal, and the situation is complicated by virtue of the fact that sections of the civil section have been struck down in the courts because of the failure to provide the necessary safeguards (such as an adversary hearing before obtaining an injunction). The criminal sections of the law still stand. The minor's section of the law has not yet been subjected to a test. A jury is provided for in the criminal section (the defendant can waive this) but not in the civil section.

Extent of the problem. There are between eight and 15 establishments which sell sex-oriented materials. The number changes as some close and others open (there is apparently more turnover of such places in "P" than in any of the other cities). These establishments include bookstores (two with peep shows) and newsstands with back rooms devoted to this purpose. There are five theaters in "P" which show skin flicks. "P" is the only city in which the bookstores sold "party records." Sex gadgets were not displayed (and apparently are not sold) but hard-core pornography is apparently available on an under-the-counter basis.

Much of the growth of this problem has occurred in the past year (as in Community O) and the growth is attributed to the large amount of money to be made. The stores and theaters are more widespread than in most other communities. One bookstore is located in the university area and the skin flicks are in local family theaters that have been converted for this purpose.

As in all other cities, the clientele of the bookstores is described as middle class.

Unlike most other cities, however, there are a significant number of blacks to be found among the patrons of these stores in Community P. It appears that because of local conditions there are more middle class blacks in "P" and that they have picked up this middle class interest.

Community attitudes as reported by the police. As the problem began to grow in "P," at least four or five complaints were made to the police each day. This number has now dwindled to approximately one per day.

There was an increase in the number of complaints prior to the arrival of *I Am Curious (Yellow)* and during its showing in one of the skin flick theaters. Other X-rated films have been shown in the regular theaters without any great increase in complaints.

There have been two instances of picket line activity, one successful and other other unsuccessful. A skin flick type theater planned to open in a Mexican-American neighborhood and was successfully prevented from doing so by the picket line. A local civic association tried to close *Infra-Sexum* by the use of a picket line but gave up after two evenings (it was still running many weeks later).

Only one complaint has been received from a clergyman and, except for this, there has been no action on the part of the clergy related to this problem.

None of the news media have had any active involvement in this problem area.

Police attitudes. "Pornography is as important as all other areas of vice and it has not been handled as a less important area of function." This statement by the head of the Vice Bureau reflects the general attitude toward the problem. During 1969, 48 arrests were made for pornography as compared to 19 arrests in 1968.

While one man used to devote his full time to pornography, the time spent on this problem has dwindled in the past six months to less than one-half of one man's time. This has not been due to a loss of interest or a decrease in the problem but rather to the difficulty in enforcement brought about by the court decisions.

The police feel that they are getting excellent cooperation from the prosecutor's office, since not only does he accept all the cases they bring him, but he also refers complaints to them.

As in most other communities, most of the cases are tied up in the courts at various levels and stages of appeal. The last decision was in February in the county court and the punishment was a fine.

The procedure used by the police varies in an interesting way from most of the other cities in our study. In order to avoid tying up a great deal of the police department's monies in making purchases of these materials, the police make their purchases with marked money and then "seize" the money. Following this they take the material to the district attorney and on his advice take it to a judge for a judicial opinion and a warrant. This is followed by the issuance of a summons or an arrest.

The police feel that no new laws are needed, but rather that all they want is to be able to enforce them. The present laws are OK; they " . . . just need to be made constitutional."

The police have been asked to preview materials but have vigorously opposed taking on the role of censors.

The prosecutor's attitudes. One member of the district attorney's staff is

currently spending 20% of his time on cases relating to obscenity and pornography. Until a few months ago he used to devote 50% of his time to this problem. This drop in the amount of time spent on the problem is a result of the fact that the State courts have knocked down the latest State statute on constitutional grounds (because it does not contain adequate safeguards such as adversary hearings prior to obtaining an injunction).

The prosecutor feels that the problem has been growing because of the tremendous profits to be made and, also, because the whole matter is being publicized by court decisions.

The prosecutor's report concerning the community's reactions is somewhat stronger than that of the police. He reported receiving many complaints involving threats of personal action, because of loss of confidence in the capability of the police and district attorney to deal with the problem. This has been particularly true when the skin flick theaters have tried to move into the northeast section of the city which is inhabited, primarily, by Mexican-Americans who don't want homosexuals coming into the community. The theater which the police indicated had been kept from opening because of community pressure did in fact open, according to the prosecutor.

The prosecutor is concerned with the sensitivity of the State court judges against being reversed and/or being called censors. As a result they refuse, among other things, to view any questionable films. In local actions against *I Am Curious (Yellow)* and *Infra-Sexum,* one of the top legal experts in the country and the A.C.L.U. appeared for the defense.

The courts have tended to use fines as the medium of punishment. In only one case was a jail sentence of 30 days meted out.

The district attorney indicated that the local newspapers were largely against his prosecution of *I Am Curious (Yellow).*

The prosecutor feels that the only thing that would really solve this problem is the Dirksen Amendment. "If the jury applies the four tests of the Supreme Court and comes to a decision it should not go up any further."

Relationship to organized crime. Neither the police nor the prosecutor saw any connection between the problem of obscenity and pornography and organized crime.

Outside involvement in the problem. The Citizens for Decent Literature has been very active in "P." It has worked closely with the civic association representing the Mexican-Americans in their attempt to keep the sex-oriented movie theaters out of their area. They have lectured extensively to various civic groups such as the Lions Club, Kiwanis (who are now mounting projects), P.T.A.'s, and the Boy Scouts.

The A.C.L.U. has been active on the other side of the problem, coming to the defense of those who have been arrested for offenses relating to obscenity and pornography.

Traffic in Sex-Oriented Materials* and Criminality and Organized Crime

The Relationship

M. Marvin Finkelstein
Boston University
School of Law

CRIMINALITY

Profile of Boston bookstore operators and employees: Criminal charges

SAMPLE

The sample on which this section is based consists of 63 individuals associated with the "adult" bookstore business in the greater Boston area. Thirteen of these individuals are "operators" of adult bookstores while the remaining 50 are "employees." An "operator" is any individual who is known to have a proprietary interest in a particular bookstore *and* who plays an active role in the management thereof. For purposes of this analysis, members of family units who actively engage in the management of bookstores are included in this group. An "employee" is any individual working in an adult bookstore as either a clerk or a manager but having no known proprietary interest.

The members of the "employee" sample consist of all known bookstore employees in the city of Boston since 1965. The members of the "operator" sample consist of all known bookstore operators in Boston since 1960. This sample also includes one bookstore operator located in a Boston suburb who has close familial and other relationships with Boston bookstore operators.

PROCEDURE

Information pertaining to the criminal records of these 63 individuals was obtained from records of the Probation Department of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Only offenses occurring under Massachusetts law are systematically incorporated in these records. Offenses arising under Federal law are only

*See also "The Traffic in Sex-Oriented Materials in Boston," in Volume IV, of the Technical Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

sporadically incorporated. However, such offenses are included in the tabulations of crimes reported in this chapter when they appear in the records of the Massachusetts Probation Department. Also included are the criminal records of Rhode Island residents who are associated with the adult bookstore business in Boston. Such records were obtained from the Rhode Island Bureau of Probation and Parole.

The sample of 63 participants consists of 59 males and four females. Of these 63, 79% are employees while 21% are operators. The ages of these individuals range from 20 through 75. The operator group consists of 11 males and two females while the employee group consists of 48 males and two females. The mean age of the operator group is 41.4 years while the mean age for the employee group is 37.2 years.

Criminal offenses were categorized according to the following classification system:

1. *Principal crimes against persons* (murder and non-negligent manslaughter; forcible rape; assault and battery; sex offenses)

2. *Principal property crimes* (breaking and entering; larceny; larceny of a motor vehicle)

3. *Principal white-collar crimes* (forgery and counterfeiting; fraud; loan-sharking)

4. *Principal vice crimes* (narcotic and drug law violations; gaming)

5. *Abuse of alcohol offenses* (drunkenness)

6. *Family offenses* (offenses against family and children; truancy; runaway)

7. *Public nuisance offenses* (vandalism; malicious destruction of property)

8. *Miscellaneous offenses* (carrying or possession of weapon; waywardness; participation in an illicit performance)

9. *Motor vehicle offenses* (moving violations only)

10. *Obscenity offenses* (possession or sale of obscene material)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The criminal records for the 63 members of the sample indicated that these individuals have accumulated a total of 538 charges for the 10 types of offenses. The 13 operators accounted for 194 of these offenses, or an average of 14.9 charges each, while the 50 employees accounted for 344 of the total offenses, or an average of 6.8 charges each (see Table 1).

Further inspection of Table 1 reveals that for both operators and employees, the largest number of charges filed were for motor vehicle offenses and for the sale and possession of obscene materials. Excluding these offenses, operators averaged 5.0 charges while employees averaged 2.8 charges.

In order to detail more fully the patterns of lawbreaking exhibited by booksellers and to compare the levels of "criminality" between bookstore operators and bookstore employees, the average number of charges were computed for each group of booksellers, by each offense type.

Bookstore operators have higher average charge rates than employees in nine of

Table 1

CHARGES FILED AGAINST ADULT BOOKSTORE OPERATORS AND EMPLOYEES (JUVENILE AND ADULT)

Type of offense		Operators	Employees	Total
1. Principal crimes against persons	N	5	8	13
	%	2.50	2.30	2.41
2. Principal property crimes	N	21	39	60
	%	10.80	11.30	11.16
3. Principal white-collar crimes	N	3	5	8
	%	1.50	1.50	1.49
4. Principal vice crimes	N	10	11	21
	%	5.20	3.20	3.90
5. Abuses of alcohol offenses	N	21	41	62
	%	10.80	11.90	11.52
6. Family offenses	N	—	22	22
	%	—	6.40	4.09
7. Public nuisance offenses	N	2	1	3
	%	1.10	0.30	0.56
8. Miscellaneous offenses	N	4	15	19
	%	2.10	4.40	3.53
9. Motor vehicle offenses	N	59	85	144
	%	30.50	24.70	26.76
10. Obscenity offenses	N	69	117	186
	%	35.50	34.00	34.58
Total	N	194	344	538
	%	100.00	100.00	100.00

the 10 offense categories. Employees register higher in only one of the 10 offense categories, number 6 (family offenses).

For *adult* charges, operators manifest higher average rates in seven of the 10 offense categories. For *juvenile* charges, however, the pattern tends to reverse itself, with operators manifesting higher average charge rates in only one of the 10 types of criminal offenses.

As a group, the members of the sample tend to exhibit a rather high average rate of criminal charges for the eight offense categories, excluding motor vehicle and obscenity-related offenses, suggesting that neither operators nor employees, as groups, are strangers to police contacts. Comparing operators and employees, it appears that the former tend to manifest higher average charge rates in all "serious" crime categories with employees exhibiting a relatively greater activity in offenses by juveniles, in general, and particularly in those involving family offenses.

A closer examination of the criminal records of the operators reveals that the total criminal charges for the group of 13 operators are neither evenly distributed among the individual members of the group nor do they fall in an evenly spaced continuum of operators from a light to a heavy incidence of charges. Rather,

there appear to be two widely divergent operator subgroups. The first, Group I, consists of the five operators with the most extensive records of criminal charges. The second, Group II, consists of the eight operators with the least extensive records of criminal charges. As shown by Table 2, the Group I operators accounted for 148 (76.2%) of the 194 charges recorded against all operators for all 10 offense categories; they averaged 29.6 charges each against 5.7 charges each for the Group II operators. Excluding motor vehicle and obscenity-related charges, the five Group I operators accounted for 62 of the remaining 66 charges recorded for the 13 operators. For these charges (offense type Nos. 1-8), Group I operators averaged approximately 25 times the number of charges recorded for Group II operators (12.4 charges each for the former as against 0.5 charges each for the latter).

In terms of average number of charges, Group I is consistently higher than Group II throughout the 10 offense categories. In some categories, particularly motor vehicle (No. 9), obscenity (No. 10), property (No. 2), vice (No. 4), and abuse of alcohol (No. 5) offenses, the differences between the two groups are striking and, with the exception of motor vehicle and obscenity offenses, the five

Table 2

CHARGES FILED AGAINST ADULT BOOKSTORE OPERATORS: GROUP I AND GROUP II

Type of offense		Group I	Group II	Total
1. Principal crimes against persons	N	3	2	5
	%	2.0	4.3	2.6
2. Principal property crimes	N	21	–	21
	%	14.2	–	10.8
3. Principal white-collar crimes	N	3	–	3
	%	2.0	–	1.5
4. Principal vice crimes	N	10	–	10
	%	6.8	–	5.2
5. Abuses of alcohol offenses	N	19	2	21
	%	12.9	4.3	10.8
6. Family offenses	N	–	–	–
	%	–	–	–
7. Public nuisance offenses	N	2	–	2
	%	1.4	–	1.0
8. Miscellaneous offenses	N	4	–	4
	%	2.7	–	2.1
9. Motor vehicle offenses	N	48	11	59
	%	32.4	24.0	30.4
10. Obscenity offenses	N	38	31	69
	%	25.6	67.4	35.6
Total	N	148	46	194
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0

members of Group I account for virtually all the charges (94%) against the operators as a whole.

Group I operators are highest in average charge rates for nine of the 10 offenses, Group II operators register lowest in most offense categories, and employees appear to constitute a middle group.

Group I operators are responsible for 100% of all charges relating to property, white-collar, vice, public nuisance and miscellaneous offenses.

On the basis of the foregoing, it may be concluded that one segment of bookstore operators (the five in Group I) is composed of individuals whose backgrounds are steeped in lawbreaking activities of a very serious nature. Among the specific offenses with which this group has been charged and the number of Group I operators who were so charged are: murder (1); assault and battery (2); breaking and entering (3); larceny (3); mail fraud (2); loansharking (1); and gambling (3).

In contrast, the eight members of Group II are almost free of any history of major criminal offenses.

An examination of the membership of the two groups of operators reveals a number of interesting differential characteristics. Group II operators have a mean age of 45.1 years (they range in age from 37 years to 53 years) and include six males and two females. The Group I operators are considerably younger, having a mean age of 35.6 years (ranging from 23 years to 50 years), and consist entirely of males.

Of the eight Group II operators, only two entered the adult bookstore business during or after 1966, whereas, of the five members of Group I, all initially entered the adult bookstore business during or after 1966. The members of Group II initially became active in the traffic in sex-oriented materials on an average of nearly 7 years ago, whereas the members of Group I average only a little more than three years in the bookstore business.

Notwithstanding their longer association with the adult bookstore business, members of Group II average 3.9 obscenity offenses while members of Group I average 7.6 obscenity offenses. This suggests that the "newcomers" of Group I may tend to carry forward their aggressive lawbreaking propensities after entering the adult bookstore business, as opposed to the more conservative "old timers" of Group II whose rate of obscenity charges tends to be consistent with its much lower rate of criminal charges in general.

In terms of overall lawbreaking activities for the various sample groupings, obscenity charges play a far heavier role for Group II operators (67%) than for employees (34%) or Group I operators (26%).

Insofar as can be ascertained, Group I operators tended to have minimal "legitimate" business backgrounds prior to their entry into the adult bookstore business. Group II operators, on the other hand, tended to enter the adult bookstore business from a background of "legitimate" commercial activities.

In conclusion, the foregoing data suggests that extensive patterns of criminality exist among employees and bookstore operators, generally. With regard to operators, however, the earliest participants in the adult bookstore business tend to display considerably less evidence of "criminality" than those entering the business during or after 1966, and those entering the business as operators during or after 1966 are statistically dominated by "criminal types."

Sex-oriented material of a type traditionally repugnant to large segments of our society has, in a relatively short span of time, emerged from the obscurity of private libraries and fraternity stag parties to assume a "legitimate" position in the public marketplace of many regions of the United States. Retail outlets for the sale of sex-oriented books, magazines, films, photographs, and so forth, openly market their wares in busy commercial districts with the same apparent legitimacy as the vendors of Pablum or shaving cream. Consumers of such materials need no longer rely on a "contact" to satisfy their interests. The material is available openly at fixed locations during normal business hours and the public controversy engendered as a result is likely to remain for some time.

The aura of mystery that surrounds the traffic in sex-oriented materials and its participants has stimulated wide-ranging speculation. To some who condemn the easy availability of sex-oriented material and urge an intensification of legislative and judicial controls, a facile explanation for the explosive growth of this industry may be founded on its presumed assocation with other powerful, insidious systems. With organized crime now generally regarded as a major national problem, wide-ranging speculation as to its actual, specific activities is easily encouraged and, as with other secret systems which are perceived as a threat to established values, it is not uncommon for some to automatically attribute to it a measure of influence far beyond its actual, albeit widespread, involvements.

At the other extreme, some who favor more permissive treatment of sex-oriented materials have tended to dismiss such assumptions out of hand as being the products of overworked imaginations, or worse, a cynical attempt to manipulate public and legislative opinion in support of greater repression. A few individuals have even suggested that an inquiry into the possible relationships between the traffic in sex-oriented materials and organized crime is moot in view of their predictions that all controls in this area will soon be abolished.

Clearly, the many valid public policy considerations surrounding the use of positive law to control the dissemination of sex-oriented materials are properly independent of an examination concerning the nature of the participants in such traffic. No serious advocate on any side of the issue would urge that the social acceptability of a particular commodity should be judged on the grounds that those who traffic in it are of high or ill repute, especially since the types of persons engaging in the traffic in a commodity may well be determined a priori by the kinds of controls which society places upon its availability. Similarly, it would be absurd to argue that the most socially desirable means for combating organized crime rests on the legalization of its traditional activities.

The information which is presented on the following pages represents the views and conclusions of law enforcement and other public officials in several cities concerning the possible relationships between the traffic in sex-oriented materials and organized crime. Where possible, incidents of purported organized crime involvements which were cited by respondents in support of their conclusions are included in this report. Because there is a scarcity of well-developed data in this area (no fully adjudicated case involving organized crime participation in the traffic in sex-oriented materials has come to our attention in any of the cities examined), opinion tends to rely mainly on a blend of intelligence data,

unconfirmed rumors and professional intuition. Several law enforcement officials who are reportedly in possession of documented information on this subject were unwilling to be interviewed.

In all, well over 50 law enforcement and other public officials with experience in the area of this inquiry were interviewed. These officials represent law enforcement agencies at all governmental levels–local, State, and Federal–which were active in the cities studied, and include both police and prosecuting attorneys.

The subject cities–New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston and greater San Francisco–were chosen for various reasons, including regional distribution, alleged centrality in both the national distribution of sex-oriented materials and the national organized crime networks, and/or because of research activities commenced in connection with the first part of this report.

With few exceptions, neither respondents nor alleged participants in the activities discussed below are identified by name. Anonymity was requested by a number of respondents and essential fairness dictates this policy in connection with alleged participants.

If our hypothesis is correct, the black market characteristics of the traffic in sex-oriented materials is likely to attract a relatively large number of "criminal types." The extent to which the industry as a whole, or significant components thereof, may be related to *organized crime systems* is, however, a question which is quite distinct. Whatever inferences may be drawn regarding the life styles of participants in this business, it should be recognized that there is no necessary correlation between individual or collective criminality and "organized crime" as it is used herein. If there was, any cooperative effort by two or more individuals to engage in an activity in violation of law could be regarded as an "organized crime" enterprise. Under such a broad definition, it would follow that any combination of persons associated in the traffic in sex-oriented materials of a legally obscene nature would be engaging in an "organized crime" activity. For the purposes of this study, however, "organized crime" refers only to that particular structure of crime systems most commonly known as the Mafia or Cosa Nostra.

> "It involves thousands of criminals working within structures as complex as those of any large corporation, subject to laws more rigidly enforced than those of legitimate governments."[1]
>
> "Today the core of organized crime in the United States consists of 24 groups operating as criminal cartels in large cities across the Nation. Their membership is exclusively men of Italian descent, they are in frequent communication with each other, and their smooth functioning is insured by a national body of overseers."[2]
>
> "In individual cities, the local core group may also be known as the 'outfit,' the 'syndicate' or the 'mob.' These 24 groups work with and control other racket groups, whose leaders are of various ethnic derivations."[3]

---

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report on Organized Crime* 1 (1967).
2. Id., 6.
3. Id., 7.

"Organized crime in its totality thus consists of these 24 groups allied with other racket enterprises to form a loose confederation operating in large and small cities."[4]

New York City

On April 31, 1969, a Federal grand jury in Brooklyn, New York, indicted 10 persons for conspiracy to transport obscene materials in interstate commerce for the purpose of sale and distribution. Each of the defendants was also charged with one to five counts of transporting such materials in interstate commerce between January 13, 1969 and February 10, 1969. Shipments allegedly originated in Brooklyn, New York, and were transported by means of commercial air freight from Kennedy and Newark Airports to cities in Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and upstate New York. The transactions cited in the indictment include the following materials: 300 reels of 8 mm. film, 900 copies of a magazine entitled *Wife Swapping,* 1,300 packets of photographs and 2,000 decks of obscene playing cards. In raids which were conducted in connection with the investigation of this case, Federal authorities seized obscene materials having an estimated retail value of between $500,000 and $1,000,000.

The far-flung activities of this operation are suggested by the addresses of the defendants, which included Brooklyn, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Cleveland, and Southfield, Michigan. Records which were in the possession of the defendants when they were arrested contained more than 60 names. Locations which were identified therein included, in addition to the foregoing: Detroit; Minneapolis; Boston, Springfield, and Chelmsford, Massachusetts; Baltimore; Northfield and Mayfield, Ohio; Hoboken, Trenton, and Bayonne, New Jersey; and Canada. Notations were also recorded of transactions with two major national distributors of sex-oriented materials, located in Atlanta, Georgia, and North Hollywood, California.

This case is of particular interest in view of the alleged affiliations of some of the participants, the purported circumstances surrounding the establishment of the enterprise and the inclusive nature of the group's activities.

According to Federal authorities, the two central figures in the "Brooklyn conspiracy" are *members* of the Brooklyn Cosa Nostra family of Joseph Colombo. A codefendant whose name appears in the aforementioned records and who was indicted separately in Cleveland, Ohio, has been identified as a member of the Detroit Cosa Nostra family allegedly led by Jospeh Zerilli. Another name appearing in the records is believed to be that of an individual residing in Niagara Falls, New York, who was identified in 1968 by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a member of the Cosa Nostra and linked to the family of Stefano Magaddino. Mr. Magaddino is reputed to control organized crime activities in Western New York, the Ohio Valley and portions of Canada.

Law enforcement officials outside New York City who have access to intelligence reports relating to the Brooklyn conspiracy claim that the funds necessary to establish the operation were provided at the very highest levels of the Colombo family hierarchy and were subsequently transferred, by an intermediary,

---

4. Ibid.

to the two central figures named in the indictment. This information, presumably accurate, establishes the Brooklyn conspiracy as a full-fledged Cosa Nostra undertaking.

Further evidence of the organized crime connection is derived from the alleged scope of the organization's activities. In addition to the obscene material, other contraband, having the estimated value of $500,000, was seized. Such material included stolen stock certificates and watch movements, 3,500 one-ounce bottles of phony Chanel No. 5 perfume, forged New York and New Jersey motor vehicle registration forms (often used to facilitate the transfer of stolen automobiles), and $26,000 in counterfeit currency.

It is believed that an organizational relationship existed between the distribution of obscene materials and the flow of other contraband, and that some or all of the individuals indicted for the obscenity offenses also participated in the movement of other contraband. When arrested in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, one of the codefendants allegedly had in his possession counterfeit $20 bills having a total face value of $25,240. These bills were similar to those discovered in the possession of one of the defendants who resides in Brooklyn.

Whether the counterfeit currency and other contraband were intended for more extensive distribution through networks established for the traffic in sex-oriented materials (e.g., retail outlets) has not been ascertained. Law enforcement officers are certain, however, that at least to the degree indicated above, the Brooklyn conspiracy was an organized crime enterprise engaged in the production and distribution of hard-core pornography and was associated with a variety of other illegal activities.

On July 23, 1969, the Manhattan Strike Force on Organized Crime gained indictments against 14 persons for conspiracy to transport in interstate commerce various types of obscene materials and 12 additional counts of transporting such material in interstate commerce. The indictments alleged that between November 15, 1968 and July 12, 1969, the named defendants conspired to and/or did transport from New York City 2,500 reels of black-and-white and color 8 mm. film, 8,000 decks of obscene playing cards, and 43,000 copies of obscene magazines to various cities, including Baltimore, Las Vegas, Minneapolis, Chicago, Cleveland, and Philadelphia. A conservative estimate of the retail value of the material transported would be in excess of $500,000. In furtherance of the conspiracy, and not included in the above figures, the defendants were said to have printed 80,000 copies of obscene magazines entitled *Color Climax* and *Pornography*.

The conspiracy involved the production of domestic pornographic materials, the reproduction of such imported materials and the distribution of both. The pornography placed in circulation was hard-core in nature and destined for retail sale through underground channels as well as for retail under-the-counter sale in adult bookstores.

The individuals indicted included the most prominent producers of hard-core pornography in New York City. The leading figure in this operation is a person long known to local law enforcement officers as a major producer and distributor of hard-core underground material. He has been described as a former bodyguard and successor to an individual who, until his recent "retirement," was regarded as the foremost Manhattan distributor of hard-core pornography. Although still in

his late twenties, he has a record of more than 38 arrests for obscenity violations; he was recently arrested for possession of counterfeit subway tokens. His wife was also named in the Manhattan indictment.

Also indicted was the most prominent producer of hard-core stag films in New York City. His financial condition appears to be more stable than that of others engaged in similar activities. He is believed to have "backers" whose identities have not been determined and is reported to have raised $50,000 to finance a recent appeal "without blinking an eye."

Two brothers who are major distributors in Minneapolis are alleged to have received a total of 41,000 copies of obscene magazines and 8,000 decks of obscene playing cards in a period of less than six months. These individuals, while not named in the Brooklyn indictments discussed above, are believed also to have been leading customers for material produced by that enterprise. The name of one of the brothers appeared in the records referred to earlier.

Other defendants included a printer who was reportedly arrested in the past year for producing counterfeit $10 bills and a former Baltimore police officer.

The defendants enumerated above have been described as independent operators with extensive involvement in the production and distribution of hard-core obscene material. Because of the underground nature of their business and the constant dangers presented by informants, their associations with others in the traffic are often uneasy and temporary. Combinations of participants change with the pressures of police action and the constant need for new capital. It is not unrealistic to assume that they seek and perhaps engage necessary services which are only available to them through organized crime channels. One defendant, particularly, is regarded as a mob-associated figure (although not necessarily a member) and it is alleged that his continuing need for funding sources has enabled organized crime to gain a foothold in the production and distribution of hard-core pornographic materials.

The significance of this indictment, beyond the fact that it concerns a venture of considerable size and includes individuals of some prominence in the traffic in hard-core pornography, is believed to lie in the involvement of one particular defendant who is seen by law enforcement officials to represent an additional step in the involvement of organized crime in the traffic in obscene materials. According to knowledgeable sources, this individual, named in the Manhattan indictment, is a loan shark who operates out of Las Vegas and has substantial and definite organized crime connections. It is believed that the other defendants, in desperate need of cash to launch this venture, requested and received the necessary financial assistance from the loan shark who, in turn, became a silent partner in this operation.

Law enforcement officials regard this case as an important example of the increasing participation of organized crime elements in the traffic in hard-core materials.

On May 21, 1969, a Federal grand jury indicted four persons on charges of conspiring to pay a bribe to a customs agent to pass pornographic literature into the United States. The case was prepared by the Office of the U.S. Attorney, Southern District of New York.

It appears that on April 29, 1968, a crate containing pornographic material broke open on a New York pier. The crate was part of a shipment which was

labeled "earthen ware" and "cups and saucers" and had been imported from Denmark. In a subsequent investigation, customs agents recovered substantial quantities of similar materials in a warehouse. This material had been imported by the defendants in December 1967. It is alleged that the four defendants conspired to pay a bribe of $3,000 to a customs agent in an effort to suppress the investigation.

The individual charged with being the "bag man" has been identified as a "high lieutenant in the Genovese Mafia family" and is said to be a Cosa Nostra leader in Philadelphia and Southern New Jersey. Called as a witness in connection with public hearings conducted by the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Crime in January 1970, the defendant refused to answer questions concerning matters implicating him in Cosa Nostra vending machine operations in Miami, Los Angeles, and St. Louis. The defendant was also linked to a major financier with extensive holdings in the motion picture industry, airlines, and a Las Vegas hotel.

The four defendants were not charged with obscenity offenses but rather with bribery of a customs agent. This matter was tried and resulted in the conviction of two of the defendants and a hung jury with regard to the two other defendants, including the alleged Cosa Nostra figure.

Although the reputed Cosa Nostra leader was not a record participant in any of the enterprises associated with the other three defendants, authoritative sources are convinced that this defendant has had a long-standing relationship with the other defendants and was involved in the scheme to import and distribute sex-oriented materials. It is their contention that a Cosa Nostra figure of this individual's rank and stature would not involve himself as a "bag man" in a relatively petty matter of this type unless he was acting to protect his own interests in the enterprise. While no hard evidence is available to support this conclusion, officials familiar with the facts and circumstances of this case are of the very firm belief that a joint venture existed to import sex-oriented materials and that the Cosa Nostra figure played an on-going role as a participant.

Another case prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney, Southern District of New York, involved the interstate shipment of securities which had been stolen from several major New York City brokerage firms by a ring allegedly organized and controlled by the Cosa Nostra. When arrested at Kennedy Airport, three of the defendants were found to have 60 reels of hard-core pornographic film in their possession. Convictions were subsequently obtained on charges arising out of the securities theft.

It is not known whether the defendants were dealing in pornographic films on a wide scale or were merely engaged in an isolated transaction. Of significance, however, is the fact that the defendants in this case were definitely associated with organized crime systems and were trafficking in pornographic films to some extent.

Virtually all law enforcement officials in New York City who were interviewed in connection with this inquiry have expressed a belief that organized crime systems are associated with the traffic in sex-oriented materials. However, with the exception of the four cases discussed above, most officials disclaim having any hard evidence which would confirm their generalized views; nevertheless, a consensus of knowledgeable *opinion* emerges in the following areas: (1) that

organized crime systems are becoming increasingly active in all phases of the traffic in sex-oriented materials in New York City and that high profits and relatively low risks have combined to attract individuals who were formerly associated with the narcotics traffic; (2) that strong-arm tactics have been employed by "well-known hoods" in a successful effort to gain a share of the profits of adult bookstores in Manhattan; and (3) that the "peep shows" which appear in many New York City adult bookstores are controlled by organized crime elements.

Los Angeles

On December 17, 1969, the *Los Angeles Times* carried a front page, lead headline which read as follows: "Pornography Blamed: ORGANIZED CRIME 'IS HERE,' PITCHESS SAYS." In the story that followed, Peter Pitchess, Sheriff of Los Angeles County, was reported to have stated that while local law enforcement agencies have been successful in excluding organized crime from Los Angeles in the past, the sex-oriented materials industry is now making it possible for organized crime to gain a foothold in Los Angeles.

> " 'I'm not about to warn you that organized crime may move in. They are already here. They have established a strong foothold, and if that doesn't shock you, it should.
>
> " 'We must recognize that a vehicle presently exists that is bringing big crime to our area and enabling these criminals to establish themselves. We must accept the fact that Los Angeles is the smut and pornography capital of the world, and that the right conditions exist for organized crime.'
>
> "Recently, Pitchess noted, a pornographic film bought by an undercover member of the vice bureau was delivered by a member of a Cosa Nostra family. He said that three Cosa Nostra members have been identified as being active in the sale and distribution of pornography.
>
> " 'The Cosa Nostra front men are here, with more takeovers to follow,' he said."

Efforts to arrange a personal interview with Sheriff Pitchess proved unsuccessful. However, we were informed by a high-ranking member of his staff that the Sheriff's statements concerning organized crime should be interpreted as a warning to the general public that existing conditions *could* bring organized crime into the traffic in pornographic materials. We were further informed that while evidence exists that certain individuals who are known associates of organized crime have been involved in the traffic in obscene and pornographic materials in the Los Angeles area, the Sheriff is not prepared to suggest at this time that a complete takeover has yet occurred.

State and local law enforcement officials in the Los Angeles area tended to support the hypothesis that organized crime is becoming more actively involved in the traffic in obscene materials. Opinions expressed by law enforcement officials varied from tentative conclusions that an association between organized crime and the traffic in sex-oriented materials is quite possible to positive assertions that a "definite connection" exists. One representative of the Los Angeles Police Department with extensive experience in this area replied that he "emphatically" believes that there is a substantial organized crime involvement and would "stake

my right arm on it." Most law enforcement sources freely acknowledged that their conclusions, however firm, are derived from intelligence information rather than hard and demonstrable evidence.

It is also apparent that much of the information which underlies the various assertions concerning the involvement of organized crime in this traffic is based on a common pool of intelligence information which was not necessarily developed by the particular respondent or the law enforcement agency which he represents. The most appropriate conclusion, perhaps, is that drawn by a law enforcement officer presently involved in a study of the relationship between organized crime and sex-oriented materials in California and who is familiar with all the data which is presently available on that subject. After assessing such data, he has concluded that specific evidence of organized crime involvement is presently very limited. Although he believes that future investigations may produce more substantial evidence of the possible connection, he cautioned that it would be premature to base firm and wide-ranging conclusions on presently available information.

Constructed from the various interviews conducted with law enforcement officials in the Los Angeles area, the following emerge as the major evidentiary items supporting the possible involvement of organized crime in the traffic in sex-oriented materials.

About 2 years ago, rumors began to come to the attention of law enforcement agencies which suggested that high-ranking organized crime overlords were disturbed that the traffic in sex-oriented materials was not being exploited by organized crime subordinates. (Such information is supported to some extent by New York City officials who reported that Cosa Nostra personnel have adjusted their views during the last few years and no longer regard their association with sex-oriented materials as inconsistent with their notions of "manliness.") In the months which followed, police became aware of the Brooklyn conspiracy and began to notice incidents of actual organized crime participation.

Early in 1969, an undercover agent for the Sheriff's Department made a purchase of several hundred reels of hard-core, 8 mm. obscene film. The seller had no significant status as an organized crime figure. However, in the course of negotiating, the seller cautioned the undercover agent that the latter would be in trouble if the purchase price was not ready as agreed because "the big guys" had an interest in the transaction. When the film was delivered, the courier was arrested and taken into custody. It was discovered that each reel of film was wrapped in a page of the Manhattan telephone directory and that the delivery agent was a known "runner" for the Cosa Nostra family of Joe Bonanno. It is believed that the film was produced in New York although the identities of the producers have not been determined. The courier presently resides in Los Angeles and has been visited by "well-known" East Coast organized crime figures, particularly members of the Joe Bonanno family.

In another incident, a large quantity of 8 mm. pornographic film was shipped from the East Coast for delivery to a Los Angeles distributor. The distributor was observed at the airport on a number of occasions but never claimed the films. After a period of time, the films were confiscated. They were dusted for fingerprints and bore those of a "very close associate of an East Coast Mafia family."

Two individuals implicated in the Brooklyn conspiracy have been observed in Los Angeles. The first, an alleged leader in that conspiracy, was named in the indictment and identified by New York authorities as a member of the Colombo Cosa Nostra family. He is believed to have contacted one of the largest publishers of borderline sex-oriented magazines in the United States in an effort to gain control of the business.

The second individual, while not indicted as a participant in the Brooklyn conspiracy, has been linked by its records to the operations conducted by the Brooklyn defendants and is regarded as an "associate" of the leaders of that venture. He has been described as a representative for an organized crime syndicate but not a major figure in his own right. He was in Los Angeles recently for a period of more than two months before returning to New York City. During his stay in Los Angeles he too was observed to make contact with the aforesaid publisher.

About 2 years ago, Beverly Hills police reportedly confiscated large quantities of obscene 8 mm. films. The persons arrested in connection with the distribution of those films have been identified as known Cosa Nostra associates.

Another nationally prominent producer and distributor of borderline sex-oriented magazines, located in Los Angeles, is said to have admitted accepting a $10,000 loan in 1960 from an East Coast Cosa Nostra family in order to establish his business. As a result, some law enforcement officials believe that organized crime elements have retained a continuing financial interest in this individual's business. It is rumored that an organized crime associate has been placed in an important position in this publishing firm, that this alleged organized crime functionary may have assumed control over one particular enterprise in the publishing empire, and that he has made suspicious financial investments in another. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that an actual organized crime takeover has occurred.

Also cited is an individual who owns a number of arcades in San Diego, California. This individual, formerly from Newark, New Jersey, has been on the West Coast for three or four years and is believed to have organized crime connections. He is regarded by police in Los Angeles as a possible organized crime operative.

In summary, Los Angeles law enforcement officials are convinced that East Coast Cosa Nostra families have become prominent in the production and distribution of hard-core pornographic materials, particularly films. They strongly suspect that efforts have been made to expand organized crime influence to Los Angeles dealers in sex-oriented materials. Information has only recently been developed in this area; there is, however, general agreement that participants in the local traffic in borderline materials have not demonstrated traditional organized crime connections, although many have unsavory personal backgrounds and histories of white-collar criminal activity.

Chicago

In Chicago, as in most other cities, the evidence supporting organized crime involvement is fragmentary and undeveloped. No consistent data has been adduced that would support firm conclusions in this area and respondents have

generally conceded the difficulty in establishing a nexus between organized crime and the traffic in sex-oriented materials. Opinion in Chicago, therefore, tends to be divided and uncertain. Even those taking the strongest positions in support of an organized crime involvement caution that their conclusions are premised largely on untested intelligence reports and hearsay. Officials in the same law enforcement agencies have occassionally reached quite different and contradictory conclusions.

A number of respondents have charged that certain local retail adult bookstore operators are "fronts" for organized crime. Specific references in that regard are often directed at two or three bookstore operators and the stores which they control. However, no specific information has been presented which would link these individuals or stores with organized crime systems nor has any consistent description of the purported link emerged. Others discount the possibility that these retail bookstores are controlled or associated with organized crime systems. One respondent who is familiar with the operations of these bookstores and is personnally acquainted with a number of the operators stated that he would be "very much surprised" if any of them were affiliated with organized crime. A series of raids that were conducted jointly by the Chicago Sheriff's Department and the State Revenue Department's Internal Security and Fraud Unit produced no hard evidence of organized crime involvement in the operation of the bookstores. Again, differences of opinion were expressed by law enforcement officials who participated in those raids. While conceding the absence of any specific evidence, one such official indicated that he is absolutely convinced of an organized crime tie-in. Another, equally familiar with the evidence obtained in the raids, stated that there is nothing to indicate that the various bookstores which were raided are "fronts" for organized crime and disputed allegations made by other officials which charged that various bookstore owners are organized crime associates.

Several respondents also speculated that "peep show" operations may be controlled by organized crime personnel.

Specific incidents of possible organized crime involvements which were reported in Chicago are set forth below.

An investigation was conducted on the activities of a North Chicago distribution center for sex-oriented materials. It is known that this operation is regional in scope and supplies materials to Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Ohio. Although the identities of the major individual participants have not been ascertained, there is a very strong belief that the operation is controlled by the Cosa Nostra. In the latter part of 1968, various organized crime associates were tried and convicted in the Federal District Court in Chicago on charges arising out of a 1963 robbery. During the trial, the defendants were kept under surveillance and two of them were observed making periodic visits to the above-mentioned distribution center. There is no question that both individuals are mob-connected; in fact, one of them has been identified by the Chicago Crime Commission as being among the top ten Cosa Nostra figures in Chicago.

A current investigation has been undertaken to study the arrangement of "smokers" for visiting out-of-town businessmen. Such smokers feature gambling and the exhibition and sale of stag films, among other things. Very large quantities of stag films (ranging from 500 to 4,000 reels) are known to have been

flown to Chicago from New York City and Newark, New Jersey, to service this operation. It is alleged that these smokers are controlled by Cosa Nostra figures.

In October 1967, a New York City distributor of borderline sex-oriented magazines of the type sold over the counter appeared in Chicago for the purpose of developing new markets for his material. In the course of his activities in Chicago, he is known to have approached the owner of at least one Chicago adult bookstore and threatened him with bodily harm if he refused to purchase material from the distributor. The warnings were coupled with an assertion that he represented East Coast mob interests and that the Cosa Nostra would enforce his threats. No independent verification for the New York City distributors self-proclaimed mob affiliation has been produced.

Boston

One individual with close associations to the traffic in sex-oriented materials in Boston denied the existence of organized crime involvements by describing adult bookstore operators in the following way:

> "These are all individual entrepreneurs who came from rather similar backgrounds which might lead people to think that there is a basic organization. But then captains of industries seem to come from the same backgrounds too. But people don't seem to notice it quite as much. The only difference is, that instead of talking with a Harvard accent, they talk with a South Boston accent and of course, that makes them suspect. In addition to which, most of them have police records."

The fact is that many of Boston's bookstore operators do, indeed, have criminal records. In some cases, the criminal records are quite extensive. Moreover, most emerge, in one way or another, from long business and social relationships in the "combat zone" (the area in Boston where most adult bookstores are located and which is notorious as a congregation point for "underworld types" and as a center for the traffic in various prohibited goods and services—see first part of this report) and these relationships have encouraged speculation about possible tie-ins with organized crime. Such speculations are fed by the occasional involvement of participants in the traffic in sex-oriented materials in other serious violations of law. In a very recent case, a former clerk in one of the bookstores was held on $100,000 bail and charged with 41 counts of unlawful sale of heroin. He was described as one of the area's most important dealers in narcotics. Paradoxically, his arrest occurred on the same day the Federal Court of Appeals overturned his 1968 conviction for sale of obscene material.

From time to time during the past year, pronouncements have been made by public officials which were suggestive of links between the adult bookstores and crime systems. A former Suffolk County assistant district attorney was quoted as stating that his office has "evidence that indicates that organized crime is dealing in this stuff." A Boston city councilor, active in legislative efforts to close Boston's adult bookstores, declared that these stores are operated by "a proven gangster element." In correspondence, a Boston city official referred to

"booksellers whom the Boston City Police believe to be tied in in some way with an organized crime syndicate based in Providence."

Efforts to obtain verification of the foregoing statements have been unsuccessful. In two separate telephone interviews conducted by staff researchers, the Suffolk County assistant district attorney quoted earlier, now in private law practice, asserted that although the organizations behind the distribution of "girly magazines" in Boston's "combat zone" are corporate fictions, "I don't think that organized crime is involved." Some months later, he stated that the alleged link between organized crime and the traffic in sex-oriented materials was only an assumption.

When contacted by a staff member, the Boston city councilor explained his earlier remarks as follows: "When I say gangster or criminal element, I am echoing certain members of the Boston Police Department."

Conversations with law enforcement officers have produced no hard evidence of a relationship between Boston's "adult only" bookstores and organized crime. A high-ranking Boston police official, after acknowledging that his department has conducted no full, in-depth investigation of the traffic in obscene materials, stated that on the basis of information which is available to him, no evidence of organized crime involvement in the local traffic in sex-oriented material has been observed. Although the possibility of such involvement has not been ruled out, no evidence has been developed which would confirm such relationship to any degree of specificity. Moreover, there is no evidence of a relationship between the systems or individuals involved in the traffic in sex-oriented materials and traffic in other illicit goods or services. The adult bookstores appear to be "clean" in such areas as prostitution, narcotics and gambling.

Representatives of the Boston Strike Force on Organized Crime stated that their agency has conducted no inquiries in this area but that continuing investigations of organized crime personnel in and around Boston have not suggested the existence of a tie-in. No hint of a connection has been elicited from underworld informants. Furthermore, they expressed no knowledge of any Boston relationships to the organization or activities described in the Brooklyn indictments.

A Justice Department official in Washington cited hearsay information ascribing organized crime connections to a prominent Boston bookstore operator but knows of no evidence which would support a firm conclusion.

A representative of the Attorney General's office who "strongly suspects" an organized crime involvement concedes that investigations of this subject have produced no tangible evidence.

Division of opinion exists in Boston concerning the alleged existence of a substantial extra-bookstore underground traffic in sex-oriented materials. Those who doubt its existence tend also to doubt organized crime involvement in the traffic in obscene materials in general. The correlation of these views is consistent with the pattern of responses observed among many respondents. Association of organized crime with sex-oriented materials is often most closely related to the underground distribution of hard-core materials.

Accordingly, the one law enforcement officer who expressed an absolute conviction that a wide-scale underground network for the circulation of hard-core materials is operative in and around Boston also asserted that despite his inability

to establish an organized crime connection by positive proof, he is firmly convinced that one exists and that a State-wide system of the size described could not continue to operate without organized crime approval, at the very least. In support of this thesis, he cited information obtained from police informants revealing that a bookmaker was approached by persons identified as Cosa Nostra associates and offered an opportunity to handle the underground distribution of hard-core sex-oriented materials in a particular region of Massachusetts. The bookmaker reportedly refused to participate because the sale of such materials was inconsistent with his self-image and contrary to his own definitions of "manliness."

One of the major New York producers of hard-core materials and a "feeder" for the underground distribution ring allegedly operating in Massachusetts is an individual, based in Brooklyn, who has been identified by one New York authority as "associated with organized crime."

At least one of the leaders of the Manhattan conspiracy is also known to have shipped material to Boston.

It should also be noted that records which were maintained by the Brooklyn conspirators indicate some business associations with individuals in the Boston area. The nature and full extent of such association, however, is unknown. Among the items seized in a raid conducted by local police on the storage center of Boston's largest distributor of sex-oriented materials were copies of a hard-core magazine (not necessarily the identical issue) which the Brooklyn conspirators were known to be distributing.

In the course of conducting research on Boston's adult bookstores, various rumors were encountered which suggest a possible organized crime involvement. Most were so fragmented and/or patently speculative as to prohibit inclusion in this report. The following information is included only because it is derived from two independent "combat zone" sources whose positions are such as to add some credence to their disclosures. According to these informants, two combat zone bookstore owners are affiliated in a venture which includes ownership of combat zone bars and night clubs and participation in a ring which produces and distributes hard-core pornography. It is further alleged that these two individuals operate under, and report directly to, a person who is reported to be the third-ranking Cosa Nostra figure in New England.

Again, it must be cautioned that this information is based wholly on hearsay and lacks any external verification.

In summary, no tangible evidence of organized crime participation has been adduced in Boston, notwithstanding some charges of Cosa Nostra involvement in the traffic in sex-oriented materials.

San Francisco

Respondents in the San Francisco Bay area report that there is no evidence of an organized crime involvement in the local traffic in sex-oriented materials. Although a number of producers, distributors, and bookstore and motion picture theater operators have exhibited law-breaking propensities (receipt of stolen goods and traffic in drugs were among the violations mentioned), incidents of this sort appear to bear no systematic relationship to the operation of the various

businesses. Most local participants in the traffic are independent entrepreneurs with a penchant for schemes which promise fast money. Some suspicion was expressed concerning the "gray areas of ownership" and it is believed that some of the larger operations may be controlled by persons other than the ostensible owners. However, these suspicions have not, as yet, been confirmed.

Officials reported that they have heard rumors of organized crime involvements in Los Angeles, but none could provide detailed information on that subject. A Los Angeles distributor of pornographic 8 mm. film, with more than 90,000 reels in stock, was said to be tied in with "hoodlum elements."

Several respondents are of the belief that much of the hard-core material is being brought in from the East Coast. An individual, operating out of Brooklyn, New York, is known to have been very active in transporting hard-core films from New York City to San Francisco. It has not been determined if the aforesaid individual was connected with the Brooklyn conspiracy.

Citizen Action Groups

Collective Dynamics of Ad Hoc Antipornography Organizations

LOUIS A. ZURCHER

R. GEORGE KIRKPATRICK

University of Texas at Austin

FOREWORD

This document was prepared under contract with the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, Washington, D. C., W. Cody Wilson, executive director. The project director was Louis A. Zurcher. Robert G. Cushing was consultant for statistical analysis. Ronald D. Birkelbach, Charles K. Bowman, Mickey Courson Bowman, Adreain Ross Kirkpatrick, R. George Kirkpatrick (as research coordinator), Vicki Watkins, and Susan Lee Zurcher gathered and organized the field data in Southtown and Midville. Marilyn Bidnick, Nijole Benokraitis, Marilyn Clayton, Rosemary Cooney, and Paula Miller were on-campus research assistants. Malvern Lusky, Ralph Nemir, Janine Nussbaum, and Mark Swope assisted in data gathering during the Southtown phase of the field research.

In order to protect the anonymity of respondents as much as possible, names of persons (with the exceptions of a few nationally known individuals) and of locations are pseudonyms.

Many quotes in the text are not cited: all references to Midville are taken from Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1970), and all references to Southtown are taken from Zurcher and Bowman (1970). The appropriate citations have been deleted because it was felt that they would, by sheer number, detract from the continuity of the paper.

INTRODUCTION

"Collective behavior" has traditionally been a sociological "basket category." As Robert Evans points out.

> Collective behavior is *not* concerned with people in cooperatives, rural folks undergoing farm collectivization, behavior resulting from such projects as the

Tennessee Valley Authority, or the adjustment of families to the kibbutz system. These all lie in the domain of everyday sociology, the study of organized groups, their interactions, and their effects on the individual and society. There is the assumption however, made explicit almost half a century ago by Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess (1921), that there exists a special kind of behavior, activity which is different from "normal" behavior.

Under the rubric "collective behavior" are included theoretical and empirical treatises on riot, revolution, insurrection, rebellion, disorder, protest, strike, disaster, panic flight, hysteria, fads, crazes, fashion, rumor, contagion, communication, mobs, crowds, audience, public, mass, social-political-religious patterns of destruction, and other movements or cults. The preconditions, motivations, effects, leadership and followership characteristics, and the means of control and causes of loss of control of collective behavior phenomena have been studied from historical, journalistic, philosophic, psychological, sociological, economic, political, and various other practical and impractical points of view. (Evans, 1969, p. 1)

In an attempt to restrict this vast area of social phenomena, Kurt and Gladys Lang (1961) choose to replace the term "collective behavior" with "collective dynamics," the study of interactional episodes which may be distinguished as relatively spontaneous and transitory. This definition suits the purposes of this report. Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1970) describe the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Zurcher and Bowman (1970) describe the events in Southtown by highlighting the social and psychological functions of their relative spontaneity and short lives.

"Social movements" are large groups which arise spontaneously, tend to be enduring (or at least longer lasting than, for example, panics or riots) and, most importantly, have a clear program or purpose. Furthermore, social movements are aimed at promoting or resisting change in society at large. A "social movement," therefore, as defined by Hans Toch (1965, p. 5) is a large-scale informal effort designed to collect, supplement, overthrow, or in some fashion influence the social order. It represents a collective effort by a group of people to solve a problem they feel they have in common. Characteristically, the social movement has an apparent ideological component, that is, a set of ideas which specify discontent, prescribe solutions, and justify change (Gusfield, 1970).

The ad hoc antipornography organizations were thus social movements, though of a somewhat limited variety. There was a great deal of spontaneity, transitoriness, and socially shared change orientation (or resistance to change orientation) centered around and dynamically associated with antipornography activity. A complex ideology was present, an ideology that reflected a composite of "real Americanism," "good Christian principles," and "basic values."

Smelser's "value-added" stages of collective behavior

Neil Smelser (1962) suggests that a number of specifiable determinants, or necessary conditions, must be presented for any kind of collective behavior, including social movements, to occur. His outline of "value-added" stages of collective behavior, which are the necessary but not sufficient prerequisites to the emergence of specific forms of collective behavior, will provide a theoretical

structure for the analysis of the growth and development of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Southtown and Midville. The "value-added" stages are (a) structural conduciveness, (b) structural strain, (c) growth and spread of a generalized belief, (d) precipitating factors, (e) mobilization of participants for action, and (f) the operation of social control.

This report will follow the development of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Southtown and Midville and describe those settings, events, and interactions which can be classified under Smelser's value-added stages of collective behavior. It will be shown that these factors were necessary for the emergence of the ad hoc antipornography organizations, and that they shaped both the direction of the organization's activity and the degree to which they accomplished their goals.[1]

Smelser differentiates between the "value-oriented" movement and the "norm-oriented" movement. Values, according to Smelser, state in general terms the desirable goals which act as a guide to human endeavor. He illustrates the general character of values by citing examples of "democracy" and "free enterprise." Values are the most general statements of legitimate ends which guide social action (1962, p. 25). Smelser further elaborates the definition of values by quoting Kluckhohn, who states that values are "generalized and organized conceptions, influencing behavior, of nature, of man's place in it, of man's relation to man, and of the desirable and non-desirable, as they may relate to man-environment and interhuman relations" (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 411). The value-oriented social movement, therefore, according to Smelser (1962, p. 313), is a collective attempt to restore, protect, modify, or create values in the name of a generalized belief.

Norms, on the other hand, are more specific than general values, specifying certain regulatory principles which are necessary if values are to be realized. The value of democracy, for example, provides only criteria for judging the legitimacy or illegitimacy of whole classes of behavior. Various rules, or norms, must be established to indicate how democracy (or any other system of values) may be realized—rules of election, office holding, and rights and privileges of the state and citizens. As such, the rules represent the narrowing of possible applications of general values (Smelser, 1962, pp. 26-27). Smelser defines the norm-oriented movement as an attempt to restore, protect, modify, or create norms in the name of a generalized belief. The norm-oriented movement frequently results in some sort of normative innovation—a new law, custom, bureau, association, or segment of a political party. Agitation by a group of nations to establish an international police force, agitation by groups of businessmen for tax legislation on the Federal, State or local level, agitation by the members of a local union to federate with other unions, agitation by a minority of members of a local chapter of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to amend the by-laws of a chapter—all of these are examples of norm-oriented movements (Smelser, 1962, p. 270).

This report argues that the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville

---

1. Since its publication in 1962, there have been several applications of the Smelserian value-added theory. Brown (1965) applied the model to the Detroit race riot of 1943. Milgram and Toch (1965) studied the Berkeley student riots of 1965 using the value-added model. Fendrich and Pearson (1969) used the stages to study the impact of alienation among black veterans. Quarantelli and Huntley (1969) tested the applicability of the model to campus demonstrations.

and Southtown were both examples of norm-oriented social movements, and that participants in the antipornography organizations were quite content with the "basic values" of American society, but were not content that the "rules," "regulations," or "practices" extant or emerging and were acting to protect those "basic values." Therefore, their actions in the ad hoc antipornography organizations, indeed the very growth and development of these organizations, were born of a perceived need to restructure or reinforce those rules, regulations, and practices—those norms.

Gusfield's dramatistic theory of status politics

Gusfield (1963, p. 3) hypothesized (and then confirmed the hypothesis) that moral reform (at least in the case of the American Temperance Movement) was a method for a cultural group to preserve, defend, or enhance the dominance and prestige of its own style of living within the total society. The participation of the moral crusader was motivated by threats to his socially dominant position by individuals whose style of life differed from his. As his own claims to social respect and honor were diminished, the moral crusader sought for public acts by which he could reaffirm the dominance and prestige of the value system to which he had become accustomed. Gusfield demonstrated that those "public acts," whether attempts to "convert the sinner" (assimilative reform) or change the law to proscribe the behavior of the "deviants," (coercive reform) were often more important for their *symbolism* than for their utility. That is, the overt display of resistance to value-system challenges, and the recognition of that overt display by significant members or numbers of the general public, were as important to the moral crusader as the ultimate impact of that display upon the formalized normative system (e.g., the changing of laws). If the moral crusader could gain widespread support for his conception of morality at the expense of a "challenging" conception, the prestige and self-esteem of the victors would be enhanced, while that of the losers would be degraded (Gusfield, 1963, pp. 4-5).

Gusfield observed that the dishonoring of cultural values is part of the process of cultural and social change. As America had become more urban, more secular, and more Catholic, the sense of declining status intensified the coercive, populist elements in the American Temperance Movement. The values of "small-town America" conflicted with those of big-city commercial capitalism. According to Gusfield, the Eighteenth Amendment was the apex of the struggle to assert the public dominance of old middle-class values. It established the victory of Protestant over Catholic values, rural over urban life styles, tradition over modernity, and the middle class over both the lower and the upper strata.

The establishment of prohibition laws was the most significant battle in the struggle for status between two divergent styles of life—the drinker and the nondrinker, the cosmopolitan and the local, the irreligious and the religious, the foreigner and the native. The passing of prohibition symbolically and dramatically marked the public affirmation of the abstemious, ascetic qualities of American Protestantism—an act of ceremonial deference toward old middle-class culture. Gusfield (1963, pp. 7-8) noted that the moral crusader cared little whether the prohibition law was disobeyed or not enforced, because the respectability of its adherents and supporters was honored even in the breach of the law—it was *their* law that drinkers had to avoid.

To Gusfield, the traditional values of the "old middle class" have continued to be

challenged by the "modern" values associated with the passage of time and the acceleration of social change in our society. Those individuals who had built their self-conceptions on traditional values strived to defend and restore the prestige of those values, which they perceived to be threatened by such things as fluoridation, domestic Communism, school curricula, and the United Nations (Gusfield, 1963, pp. 10-11).

Thus, it may be hypothesized that antipornography activity, as manifested in the ad hoc antipornography organizations, represents a conflict between rival social systems, cultures, and status groups, protest against a changing status system, and a mechanism influencing the distribution of prestige associated with adherence to certain accepted "basic values."

To Gusfield, and in this report, "social status" will refer to the distribution of prestige among individuals and groups in a social system. "Prestige" means the approval, respect, admiration or deference a person or group is able to command by virtue of his or its imputed qualities or performances. "Style of life" will refer to the system of values, customs, and habits distinctive to a status group. When conflicts arise among individuals and groups from differences in status aspirations or the presence of status discontent, the resultant activities intended to resolve that conflict are referred to as "status politics" (Gusfield, 1963, pp. 14-17. See also Hofstadter, 1955a, and Lipset, 1955). When the group member's prestige is less than he expects, when his self-esteem is challenged by the failure of others to grant him the respect, approval, admiration and deference he feels that he justly deserves as someone who has pledged himself to a previously prestigeful and dominant set of values, beliefs, and behaviors, he becomes a "status discontent" (Gusfield, 1963, p. 17). Status politics, therefore, is an effort to control the status of a group by acts which serve to raise or maintain the social status of the moral crusader vis-a-vis other groups in the society (Gusfield, 1963, p. 19). When these activities reach collective proportions in an attempt to raise or maintain the prestige of a group, a "status movement" emerges—such as the American Temperance Movement as outlined by Gusfield, and, we hypothesize, the ad hoc antipornography organizations we shall describe.

Gusfield insists upon the importance of the symbolic nature of status movements, particularly as manifested by moral reform movements. The prestige-enhancing public act is ritualistic and ceremonial, and is in itself rewarding and goal-attaining, rather than the end result which such activity might bring about. The "political victory" or the passage of a law is in itself, symbolically, a victory over the challenging "enemy," and a public display of the viability, acceptability and prestige of the victors' life styles.

This report will be primarily narrative in format, and will draw upon the work of Zurcher and his colleagues (1970) for materials to be analyzed according to Smelser's and Gusfield's theories of collective behavior. Not all of the components of Smelser's and Gusfield's theoretical formulations will be used—only those aspects which serve to illustrate, elucidate, or order the natural history data offered by Zurcher and Bowman (1970) and Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1970). The audience for this is considered to be both social scientists and educated laymen; thus we will attempt to avoid undue use of social science jargon (although this report, of necessity, will contain more of that "jargon" than the studies of Zurcher and his colleagues. A further purpose of this report is to set hypotheses for subsequent analysis using empirical data from the structured and unstructured

interviews and questionnaires gathered in both Midville and Southtown during the course of the study.

The following six sections will be titled, consecutively, with one of Smelser's value-added stages of collective behavior—that is, *Structural Conduciveness, Structural Strain, Growth and Spread of a Generalized Belief, Precipitating Factors, Mobilization of Participants for Action,* and *The Operation of Social Control.* Each of the sections will open with a brief definition of the specific value-added stage. The definition will be followed by a presentation of that stage of collective behavior as manifested in both Midville and Southtown. The Midville and Southtown examples will then be followed by a brief discussion highlighting the relevant differences and similarities between the ad hoc antipornography organizations, as collective behavior, in the two communities.

STRUCTURAL CONDUCIVENESS

> We read that financial booms, fashion cycles, and crazes do not plague simple, traditional societies; we also read that America as a civilization is prone to such seizures, and that, within America, places like Los Angeles and Detroit are especially productive of bizarre movements. Are such statements true, and if so, why? Do certain structural characteristics, more than others, permit or encourage episodes of collective behavior? To illustrate this condition of structural conduciveness with respect to the occurrence of financial panic, let us assume that property is closely tied to kinship and can be transferred only to first-born sons at the time of the death of the father. Panic under such conditions is ruled out, simply because the holders of property do not have sufficient maneuverability to dispose of their assets upon short notice. Under conditions of economic pressure, certain responses are possible—for instance a movement to change the customs of property transfer—but not panic. The structure of the social situation does not permit it. At the other extreme lies the money market, in which assets can be exchanged freely and rapidly (Smelser, 1962, p. 15).

Midville

Midville, USA, seems to possess many of the community characteristics Gusfield cites as prerequisites for the development of a symbolic crusade. It is a relatively small city (population 103,600) with a somewhat recent "frontier" experience, and still seems to be undergoing the social complications of a shift from rurality to urbanity. It is, comparatively speaking, a religiously oriented community, with 145 churches representing 36 different denominations. Of the employed Midville citizens, 40% are industrial workers and 41% white-collar workers. A total of 84% of the gainfully employed citizens are wage or salary earners, and therefore are dependent upon the economic fluctuations associated with heavy industry.

The level of participation in public affairs in Midville appears to be relatively high (72% of those eligible voted in the last presidential election). Barton and Lazarsfeld (1969, p. 191), comparing a number of communities on the variable of political participation, concluded that those communities with the highest levels of citizen involvement were those which manifested (a) economic fluctuation, (b)

small social units, and (c) little stratification. Midville, greatly dependent upon the economic health of consumer-oriented heavy industry, is subject, as indicated above, to economic fluctuations. The community also appears to place great significance on interaction among small social units such as the family, the small voluntary association, and so forth. Midville is a community, for the most part, of wage and salary earners, and thus seems to manifest less stratification than other larger, more urban cities.

In 1969, Midville was chosen as an "All-America City," and many of the citizens took this honor to heart. They consider themselves to be more "American" and more aligned with the "basic values" of Americanism than those from other cities. This definition of "Americanism" seems to connote religiousness, "decency," localism, morality, family orientation, and traditional views of authority. The residents seem to fear, or at least be suspicious of, accelerating social change—especially in the areas of youth independence, ethnic equality, and sexual freedom.

In describing the "All-America City," one magazine described Midville as "insular, provincial and undisturbed." During and after its stay in Midville, the research staff concluded that Midville was, although industrialized and relatively affluent, nonetheless "small-townish" in life style. Its citizens, as reflected by the city's "All-America" label, were generally zealous about their identification with traditional Americanism. Although they were not necessarily resisting social change, many of the citizens were "concerned" that "things are happening too fast," and that there was a definite need for "beneficial controls" (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1970).

Although fewer than 6% of Midville's population had earned college degrees, the annual average family income was considerably higher than the national average. This potential disparity between education and income, combined with the high percentage of individuals in relatively low-status jobs, provided a conduciveness for structural strain which shall be described in the next section *(Structural Strain)* as a possible basis for feelings of status inconsistency.

Seventeen percent of Midville's population was nonwhite—a figure considerably higher than the national average—and many Midville citizens with whom the research staff talked were anxious about the possibility of "racial violence" in their community.

Midville had a lengthy history of antipornography activity, dating as far back as 1950 with the establishment of the Midville Censorship Advisory Board. Most of this activity was conducted through official police channels, with the voluntary compliance of movie and publication merchants.

The macroscopic view of Midville as possessing components of "structural conduciveness" enabling the development of collective behavior is further illustrated by a microscopic view of some of the characteristics of the central participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization. Thirty-three of the 36 central members of the organization were interviewed; of these, 91% were over the age of 30. Only 6% of those interviewed were college graduates, but 44% earned over $1,200 a month. Sixty-four percent of the participants in the Midville ad hoc antipornography organization had families with three or more children; 60% were Protestant; 26% were Catholic; 59% indicated that their orientations were politically conservative; 83% reported attendance at church one or more

times a week; 94% were born in cities with a population of less than 500,000; 61% in cities with a population of less than 100,000. Nearly all of the central participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization had had prior experience in some type of community political or voluntary association activity. Their history of religiousness, political conservativeness, lack of college education, relatively high industry-dependent income, and rural birth suggest that Midville was inhabited by the kind of individual Gusfield depicts as being prone to participate in moral crusades.

Southtown

The population of Southtown is 245,295—a figure which has doubled in the past 15 years. Like Midville, Southtown has a recent "frontier" history, and continues to manifest a tendency toward local rather than cosmopolitan, and rural rather than urban, values and life styles. These attributes often contrast sharply with those of the students of the major university situated in the center of the city (Zurcher & Bowman, 1970). Southtown is the capital city of the State, and thus is the seat of an overtly politically conservative State legislature. Unlike Midville, Southtown does not appear to meet the criteria specified by Barton and Lazarsfeld (1969) to be associated with a high degree of political participation. Southtown citizens are not noticeably politically active—only 20% of the eligible voters cast ballots in the last presidential election. The citizens, only relatively few of whom are associated with consumer-oriented production or heavy industry, are also less subject to economic fluctuations. Furthermore, there appears to be a greater degree of social stratification in Southtown than in Midville, with university, State government, and Federal government facilities contributing to that stratification. White-collar workers account for 54% of the employed population; 31% of these work in government service.

Whereas the "structural conduciveness" for status inconsistency in Midville was lower education and higher income than the national average, in Southtown, citizens average a higher level of education but a lower index of annual family income than the national average.

Thirteen percent of Southtown's population is nonwhite, and essentially residentially and occupationally segregated, thus providing "structural conduciveness" for interethnic conflict.

Southtown, like Midville, appears to be a religiously oriented community. There are 275 churches representing 32 denominations, the most heavily represented being the fundamentalist Baptist groups.

Southtown does not have the history of antipornography activity that Midville has, but a few church groups and the local chapters of the Knights of Columbus have histories of antipornography activity at the State level, and somewhat intensively in other of the State's smaller cities.

Some of the characteristics of active participants of the ad hoc antipornography organization (Upsurge for Decency) in Southtown suggest that potential moral crusaders were available in the city. While 63% of the participants were Protestants (most of them fundamentalists), and only 38% were Catholic, the leadership of the organization was predominantly Catholic. Fifty-eight percent of the participants attended church at least once a week; 70% indicated that they were politically conservative; 14% were college graduates; 60% earned less than

$1,200 a month; 91% were born in cities with populations of 500,000 or less; 69% were born in cities with populations of 100,000 or less; and 55% had families with three or more children. The participants in Southtown's ad hoc anti-pornography organization meet Gusfield's criteria for moral crusaders.

Discussion

Both Midville and Southtown seemed to manifest evidence of the kind of "structural conduciveness" which could serve as a necessary but not sufficient condition for the emergence of a moral crusade. Both cities had reasonably small populations which were experiencing a transition from a rural to an urban society with the associated value conflicts (i.e., they were highly religious and politically conservative, family oriented, and showed evidence of inconsistency between education and income levels). Furthermore, both cities, either at a formal community or voluntary assocation level, had histories of prior antipornography activities and either "adult" theaters or bookstores which could become targets for a moral crusade.

On the basis of these fragmentary and tenuous indices of "structural conduciveness," it might have been hypothesized that the ad hoc antipornography activity would, if other value-added stages were present, have been considerably more intense, and perhaps more coercive, in Midville than in Southtown. Southtown was perhaps more highly stratified than Midville, and to some extent was subject to the "liberalizing" influences of a major university, and the "cosmopolitizing" presence of State and Federal agencies. Furthermore, Southtown's population was not subject to the industry-related economic fluctuations among the work force that occurred in Midville. The citizens of Southtown were better educated than those in Midville, even those who were actively involved in the ad hoc antipornography organizations, and Midville manifested considerably more political participation among its citizens than did Southtown. These factors indicated greater conduciveness for citizen action with regard to perceived community problems.

STRUCTURAL STRAIN

> Financial panics develop when loss or annihilation threatens the holders of assets. Real or anticipated economic deprivation occupies an important place in the initiation of hostile outbursts, reform movements, revolutionary movements, and new sects as well. Extreme religious movements seem to cluster among deprived groups, such as colonial populations, the disinherited members of a society, and recent migrants. Race riots follow population invasions and new kinds of cultural contacts. . . In explaining any case of collective behavior (a panic, for instance), we must consider the structural strain (the threat of economic deprivation, for instance), as falling *within the scope established by the condition of conduciveness.* Otherwise this strain cannot be a determinant of a panic, however important it may be as a determinant of some other kind of behavior. It is the *combination* of conduciveness and strain, not the separate existence of either, that radically reduces the range of possibilities of behavior other than panic (Smelser, 1962, p. 15).

From observations and interviews with some of the citizens, the research staff concluded that Midville, and in particular the members of the ad hoc antipornography organization, was experiencing a significant amount of the "structural strain" postulated by Smelser as another necessary but not sufficient stage supporting the emergence of collective behavior. The components of "structural strain" for the most part appeared directly linked with the elements of the "structural conduciveness" discussed above.

Many of the people interviewed, not a few of whom were in key community positions, were concerned about the possibility of a national recession, which would have drastic impact upon the economic health of Midviile. Both those interviewed and the local media reported the negative impact of inflation upon the local wage earner, and bemoaned the fact that their hard-earned dollars did not seem to have much buying power. Some of the respondents were concerned that utlimately, particularly if the war in Vietnam ended, economic inbalance might lead to a large number of "layoffs" from employment in the local factories and plants.

There also seemed to be community concern about the possibility of racial trouble in Midville. Some of the larger cities in the state had experienced severe rioting, and although Midville had, as yet, experienced no marked conflict, there was some anxiety that the 17% nonwhite population was becoming more militant.

The fact that Midville had been named an "All-America City" was in itself a "structural strain." It was, as one respondent put it, "a hard image to live up to." "All-America" denoted a multitude of "basic values" that Midville was supposed to possess and manifest in citizen behavior. The research observers were impressed by the fact that not a few Midville citizens seemed to view their community as one of the few remaining bastions of true Americanism, and that as an "All-America City" Midville was charged to be an example of resistance to those courses of social change which might undermine the "American way."

According to the respondents, challenges to the Midvillian life style were apparent everywhere. The mass media daily reminded them of, and even seemed to give approval to, the fact that the "now generation" was becoming more forceful and prestigious. Traditional attitudes toward sexual behavior, work, religion, war, education, and patriotism were "eroding," especially among young people. Attitudes which were associated with the life style of the "typical" Midville citizen were being threatened, not only by the behavior of other citizens, the editorials and programs of the media, and the teachings of contemporary educators and theologians, but even (pre-Nixon-Agnew) by significant acts of the Federal government. The Supreme Court, the most revered and powerful guardian of "traditional" American values, even legislated against aspects of the respondents' life styles. The "no prayer in public schools," the "freedom for pornography," and, to a lesser extent, the civil rights and rights of arrestee decisions were viewed by the respondents as grievous errors which enormously complicated their traditional, "right thinking" expectations for human behavior.

The question of status inconsistency remains a factor possibly contributing to "structural strain." Among the participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization, there seemed to be many who possessed relatively high annual incomes and relatively low levels of formal education. The degree to which this

discrepancy contributed to "structural strain" and in fact the precise degree to which the discrepancy actually existed, remains an hypothesis for further analysis.

An increasing amount of unsolicited "smut mail" was being received by the citizens of the "All-America City." The citizens' initial inability to control receipt of such unsolicited mail, or the "unsavory" programs, stories, films, and advertisements, in the mass media, contributed to overall "structural strain," as experienced in particular by those who became active in the ad hoc anti-pornography organization. A more dramatic example of the unwanted presence of such "unsavoriness," and ultimately the central focus of the antipornography endeavor, was Midville's adult bookstore. The adult bookstore offered the shopper a wide variety of "rough beaver" films, pictures, magazines, and a large selection of quite sexually descriptive paperback books. The bookstore was in the heart of downtown Midville, actually across the street from the offices of Midville's major newspaper, its most prestigious hotel, and several other "respectable" businesses. To several of the respondents, the bookstore actually "flaunted" its presence, and as one respondent commented, "thumbed its nose at all we believe in."

The "informal" arrangements between the local police department and community businesses which sold books and magazines did not work with the adult bookstore. Furthermore, legal sanctions had been rendered ineffective by the fact that the Supreme Court had ruled the State antipornography statute (after which Midville's antipornography statute had been modeled) to be unconstitutional. Thus, in the opinion of many respondents, the local government structure was unable or unwilling to act with regard to this "blight," this "cancer," in the middle of an "All-America City."

Gusfield reports the work of Gregory Stone and William Form, who studied another small city in the same State as Midville in terms of the "structural strains" which contributed to the emergence of another form of moral crusade—temperance organizations. Gusfield writes:

> . . .Gregory Stone and William Form have produced a clear picture of the cleavages within middle class life to which we are referring. With the location of national corporations in Vansburg, a large number of managerial personnel and salaried professionals became residents of the city. These people rejected the existing symbols of status and styles of life held by the upper middle class people who had been living in Vansburg. They did not attempt to emulate the patterns of the established social elites. Instead they utilized the habits and customs of the sophisticated metropolitan resident. They developed their own communal forms and challenged the previous status of the "old" elites. . . .
>
> Stone and Form found that the matter of drinking was the major symbol by which these two contestants in a status contest were differentiated, by themselves and by other residents of the city. The split in the middle class was characterized by interviewees as one between "drinkers and non-drinkers." Unlike our descriptions of these terms in the late nineteenth century temperance accounts, this was seen as a horizontal cleavage, within the middle class, and not a vertical one, between middle and lower orders. It is also noteworthy that the examples of areas in which these two groups were in conflict were largely those of leisure time behavior, with the "cosmopolitans"

rejecting the restrictions on impulse release so central in the life styles of the "old families."

The effect of the cosmopolitan ethic of mass society is to debunk the older values of the middle class in which a production orientation toward life was bolstered by religious institutions. . . . (Gusfield, 1963, pp. 142-149)

The conclusion is that a significant amount of "structural strain," as a prerequisite for the emergence of collective behavior, did in fact exist in Midville. Some of the strains were quite general—economic concerns about the impact of inflation and the possibility of recession or job loss and anxieties about the possible emergence of ethnic conflict. More specific, and perhaps more important, however, were the strains engendered and symbolized by efforts to maintain and advance a traditional and accustomed life style—a life style to be expected in "All-America City." As a result of their perceptions of the Supreme Court, the mass media, and the eudcational system, those who would become active participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization experienced this "structural strain," and became, in Gusfield's terms, status discontents.

The status discontents described by Gusfield and Stone and Form chose prohibition as the battleground upon which to defend their life styles. Over time, moderate drinking behavior became part of even the most "respectable" American style of life and failed to serve as a criterion for contrast. Pornography, however, still retains viability for contrast. The use of pornography can still clearly be made a focal point for differences in life styles, and Midvillians, as status discontents, utilized the issue of smut to fight a far larger battle—a battle to maintain the integrity of their accustomed style of life against the challenges of social change. This interpretation is rather dramatically supported by the fact that 64% of the participants in the antipornography organization reported that their opposition in this endeavor was "ultra-liberals" and "young people." Only 27% of the participants, by contrast, saw that opposition to be the "smut peddlers" themselves.

Southtown

In Southtown, there seemed to be relatively less "structural strain" concerning economic factors than in Midville. Although the citizens were concerned about inflation, a large percentage of them held government or service related jobs and felt that they were essentially invulnerable to a possible recession. Furthermore, Southtown had one of the lowest costs of living among United States standard metropolitan areas. The possibility of ethnic conflict did not seem to be of much concern to Southtown residents; although blacks and Mexican-Americans accounted for nearly 25% of the total Southtown population, little overt ethnic strife had been encountered, and Southtowners generally felt that ethnic minority groups were "well controlled" by formal and informal aspects of the social structure.

Like Midville, the "All-America City," Southtown, the State capital, tends generally to present itself as a "stronghold" of traditional frontier Americanism. The "typical" citizen seems to espouse a life style that is local rather than cosmopolitan, rural rather than urban, "pragmatic" rather than "intellectual,"

and traditional rather than modern. Like the Midvillians, Southtown respondents were almost universally upset with the "breakdown of basic values" that was reported in and reflected by mass media, the actions of young people, and the decisions of the Supreme Court, especially the decisions concerning school prayer, pornography, and, to a lesser degree, arrestee and civil rights. Southtowners also were concerned about the unsolicited materials that they were receiving through the mails, and the restricted choice of "family film entertainment" available to them in the town. Southtowners, as well as Midvillians, were quite family-oriented, and felt that much of the information and entertainment presented to them through the mass media was threatening the integrity of their life style and of the family.

Contrasts in "traditional" and "modern" life styles were manifested daily for Southtown citizens on the campus of the large, major State university located in the heart of Southtown. At one level of abstraction, there was "structural strain" between the conservative State legislators and the university as a whole. At another level, within the university itself, more or less "liberal" staff and more or less "liberal" students engaged in activities which depicted their differing views of appropriate styles of life. Controversies about nudity in a campus play, disagreement about student participation in and control over administrative decisions, controversies about "academic freedom," and so on, all reminded the Southtowner of the contrasting value system, which was receiving a great deal of attention.

The most dramatic representation of that competing value system was certainly the on-campus chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society. Virtually everything that the members of SDS represented was considered by the participants in Southtown's ad hoc antipornography organization to be destructive of "basic American values." Many of the respondents were far more disturbed by the fact that SDS and SDS-like individuals were receiving local and national publicity.

As a result of their perceptions of the existence and mounting prestige of differing life styles, those individuals who were to become participants in the Southtown ad hoc antipornography organization had become status discontents. As status discontents, they decided to "do something" about their situation; the issue of pornography and pornography-related events fulfilled criteria for other value-added stages which, according to Smelser, would make possible the emergence of an ad hoc antipornography organization—a form of collective behavior.

Another very important kind of "structural strain" existed in Southtown —without which the pressures for collective behavior might not have been sufficient. Although, as mentioned in the "structural conduciveness" section, Southtown had a markedly lower degree of citizen political participation than Midville, there was in Southtown a voluntary association which itself was experiencing a kind of "structural strain" and which was working toward the resolution of that strain. The major Knights of Columbus Council in the city found itself temporarily without a community action project. Furthermore, several of its leaders and members had become quite concerned about the lack of "family film entertainment" in Southtown.

Southtown did have two "skin flick" theaters which had operated with

voluntary compliance to the formal and informal sanctions of the police department. The Knights of Columbus members were not happy with the presence of those two theaters in Southtown, and felt that the local police were "ham strung" by Supreme Court decisions and the inadequacies of State statutes. Knights of Columbus members were more concerned, however, with what they perceived to be a lack of "family" films at all of Southtown's theaters. They felt that the kinds of films displayed at the theaters were nationally and locally determined by what really amounted to a minority of citizens—those manifesting the "modern" style of life. In essence, the Knights of Columbus members (and the rest of the respondents who would become active participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization) felt that they, the so-called "silent majority," were being deprived in particular of their freedom to view the kinds of films they wanted to, and in general of the freedom to live, and have rewarded, the style of life that they had become accustomed to.

The Knights of Columbus Council took as their action project an anti-pornography campaign (a pro-family entertainment campaign), and enlisted considerable community support.

The majority (51%) of the participants named "campus radicals" and "university professors" as those who would oppose their activity; in contrast, only 37% of the respondents indicated that "smut peddlers" would be the source of their opposition. This would seem to indicate that the questionable films were not being attacked; rather, a life style was being defended.

Discussion

Gusfield makes several comments, specifically about participants in temperance organizations and generally about moral crusaders, which seem quite relevant to the dynamics of ad hoc antipornography organizations. He points out that the membership of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) was not composed of individuals who conformed only minimally to the American way of life; its members belong to major churches (fundamentalist, but not sects), and were quite "middle class" in socio-economic terms. Their life style was a model of the legitimate and dominant definition of respectability (1963, pp. 84-85). For the members of WCTU, abstinence was a mark of middle-class membership, of that respectability. However, according to Gusfield, middle-class "respectability" was at that time undergoing considerable challenge. Individuals who had become active in WCTU had begun to realize that new middle-class norms were increasing in dominance, and that those who adhered to the "old" ("traditional") middle-class norms were becoming objects of ridicule, contempt, and inferior status. Those who abstained from alcoholic beverages, rather than those who drank, were beginning to be perceived by some as deviates. The kinds of social changes (including an increased acceptance of drinking), which were taking place throughout the country impinged upon the chosen and previously rewarded life style of those who would become active in WCTU (Gusfield, 1963, pp. 133-134). It became a battle of traditionalists and localites against modernists and urbanized cosmopolitans (Gusfield, 1963, p. 177). This status conflict profoundly disturbed those who from an early period of socialization had internalized the traditional values, and for whom those values provided the core of a claim to status and respectability.

Gusfield (1963, p. 143) suggests that participation in the temperance organization, a fundamentalist reaction, was an attempt to reassert the challenged values, and to denigrate the threatening "modern" values as illegitimate and not worthy of cultural domination. The traditionalists emerge as status discontents, threatened by the character of social change, and in defense become preoccupied with those groups which are seen in status opposition.

Gusfield (1963, p. 184) cites the further example of antifluoridation activity, which he feels represented a status struggle between the culturally modern and cosmopolitan middle-class individuals and the culturally fundamentalist and localist old middle classes. In his view (1963, p. 184), the rhetoric of status issues is the rhetoric of moral condemnation, which opposes wrong with right, ugly with beautiful, sinful with virtuous, and so forth. When status anxieties do exist, when "structural strain" is in evidence, when status discontents seek to resolve their frustrations, the issues which arise are more symbolic than anything else (1963, p. 176).

Gusfield (1963, p. 110) notes the powerful impact of a political victory by the norm violators (even if symbolic) upon those adhering to traditional norms. It is a blow to the traditionalist's belief in his domination, in his right to be followed, in the worth of his cultural and moral beliefs. The government serves a key role in assigning prestige to various societal value systems. Gusfield (1963, pp. 166-167) suggests that the government can influence this hierarchy of values not only through its instrumental acts, but through its symbolic acts as well. Public figures and political individuals can, by expressing their opinions, reinforce or demean specific societal value clusters and, by doing so, enhance, maintain or threaten the life styles of those who adhere to such value clusters. Generally, the individuals whose status has been threatened in one way or another may call upon the government, or important and visible representatives of the government, to make pronouncements or take acts which will instrumentally or symbolically support the value system that they espouse and help to remove the threat to that value system.

Thus, it seems that a sufficient amount of "structural strain" and a sufficient number of status discontents (generated in much the same way that Gusfield describes the strains and discontents which supported the development of temperance activity) existed in both Midville and Southtown and were among the factors that made possible the emergence of ad hoc antipornography organizations in both communities. Life styles were threatened by social change pertaining to such areas as sexual behavior, family life, religion, education, patriotism, war, politics, and adult-youth relations. These "emerging" and "modern" value systems were perceived by the traditionalists to be receiving more prestige and reinforcement from status distributors (i.e., the Supreme Court, the mass media, "respected others") than they deserved, and, as a result, their own tradition-based and oriented life styles were suffering status degradation. A significant number of citizens in both Midville and Southtown (who sharply felt "structural strain" and status discontent) were thus motivated into action—to do something instrumental, something symbolic, something effective, something which would restore the balance of prestige to its "rightful" place. The issue of pornography was ripe for such exploitation—a reasonable, feasible, acceptable, and efficient issue for sharpening the distinction in life style between the traditionalists and modernists,

and for enhancing the values of the former while denigrating the values of the latter.

In discussing "structural strain," Smelser indicates that the histories of norm-oriented movements abound with agitations on the part of groups who experience a real or apparent loss of wealth, power, or prestige. He summarizes this view by stating that norm-oriented movements are usually brought about by strains which create demands for readjustments in the social situation. These strains can result from alterations and expectations concerning social life and periods of rapid and uneven social change. Negative stereotypes are often involved, with one group frequently labeling another as engaged in a conspiracy to create the conditions of strain. Among the kinds of complex and multiple "structural strains" underlying norm-oriented movements, Smelser (1962, pp. 290-291) cites industrialization, urbanization, commercialization of agriculture, and colonial domination.

Gusfield (1963, p. 188) concludes his book, *Symbolic Crusade,* with the following quote:

> Temperance has receded as an issue of paramount significance in American life. It is highly doubtful that the status conflicts which it represented have disappeared from the American scene. The quest for an honored place in society is likely to persist. Social changes are likely to continue to upset old hierarchies and develop new aspirations. Cultural transformations are to be expected and resistance to them is almost certain. Status politics is neither a new nor a transient aspect of American society.

The emergence of ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Southtown thus represents another "quest for an honored place in society." The "structural strain" which existed both in Midville and Southtown (and which met Smelser's criteria for that value-added stage toward collective behavior) would subsequently be dealt with according to the kinds of status politics reported by Gusfield.

GROWTH AND SPREAD OF A GENERALIZED BELIEF

> Before collective action can be taken to reconstitute the situation brought on by *Structural Strain,* the situation must be made meaningful to the potential actors. This meaning is supplied in a generalized belief, which identifies the source of strain, attributes certain characteristics to their source, and specifies certain responses to the strain as possible or appropriate. The growth and spread of such beliefs are one of the necessary conditions for the occurrence of an episode of collective behavior.
>
> Many generalized beliefs, however, enjoy a long existence without every becoming determinants of a collective outburst. Throughout history, for instance, men have harbored superstitions about creatures from other planets, their powers, and their potential danger. Only on very few specific occasions, however, do such beliefs rise to significance as determinants of panicky flights. These occasions arise when the generalized beliefs combine with the other necessary conditions of panic. (Smelser, 1962, p. 16)

A number of consistent themes ("generalized beliefs") emerged from the several sources of data and impressions gathered by the researchers in Midville—newspaper articles, documents, informal interviews, structured and unstructured formal interviews, and participant observation. These "generalized beliefs" existed prior to the formalizing of the ad hoc antipornography organization in Midville, although they continued to be reinforced and elaborated by participant perceptual selection throughout the operation of the organization. Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1970) deal with the existence, impact, and evolution of the "generalized beliefs" and present a large amount of detailed source material indicating the content and intensity of the beliefs. An example is a letter written by a Mrs. Roberts, who subsequently would become secretary-treasurer and perhaps the most active individual in the Inter-Faith Citizens' Committee for Decency, Inc. (ICCD, the Midville ad hoc antipornography organization). That letter reflected some of the "generalized beliefs" relevant to and supporting of the development of ICCD:

> This letter seemed to be of particular import, since it concisely reflected several themes dominant throughout the evolution and implementation of ICCD. Belief in God is explicitly stated to be not only exemplary, but based in the very roots of America and patriotism. Atheists implicitly are equated with Communists, and there are strong indications to a Communist conspiracy touching upon education and entertainment.
>
> "Liberalism" is construed to be somehow dangerous, and as having its wellsprings in public secondary schools, colleges and universities. Adults who tend to accept a liberal philosophy are held to be "weak-kneed," and Americans in general are perceived to be getting "less and less able" to think for themselves. This sort of weakness is presented as providing Russia with the opportunity to "take over this country without a shot being fired." Citizens are admonished to "wake up."
>
> Young people in particular are cited as being vulnerable to the influence of "such propaganda," and the obligation to protect them against such messages is stressed.
>
> The letter turns specifically to the issue of obscenity. A conflict is defined between freedom of speech and freedom of the press, and the invasion and violation of community moral conscience. Such invasion and violation is construed to jeopardize the democratic system, and to serve only special interest groups.
>
> The use of sex and "fun morality" in television commercials is seen to be dangerous, especially to young persons and to those individuals who are "not morally or mentally stable." Implicit here is the causal link between such messages and deviant and criminal behavior of various kinds. Lastly, a distinction is made between "lives" and "souls" of the citizens.
>
> These generalized beliefs concerning the impact of visual materials upon individual, community and national values reflect rather strikingly the signers' perception of human nature, and their view of the world in which they live.

> Human nature is essentially weak, can fall to temptation, and those who have not fallen have an obligation to protect those who might fall. The world, at least those things in the world that are perceived to be valuable and "moral," are also in jeopardy, challenged by outright conspirators or those who naively counsel change. (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1970)

This and other materials indicate a wide but consistent array of "generalized beliefs," which had many sources: newspaper articles, speeches by "significant" individuals, letters to the editor, letters from citizens to various public officials, religious and political ideologies, family "traditions," educational messages, and so on.

Some of the operating "generalized beliefs" were at a relatively high level of abstraction: they were broad enough to include the general state of man's relation to his world, to other men, to the normative order, and the general condition of the United States and its value system. A predominant belief espoused by the participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization was centered around the "decline of morality." The United States was seen to be in a period of moral crisis, but there was still time to save the country. The decline and fall of Rome and Greece were associated with the prerequisite decline of morality and "basic values." The more pessimistic participants referred to the United States as a new "Sodom and Gommorah," which would need almost a miracle to be saved from fiery destruction.

The general decline of morality in the United States was, according to the view of some respondents, being planned or at least encouraged by the conspiratorial efforts of Communists and/or liberals, educators, evolutionists, and young people (64% of the participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization named "ultra-liberals" and "young people" as those who would oppose their moral crusade). Law and order was failing, according to several respondents, and a few worried that criminals would end up running the country, or at least making it impossible for "good people" to live normal lives.

Many respondents held the belief that man was inherently weak, and that the weaker needed help (requested or not) from the stronger. Many adults and all young people were prone to the temptations of modernism and were willing to take the "easy road," rather than adhere to the more strenuous but by far more righteous and rewarding "basic values" of society.

Virtually all the respondents professed the belief that they, and other like-minded individuals in the community (and in the nation), had been apathetic and silent for too long. The respondents felt that they and their values were in the majority (a theory later intensely magnified by the Nixon-Agnew popularizing of the "Silent Majority" phrase), and they began to conclude that they should "wake up" and do something more about expressing themselves and exerting their influence. They felt that their feelings were being challenged by a vocal minority. The respondents felt that not enough individuals knew what their "community standards" really were and the kinds of behaviors that were acceptable to the majority in those communities.

The respondents strongly felt that if they acted, those actions would have an impact, a marked impact upon the "moral tone" and general behaviors of others in the community (and in the nation). They did not feel powerless, but had been inactive too long. However, this was all changing: the "pendulum was swinging" in

their direction. More and more like-minded individuals in the community and throughout the nation were beginning to "awaken." Others were speaking out on all sorts of issues—patriotism, sex education, fluoridation, enforced integration, and "decency" in general.

Pornography, in our research view, was one aspect of a generalized syndrome of respondent-perceived maladies. However, it was a particularly significant component, since it could be attacked immediately, and thus served to differentiate between the two life styles.

The respondents perceived a "wave of smut" which was covering the nation and even infiltrating the "All-America City." The prevalence of pornography was a clear manifestation of a general moral decline; it was seen by some to be either a tool of those conspirators who would destroy the nation from within or a tool of ruthless profiteers who did not care about the nation and its young people. The use of pornographic materials was associated, causally or correlatively, with venereal disease, drug usage, sex crimes of all sorts, the failure of marriages, juvenile delinquency, failure in school, loss of religion, family troubles, and many other things.

The citizens of Midville firmly believed that pornography, as represented by the adult bookstore, was more severe in their own "All-America City" than in many other cities, and perhaps in *any* other city, in the United States. The respondents universally agreed that the local government and law enforcing officials were unable to do anything about the problem of pornography in Midville because their hands were tied by ineffective laws and Supreme Court decisions favorable to the smut peddlers. They felt that they had to do something on their own to rectify the situation—specifically, they would need to bring attention to the problem and thus arouse the citizenry; they would have to bring what law there was to bear upon the adult bookstore, even if it was not totally effective; they would have to work to inaugurate new legislation and establish it in the existing city and State statutes; and finally, they would have to join together with other like-minded individuals in a demonstration of strength.

The fact that the adult bookstore actually existed in the middle of town was abhorrent to the respondents and consequently to a significant number of other Midvillians. The bookstore became a focal point, a symbolic representation, of all those "generalized beliefs" expressed above, and most importantly, of the threat to long-established, comfortable, and previously rewarded styles of life.

Southtown

As indicated by Zurcher and Bowman (1970), virtually the same set of "generalized beliefs" existed, with equal consistency but perhaps with less intensity, in Southtown. The petition prepared by the Southtown ad hoc antipornography organization (Upsurge for Decency) perhaps best exemplifies some of the major beliefs.

> We the undersigned citizens of Southtown, U.S.A., hereby dedicate ourselves for a more concentrated effort in supporting and regulating more strigent laws which will curb the production and sale of materials which are obscene in the form of lewd films and pornographic materials. The moral strength of our nation is at stake, and we pledge ourselves to support our lawmakers and law

enforcement agencies and courts in doing something about this *NOW!*

We citizens of Southtown for an *UPSURGE FOR DECENCY* wish to commend our President of these United States in his pledge to initiate an immediate program to protect our young boys and girls from the twisted minds trying to seduce them with pornographic materials. President Nixon has stated, "The most dangerous threat to the psychic health of our young people goes relatively unregulated. This is the business of dealing in obscene and pornographic materials, a lucrative industry with sales estimated at up to two billion dollars a year. There is no difficulty in setting up standards of obscenity for children because the Supreme Court has held that laws could be drawn to establish differing standards of obscenity for minors. We can constitutionally restrict from children matter that would not be objectionable for adults."

We citizens of Southtown for an *UPSURGE FOR DECENCY* are determined to press for more effective legislation against obscenity, both in films and in printed matter. We heartily endorse measures to stamp out this "plain, flat filth" that entices our youth away from the family atmosphere that they are entitled to—and we trust that our voices will be heard by men of responsible position who receive this petition. PLEASE DO NOT TURN A DEAF EAR TO THE VAST MAJORITY OF AMERICANS WHO ARE SICK AND TIRED OF THE TRAFFIC IN OBSCENITY, AND WHO PLEAD FOR RETURN TO MORAL DECENCY AND UPRIGHTNESS. (Zurcher & Bowman, 1970)

The speeches at the subsequent Upsurge for Decency rally conducted by the participants of the ad hoc antipornography organization dramatically reflected other central "generalized beliefs" which had existed prior to and had evolved throughout the development of the organization:

The speeches at the rally had reflected several themes quite typical in anti-pornography endeavors. The United States was depicted as being in a state of moral disintegration, with basic values being eroded ever more rapidly. Law and order were seen as breaking down, and comparisons were drawn with the fall of other great civilizations. The use of pornography was cited as being related to various forms of criminality and social pathology, and to be a greater social problem than many others that are currently considered to be more urgent by government officials.

The members of Upsurge for Decency were described not as "censors" or "vigilantes," but as individuals who are quite concerned about freedom—their freedom, and the freedom of their children. Their actions were described not as the results of pettiness, nor irrationality, but as a sense of responsibility for the "greater good" of the society. The speakers suggested that antipornography campaigners and citizens must take a stand, lest they have their own freedoms to choose restricted by purveyors of pornography. Antipornography activity was equated with patriotism, with religiosity, with virtue, and with respect for the dignity of man.

The speakers also indicated that anti-pornography campaigners, such as those in Upsurge for Decency, were not alone. Rather, there was a momentum that was sweeping the nation—a momentum of righteous individuals who were no longer going to stand by passively while all they respect and value was challenged by

> individuals and events urging or stimulating wanton and undue change. All of the speeches hinted at those dynamics which some months later would be considered illustrative of the awakening of the "Silent Majority." (Zurcher & Bowman, 1970)

Thus, the "generalized beliefs" expressed by Southtown respondents in general and the petition and rally speakers in particular, can be seen as quite similar to those expressed in the Midville materials.

The Southtown respondents in general, and the Knights of Columbus leader in particular, tended, however, to be considerably more restrained with regard to the expression and intensity of the "generalized beliefs," particularly those which were more sweeping and at a higher level of abstraction. As will be pointed out in the *Mobilization of Participants for Action* section of this report, the Knights of Columbus served as the organizing body for the ad hoc antipornography endeavor and, under the direction of their leader, maintained a clearly focused, specific task orientation throughout the activity. That orientation was aimed at legislative change initially concerned with local, commercially available movies (later to include written materials).

The active participants in the ad hoc antipornography organization, and several other Southtown citizens as well, generally believed there to be a problem with "skin flicks" in their community, specifically with the two Southtown "skin flick" theaters. They also believed that the general level of film entertainment available in the city was not appropriate for family attendance, and they determined that they could, and would, do something about it.

The Southtown antipornography activity, like the Midville antipornography activity, was a manifestation of individuals acting to maintain, and even enhance, their life styles–life styles which they perceived to be threatened by components of social change and challenges to the "basic values" they held dear. Sixty percent of the respondents named "campus radicals," "university professors," and "atheists," as those who would oppose their moral crusade. Family film entertainment, "skin flicks," and pornography in general became the readily available issue which fulfilled all of Smelser's value-added stages prerequisite to the emergence of collective behavior and clearly contrasted the life styles in contention.

Discussion

Smelser points out that the "generalized beliefs" associated with a norm-oriented movement include a diagnosis of those circumstances and individuals which cause a disruption of the participants' expectations. The belief also includes some sort of solution, such as a regulatory agency, doing away with an antiquated custom, or passing a law (the latter was the central part of the Southtown, and a main part of the Midville, strategy for antipornography intervention). The participants in the norm-oriented movement believe that their actions will control, damage, or punish the individuals responsible for the "structural strain" (challenges to life style) and mitigate or eliminate the source of that strain (Smelser, 1962, p. 292).

Smelser states that "generalized beliefs" in the early stages of the norm-

oriented movement generally reflect diffuse discontent and are disseminated by random verbal statements, scattered protest meetings, rumors, speculations, and so on. This dynamic was at work both in Midville (when Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues gathered together informally to discuss general problems of decency) and Southtown (when Mr. King and his colleagues in the Knights of Columbus expressed their opinions about lack of "family entertainment" in their community). Subsequently, more abstract "generalized beliefs" and uneasiness about the moral condition of the United States and the local community (challenges to their accustomed styles of life and value systems) focused on a bookstore (in Midville) and two theaters (in Southtown). It became necessary to "do something," instrumentally or at least symbolically, in order to "let the world know where we stand." Subsequently, as Smelser (1962, p. 293) predicts, the ad hoc antipornography organizations which were formed in both Midville and Southtown utilized rather sophisticated, formal publicity methods to "spread the word."

Gusfield's analysis of the temperance crusade again provides a useful comparison with some of the aspects of the antipornography activity. Participants in both activities associated the use of the object (alcohol and pornography), causally and correlatively, with all kinds of social pathology (Gusfield, 1963, pp. 30-35). Persons who were known users or supporters of pornography were perceived to be less than human and/or duped. The antipornography crusaders and those who opposed them perceived each other reciprocally and mutually as misguided, mentally ill, or sexually disturbed. As Smelser (1962) has indicated, an important part of the "generalized belief" underlying the emergence of collective behavior is a labeling of the "deviate," the perpetrator, the conspirator, the naive dupe who is threatening the protagonists.

According to Gusfield, temperance crusaders, like antipornography crusaders, believed their own lives to be models of "right thinking," decency, and the majority life style. They very much wanted other individuals to be like them. Furthermore, the temperance crusader, like the antipornography crusader, viewed man as "weak," as easy prey to temptation. This was felt to be especially true of young people, who seemed to some of the repondents to be less controllable in the family situation. (Indeed, it is hypothesized that part of the plea for legislation to control minors' access to theaters and bookstores was the hope that the Federal, State, or local government could help the respondents to control, according to the respondents' definition of control, their children—a task which they felt they were not successfully able to accomplish [Gusfield, 1963, p. 79]).

Temperance crusaders felt that power, prestige, and even income were legitimately tied to the values of the sober, industrious, middle-class citizen (Gusfield, 1963, p. 85). The antipornography crusader also associated decency and "decent" behavior with the reward structures inherent in the American way of life. Some of the respondents, in fact, became quite agitated when they learned that local "smut peddlers" were earning rather large amounts of money.

Gusfield draws from Hofstadter's (1955b) analysis that Populist appeals were based essentially on a theory of conspiracy. According to the theory, heinous individuals in the industrialized cities of the East manipulated currency, taxes, and government policy for their own advantage. Legislatures and governmental systems were bribed, gerrymandered, and rigged. "Ordinary people" were preyed

upon and cheated by such "Easterners." Gusfield suggests that Populist and Prohibitionist ideologies were bridged by this kind of thinking. The Populist assumption of conspiratorial malevolence and profiteering could easily be extrapolated to the impact of liquor "trusts" upon "good people's" attempts to stop immoral trade in alcohol (Gusfield, 1963, p. 97). The antipornography crusaders' "generalized beliefs," at the highest level of abstraction, included such perceptions of conspiracies. The conspiracies, however, were those in which individuals, and groups of individuals, inadvertently or advertently, were causing the moral ruin of the nation. The crusaders felt cheated, not financially, but rather culturally—they were being robbed of the prestige frequently associated with their chosen style of life, the "American" style of life.

The antipornography crusaders in both Midville and Southtown were convinced that they had a *right,* even an obligation, to be indignant about the fact that their "basic values" were being challenged. Gusfield points out that moral indignation generally indicates threatened status. The injured party must demonstrate that the deviant has violated not only his norm, but also the socially dominant norm. Thus, the threatened party takes steps to show publicly, and perhaps dramatically, that his norms are in fact the socially dominant ones. That act, it is suggested, can manifest itself as a form of collective behavior—if circumstances, events, and individuals contribute to the emergence of such behavior.

According to Gusfield, attempts to maintain or enhance status against challenge more often than not become fundamentalist reactions. There is a revivalist tone to these activities, and a preoccupation with the regeneration of values in such areas as family life, child training, and religion. Gusfield reports that the temperance crusaders depicted American life as having fallen from its earlier position of virtue. The crusaders called for a restoration of such "basic values" as truth, honesty, recognition of authority, morality, and respect for age (Gusfield, 1963, p. 144). Such a fundamentalist reaction, with its revivalistic and regenerative tones, was clearly apparent among the "generalized beliefs" of both Midvillians and Southtowners.

Gusfield further observes that among the temperance crusaders, the tendency toward fundamentalism revealed a belief that a return to the dominant values of the past, as they were being continued by the crusaders themselves, could solve contemporary social problems. The fall of Rome was cited repeatedly by both temperance (Gusfield, 1963, p. 144) and antipornography crusaders.

Gusfield summarizes some aspects of status interests which reflect the operation of "generalized beliefs":

> Precisely because prestige is far from stable in a changing society, specific issues can become structured as tests of status when they are construed as symbols of group moralities and life styles. A civil liberties issue, such as domestic Communism, takes much of its affect and meaning from clashes between traditionalized and modernist groups in American culture. Elements of educational sophistication, religious secularism, or political liberalism may appear as alien, foreign, and in direct contradiction to the localist ways of life of the traditional oriented culture. Issues of civil liberties become [the] field on which cultural and educational groups fight to maintain their claims to public recognition and prestige.

In his analysis of McCarthyism, Peter Viereck (1955, pp. 91-116) has referred to just this kind of process in characterizing the attack on officials in the State Department. Viereck placed one source of this attack in the feeling of degradation which the Midwestern, agricultural, middle class felt at political domination by the aristocracy of the Eastern seaboard, educated at Ivy League schools and so prominent in State Department affairs. They symbolized the State Department personnel as "striped pants" diplomats and as "cookie pushers." "Against the latter . . . the old Populist and LaFollette weapon against diplomats of 'you internationalist, Anglo-phile snob' was replaced by 'you egghead security risks'."

> In the struggle between groups with prestige and social position, the demands for deference and the protection from degradation are channeled into government and into institutions of cultural formation as schools, churches, and media of communication. Because these institutions have power to affect public recognition, they are arenas of conflict between opposing status groups. Their ceremonial, ritual, and policy are matters of interest for status groups as well as for economic classes (Gusfield, 1963, p. 175).

The life styles of the respondents in Midville and Southtown were also in contrast to those educationally sophisticated, religiously secular, and politically liberal "modernists," the members of the "now generation," the users, supporters of, or even those indifferent to, pornography. The "modernists" were getting too much attention from the media and too much prestige from significant individuals at the expense of the respondents. This feeling is perhaps best summed up in part of a letter written by Mrs. Roberts, the leader of Midville's Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc., to a newspaper editor. She informed the editor that the God-fearing crew of Apollo 8 will be remembered long after Hugh Hefner (perhaps a symbolic paragon of "modernism") and *Playboy* had been forgotten. She wrote "they will have left a real legacy to mankind, even as Hugh Hefner and his money lie mouldering in the grave–obscure and forgotten." She continued, "With their contribution, they have become the number one newsmakers of the year, and perhaps of this generation, while Hugh has been plugging along and didn't even make the top ten" (p. 124). Mrs. Roberts told the editor, almost with wish-fulfillment urgency, that God-fearing Americans must be remembered, recognized, granted prestige, and reinforced in their life style more than individuals like Hugh Hefner.

Thus the criteria of the growth and spread of a "generalized belief," as outlined by Smelser, were met in both Midville and Southtown. Those criteria included a diagnosis of the situation, a labeling of individuals and events responsible for the situation, and some idea of the type of action it would take to rectify the situation.

PRECIPITATING FACTORS

> Conduciveness, strain and a generalized belief–even when combined–do not by themselves produce an episode of collective behavior in a specific time and place. In the case of panic, for instance, these general determinants establish a predisposition to flight, but it is usually a specific event which sets the flight in

motion. Under conditions of racial tension, it is nearly always a dramatic event which precipitates the outburst of violence—a clash between two persons of different race, a Negro family moving into a white neighborhood, or a Negro being promoted to a traditionally white job. These events may confirm or justify the fears or hatreds in a generalized belief; they may initiate or exaggerate a condition of strain; or they may redefine sharply the conditions of conduciveness. In any case, these precipitating factors give the generalized belief concrete, immediate substance. In this way they provide a concrete setting toward which collective action can be directed.

Again, a precipitating factor by itself is not necessarily a determinant of anything in particular. It must occur in the context of the other determinants. A fist fight, for instance, will not touch off a race riot unless it occurs in the midst of—or is interpreted in the light of—a general situation established by conduciveness, strain, and a generalized belief (Smelser, 1962, pp. 16-17).

Midville

Smelser notes that "precipitating factors," as a value-added stage toward collective behavior, shade into the other stages. A single event may be treated as a "precipitating factor," or some other characteristic value-added stage, depending upon the time perspective with which the analyst views the case history. In fact, he (1962, p. 295) points out that an important characteristic of collective behavior is that any single empirical event or situation may be analytically significant in several different ways. In the analysis of those events or situations which will be specified as "precipitating factors" in the Midville (and subsequently the Southtown) ad hoc antipornography organizations, there are many overlapping areas. An early and major "precipitating factor" in the emergence of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization occurred in 1956 when the United States Supreme Court ruled that the State (and consequently the Midville) obscenity statute was unconstitutional. The "decency" situation in Midville was, by that ruling, considerably "muddied," and there seemed to be some confusion as to an effective means of controlling pornographic materials in the community (p. 21). The Police Department and Midville's Censorship Advisory Board continued to work together, depending primarily upon voluntary compliance from local businessmen to police and Board suggestions. The citizenry, however, appeared steadily to lose confidence in the ability of these relatively "informal" sanctions to work, and they began doubting the efficacy of the local formal police and legal machinery with regard to the control of such materials.

As early as 1961, Mrs. Roberts, who was to become the secretary-treasurer of the Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc. (Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization), was actively corresponding with government officials concerning various aspects of public morality. Mrs. Roberts, as the key developer and leader of ICCD, will be discussed again in the section dealing with "mobilization for action"—that value-added stage which Smelser suggests manifests the importance of leadership. However, Mrs. Roberts (and Mr. King, her Southtown counterpart) was clearly a precipitating factor in the emergence of the collective behavior. She utilized the "structural conduciveness" in Midville, exposed and publicized "structural strain," defined and disseminated the

"generalized beliefs," and precipitated many of the significant events which contributed to the establishment, growth, and maintenance of the ad hoc antipornography organization itself. By 1963, she had organized meetings of "concerned citizens," who subsequently would become the nucleus of the Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc.

In March 1963, two episodes of "The Defenders," a network television program, served as a "precipitating factor" for Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues. Essentially, the concerned Midvillians felt the two episodes showed sympathy with, if not actual support of, atheism, liberalism, immorality, and pornography. In other words, this highly rated television program had rewarded a life style directly opposed to the type of life style they espoused, thus denigrating and threatening their value system. Mrs. Roberts and others felt that the program portrayed law enforcement officers, politicians, librarians, and individuals opposed to "obscene" books as being "dirty-minded, ignorant, do-gooders, busy-bodies, snoops, etc." She and her colleagues added, "We wear those titles proudly as Christ wore his crown of thorns" (p. 34).

The offshoot of this "precipitating factor" was that Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues formed a loosely knit group which they named United Social Action—the first indication of relatively formal concerted action. Under the title United Social Action, the members established a written plan of purpose and action, and the moral crusade began to emerge.

The development of Unied Social Action was associated with another important "precipitating factor"—the discovery by Mrs. Roberts and her group of the nationally-organized Citizens for Decent Literature (pp. 36-38). The knowledge that antipornography endeavors were actively taking place at the national level, and that there existed formalized mechanisms and expertise for accomplishing local moral crusades, was singularly important in the development of ICCD.

Similar national organizations such as Morality in Media, Inc., the National Catholic Office of Motion Pictures, and the Christian Crusades of Billy Graham also influenced the development of the antipornography organization in Midville, but considerably less so than Citizens for Decent Literature.

Mrs. Roberts, whether working independently or together with her fellows in United Social Action or in other informal associations, had considerable success with her antipornography endeavors prior to the formalizing of ICCD. These successes can in themselves be considered "precipitating factors," in that they convinced Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues that "something could be done," and that their strategy of direct community action was successful and had potential for greater success. Mrs. Roberts was instrumental in bringing about changes in the kinds of magazines and publications available in several Midville grocery and drug stores, convincing the *Midville News* that it should not run advertisements for X-rated films, encouraging the State fair management to eliminate "girlie shows" from the fair midway, and convincing the local television station to move its "adult" movies to a later hour.

These successes encouraged the concerned Midvillians to formalize and incorporate their endeavors, and ICCD was established in June 1965.

In May 1966, ICCD was able to convince the mayor of Midville to declare an Action for Decency Day. This success greatly pleased the members of ICCD, and impressed other citizens of Midville who were in sympathy with the activities of

the ad hoc antipornography organization. Furthermore, the publicity of the mayor's proclamation precipitated a much wider community support than ICCD had thus far obtained, resulting in an increase in both the active and auxiliary membership.

ICCD was influential in forcing the closing of an "adult" theatre in Midville and in encouraging the arrest of management and sales personnel of the Midville adult bookstore. The arrest of the bookstore management and personnel, however, did not have the hoped-for results. Midville judges, citing Supreme Court decisions, in July 1968, dismissed the cases. These dismissals may serve as "precipitating factors," escalating and intensifying the future direct antipornography activities of ICCD.

Midville was then named an "All-America City"—a "precipitating factor" in itself. This honor made the challenges and challengers to that style of life more immediate. The citizens of an "All-America City" had an obligation to protect that community, and even the nation, from "moral decay." The adult bookstore in the heart of downtown Midville, as one respondent put it, began to "stick out like a sore thumb."

In October 1968, Raymond P. Gauer, executive director of Citizens for Decent Literature, came to Midville under the sponsorship of ICCD and the Midville Valley Public Health Association. His appearance in Midville, his speeches, and his comments to the *Midville News* served as an important "precipitating factor," which considerably escalated the activities of the ICCD. Gauer's statement that the adult bookstore had "one of the worst displays of obscene literature in the country—In 70 major cities I've never seen a worse display of material—it is unbelievable" was of particular significance. He had demonstrated dramatically the existence of an alien entity in the middle of the "All-America City." This was a challenge to the life styles of the good people of Midville, a challenge which which had to be met and overcome.

Equally important as a "precipitating factor," Mr. Gauer outlined specific strategies and tactics by which direct citizen action could be taken against the adult bookstore. He reviewed a plan of purchasing allegedly pornographic materials from the bookstore, filing a complaint with the police, having the police make an arrest, and then prosecuting the bookstore management. This strategy had been used earlier by the Midville police department in arrests of bookstore personnel and would also be suggested by the Midville prosecuting attorney at a later time. Mr. Gauer's respected judgment, his expertise, and his outline of specific strategy for action precipitated a sharp escalation of ICCD activities in Midville. Several Midvillians implemented the purchase-complaint-arrest strategy in the adult bookstore, and bookstore personnel were subsequently arrested on a number of occasions.

Mrs. Roberts and her close friend in ICCD, Mrs. Nelson, again following Mr. Gauer's suggestion, purchased some materials from the adult bookstore, and circulated them among 16 of Midville's most influential citizens. The circulation of those materials served as another "precipitating factor," enlisting considerable additional community support for the endeavors of ICCD, particularly among individuals who were centrally associated with local government, business, and communications. One of these individuals, the local editor of the *Midville News,* decided, on the basis of the materials that he had seen, to run a major series of

editorials and articles concerning the adult bookstore, in the hope that Midvillians would become aroused and act accordingly. This is a case where one "precipitating factor" led to another, and finally culminated in the signing of antibookstore petitions by 11,000 Midvillians.

This series of "precipitating factors," each of which had relevance to the events, circumstances, and individuals establishing the prerequisites of "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," and "generalized belief," served as catalysts for the emergence of the next Smelserian value-added stage of collective behavior—the "mobilization for action."

Southtown

The "precipitating factors" that existed in Southtown and contributed to the development of the ad hoc antipornography organization seemed rather less intense than those which took place in Midville (at least the reaction of the respondents to those events seemed less intense). This may have been because the specifics of "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," and "generalized belief" in Southtown were less effective and less immediate. Other kinds of events, situations, or individuals may also have served to mitigate the impact of the "conduciveness," "strain," "belief," and "precipitating factors" in Southtown (this was also true of "mobilization for action" and "social control" in Southtown).

The regularly scheduled January 1969 meeting of the Council of the Knights of Columbus in Southtown was a "precipitating factor." At that meeting, the members decided that their presently empty community action agenda might well be filled by the issue of inadequate family film entertainment in Southtown. Perhaps another "precipitating factor" prior to the January 1969 meeting might have been the period of time during which the members of the Knights of Columbus perceived a growing lack of commercially available films to which they could take their families as a group. Clearly, the respondents felt that this availability had become markedly restricted. Furthermore, no one seemed to be able to do anything about it or the two Southtown "skin flick" theaters, which represented the extreme in "undesirable" films to the general public.

The Knights of Columbus members agreed that local laws and law enforcement agencies were unable to handle the problem, and this served to precipitate their search for alternative methods to control what they considered an important deviance from the norms and values inherent in their life style.

Mr. King, the chairman of the Council's community action committee and the person who had suggested the issue of local film entertainment to the Knights of Columbus Council, became the central figure in Southtown's emerging ad hoc antipornography organization. As in the case of Mrs. Roberts, Mr. King's leadership style was in itself a "precipitating factor." His activities evidenced "structural conduciveness" and "structural strain," defined "generalized beliefs" about the nature of the problem and the best means of dealing with it, and (as shall be demonstrated subsequently) precipitated the course of the organization's "mobilization for action" and the kinds of "social control" that were brought to bear upon the organization's activities.

Mr. King's meeting with Senator Welles and the Southtown district attorney

was another crucial "precipitating factor" in the emergence of the ad hoc antipornography organization. Senator Welles and the district attorney both supported Mr. King and his group's beginning endeavors and provided them with important suggestions for a strategy of legislative change—a strategy which was completely accepted and subsequently operationalized by Mr. King. That strategy essentially included demonstrating to legislators, reasonably and rationally, that considerable community support existed for changes in State statutes concerned with the issues of pornography and obscenity. The meeting with Senator Welles and the district attorney also served to widen Mr. King's scope of endeavors beyond the area of family film entertainment and into the broader fields of obscenity and pornography, and the legal sanctions pertaining to them.

On February 6, 1969, a play was held on the university campus in which some performers were alleged to have appeared partially or completely nude. The "nudity" event was given a great deal of publicity in the local media and served as a critical "precipitating factor" in both the emergence of the ad hoc antipornography organization and the degree of community support it would subsequently receive. The nudity issue helped to focus citizen attention on a specific incidence of "decency," and very probably was related to subsequent antipornography police action in Southtown.

On February 10, 1969, the Southtown police arrested the managers of Southtown's two "skin flick" theaters. This "precipitating factor" had the impact of sensitizing the community to the existence of "smut" in their community, and also encouraged Mr. King and his colleagues in their efforts to create an ad hoc antipornography organization which could influence legislative change in this field.

Mr. King had scheduled an "experimental" public meeting on February 17 to discuss the existence of and possible answers to pornography and obscenity in Southtown. That "experimental" meeting was a rather dramatic success; 200 persons attended the meeting, including several of Southtown's influential government officials, and the success of that meeting served as a "precipitating factor" in the further development of an ad hoc antipornography organization.

During that meeting one of the local politicians, Representative Randall, referred to the kind of films being shown at Southtown's two "skin flick" theaters as being "plain, flat filth," and urged that "effective legislation be passed." The term "plain, flat filth" became a "precipitating factor" which served to define such films according to "community standards."

The fact that members of the audience asked for specific information about positive action was also a "precipitating factor." At the conclusion of the meeting, Mr. King and his colleagues were convinced that they could succeed with an ad hoc antipornography organization and bring about orderly legislative change.

On the following day (February 18), the grand jury viewed two films seized from the Southtown "skin flick" theaters. Their reaction, as reported in the newspapers, was a dramatic "precipitating factor." The grand jury and other influential spectators in the audience roundly condemned the films, the theaters, and anyone who might be associated with such materials. More than one local politician pledged to bring about or support legislative change which would bar such materials from the community—or at least make certain that young people

would not have access to them. The publicity surrounding the grand jury decision also served to crystallize community opinion and created a larger body of concerned citizens.

On February 27, 1969, Mr. King and his Knights of Columbus colleagues met to discuss ways of formalizing the ad hoc antipornography organization and establish an operating structure. They decided that perhaps the best way to demonstrate community support for legislative change would be to hold a rally, during which petitions could be signed. They presented their ideas to significant groups of Southtowners representing many other community voluntary associations in a number of meetings, during one of which the name "Upsurge for Decency" was affixed to the organization. The naming of the organization, on March 13, 1969, was a key "precipitating factor," formally crystallizing the intent, representative life styles, and kinds of utilitarian and symbolic concerns of the involved citizens.

On April 17, 1969, a successful rally was held, many individuals signed the petition, and legislative change on State pornography and obscenity statutes was markedly escalated.

Discussion

Smelser points out that the role of "precipitating factors" in the development of collective behavior most importantly dramatizes or symbolizes one of the conditions of "conduciveness" or "strain." The "precipitating factors" focus the "generalized belief" on a particular person, event, or situation, consequently creating a sense of urgency, and thus lead to "mobilization for action" (Smelser, 1962, p. 294). The "precipitating factors" which existed in Midville and Southtown were obviously related to the conditions of "conduciveness," "strain," and "generalized belief," and can be seen to dovetail with, or to be actually imbedded in, the subsequent "mobilization for action."

Gusfield (1963, pp. 16, 185) has written that those events which served to differentiate status groups were crucial in the development, maintenance, and intensification of the prohibition crusade. Several of the "precipitating factors" discussed above contributed to the differentiation in life styles between the "traditionalists" and the "modernists." In Midville, for example, status groups were differentially rewarded by the decisions of the Supreme Court, the television program "The Defenders," the dropping of charges against those arrested on obscenity or pornography statutes, and the speeches of Raymond P. Gauer of Citizens for Decent Literature, among others. In Southtown, for example, status groups were differentiated by the Supreme Court decisions, the university's initial tolerance of "nudity on campus," and the fact that police enforcement of State statutes was ineffective in eliminating "undesirable" film fares. From the respondents' point of view, these and other "precipitating factors" originated or intensified their perceptions of an "us" versus "them" with regard to the maintaining of "basic values."

When originally instrumental activities fail, when actual goals are not accomplished, symbols are often developed which are substitute goals for the genuine aims (Gusfield, 1963, p. 23). The failure of instrumental goals, therefore, may be considered a "precipitating factor" for the development of the symbolic

moral crusade.

In both Midville and Southtown, the control of "pornography" as perceived by the participants in the ad hoc antipornography organizations had failed because of inappropriate statutes, Supreme Court decisions, citizen apathy, inability of the officials, and so on. Thus, the development of antipornography activities, preferably instrumental but at least symbolic, developed in both Midville and Southtown. As shall be suggested in the section *Mobilization of Participants for Action,* the impact of the acts themselves was, to the respondents, generally less important than the symbolism of that act. The inability to gain convictions against the management of the adult bookstore in Midville was certainly frustrating, but, at the same time, the ability to have them arrested repeatedly (and thus "harass" the management) was symbolically satisfying. Despite the fact that the changes in the State statutes (brought about in large part by the activities of the Southtown ad hoc antipornography organization) applied only to minors, and therefore did not actually affect the two Southtown "skin flick" theaters, it was nonetheless a significant symbolic victory.

Gusfield (1963, p. 99) indicates that the temperance movement drew a great deal of strength from the national aspects of the campaign for prohibition—a campaign which included far more individuals than just the temperance crusaders. The antipornography crusaders in both Midville and Southtown similarly drew strength from their perception of the national endeavors of the Citizens for Decent Literature, and to a lesser degree from the national activities of Morality in Media, Inc., and the National Catholic Office of Motion Pictures. The symbolic alignment with a nationwide organization intensified the crusade.

The influence of Citizens for Decent Literature as a "precipitating factor" in both Midville and Southtown was accomplished by parallel kinds of "precipitating factors." Most ad hoc antipornography organizations begin informally with only a few participants, and, by virtue of modest initial successes in "making things right," precipitate further activity. As indicated in the section *Growth and Spread of a Generalized Belief,* both ad hoc organizations perceived themselves to be part of a larger movement, part of the "pendulum swing" toward national decency.

Concerned citizens in both Midville and Southtown became aware of the challenges to their life styles, to their "basic values," primarily via the mass media—in Midville through television programming, in Southtown through the lack of "family film entertainment." Direct action was also precipitated by a perception that current law enforcement and legal systems were not effectively combatting the pornography situation.

On the basis of the above description, it is suggested that the criteria for the "precipitating factors" value-added stage toward collective behavior did in fact exist in both Midville and Southtown. These factors were related to the "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," and "generalized beliefs" which, as indicated, were flourishing in the two communities.

MOBILIZATION OF PARTICIPANTS FOR ACTION

Once the determinants just reviewed have been established, the only necessary condition that remains is to bring the affected group into action. This point

marks the onset of panic, the outbreak of hostility, or the beginning of agitation for reform or revolution. In this process of mobilization the behavior of leaders is extremely important (Smelser, 1962, p. 17).

Smelser notes that mobilization to organize and implement a particular correctional program takes a relatively longer time than other forms of collective behavior. Therefore, he observes, the mobilization phase of a norm-oriented movement probably will be very complicated, adapting to the multifaceted exigencies of maintaining the effort over a long period of time (Smelser, 1962, p. 296). The reader will have observed that complication in the value-added stages discussed thus far. Specific "mobilizations for action," whether minor or major, could be seen as related to individuals, events, and situations discussed previously.

In a sense, the natural histories by Zurcher and his colleagues (1970) are discussions of "mobilization for action," since the history of any norm-oriented movement is essentially such a narrative. Analytically, however, that value-added stage can be considered more narrowly than that. Smelser points out that the most important aspect of the "mobilization for action" stage is the style and direction of leadership. This section, therefore, will concentrate primarily upon the kind of leadership which guided the emergence, maintenance, and accomplishments of those ad hoc organizations. There are generally two kinds of leadership in norm-oriented social movements–leadership in the formulating of beliefs and leadership in mobilizing the participants for action. In some cases, the same person accomplishes both of those functions (Smelser, 1962, p. 297).

In Midville and Southtown, the ad hoc organizations each centered around the leadership of one individual–Midville's Mrs. Roberts, and Southtown's Mr. King. Both leaders mobilized the participants for action, and both served to crystallize the "generalized beliefs" of community members concerning the existence of the problem and their potential to do something about it. Mrs. Roberts, however, actively attempted to formulate those beliefs and proselytize them among potential followers far more intensively than did Mr. King.

Both Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King depended upon a cadre of associates who remained a closely knit group throughout the development and operation of the organizations. Lang and Lang (1961, p. 530) state that a social movement is impossible without the discipline provided by such a cadre, which is always recruited from a limited group of individuals. Mrs. Roberts' helpers cut across organizational membership, while Mr. King's group, on the other hand, was composed entirely of fellow members of a local council of the Knights of Columbus.

The leadership styles of Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King in large part determined the emergence and consequent course of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Southtown. Each of these leaders had a significant impact upon formulating the criteria needed in all of Smelser's value-added stages as they related to the antipornography collective behavior.

Lang and Lang (1961, p. 523) cite the complete dedication demanded from leaders of some social movements, and Gusfield documents the intensity of leadership involvement in moral crusades (1963, pp. 76, 80-81, 88-93, 124-125, 129-131, 149-152). Without a doubt, both Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King were dedicated to their activities in the ad hoc antipornography organizations which they led. Mrs. Roberts spent most of her waking hours engaged in work associated

with ICCD. (Since her children were grown and her financial situation was very stable, Mrs. Roberts was able to devote full time to such activities.) Mr. King, during the existence of Upsurge for Decency, worked as many as 50 hours a week on that organization's endeavors. (He was an insurance agent, and consequently could schedule his formal working hours to meet the exigencies of the organization.)

Gusfield (1963, pp. 80-81) reported that the local leadership of the Women's Christian Temperance Union primarily consisted of the wives of men employed in middle-class occupations. The state in which Midville is located is one of those in which WCTU leadership was sampled by Gusfield. The most active leaders of Midville's Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc., were, indeed, wives of middle-class men. The most active leaders of Southtown's Upsurge for Decency were, by contrast, the middle-class men themselves.

Midville

Mrs. Roberts was unquestionably the key leader in the development and operation of Midville's Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc. She was an articulate, well-educated woman in her fifties, and had for many years been actively involved in various community voluntary associations, generally associated with the Catholic church. She was married, her husband was still actively employed, and she was the mother of at least one grown child, a son. (The biographical information on Mrs. Roberts is somewhat sketchy. After the research staff learned that Mrs. Roberts was one of the principals named in the $1 million lawsuit by the adult bookstore, they agreed with defense attorneys not to interview her directly. The research staff was, however, able to gather a large amount of information about Mrs. Roberts' leadership of the ad hoc antipornography organization.) Prior to the formation of ICCD, Mrs. Roberts had a long history of letter-writing to local, State, and Federal officials concerning issues related to "decency." The research staff was able to gather evidence of Mrs. Roberts' letter-writing as early as April 17, 1961, in a letter to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, urging intensified Federal action regarding sexual offenses against children. J. Edgar Hoover responded to her letter. She operated by directly contacting officials whose plans, programs, or decisions were relevant to the specific decency issue with which she was concerned.

Mrs. Roberts' Midville activities were accomplished with the aid of a cadre of colleagues, most of whom would remain active throughout the operation of ICCD. As indicated by Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1970), this group included a Baptist minister who was also a representative of the Midville Council of Churches; a Catholic priest who was also director of the National Organization for Decent Literature for the Catholic diocese of Midville; another Catholic priest who was director of the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures of the Midville diocese; a police captain in the Juvenile Division of the Midville Police Department who also was chairman of the Midville Censorship Advisory Board; a Lutheran pastor who was the representative of a Midville synod of Lutheran pastors; the director of secondary education of the Midville Public School Administration; a Midville rabbi; and a minister who represented the Evangelical Ministerial Association. Mrs. Roberts' closest colleague in the cadre was Mrs. Nelson, a Midville housewife, somewhat younger than Mrs. Roberts, who had also

been very active in community voluntary associations generally associated with the Catholic church. Although her aides were primarily representatives of religious organizations, the group was fairly broad in scope, cutting across several religious denominations, and including representatives of educational, law-enforcement, and public health institutions. A few other individuals later joined the group, including representatives of parent-teachers associations and voluntary community associations such as Church Women United, the Midville Deanery Council of Catholic Women, and the Youth Protection Agency. Several of Mrs. Roberts' aides were members of voluntary associations that were affiliated with national groups, and a few of the cadre members held memberships in local and national associations which were specifically concerned with the issues of pornography and obscenity: Citizens for Decent Literature, Morality in Media, the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures, the National Organization for Decent Literature, and so on.

The influence of Citizens for Decent Literature was a significant factor in the emergence of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization. Mrs. Roberts first learned of its existence through her association with Our Sorrowful Mothers Novena, a local organization of Catholic Women. She reported to the research staff that her discovery of CDL "opened her eyes about what to do" (p. 40). Much of the organizational structure of ICCD would be patterned after that of CDL.

Mrs. Roberts apparently had an eye for formal organization. Her 1963 campaign to influence the content of television programming—specifically the program "The Defenders"—culminated in the formation of United Social Action; although this organization never became quite viable, it was the prototype for what would become the Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc.

In June 1965, ICCD was formally chartered and incorporated. ICCD was actually an organization of organizations, ultimately composed of representatives of at least 31 other Midville voluntary associations, most of them church, school, or health oriented.[2]

The constitution of ICCD stated that the organization's purpose would be (a) to safeguard the standards of decency in the community in the field of entertainment, and (b) to establish a community conscience concerning decency. The organization intended to function (a) through education on the many-faceted problems of decency, (b) through moral persuasion for decency, and (c) by encouraging the legal enforcement of the present laws, and those laws which might be enacted to further decency.

The purposes of ICCD, as specified in its constitution, lend themselves well to a Gusfield interpretation. That is, the "standards of decency" which are to be safeguarded, and the "community conscience" which is to be established, are both readily interpretable as representing "style of life" and the attending beliefs, habits, and behaviors. The purposes are quite broadly stated in the constitution, but nonetheless indicate a defense of "basic values."

The actual operating procedures were quite vague. The "safeguarding" of the standards of decency and the "establishing" of a community conscience were to be effected by "education," "moral persuasion," and "legal enforcement" of

---

2. See Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1970) for a list of the organizations represented in ICCD.

present or improved laws. As the reader will observe, the purpose and orientation of ICCD were much broader and considerably more vague than those of Southtown's Upsurge for Decency. This broadness and vagueness might have been related to the greater breadth and intensity of "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," "generalized belief," and "precipitating factors" which existed in Midville as compared to Southtown.

The "tentative objectives" of United Social Action, the prototype of ICCD, revealed even more of the sweeping value concerns of Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues. The ten objectives, having much the tone of the proclamations of Gusfield's temperance crusaders, are as follows:

To work for love of God and County.

To promote Patriotism.

To encourage respect for Law and Law-enforcement Agencies.

To laud the virtues of honesty and morality and to promote and encourage them.

To laud good citizenship in our Youth.

To influence Youth by good example.

To encourage church affiliation and religious instruction of Youth and family participation in these activities.

At all times to work within the framework of our State and National Constitutions in seeking objectives.

To work with and to seek interest from already established organizations and not to duplicate their efforts where feasible.

To be interested in and to seek or support legislation and to correct any unwholesome situation, especially as it relates to the moral or patriotic climate which affect our young citizens.

As indicated by this list of tentative objectives of United Social Action and the statement of purpose and method for ICCD, it appeared that Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues intended not only to "establish" a community conscience concerning decency, but to *be* that community conscience. ICCD was incorporated, institutionalized, and gave (and still gives) every indication of being a relatively permanent fixture in the community. The relative permanence of the ad hoc antipornography organization was consistent with "the need to be always vigilant against temptation."

Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues in ICCD engaged in diverse activities for that organization—reporting an alleged homosexual to the Vice Squad, passing information to the Midville Public Health Association about a possible case of venereal disease in a local school, providing the Midville public school administration with information concerning a family whose children allegedly were becoming involved with moral problems, pressuring the city for better lighting in areas of "high-crime incidence," including discussions of narcotics and venereal disease in public meetings, etc.

In order to "safeguard the standards of decency in the community in the field of entertainment," and "establish a community conscience concerning decency,"

Mrs. Roberts and ICCD used several different tactics, including education, moral persuasion, encouraging the legal enforcement of present laws, and attempting to enact additional or improved laws. Members of ICCD wrote letters to local, State, and Federal officials, administrators, executives, and experts; held public meetings; conducted seminars, classes, and information sessions; established personal contacts with influential citizens such as local politicians, businessmen, lawyers, clergy, and key members of other voluntary associations, including young persons' groups; affiliated themselves, through ICCD's multiple representation, with a large number of community service, fraternal, religious, educational, health, law enforcement, and civic organizations; established contacts with the local media, including press, radio, and television, in order to publicize their endeavors and recruit support; maintained a speakers bureau of individuals with expertise in decency-related matters; aligned themselves with other national formal "decency" organizations; and made their membership expertise available to other communities desiring to organize or escalate ad hoc antipornography organizations.

ICCD not only utilized a strategy of attacking those individuals, businesses, or organizations they felt were contributing to the downfall of "community conscience," but rewarded, with letters, phone calls, and personal contacts any individual, business, or organization which lived up to the "appropriate" standards of "community conscience."

ICCD recruited new active members primarily from other cooperating community voluntary associations. ICCD, however, had an additional tactic for gaining individual members. Article IX of the ICCD Constitution provided for the establishment of an "auxiliary membership"—individuals who agreed with the aims and methods of the organization" in promoting a more wholesome environment in the community and for the purpose of establishing community conscience" (p. 63). By 1969, 8,000 Auxiliary Membership Cards had been distributed to individuals and organizations in the city of Midville, and this auxiliary membership could be reached by mail or phone at any time.

When summarizing the "method of establishing community conscience" (the ICCD's "mobilization for action"), Mrs. Roberts herself specified the importance of holding meetings, making personal contact, distributing literature, and "phone—phone—phone—and phone," and "write—write—write—and write."

For nearly a year after Action For Decency Day (a mayoral proclamation influenced by ICCD), there was a period of antipornography activity during which Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues were in turn pleased and frustrated—pleased by police activity in the arrest of individuals engaged in the sale of allegedly pornographic materials, and frustrated by court decisions which dismissed the cases against those individuals on constitutional grounds.

During that same period of time, Mrs. Roberts and ICCD members, especially Mrs. Nelson, significantly influenced the wording and passage of a revised city ordinance concerned with pornography and obscenity. Interestingly, the ordinance was designed specifically for minors (under the age of 18) and did not apply to adults. The passage of that ordinance, therefore, has less of a utilitarian value for the overall goals of ICCD (which included the "decency" of adults, as well as minors), than it did a symbolic value—proclaiming the "community conscience" (the accepted and valued life style of the antipornography crusaders).

In keeping with their overall set of tactics, ICCD members distributed copies of the revised ordinance to Midville businessmen and called for voluntary compliance. In a covering letter on ICCD stationery was an extremely important "mobilization for action" statement. This statement was the first indication available to the researchers that the ICCD actually hoped to *close* the adult bookstore, rather than modify the content of its sales, as had been Mrs. Roberts' intent in earlier dealings with drug and grocery stores.

In 1968, Mrs. Roberts engaged in perhaps her first direct action against an alleged "smut dealer." She reportedly stood on occasion outside an "adult" theater and attempted to assess the ages of individuals entering the theater, in order to build a case against the management. Subsequently, ICCD was able to influence the closing of the adult theater by initiating and apparently proving charges of false advertising (previewing films which were never shown). Shortly after that success, Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues apparently began to take a serious look at the possibility of direct action against the adult bookstore.

The leadership of ICCD was greatly influenced by the expertise and leadership of Raymond P. Gauer, executive director of the Citizens for Decent Literature, who spoke in Midville in October 1968 (this, like several other of the aspects of "mobilization for action," was empirically bound to the analytic category of "precipitating factors"). Mr. Gauer's speeches in Midville argued strongly for citizen participation in the enforcement of obscenity laws and the right of citizens to establish contemporary community standards (in line with his Supreme Court criteria for obscenity of pornography). He advised his audience, which included virtually all of the ICCD leaders and many of its active and auxiliary members, that attempts to gain voluntary compliance by "smut peddlers" was impractical. He advised citizens to engage in a campaign of complaints against such businesses; hopefully these complaints would accomplish four important goals:

> (1) Every complaint indicates that the standards of the community are being violated . . .
>
> (2) Every complaint indicates that there will be support for any action taken by law enforcement or prosecution in this area . . .
>
> (3) And probably most important of all—every complaint must be investigated. Just the fact that the Vice Squad officers are checking on outlets in the community, as a result of citizen complaints, can go a long way to discourage the display and sale of such material . . .
>
> (4) And of course most important of all is that a complaint by you as a concerned citizen can trigger the whole mechanism that can result in the arrest, the prosecution and the conviction of the criminal who is producing, distributing or selling the materials in your community . . .

Mr. Gauer's admonishments and advice were certainly, as indicated above, "precipitating factors" in the further mobilization of ICCD for action. Beyond this, however, Mr. Gauer's formal and informal suggestions (he spent some time with Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues during his visit) provided the ad hoc antipornography organization with the rationale for and additional expertise about direct action against the adult bookstore. The tactic of citizen purchase, citizen complaint, arrest, and prosecution was firmly planted in the overall strategy of

ICCD by Mr. Gauer. When he informed Midvillians that their community had "one of the worst displays of obscene literature in the country," and that "all that is required for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing," ICCD was impelled into the most fervent "mobilization for action" in its history.

Mrs. Roberts and Mrs. Nelson reported in an interview that Mr. Gauer had even more specifically advised them concerning the kind of direct action that could be taken. He suggested that the two women enter the adult bookstore and buy two copies of a book that was clearly hard-core pornography. The women should then give one copy of the book to the Vice Squad, and hand carry the other copy to a group of community leaders. Two months after Mr. Gauer had visited Midville, Mrs. Roberts and Mrs. Nelson took his advice, went to the bookstore, purchased some books, and passed them, or segments of them, to the Vice Squad and to 16 selected community leaders. Mrs. Roberts, Mrs. Nelson, and ICCD had escalated mobilization for direct action.

The result of Mrs. Roberts' and Mrs. Nelson's direct action electrified the community and mobilized the *Midville News* and many other Midvillians who had previously been uninvolved in antipornography activity. The *Midville News* ran a series of articles that further aroused Midvillians into writing letters to the editor, to their Congressmen, and to local officials and also instigated a flurry of petition-signing (against the bookstore) by Midvillians.

By January 1969, Midville citizens were actively engaged in the purchase-complaint-arrest strategy against the adult bookstore (as recommended by Mr. Gauer and subsequently explained in detail by the Midville prosecuting attorney). Petition after petition was presented to the Midville city government and to various State and Federal officials complaining about and/or calling for action against the adult bookstore. The petition-gathering effort, which ultimately resulted in 11,000 signatures, was another aspect of "mobilization for action" instigated by the ad hoc antipornography organization and escalated by Raymond Gauer's speeches and the campaign of the *Midville News*. The petitions and other resolutions by Midville voluntary associations were, as mentioned above, forwarded to legislators and administrators at the Federal level, including the President of the United States. Mr. Nixon did not respond directly to the Midvillian action, but Vice-President Agnew did (p. 196), and his response delighted ICCD members.

The ICCD and community mobilization for direct action continued at an intense pace until the adult bookstore, through its lawyers, responded with a $1 million lawsuit directed against specific individuals and organizations involved in the ad hoc antipornography activity. The "mobilization for action," at least for direct action against the adult bookstore, slowed considerably as a result of the lawsuit. In fact, one woman, reportedly a leader in ICCD, was quoted in the *Midville News* as stating that the antipornography workers "are not trying to close down the store, just clean it up."

In a sense, the $1 million lawsuit against specific antipornography crusaders was a factor which precipitated other kinds of "mobilization for action," namely: a *Midville News*-led endeavor to raise a defense fund for those named in the "smut suit"; further involvement of the City Council in backing the citizen antipornography endeavors; a picketing of the *Midville News* by some local college students in support of free speech for the adult bookstore; some outspoken

criticism of the antipornography endeavors by a few Midvillians; an *amicus curia* brief filed in a U.S. District Court by the Federation of Womens Clubs; and the legal assistance support of the Citizens for Decent Literature. In March 1969, one month after the filing of the $1 million civil suit by the adult bookstore, Mr. Gauer himself returned to Midville to speak in support of the endeavors of ICCD and the citizens of Midville.

Despite the $1 million lawsuit, ICCD continued to maintain some degree of "mobilization for action." Some of its members, or individuals associated with organizations which were part of or cooperating with ICCD, testified at the hearings and trials of the employees and management of the adult bookstore. ICCD members also became deeply involved in urging modifications of the State statute concerning pornography and obscenity. They attended House hearings on the bill, wrote letters to legislators supporting changes, and were able to detail, in a *Midville News* article, those aspects of the proposed bill which did not appeal to them.

Mrs. Roberts was centrally involved in activities concerning the new legislation and corresponded with Mr. Gauer about aspects of and amendments to the bill. Interestingly, Mr. Gauer called Mrs. Roberts' attention to the fact that the bill was concerned only with the sale of pornographic material to minors, and not to adults. Apparently, this plan had been initially satisfactory to Mrs. Roberts and her colleagues, but Mr. Gauer insisted that such a bill would be ineffective. (It seems that Mr. Gauer's concern with antipornography legislation was more of a utilitarian than a symbolic nature; that is, he and his organization wanted to see laws passed which had a broad impact on the availability of pornographic materials to all citizens.) It seems that Mrs. Roberts and her aides were less concerned with the utility of the statute than with the symbolic act of being able to influence its passage. This interpretation is consistent with Gusfield's conception of status politics.

The various phases of "mobilization for action" by Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization resulted in several tangible accomplishments: influencing the content and scheduling of television programs; influencing drug, grocery, and magazine stores to modify the content of their sales; influencing a local fair to modify its midway offerings; influencing the local major newspaper to change its movie advertisement policy; forming a corporation and acquiring funds for the operation of an ad hoc antipornography organization; contributing considerably to the closing of an "adult" theater and an "adult" book concession housed within that theater; bringing together many diverse community voluntary organizations into a concerted effort toward a common goal; intensifying local and State police action with regard to the issue of pornography; influencing the Midville mayor to proclaim "Action for Decency" Day; contributing to the establishment of better lighting in "high-crime areas"; starting, or helping to start, ad hoc antipornography organizations in two neighboring communities; involving administrators, businessmen, and legislators at the local level in antipornography issues, if not in actual action; involving, or at least gaining recognition from, legislators and administrators at the State and Federal levels—up to and including the President—in Midville's antipornography concern; involving national antipornography organizations such as Citizens for Decent Literature in the Midville endeavor; significantly modifying and obtaining passage of a change in the

Midville City Ordinance concerning pornography; modifying and contributing toward suggested changes in the State statute relating to obscenity and pornography; acquiring an auxiliary membership of approximately 8,000 individuals; obtaining 11,000 signatures on petitions protesting the adult bookstore; bringing the pressure of 16,000 Midvillians, through the various organizations represented in ICCD, to bear on antipornography considerations; enlisting editorial and feature support from Midville's major newspaper; influencing, through political representation, the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography to include Midville as a "case history" in ad hoc antipornography endeavors; and considerably restricting the sales of and even temporarily closing the adult bookstore.

There seems little doubt that the "mobilization for action" of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization, and the community "mobilization for action" that it precipitated, had the impact of at least symbolically proclaiming the "community conscience" about decency. Furthermore, the ICCD "mobilization for action" demonstrated the dedicated intention of some Midvillians "to safeguard the standard of decency in the community in the field of entertainment." Indeed, ICCD did, as its constitution specified, use "education," "moral persuasion" (operationalized as direct action), encouraged "the legal enforcement of our present laws" (operationalized as the purchase-complaint-arrest tactic), and influenced modification in those laws which would "further decency." ICCD accomplished these goals over a period of 5 years (1965-1970). However, the prototype of ICCD, United Social Action, was operating as early as 1963, and Mrs. Roberts had been active in relatively independent "decency" activities as early as 1961. All in all, the evolution of the ad hoc antipornography organization and the accomplishment of some of its goals were spread over a relatively lengthy period.

What the ad hoc antipornography organization did accomplish was often controversial, and the lasting nature of its accomplishments is as yet problematical. The research staff was impressed by the degree to which the "mobilization for action" of the ICCD was associated with a high level of emotion and with its diffuse and highly abstract goals and rationales. There seemed always to be a volatility, a potential for emotional outbursts, just beneath the surface or actually manifest throughout the "mobilization for action" (violence is not implied here). The research staff got the impression that this mobilization was, especially at the later stages of the organization's activities never completely under the control of the ICCD leadership, that it had moved beyond the influence of the cadre, even had they wished to restrict it. In comparison with Southtown, the character of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization was more volatile, more expansive, and more dramatic because in Midville, the "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," "generalized beliefs," and "precipitating factors" were more intense, and the components of "social control" less influential, than in Southtown.

Southtown

Mr. King, the principal leader of Southtown's ad hoc antipornography organization, Upsurge for Decency, was a tall, clean-cut, religious, intelligent, and

soft-spoken man in his thirties. He was an insurance agent by profession, a college graduate, and had for many years been extremely active in local civic organizations, especially the Knights of Columbus. In the latter organization he had held major official positions and won several awards for outstanding service.

When Mr. King had lived in another part of the State he had, as an active member of the Knights of Columbus, led a small but successful action toward "cleaning up publication racks." Thus he had brought with him to Southtown some experience in "mobilization for action" concerning pornography. Now, as the elected chairman of the Southtown Council's Action Program Committee, and stimulated by his discussion with others and his observation of the local situation, Mr. King had determined that the issue of "lewd films" was an appropriate one for Council focus.

From the onset of his attempt to mobilize an ad hoc antipornography endeavor, Mr. King was the epitome of the businesslike, task-oriented, and pragmatic leader. His initial goal in the Knights of Columbus was simply to "improve the availability of family entertainment in Southtown." Mr. King did not think that "hard-core" pornography was a problem in the community, and he felt that the police "were doing a very good job of keeping that kind of thing under control."

After Mr. King had discussed the "family film problem" with a State senator and the Southtown district attorney, Mr. King became convinced that "the course of action was clear." He felt that it would be necessary to demonstrate community support for legislative change pertinent to the commercial and public showing of films. Mr. King was intent upon determining the best way to indicate community support for and enactment of legislative change. (Since Southtown was the State capital, Mr. King decided to mobilize for changes in the State, rather than merely the city, statutes.)

He immediately informed his colleagues that "picketing, boycotting, or any other forms of militancy" would not "get the job done." He felt that such activity would merely crystallize the opposition, and serve to label the decency endeavors as "lunatic fringe" activities. In contrast with the tactics of the ICCD in Midville, the approach of Mr. King and his colleagues was far more controlled.

Although Upsurge for Decency was to be concerned with the broader issue of pornography and obscenity (rather than just the availability of "family film entertainment"), the ultimate goal sought by Mr. King and his cohorts was narrowly defined as legislative change, attained by means that were "orderly, rational, to the point, and by all means legal." Mr. King felt that anything less would "defeat our own purpose, and probably get a lot of sympathy and support for the film industry. The real issue would get lost."

In contrast to the strategies utilized in Midville, Mr. King specifically stated his intent to avoid any "constitutional problems" and "undue pressures on legitimate businesses." The intent from the outset was not (as in Midville) to close down businesses dealing in "questionable" materials, but rather to influence modification of the content of materials presented for sale or viewing in an orderly, legal fashion.

Mr. King hoped to avoid allowing the means of the citizen "mobilization for action" from becoming ends in themselves. He wanted brief and final action to rectify the film situation, and expressed the hope that "nobody would make a

career out of it." Again, this point of view contrasts with that of the Midville leaders, who actually incorporated their ad hoc antipornography organization, thus explicitly indicating that they were seeking organizational permanence.

In order to determine concretely whether or not there was any basis for an ad hoc antipornography organization in Southtown, Mr. King and his Knights of Columbus colleagues organized an "experimental" public meeting to discuss the topic of "family entertainment" in Southtown. Shortly before the meeting was held, the police had reacted to the "precipitating factor" of "nudity" on the university campus, and had arrested individuals connected with the management of Southtown's two "skin flick" theaters. Mr. King and his colleagues deliberately stayed in the background during these activities and disclaimed any direct association with them. This was consistent with Mr. King's insistence that he and his colleagues not call public attention to their activities "until the right time." The actual involvement of Mr. King and his colleagues in instigating the police action on the university campus and with regard to the two "skin flicks" is problematical. No direct connection could be established by the research staff, but in all probability Mr. King's visit with the district attorney lent at least moral support to subsequent police action.

The "experimental" public meeting resulted in the effective drive of some Southtown citizens for the development of an ad hoc antipornography organization. The discussions at that meeting escalated to a higher level of abstraction: problems of pornography and obscenity in general and the specific labeling of the two "skin flick" theaters as the "enemy." Several State and local political and law enforcement officials contributed to the emergence of an ad hoc antipornography organization by telling the audience of the necessity for citizen support for legislative change with regard to "filthy films."

At the "experimental" public meeting, the participants had decided that a "massive rally" might be an effective method of showing legislators that the community was concerned about the problem of "filthy films." At subsequent small meetings of the leaders of the emerging ad hoc antipornography organization which would plan and implement the rally, Mr. King established the formalized aspects of the organization.

He made telephone and personal contact with representatives of approximately 20 community organizations, began to formulate an organization of organizations, and established a "steering committee," consisting of six subcommittees, all of which would be chaired by active Knights of Columbus members. The six subcommittees were to be: Publicity, Legal, Speakers, Security, Program, and Coordinating. It is interesting to note that considerable expertise was brought to bear through subcommittee chairmanships. The Publicity Committee was headed by an experienced public relations man. The Legal Committee was chaired by a judge. All of the leaders were individuals who had been active in the Knights of Columbus and other voluntary community associations, and therefore had considerable experience in organizing community endeavors of various sorts. Mr. King, who was chairman of the subcommittees, wanted to be certain that preparation for the rally (the method for demonstrating community support toward legislative change) was carefully planned and executed.

In addition to several committee meetings, Mr. King and his colleagues conducted several public meetings, during which representatives from various

other community associations met and discussed plans for the rally. During one of these open meetings, the organization was formalized and named Upsurge for Decency.

Throughout the open meetings during which preparations were being made for the Upsurge for Decency rally, Mr. King continually demonstrated a willingness to share responsibility with other community leaders (mostly church group leaders) for the ad hoc antipornography organization.

Numerous compromises were effected, allowing representatives of the 29 community organizations which ultimately participated to have some effective say in rally preparations. For example, rather than insisting that the petition for legislative change format prepared by one of the cadre members be used for the rally, Mr. King established a committee of individuals who had various suggestions about petitions, and a compromise format resulted.

Mr. King was unyielding, however, in his task orientation. He straightforwardly refused to let Upsurge for Decency participants escalate or broaden either the goals or the "mobilization for action" tactics of the organization. When one representative called for more "direct action" in the form of a public march, and for the involvement of more "young people," Mr. King quietly discouraged him. Mr. King wished to avoid such events, and wanted the rally to be attended primarily by adult voters who could sign politically meaningful petitions.

When another representative wanted to include "the problem of drugs" at the rally, Mr. King advised that they concentrate only upon the issues of "obscene movies and printed matter." He agreed with suggestions that it would be appropriate to write letters to legislators, to phone friends, relatives, and acquaintances and involve them in the rally, and to enlist the support of local media (so long as the presentation of plans of the ad hoc antipornography organization was "phased," so that the organization would not "peak too early").

In contrast to Midville's ICCD, Mr. King earnestly discouraged the recommendation of one Upsurge for Decency participant who suggested the "purchase-complaint-arrest" strategy utilized to such a great extent in Midville. The participant explained how that strategy had resulted in the arrest of some retailers in San Lorenzo, another town in the State. Mr. King repeated his concern about the constitutionality of such actions; he wanted to be very careful not to interfere with the rights of legitimate businesses.

Mr. King occasionally had difficulty "keeping people locked in on just the issue of pornography and obscenity." He actually yielded somewhat in allowing the issue to go beyond "family film entertainment" and become concerned with the local "skin flicks" and "questionable" printed matter. At the meetings, he would also allow latitude for the expression of value and life style defenses at a high level of abstraction (expressed through concepts such as pro-Americanism, pro-"decency," and anti-"modernism"), but always viewed these expressions as being means toward the specific end of legislative change. He did not want the statements and expressions of the participants in the rally or the preparation meetings to become "ends in themselves." Proclamations of dissatisfaction, of the decline of morality, of threats to "basic values," would be of use, as far as Mr. King was concerned, only if they served to mobilize individuals for action which could be converted into community support for changes in antipornography statutes.

Members were recruited for participation in the ad hoc antipornography

organization by both formal and informal means. The formal method included newsletters, announcements from church pulpits, notices in the local media, flyers, and posters. Representatives of voluntary associations participating in Upsurge for Decency were formally charged with the responsibility for seeing to it that significant numbers of thier respective organizations attended the rally. Informally, an enormous complex of personal contacts were used to mobilize the ad hoc antipornography organization for action. Similarly, Mr. King and his aides had several personal contacts in the municipal and State governments, and utilized these contacts to make a functional connection between the organization's demonstration of community support for legislative change and the legislators' awareness of that demonstration.

According to Mr. King, he was primarily influenced in his organizational strategies by previous experience in community voluntary associations which were concerned with civic issues. However, an "antipornography campaign kit" prepared by the State office of the Knights of Columbus (and influenced by the Citizens for Decent Literature) was available to Mr. King. Several of the suggestions in that kit paralleled steps followed by Southtown's ad hoc antipornography organization. Mr. King did not approve of the kit in general because he felt its goals were too broad and its tactics not prudently enough directed toward legislative change. Furthermore, the kit concentrated primarily on the problem of pornographic "reading material," and made no mention of films. Mr. King also wished to avoid the kit's suggestion of citizen pressure on merchants.

The high point of Upsurge for Decency's "mobilization for action" was the public rally. Mr. King, his aides, and the representatives of the 29 cooperating community voluntary associations had carefully planned, publicized, and implemented the rally, which was attended by approximately 2,500 Southtowners. The speakers at the rally oriented their presentations at the very highest level of abstraction, citing the general decline of American morality, the threats of "modernists" and "liberals" to "basic values," and virtually all of the defenses against threats to accustomed style of life discussed by Gusfield and in the section *Growth and Spread of Generalized Beliefs.* The theme of the rally was patriotic, religious, and urgent. The speakers, color guard, national anthem, pledge of allegiance, and invocation all dramatically represented a public statement of dedication to fundamental American values and attendant life styles. The rally was an orgy of symbolism, in the sense that Gusfield defines symbolism as a means whereby status discontents enhance their threatened prestige in the social system.

To Mr. King, however, the speeches and the other trappings of the rally were secondary. What was important to him and to others of the Upsurge for Decency cadre was that nearly 1,500 voting adults had signed a petition calling for the improvement of State laws concerning pornography and obscenity. Five thousand postcards had been received by members of the audience and presumably mailed to Jack Valenti, President of the Motion Picture Association, supporting industry production of more films suitable for family attendance.

After the rally, Mr. King and some of his colleagues took the petitions directly to State legislators who were supporing revised antipornography bills. Furthermore, Mr. King and the cadre maintained constant contact with those legislators,

by phone and in person, and attended legislative hearings relevant to the preparation of revised antipornography bills.

Rapidly, two bills revising different components of the State antipornography statute successfully passed through the elaborate legislative process and were enacted by the governor. Mr. King felt strongly that they were "their bills," and that Upsurge for Decency in effect "wrote those bills and got them through."

As soon as the bills were well into the legislative process (shortly after the completion of the Upsurge for Decency rally) Southtown's ad hoc antipornography organization essentially disbanded. A few of the members, as mentioned above, continued to "ride herd" on the antipornography bills, but apparently none of the members, least of all Mr. King, felt that there was any need to perpetuate the organization.

Under the task-oriented leadership of Mr. King and his colleagues, the "mobilization for action" of the ad hoc antipornography organization accomplished its purpose. Within five months, the concerned Southtowners had developed the structure of an ad hoc antipornography organization, mobilized a significant segment of the city's population in support of its stated goals, actively involved several influential politicians, and influenced a change in the State laws concerning pornography and obscenity. The antipornography organization was comprised of 29 participating community groups, many of which (especially some of the church groups) most likely would not have cooperated as closely or warmly under other conditions. The task-orientation, pragmatism, affective neutrality, and clarity of purpose expressed by Mr. King and some of his cadre members enabled Upsurge for Decency to hold together, until the task was completed, individuals and groups with widely varying ideologies, purposes for participating, and variations in membership ages, socio-economic backgrounds, education, and predilections for strategy and tactics. Finally, when the legislative change goals were accomplished, the ad hoc organization was allowed, even encouraged, to dissolve, so that the structure would not have to be perpetuated with substitute or diluted goals.

Discussion

There were several important differences in "mobilization for action" between the two ad hoc antipornography organizations.

Unlike Midville's ICCD, Upsurge for Decency was not at all interested in national affiliation (except with the Knights of Columbus), nor did they wish to influence the development of ad hoc antipornography organizations in other communities.

ICCD's leaders were primarily representatives of religious organizations who were also associated with secular voluntary associations. Upsurge for Decency's leaders were primarily individuals in secular occupations who were associated with a voluntary religious association (Knights of Columbus). The most active members of Upsurge for Decency were male, while ICCD's most active members were female. Both the purposes and the methods of the Midville ad hoc antipornography organization were broad, and at a high level of abstraction—"to safeguard the standards of decency in the community in the field of entertainment," and "to establish a community conscience concerning decency," "through

education on the many-faceted problems of decency," "through moral persuasion for decency," and "through encouraging the legal enforcement of our present laws, and those laws which may be enacted to further decency." Essentially, these stated goals and methods provided carte blanche for both the targets and tactics of ICCD.

In contrast, the purposes of Upsurge for Decency were more modest—to inaugurate changes in state antipornography legislation. The methods to accomplish that purpose, as directed by Mr. King and the cadre (which included a judge, lawyers, publicity experts, and so on), were select, controlled, and relatively few in number. The ICCD apparently wanted to close the adult bookstore in Midville. Upsurge for Decency never expressed a desire to close the "skin flicks" or other commercial movie houses which showed X-rated films; rather, the intention was to modify the film content.

The "mobilization for action" in Southtown was not aided or escalated by a newspaper campaign or the active involvement of Citizens for Decent Literature, as it was in Midville. Consequently, far fewer individuals became actively involved in the "mobilization for action" by Upsurge for Decency than in the "mobilization for action" by ICCD.

One striking similarity between Midville and Southtown was the outcome of the endeavors of the ad hoc antipornography organizations. Midville's ICCD clearly effected many and varied legislative, organizational, institutional and personal changes, at least temporarily, within their community. Similarly, but in a different manner, Southtown's Upsurge for Decency influenced legislative, organizational, institutional, and personal changes, at least temporarily. Many of the changes effected by both organizations were dramatic, publicly proclaimed, and seized the attention of significant components of the community for some duration. However, the legislative change effected by antipornography efforts in both communities did not seem to solve the problem for which the antipornography activity was intended. The legislative changes in both communities concerned only *minors,* and scarcely, if at all, modified the adult patronage of Midville's adult bookstore, or adult attendance of the Southtown "skin flicks."

What were the accomplishments of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Southtown? Certainly, at least in Midville, there were some utilitarian gains—an "adult" theater was closed, the major local newspaper was persuaded to change its theater advertisement policy, the content of newspapers and news rack was modified, and so on. It seems, however, that perhaps the greatest gains accomplished by both Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc. and Upsurge for Decency were not utilitarian, but symbolic. By their "mobilization for action," citizens concerned with threats to their accustomed style of life, to the basic values they held dear, to the beliefs, attitudes, habits, and behaviors which they saw as "decent," were able to express their discontent and demonstrate that their way of life indeed was prestigious, dominant, and not at all powerless.

The most striking contrast of all between Midville's Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc. and Southtown's Upsurge for Decency was the style of each organization's leader—Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King, respectively. Mrs. Roberts was, of course, female and in her fifties. Mr. King was male and in his thirties. Both were practicing Catholics, but Mrs. Roberts gave the impression of

being more conservative in her religious beliefs than Mr. King. Both had previously been deeply involved in voluntary community associations, generally of a religious nature. Mrs. Roberts, for example, was associated with a number of Catholic women's organizations, and Mr. King was associated with the Knights of Columbus. Both were college graduates.

The leadership style of Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King differed sharply. Mrs. Roberts was "free-swinging," and would aggressively pursue a chosen action at any level of organization or with any individual. Consequently, some of her actions seemed to be less than cautious. Mr. King, on the other hand, consistently was controlled in his activities concerning the ad hoc antipornography organization. It seemed as though he never decided on a course of action without first exploring the implications and potential impact of that action—checking it, for example, with legal or legislative representatives. Consequently, he gave the impression of being more cautious in his leadership, although he was not considered timid. Perhaps the clearest example of the difference between the two leaders can be seen in Mrs. Roberts' involvement in the purchase-complaint-arrest strategy against the Midville adult bookstore, and her subsequently being named as a principal in the bookstore's $1 million conspiracy suit. Mr. King had counselled participants of Upsurge for Decency to avoid the purchase-complaint-arrest strategy, because of what he perceived to be the potential for constitutional and legal repercussions.

Midville's Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc. became an entity in itself and Mrs. Roberts as the leader of the organization subordinated her other activities to this. On the other hand, although Mr. King was the principal leader of Upsurge for Decency, he viewed that role as temporary, and *never* saw himself as more than an active member of the Knights of Columbus who was for the moment involved in a transitory occasion of community action.

The research staff got the impression that antipornography activity had almost become a way of life for Mrs. Roberts. The dominant role in her life, other than housewife and mother, seemed to be that of moral crusader. In contrast, the research observers concluded that for Mr. King, the role of moral crusader was ancillary to his more dominant role of active and rewarded member of the Knights of Columbus. It might be said that Mrs. Roberts, in every sense of the term, was a moral crusader. Mr. King, on the other hand, was a moral entrepreneur. It often seemed that Mr. King had been instrumental in the development of the ad hoc antipornography organization primarily because he felt that his role as chairman of the Community Action Committee of the Knights of Columbus called for it.

The research staff came to respect both Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King. Seldom have they encountered individuals so unselfishly dedicated, so assiduous, and so intent upon making their actions reflect what they believed to be true, right, and decent. Furthermore, members of the research staff could not but be impressed by the scope, intensity, and accomplishments (even if primarily symbolic, according to our interpretation) of the ad hoc antipornography organizations for which Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King were primarily responsible.

In his discussion of the mobilization of a norm-oriented movement for action, Smelser (1962, p. 246) quotes Schlesinger (1950, p. 52), who cites several steps operationalized during the "mobilization for action." The first step is for the

movement to choose an "imposing" title for the organization. Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc. and Upsurge for Decency both met this requirement. The term "decency," symbolically pregnant, was central to the names of both organizations.

Second, it is important for the organization to obtain a list of respectable names as members and patrons. ICCD's cadre included some of the most respectable names in Midville, and Mrs. Roberts subsequently cited influential members and/or contacts as being associated with the antipornography effort. Similarly, Upsurge for Decency, at least at the rally stage, included a roster of prominent Southtowners, all of whom manifested respectability by ordination or election.

Third, it is necessary for the movement to acquire the services of a secretary and an adequate core of assistants. Both ICCD and Upsurge for Decency were able to draw upon their own voluntary membership for a considerable amount of organizational expertise.

Fourth, a band of popular lecturers must be commissioned, and set forth as agents on the wide public. ICCD utilized popular local speakers, and imported Raymond Gauer of the Citizens for Decent Literature. The speakers at the Upsurge for Decency rally were selected for their known popularity as lecturers.

Fifth, the press must be put into operation. In Midville, the operation of the press in support of the ad hoc antipornography organization was enormous, serving significantly to escalate that organization's "mobilization for action" and community involvement. In Southtown, the press was also utilized, but only in a carefully phased and relatively small publicity campaign to make the community aware of the forthcoming antipornography rally.

Smelser (1962, p. 299) points out that if the beliefs attendant to a norm-oriented movement are broad or abstract enough to involve a sweeping selection of grievances, the movement probably will attract a large heterogeneous membership. He specifically cites "Americanism" as being a vague and inclusive symbol which can incorporate the valued feelings of a wide variety of participants. Both ICCD and Upsurge for Decency provided a platform of such beliefs, including "Americanism," "basic values," "decency," and so on, which were broad and abstract enough to attract and at least temporarily hold together in an ad hoc antipornography effort individuals whose points of view encompassed a fairly wide spectrum. Smelser (1962, p. 301) further indicates that norm-oriented movements that have such abstract and general symbols tend to display three central characteristics: "a. diversity of motivation and grievances among the participants; b. a period of very rapid growth and a period of equally rapid decline; c. a fluid association among the strands of the same general movement, strands which continuously flow into one another, break off again, then join in some other guise."

As mentioned above, the research staff concluded, on the basis of observation and informal interviews with participants, that there was indeed a diversity of motivation and grievances among the participants of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in both Midville and Southtown. Southtown's Upsurge for Decency demonstrated a period of very rapid growth and a period of equally rapid decline. Midville's ICCD, however, evolved over nearly a decade, and is currently more firmly institutionalized than Upsurge for Decency. There was little opportunity to

observe such a growth in Upsurge for Decency, since the entire history of the organization covered a period of only five months from start to finish. On the other hand, ICCD, with its longer history of evolution and maintenance, did give evidence, from documents and participants' statements, of modification of membership content over time.

Norm-oriented movements, according to Smelser, usually have access to a selection of tactics for action. He (1962, p. 302) suggests that the history of any norm-oriented movement can be described as a pattern of discarding any tactic which appears to be becoming ineffective and inaugurating some new method which is perceived to have greater potential. Southtown's Upsurge for Decency, under the control of a task-oriented leader and existing only for a short period of time, did not manifest this pattern of abandonment and adaptation, because the first set of tactics accomplished the desired end. ICCD, on the other hand, seems to have passed through a variety of strategies and tactics in pursuit of establishing or maintaining "decency."

Smelser makes an important point when he suggests that norm-oriented movements with elaborate sets of "generalized beliefs" are never able to satisfy the demands of all of those beliefs. The more successful movement, according to Smelser (1962, p. 305), focuses on a specific component of reform, and pushes it until the normative change has been won. This seems to be a crucial difference between Midville's ICCD and Southtown's Upsurge for Decency. ICCD appeared to have an extremely elaborate set of "generalized beliefs" which were maintained as ends in themselves throughout the history of that organization. Southtown's Upsurge for Decency, on the other hand, although it utilized "generalized beliefs" to recruit participants for "mobilization for action," seemed to consider the "generalized beliefs" as means to an end, rather than ends in themselves. Smelser indicates that the norm-oriented movement which operates under a complex system of "generalized beliefs" continues to stay alive for long periods in an attempt to satisfy other belief components. This characteristic may in part account for the fact that ICCD has been perpetuated for nearly a decade, while Upsurge for Decency, having accomplished its norm-oriented task of legislative change, summarily ceased to exist.

Gusfield (1963, pp. 1-10) distinguishes between assimilative and coercive reform. In assimilative reform, the crusader looks upon the individual who deviates from his style of life warmly, with compassion, and as though the deviant has been led astray through no fault of his own. The intent of assimilative reform is to attempt to convince the deviant to modify his errant ways and conform to the dominant style of life as perceived by the crusader. Coercive reform, by contrast, results when the crusader is confronted with the unwillingness of the deviant to conform to his life style, or when the crusader is threatened by the increasing strength of institutions and groups whose interests and ideals differ from his own (Gusfield, 1963, p. 110). More often than not, coercive reform, which sees the crusader and the deviant as sharply separate from each other (Gusfield, 1963, p. 88), means that the issue of social dominance will be established through political measures. A typical example is the passing of legislation which restricts the activities of the deviants, or at least symbolically indicates that their behavior is in disfavor and less prestigious than that of the crusader (Gusfield, 1963, p. 70). Gusfield (1963, p. 86) points out that the

demand for temperance legislation was evidence of the crusaders' perception that other social systems, such as the schools, could not be depended upon to complete the process of socializing children to total abstinence as the moral code of the dominant segment of the society.

Both the Midville and the Southtown ad hoc antipornography organizations, or rather the leaders and prototypical forms of those organizations, had early experience which manifested attempts at assimilative reform concerning the issue of pornography. Both Mrs. Roberts and Mr. King had attempted assimilative reform at some stage at the beginning of their antipornography activities by seeking voluntary compliance of businessmen to arbitrary standards of "decent" publications and/or films. Both leaders had some success in these endeavors, but later attempts seemed less effective. Furthermore, Mrs. Roberts, Mr. King, and their colleagues believed that the Supreme Court had removed the sanctions that the assimilative reformer could bring to bear upon the retailer and the user, and had rendered the legal and law enforcing institutions essentially powerless to control the distribution of "indecent" materials.

The above sections on "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," and "generalized belief" have suggested that among both Midvillians and Southtowners there existed a significant number of individuals who believed that there was a threatening polarization between their traditional style of life and a challenging, "modernist" style of life. The shift from assimilative reform to coercive reform should not, given these factors, have been surprising.

In both Midville and Southtown the pressures for law enforcement and the "toughening" of standing laws was intense. Raymond P. Gauer, the executive director of the Citizens for Decent Literature, in one of his typical speeches (distributed in mimeograph) straightforwardly suggested that assimilative reform was passé, that only coercive reform could work. He stated, straightforwardly, "One thing that doesn't work is to go around and talk to the guys in the community selling this kind of stuff and say, 'How about being a nice guy and get rid of your dirty books'." Coercive and not assimilative reform was the hallmark of "mobilization for action" in both the Midville and Southtown ad hoc antipornography organizations.

Gusfield (1963, p. 120) observes that the power of the antisaloon league, a central moral crusading organization of the temperance movement, was sometimes astounding. He is referring primarily to the antisaloon league's ability to pressure the passing of national legislation, and their control over local and state elections. The ICCD and Upsurge for Decency certainly did not have the power of the antisaloon league, but their ability to implement changes, whether primarily utilitarian or symbolic in impact, greatly impressed the research staff. The "mobilization for action" by these two organizations, insofar as it involved influential community leaders, politicians at various levels of government, educators, health officials, clergy from diverse religious denominations, representatives from a wide array of community voluntary associations, local press, radio and television, and significant numbers of community citizens, was indeed awesome.

> In certain respects this final determinant arches over all the others. Stated in the simplest way, the study of social control is the study of those counter-determinants which prevent, interpret, deflect, or inhibit the accumulation of the determinants just reviewed. For purposes of analysis it is convenient to divide social controls into two broad groups: A. Those social controls which minimize conduciveness in strain. In a broad sense these controls *prevent* the occurrence of an episode of collective behavior, because they attack very non-specific determinants. B. Those social controls which are mobilized only *after* a collective episode has begun to materialize. These determine how fast, how far, and in what directions the episode will develop. To assess the effectiveness of the second kind of controls, we shall ask how the appropriate agencies of control—the police, the courts, the press, the religious authorities, the community leaders, etc.—behave in the face of a potential or actual outburst of collective behavior. Do they adopt a rigid, uncompromising attitude? Do they vacillate? Do they themselves take sides in the disturbance? (Smelser, 1962, p. 17)

Midville

The major point concerning those components of "social control" which impinged upon the development of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization and the tactics it employed, is that, in fact, there were very few such components, at least initially. There were not many significant individuals, events, or situations which effectively opposed or mitigated the activities of ICCD. Those components of "social control" which did exist did not constrict collective behavior.

Within the ad hoc antipornography organization itself, one form of "social control" was operating at least some of the time. Mrs. Roberts, Mrs. Nelson and others of the cadre were concerned about being stereotyped as "little old ladies in tennis shoes." They did not want to be labeled as cranks, censors, or members of the lunatic fringe. Therefore, to some extent, the antipornography actions of the organization were restricted or contained in order to avoid such labeling. This form of "social control" operated only part of the time, because the moral crusaders occasionally interpreted such pejorative labeling to emanate from the "deviants" they opposed, and to be first-order evidence that their antipornography activities were indeed effective. Similarly, on some occasions the moral crusaders identified verbal abuse as part of the role of any righteous activist: "we wear those titles proudly as Christ wore his crown of thorns."

The interpretations of the Supreme Court on pornography and obscenity served as a component of "social control," and perhaps to some degree mitigated antipornography activity in Midville. The "perhaps" is intentional. Although the Supreme Court's mandate to protect the rights of free press and individual liberty encouraged some of the respondents to be more cautious in their actions, and although Midvillian judges drew upon Supreme Court interpretations to dismiss pornography charges against employees of the adult bookstore, such legal-social controls ultimately became ineffective when the purchase-complaint-arrest strategy

was inaugurated by ICCD as symbolic protest and a method of "wearing down" the bookstore owners.

Bookstore customers, numbers of students, some liberal theologians, and members of such organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union represented opposition to ICCD. However, that opposition was seldom publicly expressed. The organization associated its antipornography endeavors with such glittering generalities as patriotism, Americanism, decency, and religiousness. Disagreement with the purposes, and perhaps even the methods, of an ad hoc antipornography organization implied disagreement with nearly every traditional and sacred "basic value" in the society.

The *Midville News* initially served as an agent of "social control." During the prototypical stages of ICCD, the newspaper staff did not pay much attention to Mrs. Roberts and the emerging cadre of the ad hoc antipornography organization. The staff felt that the moral crusaders were concerned with relatively inconsequential issues such as girlie magazines and rather innocuous "risque'" published materials. When the newspaper staff, and particularly the editor, actually saw an example of the materials for sale at the adult bookstore (which were provided by Mrs. Roberts and Mrs. Nelson), the reaction of the *Midville News* was swift and sweeping. In an editorial, the *News* reported:

> Our first "mental" decision was an unwritten apology to those citizens who had been "pestering" us to do something about that bookstore. We had, subconsciously perhaps, written them off as "busybodies" and "do-gooders"—a bunch of women who didn't have anything better to do with their time. For even having thought of that, after seeing the type of material the adult bookstore dealt in—we were ashamed . . .

As a result of that "precipitating factor," the *Midville News* changed its cause. It was no longer an agent of "social control" impinging upon the ad hoc antipornography organization; it became a significant catalyst which considerably escalated ICCD activities and appeal throughout the community.

Interestingly, the *Midville News* itself felt some "social control" pressures from individuals in the community who disagreed with the newspaper's attack on the adult bookstore, or with the content of the attack. A flood of letters to the editor came to the *Midville News,* some of which protested the language and imagery used in describing the adult bookstore and some of which protested the "persecution" of the bookstore. Following the bookstore series, 62 persons cancelled their subscriptions. Those letters to the editor and subscription cancellations, which amounted to a form of "social control," resulted in the cancellation of the last of a series of four articles on the adult bookstore which had been scheduled to appear in the *Midville News.* For the most part, however, the community response to the *Midville News* concerning the reports on the adult bookstore was favorable, and interpreted by the active participants in ICCD to be part of a mandate to escalate antipornography activities.

Following the *Midville News* articles and editorials on the adult bookstore and the escalation of ICCD activity, there were a few sporadic and relatively ineffective manifestations of opposition. A member of the ACLU engaged in public debate with one of the staff editors of the *Midville News,* and a Midville city councilman publicly expressed his discomfort with the tactics of ICCD

against the adult bookstore and was chastised in the *Midville News.*

Apparently, the City Council as a group was somewhat hesitant to become actively engaged in the escalation of ICCD endeavors or at least members of ICCD felt that the councilmen were dragging their feet. What degree of inaction there was on the part of the Midville City Council served, to some extent, as a component of "social control" affecting ICCD.

A few college students took it upon themselves to picket the *Midville News* for what they perceived to be its "vigilante" performance against the adult bookstore. Although their action might have amounted to some sort of "social control," "that type of student" was perceived by the moral crusaders to be part of their opposition from the onset.

When modifications in the State antipornography statute (which were influenced by ICCD) were being considered by the legislature, representatives of the ACLU went on record as opposing the changes—an action which may be interpreted as a form of attempted "social control."

Essentially, therefore, there were very few efforts toward and little effective use of "social control" against the ad hoc antipornography organization by the citizens of Midville, or by any of Midville's established social institutions or voluntary associations. To the contrary, ICCD's activities were supported, either overtly, tacitly, or through indifference, by law enforcement agencies, the educational system, religious institutions, the media, most local government officials, representatives of the legislature, and nationally by public officials and organizations such as the Citizens for Decent Literature.

In effect, the only salient "social control" accomplished against ICCD was inaugurated and maintained by the adult bookstore itself—its $1 million lawsuit against key individuals and groups associated with the ad hoc antipornography organization. The lawsuit served to curtail at least some of the activities of ICCD, and brought one community institution, the legal system, to bear as an effective "social control" mechanism.

Southtown

It was the research staff's clear and unanimous impression that considerably more elements of "social control" were present in Southtown and affected Upsurge for Decency. Perhaps the most effective "social control" element was the principal leader of Upsurge for Decency himself, Mr. King. He was a pragmatic, task-oriented, and "cautious" leader, who was able to maintain, with the cooperation and support of the cadre, a relatively firm guiding hand over the strategy and tactics of Upsurge for Decency. Throughout the existence of the organization, Mr. King effectively prevented the escalation of antipornography activities above or beyond what he considered to be the rational, orderly pursuit of legislative change. Furthermore, he surrounded himself with a group whose expertise served as effective elements of "social control"—for example, judges and lawyers who could counsel Upsurge for Decency on what areas to avoid from a constitutional or legally vulnerable perspective; public relations experts who could steer the ad hoc antipornography organization clear of inopportune or ill-timed publicity, and so on.

The presence of a major State university with a liberal enclave in Southtown

was not an ineffective aspect of "social control." On more than one occasion, members of Upsurge for Decency structured their strategy so as not to "arouse the opposition on the campus."

Similarly, the presence of the State legislature and various representatives of Federal and State government in Southtown, the State capital, created a climate that was quite supportive of legally oriented citizen behavior. This, too, was an element of "social control."

In addition to the concern about possible reactions from within the university community to ad hoc antipornography efforts, a few Upsurge for Decency members, including some of the leaders, were worried about the possibility of retaliation from the movie industry, and from "hippies" in general. Anxiety about such retaliation worked as a "social control," assuring care (that is, adherence to legal and noninflammatory procedures) on the part of Upsurge for Decency.

The Knights of Columbus are not known, and do not seek to be labeled, as a militant organization. Mr. King, as an officer of the Knights of Columbus, did not wish to provide any opportunity for such labeling or stereotyping. He did not want himself or any of his colleagues to be known as censors, radical rightists, or wild-eyed reformers. The gentlemanly and religious demeanor of the Knights of Columbus was not to be jeopardized by the antipornography tactics. Mr. King's social role as a Knight, and as a businessman dependent upon community respect, was identical to and protective of that demeanor.

An occasional letter to the editor of one of Southtown's major newspapers or an editorial in Southtown's underground newspaper would criticize Upsurge for Decency and specifically the rally that was held as part of the antipornography activity. These letters served to remind the leadership of Upsurge for Decency that there was the possibility of opposition crystallizing against them.

The Southtown ACLU observed the activities of Upsurge for Decency, and this also served as a measure of "social control," again with regard to the kinds of antipornography tactics utilized.

The leadership of Upsurge for Decency had another reminder of the necessity for constant evaluation of their goals and methods. On three different occasions, a group which had chosen to affiliate with Upsurge for Decency decided to disassociate themselves because of some disagreement over goals and/or methods. If the disenchanted group had argued that Upsurge for Decency's goals or methods were not clear enough, Mr. King would reconsider the organizational style. If, on the other hand, a group pulled out of the organization because it felt the tactics employed were too "conservative," Mr. King was unmoved; if anything, he was convinced that the "social control" he was exerting upon the direction of the organization was effective.

Upsurge for Decency received a good deal of community support (and release from some agents of "social control") from various social, formal, and voluntary associations. The organization had overt support from several important members of the State legislature and the municipal government. Law enforcement and religious institutions supported and cooperated with Upsurge for Decency. The two major Southtown newspapers and the local radio and television stations cooperated with the efforts of Mr. King, the leaders, and the other members of the ad hoc antipornography organization. Importantly, however, the Southtown newspapers did not, as did the *Midville News,* take an active and precipitating role

in the community's antipornography crusade.

In summary, several components of "social control" impinged upon Southtown's Upsurge for Decency. Some of these were external to the organization, and from without influenced the formulation of Upsurge for Decency's goals and methods. The most salient element of "social control" working to shape the style of the organization was, however, within that organization—the leadership of Mr. King. In the opinion of the research staff, Mr. King, as the principal leader of Upsurge for Decency, exerted significantly more specific "social control" than did Mrs. Roberts, the principal leader of ICCD. Furthermore, with the exception of the eventual $1 million lawsuit against ICCD, there was greater overall community support for Midville's ad hoc pornography organization than for Southtown's. The relative difference in the existence of these "social controls" contributed importantly, we suggest, to the differing scope, intensity, and styles of the two moral crusades.

Discussion

Smelser (1962, p. 306) notes that the "general encouragement of the norm-oriented movement by political authorities—whether or not the authorities approve its specific proposals—usually boosts and consolidates the movement." The ad hoc antipornography organizations in both Midville and Southtown clearly had the *general* encouragement of several significant political authorities. Smelser (1962, pp. 309-310) further indicates that agencies of "social control" can escalate the activities of a norm-oriented movement considerably by openly taking sides with the crusaders. Such events in Midville as the mayor's proclamation for "Action for Decency Day," and the *Midville News's* anti-adult bookstore series, were manifestations of such "side-taking," to a degree that did not exist in Southtown.

From Gusfield's (1963, pp. 32-35) point of view, a crucial aspect of the relation of "social control" to the emergence and style of collective behavior would be the crusaders' perception of their influence over institutional constraints on behavior, over the components of "social control" themselves. That is, do the potential crusaders feel that their life style is effectively protected and valued by individuals and agencies who have the potential or responsibility for "social control" over "deviants?" Further, do the potential crusaders feel that they have the opportunity to exert their will upon or express their discontent with other persons or groups who overtly and threateningly deviate from that predominantly accepted and rewarded style of life?

In Midville, and less in Southtown, many citizens, particularly those who participated in the ad hoc antipornography organization, had pressing concerns regarding the efficacy of local agencies of "social control" to safeguard their style of life. That concern became focused upon and symbolically intertwined with the issue of pornography as it was perceived to exist in the community.

In Midville, and less in Southtown, the respondents feared that Supreme Court decisions had rendered the legal institution, a key agency of "social control," ineffective in restraining the commercial presence of pornographic material. This called for community action. It was the responsibility of "decent" citizens, who were in the majority and were manifesting the "proper" style of life, to take steps

to guarantee that the "basic values" and typical behaviors of decent citizens continue to be rewarded, and that the "deviants" continue to be punished.

Midvillians, however, as compared with Southtowners (certainly as the result of differences in leadership, and in the intensity of "structural strain," "generalized beliefs," and "precipitating factors," and presence of effective elements of "social control" as described above) felt the need more urgently and forcefully to stimulate and augment the local law enforcement agents of "social control."

Gusfield describes some of the self-imposed limitations upon temperance crusaders in their pursuit of prohibition. They did not want their behavior to be volatile to the point of encouraging a "backlash" from organized opposition. Furthermore, they did not want their legislative actions to have unwanted side effects—for example, the increasing of taxes—which would put them in national disfavor. Lastly, Gusfield (1963, p. 121) mentions the constraining impact of the philosophical position held by the temperance crusaders that "righteousness" really should not need much enforcing. The Southtown participants in their ad hoc antipornography organization clearly were more concerned about such "side effects" of their action than were their counterparts in Midville.

Gusfield (1963, p. 129) also notes that the temperance crusaders hoped to avoid being stereotyped as "queers," "old fogies," "frowzy fanatics," or other such types, and sometimes modified their behavior accordingly. This anxiety existed in both Midville and Southtown, but in Midville was somewhat neutralized by the counter-interpretation that crusaders who were pejoratively labeled were simply inheriting the abuse normally associated with righteousness in the face of powerful evil.

The operation of "social control," the last value-added stage toward collective behavior postulated by Smelser, was indeed influential in the shaping and style of activity performed by the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Southtown. Specifically, the greater overall degree of "social control" impinging upon Southtown's Upsurge for Decency combined with relatively less "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," abstractness and volatility of "generalized beliefs," and impact of "precipitating factors," to produce a more orderly, cautious, and limited norm-oriented movement than Midville's Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc.

CONCLUSION

This report has reviewed the natural histories of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Southtown and demonstrated that in both cases the criteria for each of Smelser's value-added stages were met. The conditions, situations, events, and individuals contributing to the satisfaction of those criteria and consequently influencing and shaping the emergence of collective behavior, specifically a norm-oriented social movement, have been described.

The comparison of the criteria for the value-added stages as met in Midville and Southtown yielded some striking similarities and differences. In general, both communities show similarities in manifestations of "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," "generalized beliefs," and "precipitating factors," although in Midville the manifestations defining the four value-added stages were significantly more intense than in Southtown. The "mobilization for action" in Midville,

however, was quite different from that in Southtown. The goals of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization were more abstract, more vague, than the goals of Upsurge for Decency. Midville's strategies and tactics for antipornography action were more diverse, less restricted, and less controlled than those in Southtown. ICCD involved by far a larger and broader segment of the community population than did Southtown's ad hoc antipornography organization. To some extent these differences were due to the greater intensity of "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," "generalized beliefs," and "precipitating factors" in Midville.

However, a significant influence upon the differences in Midville's and Southtown's antipornography "mobilization for action" was the quality of leadership in the two ad hoc antipornography organizations. The leader of Southtown's antipornography organization was extremely task-oriented, insisted upon the pursuit of only a few clearly defined and reachable goals, eschewed the use of emotional appeals or tactics unless they served or somehow enhanced the accomplishment of the organization's concrete goals, and carefully checked the potential impact of his organizational decisions with qualified advisors before he took steps to implement those decisions.

The principal leader of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization, in contrast, was less oriented toward the accomplishment of specific tasks, limited neither organizational goals nor strategies, sometimes conducted or supported emotional appeals or tactics as ends in themselves, and was less careful in checking with advisors concerning the range of impact her organizational decisions might have.

Mrs. Roberts seemed totally involved in that leadership role—a role which seemed to dominate all others. Mr. King viewed his leadership role as secondary to, and part of, a broader set of responsibilities encompassed in the role as an active and rewarded member in an established community voluntary association. For that reason, Midville's leader has been characterized as a moral crusader, and Southtown's leader as a moral entrepreneur.

Differences in the kinds of "social controls" impinging upon the ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville and Southtown were as important in shaping the emergence and operations of those organizations as were the contrasting leadership styles. To some extent the differences in leadership styles themselves acted as a form of "social control." Beyond that, however, there were important "social control" differences. In general, the support of traditional social control agencies (i.e., police, media, educational systems, local government, etc.) was stronger in Midville than in Southtown. Furthermore, there were far fewer manifestations of opposition to the ad hoc antipornography organization in Midville than in Southtown.

In summary, then, the emergence of ad hoc antipornography organizations in any community seems to depend upon the existence of significant elements of "structural conduciveness," "structural strain," "generalized beliefs," and "precipitating factors," and the potential for mobilizing the participants for antipornography action. If the criteria for those value-added stages are satisfied, it can be predicted that ad hoc antipornography organizations will emerge. The intensity of their activities will be related to the intensity of the value-added stages, and the degree to which those activities will vary or escalate will be dependent upon the

kinds of "social control" within the community and within the organization itself.

What are some of the characteristics, as evidenced by criteria for satisfaction of the value-added stages, which contribute importantly to the potential emergence of an ad hoc antipornography organization? Some of those characteristics as they existed in both Midville and Southtown can be listed with confidence. With less confidence it can be suggested that the same characteristics exist in other communities where ad hoc antipornography organizations are active. This list of characteristics will be brief and somewhat sketchy, and the reader is reminded that these and other characteristics are discussed in considerable detail throughout this report.

The community in which an ad hoc antipornography organization is likely to emerge is small, probably with a population of less than 250,000 (although it is possible that such an organization could emerge in a large city, if that city contained a significantly delimited and appropriate subpopulation). The community would most likely have a relatively recent frontier history, reflect a general religious orientation (preferably fundamentalist), and be essentially politically conservative. Rurality rather than urbanity would be the mode, although there would be significant pressures toward increasing urbanization. The amount of social stratification, especially by level of education, would be relatively small.

The general population would be middle-class, relatively "traditional," and would be experiencing threats to the maintenance or prestige of that "traditional" style of life. The community would contain individuals who have in general been involved in some sort of "decency" activity or who have been active in some type of religiously or patriotically oriented voluntary association. That leadership would be able to establish and draw upon a small cadre of supporters who are both influential in the community and are able to supply various kinds of organizational expertise. Some kind of commercial enterprise whose product can be defined as "pornographic" or "obscene" would be present and apparent in the community. The standing laws which impinge upon the commercial availability of that product would be relatively ineffective. Finally, the legitimized and firmly institutionalized social control agencies within the community would not be prone to interfere with the emergence of an ad hoc antipornography organization.

There are many other characteristics which might escalate the activities or encourage the diversity of the tactics of the ad hoc antipornography organization—factors such as a prior history of political activism, severity of economic fluctuations within the community, access to the expertise of national ad hoc antipornography endeavors, the reactions of the businesses which are antipornography targets, and so on.

The most important factors in the escalation and diversification of activities are the leadership style and the elements of "social control" impinging upon the ad hoc antipornography organization.

These characteristics primarily fall within the value-added stages of "structural conduciveness" and "structural strain." The community in which an ad hoc antipornography organization is likely to emerge must also have the formal and informal communication network which can provide for the growth and spread of a "generalized belief" about the nature of the pornography problem and what can be done about it, and also must have potential for the occurrence of

"precipitating factors" which can serve as catalysts for the organization's emergence.

This report has drawn analytically from Gusfield and suggested that participants in the ad hoc antipornography organizations essentially were status discontents who were striving to protect or enhance their life styles and "basic values." Some of the community characteristics outlined support the existence of status discontents throughout the population, and represent that discontent as a specific kind of "structural strain." Status discontents, however, can exist in communities where ad hoc antipornography organizations never emerge. As a kind of "structural strain," discontent about the prestige of one's style of life is an important factor in the emergence of an ad hoc antipornography organization only when accompanied by significant components of "structural conduciveness," other aspects of "structural strain," "generalized belief," "precipitating factors," potential for "mobilization for action," and the appropriate laxity of "social control."

It seems that many, if not most, of the accomplishments of the ad hoc antipornography organizations in both Midville and Southtown were symbolic rather than utilitarian. That is, to demonstrate belief in and support of a specific life style or set of "basic values," to have a large number of others join in that demonstration, and to have the demonstration recognized often seemed to be even more important than implementing restrictions which would effectively eliminate the problem of pornography as defined by the organization. If this interpretation has any validity, it suggests that a primary function of the ad hoc antipornography organization is to provide individuals whose life styles are being threatened by social change with a method of reinforcing that life style, at least for themselves, without significantly interfering with the social change processes.

This interpretation presents itself as a kind of "escape valve" hypothesis. However, when these same individuals are supported or represented by important sources of political power (for example, at the national level), or are informed that they, and the life styles they manifest, comprise society's "Silent Majority," then an antipornography endeavor may be more than an "escape valve" phenomenon. Rather, such endeavors may summate with others focused against challenges to a traditional life style, come into sweeping conflict with pressures for social change, and perhaps modify the direction and even the force of those pressures.

Antipornography activities, and the ad hoc antipornography organizations which emerged to perform those activities, cannot meaningfully be interpreted as isolated phenomena. Rather, they are part of a complex interaction among the varying societal pressures for social change and viable resistances to such change. Any decisions regarding the support or restriction of such antipornography activities, and attendant ad hoc organizations, should be considered in that broader context.

REFERENCES

Barton, A. H., & Lazarsfeld, P. L. Some functions of qualitative analysis in social research. In George J. McCall & J. L. Simmons (Eds.), *Issues in participant observation: A text and reader.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969, pp. 163-205.

Brown, R. Collective behavior and the psychology of the crowd. In Roger Brown (Ed.), *Social psychology.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1965, pp. 728-733.

Evans, R. R. *Readings in collective behavior.* Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.

Fendrich, J. M., & Pearson, M. A. Alienation and its correlates among black veterans. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, December 1959.

Gusfield, J. R. *Symbolic crusade: Status politics and the American temperance movement.* Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Gusfield, J. R. The study of social movements. *International encyclopedia of social sciences,* Vol. 14. New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1970.

Hofstadter, R. *The age of reform.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955. (a)

Hofstadter, R. The pseudo-conservative revolt. In Daniel Bell (Ed.), *The new American right.* New York: Criterion Books, 1955, pp. 33-55. (b)

Kluckhohn, C. Values and value orientations. In Talcott Parsons & Edward Shils, *Toward a general theory of action.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951, pp. 388-433.

Lang, K., & Lang, G. *Collective dynamics.* New York: Crowell, 1961.

Lipset, S. The sources of the radical right. In Daniel Bell (Ed.), *The new American right.* New York: Criterion Books, 1955, pp. 166-234.

Milgram, S., & Toch, H. Collective behavior: Crowds and social movements. In Gardner Lindzey & Elliot Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (2nd ed.), Vol. 3. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1959, pp. 555-562.

Quarantelli, E. L., & Huntley, J. R., Jr. A test of some propositions about crowd behavior. In Robert R. Evans (Ed.), *Readings in collective behavior.* Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969, pp. 538-544.

Schlesinger, A. M. *The American as reformer.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Smelser, N. J. *Theory of collective behavior.* New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Toch, H. *The social psychology of social movements.* New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.

Zurcher, L. A., & Bowman, C. K. The natural history of an ad hoc antipornography organization in Southtown, USA. Unpublished report in files of Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in U. S. Archives, 1970.

Zurcher, L. A., & Kirkpatrick, R. G. The natural history of an ad hoc antipornography organization in Midville, USA. Unpublished report in files of Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in U.S. Archives, 1970.

Participants in Ad Hoc Antipornography Organizations

Some Individual Characteristics

LOUIS A. ZURCHER
ROBERT G. CUSHING
University of Texas at Austin

FOREWORD

This document was prepared under contract with the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, Washington, D.C., W. Cody Wilson, executive director. The project director was Louis A. Zurcher. Robert G. Cushing was consultant for statistical analysis. Ronald D. Birkelbach, Linda Birkelbach, Charles K. Bowman, Mickey Courson Bowman, Adreain Ross Kirkpatrick, R. George Kirkpatrick (as research coordinator), Vicki Watkins, and Susan Lee Zurcher gathered and organized the field data in Southtown and Midville. Marilyn Bidnick, Nijole Benokraitis, Marilyn Clayton, Rosemary Cooney, and Paula Miller were on-campus research assistants. Malvern Lusky, Ralph Nemir, Janine Nussbaum, and Mark Swope assisted in data gathering during the Southtown phase of the field research.

Analysis of the data for this report was facilitated by a grant from the Hogg Foundation, University of Texas at Austin, 1970. The prototype form of the field questionnaire used in the research project was developed and pretested by project staff members with the cooperation of the Department of Sociometric Research, Tracor, Inc.

In order to protect the anonymity of respondents as much as possible, the names of persons (with the exception of a few nationally known individuals) and of locations are pseudonyms in all reports.

INTRODUCTION

Earlier research reports have described in detail the natural histories of ad hoc antipornography organizations in Midville, USA (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1970)

and Southtown, USA (Zurcher & Bowman, 1970), and the comparative collective dynamics of such organizations (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1971). This report presents and analyzes selected individual characteristics of the organizations' central participants, including demographic, political, membership (in other voluntary associations), and social-psychological characteristics; history of sex education and contact with pornography; perception of and participation in the ad hoc antipornography organizations; and perceptions and definitions of pornography and assumed correlates.

The participants' characteristics are compared with those of contrast and control groups. The contrast groups ("Proporns"), one each in Midville and Southtown, were composed of individuals who had organized at least loosely to oppose the ad hoc antipornography organization in their community. The control groups, one each in Midville and Southtown, were composed of nonparticipants drawn randomly from the same neighborhoods as the participants in the ad hoc organizations. The participants in the ad hoc organizations will be referred to as "Conporns."

Essentially, this report attempts to answer, at least partially, the question: "What kinds of people become involved in ad hoc antipornography organizations?"

Although antipornography activists have been typically labeled as "little old ladies in tennis shoes," this seems to be little more than a stereotype. Considerable evidence in the literature on other change-resisting or "rightist" action groups suggested that participants in antipornography activity might have a number of characteristics in common (Abcarian & Stanage, 1965; Apter, 1964; Bell, 1955, 1963; Gusfield, 1963; Hofstadter, 1967; Ladd, 1966; Lipset, 1955; Rohter, 1967). Consequently, several hypotheses were formed. In comparison to Proporns, it was hypothesized that Conporns would be: more often females; older; more affiliated with dogmatic religions; more religiously oriented and active; more often reared in smaller town settings; less often engaged in professional occupations; less formally educated; more family oriented; parents of more children; more politically conservative; more authoritarian; more alienated; more traditional in their view of family and heterosexual and homosexual activity; less politically tolerant; more dogmatic; more insistent upon independent training for their children; more favorable toward censorship; more willing to associate pornography with correlates of social and individual pathology; less familiar with formal sex education; and more often willing to view society as morally declining, encouraged by a conspiracy for change.

It was also hypothesized that Controls would fall somewhere between the Proporn and Conporn extremes.

PROCEDURE

The instrument

Individual characteristics of the Conporns, Proporns, and Controls were gathered by use of a structured questionnaire, assembled by the research staff. Although only one week was available for the preparation and distribution of the questionnaire, it was pretested on a small group of 30 university students, and the most apparent sources of measurement error were eliminated. The questionnnaire

was first administered in Southtown (January-February, 1969) and subsequently in Midville (June 1969). A few modifications among the questionnaire items were made in transition from Southtown to Midville, but except where noted, the questionnaires were functionally equivalent in the two cities.

In Midville and Southtown, interviews were conducted with the respondents in their homes or places of work. Whenever possible, male staff members interviewed male respondents, and female staff members interviewed female respondents. The average time for each interview was approximately one hour. Only two of the Conporns (and none of the Proporns) refused to be interviewed. However, some of the respondents chose not to answer certain items in the questionnaire which they thought too personal. Their choices were honored. The sampling response rate among the randomly selected Controls was approximately 60% in Southtown and 30% in Midville.

The items (with questionnaire number in parentheses) were categorized as follows:

Demographic characteristics:

Sex (1)
Age (2)
Religious preference (3)
Religious activity (4)
Rural-urban reared (5, 6, 6a)
Occupation (7, 8)
Hour/week work (9)
Work satisfaction (10, 11, 12)
Income (13)
Education (22)
Marital status and history (23, 23a, 23b)
  Number of children (23d)
  Spouse work (23c)
  Satisfaction with marriage (54)
  Attitudes toward children (52)

Political characteristics:

Interest and participation (14, 14a, 14b, 14c, 14d, 14e)
Political preference (15)
Political ideology (16)
Political efficacy (53)
National vote (58)
Local vote (57)

Membership characteristics in other voluntary associations:

Voluntary associations belonged to (17)
Level of participation (18, 19, 20)

Social-psychological characteristics:

Activities giving satisfaction (21)
Reading (48, 56)

Television (50)
  Hours watched (150)
Movies (55)
Alienation (24-28)
Authoritarianism (29-33)
Religiosity (34-39)
Traditional family ideology (40-44)
Political tolerance (45-47)
Alienation from mass culture (48-54)
Dogmatism (59-68)
Training for independence (69-78)
Traditional attitudes toward sexual activity (79-87)
  Traditional attitudes toward homosexuals (88-99)
  Attitude toward censorship (92-111)
  General position on censorship (127)
  Attitude toward sex in the home (112-114)

History of sex education and contact with pornography:

Self

  Sex education (119-124)
  Exposure to pornography (125)
  Parents' reaction to exposure (126)

Children

  Education in home (116-117)
  Education in school (118)

Perception of and participation in the ad hoc antipornography organizations:

  How self associated (131)
  Name of organization (132)
  Goals of organization (134)
  How goals accomplished (135)
  Attainability of goals (136)
  Perception of community support for antipornography activities (128-130)
  Future of antipornography organization (157a)
  Future of own participation in antipornography organization (157b)
  Level of participation:
    Number of meetings attended (137)
  Why joined (138)
  Offices held (139)
  Committee memberships (140)
  Attempts to proselytize (141)
  Time spent discussing the organization (142)
  Prior experience with antipornography organizations (144, 144a)
  Simultaneous memberships in other antipornography organizations (143)
  How got involved in organization (145)

Perceptions and definitions of pornography and assumed correlates:

Definition of pornography and obscenity (146)
Examples of pornography or obscenity:
Films and movies (147)
Books (148)
Magazines (149)
TV (150)
Assessment of characteristics of pornography producers (151)
Production, crime, or communist associated (152a, 152b)
Assessment of characteristics of pornography users (153)
What are effects of pornography (154)
How pornography users differ from respondent (155)
Assessment of the existence of sexual revolution (156)
How societal sexual conduct differs now from when respondent was younger (156a)
Future of pornography in the United States (157)
Is pornography a social problem (158)
Further relevant information (159)

The completed questionnaires were coded according to predetermined and empirically derived categories by a team of coders with random spot checks for reliability. The coded data were punched on IBM cards, and frequency counts derived by computer analysis. Considering the low response rate of the Control respondents (resulting from research time constrictions and lawsuit publicity), tests of statistical significance with the data were not performed. Furthermore, the reading of the Commission's specific interest in the data and the pressures of time suggested to us that intercorrelations among the variables would at this time be neither appropriate nor necessary.

The sample

The questionnaire was administered to 85 Conporns (49 in Southtown and 36 in Midville). The sample of Conporn respondents was drawn by using a "snowball" technique—that is, by reference from the members of the anti-pornography group. Since the research staff resides in Southtown, it was relatively easy to follow that ad hoc antipornography organization through its entire evolution, and consequently acquire interviews with what seemed to be the entire universe of active participants in that city. The "snowball" technique in Midville, on the other hand, was more hurriedly employed. The staff was in Midville for a total period of 17 days, many months after the organization had functionally matured. Furthermore, the organization had been sued for $1 million by a local "pornographic" bookstore, and three of the central organization participants had been named as defendants. Therefore, at least nine of the participants were lost as potential respondents—the seven defendants (who were not interviewed after staff consultation with their lawyers) and two others who were hesitant to be interviewed because of the fear of another lawsuit. Nonetheless, those Midville participants who were interviewed were indeed representative of the universe of participants and nearly exhausted that universe.

A total of 51 Proporns were interviewed (26 in Southtown and 25 in Midville),

all of whom were contacted via the "snowball" technique. This was accomplished by asking Conporn leaders in both communities to name those individuals they felt were most opposed to their antipornography activities. Individuals who had been named in the newspapers as speaking out against antipornography endeavors in their respective communities were also approached. Since the "snowball" referral process in both Midville and Southtown became circular toward the end of the interviewing period, it would seem that most of the individuals who were more or less actively engaged as Proporns were interviewed.

Since it was considered beneficial to match the Controls with the Conporns (at least roughly) in as many variables as possible, samples of potential Control respondents were drawn from the residential neighborhoods in which the Conporns lived. In Southtown, each interviewed Conporn was located on sections of the city tax maps. From all of the addresses in the limited zone of blocks surrounding each Conporn's address, a potential Control respondent and two alternates were selected by use of a table of random numbers. Similar maps were not available in Midville, so the address of each Conporn was located in the city directory, and the residence listed three spaces above the Conporn was isolated as the potential Control. The residence listed three places below was named as the Control alternate.

Letters were sent to each of the potential Control respondents briefly explaining, in general terms, the nature of the research project, and indicating that a member of the research staff would subsequently phone to establish an appointment for interview. The letter and follow-up phone call procedure was quite successful in Southtown, and interviews were completed with 38 respondents. The attempt in Midville, however, was not as successful, due to time restrictions, concern on the part of the respondents about the highly publicized lawsuit, and the interview period (the interviews were conducted over the Fourth of July weekend). As a result, the Midville Control group numbered only 12 respondents. The majority of the Conporns in Southtown were male heads of household; therefore an attempt was made to interview Controls who were also male heads of household. Most of the Midville Conporns were female, but it was impossible to approximate sex-matching in that community.

The questionnaire data is presented by categories of characteristics, and tables are used to summarize the distribution of Conporn, Proporn, and Control responses to each questionnaire item relevant to the category (Tables 1 through 94).

RESULTS

Demographic characteristics

As indicated in Table 1, most of the Southtown Conporns were male; in Midville, females slightly outnumbered males. The differing sex ratios reflected the kinds of voluntary associations which served as catalysts for the development of the ad hoc antipornography organizations. In Southtown, the catalyst was a local Knights of Columbus chapter (an all-male group). The leaders of the Southtown antipornography organization were all male; the speakers at their meetings and rallies were also all male (Zurcher & Bowman, 1970).

Table 1

Sex (Questionnaire item 1)

		Male	Female	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	38	11	49
	%	77.6	22.4	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	17	19	36
	%	47.2	52.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	21	5	26
	%	80.8	19.2	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	16	9	25
	%	64.0	36.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	32	6	38
	%	84.2	15.8	100.0
Midville Controls	N	12	0	12
	%	100.0	0.0	100.0

Catholic women's groups were the primary catalysts in stimulating the development of Midville's ad hoc antipornography organization. Consequently, most of the active leaders among the Midville Conporns were women. In contrast to Southtown, much of the active antipornography organizing in Midville was accomplished by females (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1970).

Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1971) describe the operating style of Southtown's antipornography organization as controlled, unemotional, and goal-oriented. On the other hand, the Midville antipornography organization's operating style was affective, essentially unfocused, and relatively less clear with regard to purpose. Male chauvinists may see this difference in style as reflecting the impact of male as compared with female leadership. However, the staff's observations and the collected data indicate that the antipornography leaders in Midville and Southtown had very different views of the goals and strategies of antipornography activity—differences which did not seem to be gender-related but which influenced the styles of the two antipornography organizations.

Most importantly, the data in Table 1 demonstrate that antipornography activists are not necessarily "little old ladies in tennis shoes," although it had been hypothesized that more females than males would be participants in such organizations. Antipornography organizations can, as in Southtown, be populated predominantly by males. Even in Midville, where women made up the majority of the participants, a large number of males served as active members.

Most of the Southtown and Midville Proporns were male. This in part was due to the "snowball" technique employed for gaining Proporn respondents. Those initially named by Conporns as being "opposed" to their activities were lawyers, officers of ACLU, university professors, and so on—more often than not males. Those Proporn males in turn often referred the staff to other individuals in the same professions or organizations.

By research design, the Southtown Controls were mostly men. The staff deliberately attempted to interview male heads of household in randomly drawn

Table 2

Age (Questionnaire item 2)

		15-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-60	61+	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	0	2	5	11	7	7	7	9	1	0	49
Mean age=41.1	%	0.0	4.0	10.2	22.4	14.2	14.2	14.2	18.3	2.0	0.0	99.5
Midville Conporns	N	0	1	1	5	5	4	3	10	5	1	35
Mean age=48.0	%	0.0	2.8	2.8	14.2	14.2	11.4	8.5	28.5	14.2	2.8	99.4
Southtown Proporns	N	0	0	5	8	7	3	2	1	0	0	26
Mean age=36.6	%	0.0	0.0	19.2	30.7	26.9	11.5	7.6	3.8	0.0	0.0	99.7
Midville Proporns	N	0	5	6	3	3	4	2	1	1	0	25
Mean age=35.8	%	0.0	20.0	24.0	12.0	12.0	16.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	1	3	5	2	9	2	8	5	3	0	38
Mean age=41.3	%	2.6	7.8	13.1	5.2	23.6	5.2	21.0	13.1	7.8	0.0	99.4
Midville Controls	N	0	0	2	1	0	3	2	2	2	0	12
Mean age=47.5	%	0.0	0.0	16.6	8.3	0.0	25.0	16.6	16.6	16.6	0.0	99.7

residences in order to match Controls with Conporns on another important variable. However, it proved impossible to match the Midville Controls and Conporns for sex ratio because of sampling difficulties, as mentioned in the Procedure section above.

As shown in Table 2, the average age of the Conporns (as hypothesized) was considerably higher than that of the Proporns. The mean age of the Controls, however, was not midway between that of the Conporns and Proporns, but was virtually the same as that of the Conporns. As will be demonstrated, this was the first indication that Conporns and Controls were similar on measures of many of the variables. It was the Proporns who were the "deviants" in essentially conservative communities.

Table 3 reveals that in both Southtown and Midville, Catholicism accounted for the largest percentage of Conporn religious affiliation, with Methodists and Baptists next in line. Proporns in both Southtown and Midville reported relatively high percentages of "no" or "other" (e.g., Unitarian) religious affiliation. Thus, as hypothesized, Conporns more often were affiliated with dogmatic religions than were Proporns. The Controls were somewhat, but not strikingly, different from the Conporns in religious affiliation. More Controls were Methodists and Baptists than were Conporns, while more Conporns were Catholic than were Controls.

As shown in Table 4, Conporns in both Southtown and Midville were more religiously active, as defined by church attendance, than Proporns. By far the majority of the Conporns attended church at least once a week. Nearly half of the Proporns rarely or never attended church. The Controls' frequency of attendance at church worship was approximately midway between that of the Conporn and

Table 3

Religious Preference (Questionnaire item 3)

		Roman Catholic	Baptist	Lutheran	Methodist	Presbyterian	Jewish	Other	None	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	15	9	3	5	3	0	14	0	0	49
	%	30.6	18.3	6.1	10.2	6.1	0.0	28.5	0.0	0.0	99.8
Midville Conporns	N	9	4	3	4	5	2	5	3	1	36
	%	25.0	11.1	8.3	11.1	13.8	5.5	13.8	8.3	2.7	99.6
Southtown Proporns	N	1	2	1	2	0	4	6	10	0	26
	%	3.8	7.6	3.8	7.6	0.0	15.3	23.0	38.4	0.0	99.5
Midville Proporns	N	5	0	0	1	0	0	10	9	0	25
	%	20.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	36.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	4	11	3	8	1	0	10	1	0	38
	%	10.5	28.9	7.8	21.0	2.6	0.0	26.3	2.6	0.0	99.7
Midville Controls	N	3	2	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	12
	%	25.0	16.6	8.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	16.6	0.0	0.0	99.8

Table 4

About how often do you attend church worship services? (Questionnaire item 4)

		Twice or more a week	Once a week	2-3 times a month	Once a month	2-10 times a year	Once a year	Rarely or never	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	24	17	4	1	2	0	1	0	49
	%	48.9	34.7	8.2	2.0	4.1	0.0	2.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	13	13	5	3	1	0	1	0	36
	%	35.1	36.1	13.9	8.3	2.8	0.0	2.8	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	1	4	2	2	5	1	11	0	26
	%	3.8	15.4	7.7	7.7	19.2	3.8	42.3	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	2	4	4	0	4	0	11	0	25
	%	8.0	16.0	16.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	44.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	7	15	4	3	3	2	4	0	38
	%	18.4	39.5	10.5	7.9	7.9	5.3	10.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	4	4	0	2	0	0	0	12
	%	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

the Proporn, which confirmed the hypothesis of differences in religious activity among the three groups.

Over half of the Southtown Conporns were reared in communities of 50,000 or fewer persons, as reported in Table 5. In contrast, over half of the Southtown Proporns were reared in cities of 100,000 or more—many in cities of 500,000 or more. A larger percentage of Midville Proporns than Conporns were reared in cities of 100,000 or more, but the differences were less striking than in Southtown. These differences confirm the hypothesis that Conporns had developmental experiences in smaller, and probably more rural, communities than Proporns. In Southtown, more Controls came from small towns than did either the Conporns or Proporns, while in Midville, fewer Controls came from small towns than did the other two groups. Thus, for this variable, neither Control group assumed the hypothesized midpoint between the Conporns and Proporns. Table 6 indicates that Proporns more often than Controls, and Controls more often than Conporns, were reared out-of-State (this question was asked only in Midville). Most of the respondents had lived at their present addresses for more than three years, as shown in Table 7 (asked only in Midville).

As shown in Tables 8 and 9, and as hypothesized, more Proporns were engaged in professional occupations than Conporns. The latter were often white-collar workers, middle management, and small independent businessmen. The Conporns were much like the Controls, except that the former were more often managers, officials, and proprietors. The Proporns worked more hours per week than the Conporns, as indicated in Table 10, but both Proporns and Conporns were more occupationally active than the Controls. This elevated degree of general activity, be it vocational or avocational, will be evident among other variables to be discussed.

Table 5

How large was the town or city you lived in most of the time when you were growing up? (Questionnaire item 5)

		Up to 2,499	2,500 to 24,999	25,000 to 49,999	50,000 to 99,999	100,000 to 499,999	500,000 and over	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	8	11	7	4	16	3	0	49
	%	16.3	22.4	14.3	8.2	32.7	6.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	5	1	12	8	3	1	36
	%	16.7	13.9	2.8	33.3	22.2	8.3	2.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	2	3	3	3	6	9	0	26
	%	7.7	11.5	11.5	11.5	23.0	34.6	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	3	4	2	6	6	4	0	25
	%	12.0	16.0	8.0	24.0	24.0	16.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	11	9	3	4	6	5	0	38
	%	28.9	23.7	7.9	10.5	15.8	13.2	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	2	0	2	3	3	0	12
	%	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	25.0	25.0	0.0	100.0

Table 6

What state did you live in when you were growing up? (Questionnaire item 6)

		Midville State	Other	Total
Southtown Conporns	N			
	%			
Midville Conporns	N	13	23	36
	%	36.1	63.9	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N			
	%			
Midville Proporns	N	4	21	25
	%	16.0	84.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N			
	%			
Midville Controls	N	4	8	12
	%	33.3	66.7	100.0

Table 7

How long have you lived at your present address? (Questionnaire item 6a)

		Less than 1 year	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N								
	%								
Midville Conporns	N	6	5	1	12	8	3	1	36
	%	16.6	13.8	2.7	33.3	22.2	8.3	2.7	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N								
	%								
Midville Proporns	N	3	4	2	6	6	4	0	25
	%	12.0	16.0	8.0	24.0	24.0	16.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N								
	%								
Midville Controls	N	2	2	0	2	3	3	0	12
	%	16.6	16.6	0.0	16.6	25.0	25.0	0.0	100.0

Table 8

Industry classifications (Questionnaire item 7a)

		Agriculture, forestry, fishery, construction	Manufacturing	Transportation, communications and other public utilities	Wholesale and retail trade	Finance, insurance and real estate	Business and repair services	Personal services	Entertainment and recreation services	Professional and related services	Public administration	Industry not reported	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	1	3	1	2	3	5	2	0	13	6	13	49
	%	2.0	6.1	2.0	4.0	6.1	10.2	4.0	0.0	26.5	12.2	26.5	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	1	4	5	3	3	1	0	0	11	3	5	36
	%	2.8	11.1	13.9	8.3	8.3	2.8	0.0	0.0	30.6	8.3	13.9	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1	8	26
	%	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.5	3.8	30.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	16	1	3	25
	%	0.0	12.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64.0	4.0	12.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	0	8	10	6	38
	%	5.3	2.6	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	7.9	0.0	21.1	26.3	15.8	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	2	12
	%	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.7	0.0	16.7	100.0

Table 9

Occupational classifications (Questionnaire item 7b)

		Professional, technical and kindred workers	Farmers and farm workers	Managers, officials and proprietors, except farm	Clerical and kindred workers	Sales workers	Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	Operatives and kindred workers	Private household workers	Service workers, except private household	Farm laborers and foremen	Laborers, except farm and mine	Occupation not reported	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	15	0	16	1	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	9	49
	%	30.6	0.0	32.7	2.0	4.1	8.2	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	18.4	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	15	1	11	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	36
	%	41.7	2.8	30.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	26
	%	69.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	18	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
	%	72.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	16	0	9	2	6	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	38
	%	42.1	0.0	23.7	5.3	15.8	5.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	5	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	12
	%	41.7	0.0	16.7	8.3	16.7	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 10

About how many hours a week do you work? (Questionnaire item 9)

		Average number of hours	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	54.0	1	0	1	13	15	4	3	2	39
	%		2.6	0.0	2.6	33.3	38.4	10.2	7.7	5.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	50.8	0	0	1	11	5	2	0	1	20
	%		0.0	0.0	5.0	55.0	25.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	56.6	0	1	2	5	4	5	4	1	22
	%		0.0	4.5	9.0	22.7	18.1	22.7	18.1	4.5	100.0
Midville Porporns	N	54.7	0	0	1	7	3	6	0	1	18
	%		0.0	0.0	5.5	38.8	16.6	33.3	0.0	5.5	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	47.9	1	1	0	21	9	3	0	0	35
	%		2.9	2.9	0.0	60.0	25.7	8.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	49.4	0	0	0	6	2	1	0	0	9
	%		0.0	0.0	0.0	66.6	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	100.0

Tables 11 and 12 reveal that Proporns seem to be less satisfied with their occupations than Conporns. This finding may fit the higher general pattern of alienation among Proporns which will subsequently be demonstrated and discussed.

Table 13 shows that Conporns and Proporns had family incomes which placed them in the middle economic bracket. In Southtown, Proporns had a higher median income than Conporns. In Midville, Conporns had a higher median income than Proporns, a result probably influenced by the fact that there were several university students among the Midville Proporns interviewed. There is no clear pattern of income differences among the three groups, but it is important to note that all of them fall in the middle socio-economic bracket.

Proporns, as hypothesized and revealed in Table 14, had considerably more formal education than Conporns, but Conporns nonetheless were rather well-educated (and were similar in this regard to Controls).

More Conporns than Proporns were married, were married longer, had fewer previous marriages, fewer working wives, more children, and seemed to be more satisfied with married life—as shown in Tables 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 20a. These findings confirm the hypotheses regarding differences in family orientation between Proporns and Conporns. Conporns and Controls were quite similar in these variables, with the exception that the Controls had fewer children than the Conporns.

Table 11

How would you say you like the work you do? (Questionnaire item 10)

		Dislike extremely	Dislike somewhat	Indifferent	Like somewhat	Like extremely	No opinion	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	0	0	1	9	35	4	49
	%	0.0	0.0	2.0	18.4	71.4	8.2	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	4	0	0	1	11	6	22
	%	18.2	0.0	0.0	4.5	50.0	27.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	3	2	0	4	17	0	26
	%	11.5	7.7	0.0	15.4	65.4	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	1	0	5	10	4	21
	%	4.8	4.8	0.0	23.8	47.6	19.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	4	3	0	9	21	0	37
	%	10.8	8.1	0.0	24.3	56.8	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	100.0

Table 12

Did you ever wish you had gone into another field? (Questionnaire item 11)

		Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	5	6	11	22
	%	22.7	27.3	50.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	7	5	9	21
	%	33.3	23.8	42.8	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	1	7	3	11
	%	9.1	63.6	27.3	100.0

Table 13

Give the total monthly income for the entire family. (Questionnaire item 13)

		Average monthly income	Below $400	$400-599	$600-799	$800-999	$1000-1199	$1200+	No usable response	Total
	N	$956	2	1	5	8	12	19	2	49
Southtown Conporns	%		4.1	2.0	10.2	16.3	24.5	38.8	4.1	100.0
	N	$946	2	4	5	4	4	15	2	36
Midville Conporns	%		5.6	11.1	13.9	11.1	11.1	41.7	5.5	100.0
	N	$1060	1	1	0	2	5	17	0	26
Southtown Proporns	%		3.8	3.8	0.0	7.7	19.2	65.4	0.0	100.0
	N	$874	0	1	6	7	3	7	1	25
Midville Proporns	%		0.0	4.0	24.0	28.0	12.0	28.0	4.0	100.0
	N	$982	0	3	2	9	3	19	2	38
Southtown Controls	%		0.0	7.9	5.3	23.7	7.9	50.0	5.3	100.0
	N	$832	2	2	1	0	1	6	0	12
Midville Controls	%		16.7	16.7	8.3	0.0	8.3	50.0	0.0	100.0

Table 14

Please indicate your highest level of education. (Questionnaire item 22)

		Some grade school	Completed grade school	Some high school	Completed high school	High school plus other (not college) training	Some college	Completed college	Some graduate work	Graduate degree	No usable response	Total
	N	1	0	3	2	6	20	7	3	7	0	49
Southtown Conporns	%	2.0	0.0	6.1	4.1	12.2	40.8	14.3	6.1	14.3	0.0	100.0
Mean=some college												
	N	0	0	3	7	5	8	2	3	7	1	36
Midville Conporns	%	0.0	0.0	8.3	19.4	13.9	22.2	5.6	8.3	19.4	2.8	100.0
Mean=some college												
	N	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	19	0	26
Southtown Proporns	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	19.2	73.1	0.0	100.0
Mean=some graduate work												
	N	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	7	11	0	25
Midville Proporns	%	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	16.0	4.0	28.0	44.0	0.0	100.0
Mean=some graduate work												
	N	0	0	1	4	4	11	8	2	8	0	38
Southtown Controls	%	0.0	0.0	2.6	10.5	10.5	28.9	21.1	5.3	21.1	0.0	100.0
Mean=some college												
	N	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	4	0	12
Midville Controls	%	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	100.0
Mean=some college												

Table 15

Are you now married? (Questionnaire item 23)

		Yes	No	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	46	3	0	49
	%	93.9	6.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	29	6	1	36
	%	80.6	16.7	2.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	19	7	0	26
	%	73.1	26.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	19	6	0	25
	%	76.0	24.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	34	4	0	38
	%	89.5	10.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	12	0	0	12
	%	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 16

How long have you been married? (Questionnaire item 23a)

		0	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-35 years	36 years and over	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns Mean=16-20 years	N	0	5	2	12	10	5	6	3	0	3	46
	%	0.0	10.8	4.3	26.0	21.7	10.8	13.0	6.5	0.0	6.5	100.0
Midville Conporns Mean=21-25 Years	N	0	0	1	4	4	6	4	5	5	0	29
	%	0.0	0.0	3.4	13.7	13.7	20.6	13.7	17.2	17.2	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns Mean=11-15 years	N	0	2	3	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	19
	%	0.0	10.5	15.7	26.3	26.3	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns Mean=11-15 years	N	0	7	3	4	0	2	2	0	1	0	19
	%	0.0	36.8	15.7	21.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	5.2	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls Mean=16-20 years	N	1	5	5	4	9	6	3	0	1	0	34
	%	2.9	14.7	14.7	11.7	26.4	17.6	8.8	0.0	2.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls Mean=16-20 years	N	0	0	2	3	2	3	0	1	1	0	12
	%	0.0	0.0	16.6	25.0	16.6	25.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	100.0

Table 17

How many previous marriages have you had? (Questionnaire item 23b)

		None	One	Two	Three	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	37	3	1	1	4	46
	%	80.4	6.5	2.1	2.1	8.6	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	29	0	0	0	0	29
	%	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	15	6	1	0	1	23
	%	65.2	26.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	18	2	1	0	0	21
	%	85.7	9.5	4.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	32	3	0	0	0	35
	%	91.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	10	2	0	0	0	12
	%	83.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 18

Does your present spouse work? (Questionnaire item 23c)

		Full-time	Part-time	Not at all	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	20	9	17	0	46
	%	43.4	19.5	36.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	15	1	11	2	29
	%	51.7	3.4	37.9	6.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	8	3	8	0	19
	%	42.1	15.7	42.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	9	2	7	1	19
	%	47.3	10.5	36.8	5.2	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	17	3	14	0	34
	%	50.0	8.8	41.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	2	9	0	12
	%	8.3	16.7	75.0	0.0	100.0

Table 19

How many children do you have? (Questionnaire item 23d)

		None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns Mean = 3	N	1	5	15	15	5	4	1	0	46
	%	2.1	10.8	32.6	32.6	10.8	8.6	2.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns Mean = 3	N	2	1	8	11	6	4	0	0	32
	%	6.2	3.1	25.0	34.3	18.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns Mean = 2	N	3	1	9	6	2	3	0	0	24
	%	12.5	4.1	37.5	25.0	8.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns Mean = 2	N	4	5	2	8	3	0	0	0	22
	%	18.1	22.7	9.0	36.3	13.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls Mean = 2	N	3	8	10	11	1	2	0	0	35
	%	8.5	22.8	28.5	31.4	2.8	5.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls Mean = 2	N	1	1	6	1	1	0	1	1	12
	%	8.3	8.3	50.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 20

Assuming you could do things over again, do you think a single life or a married life would be more satisfactory? (Questionnaire item 54)

		Single	Married	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	1	47	1	49
	%	2.0	95.9	2.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	0	29	7	36
	%	0.0	80.6	19.4	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	2	24	0	26
	%	7.7	92.3	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	3	20	2	25
	%	12.0	80.0	8.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	0	37	1	38
	%	0.0	97.4	2.6	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	12	0	12
	%	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Table 20a

Do you agree that if people really told the truth, that they would say that children are a nuisance more often than a pleasure? (Questionnaire item 52)

		Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	5	42	2	49
	%	10.2	85.7	4.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	7	24	5	36
	%	19.4	66.7	13.9	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	9	16	1	26
	%	34.6	61.5	3.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	14	10	1	25
	%	56.0	40.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	8	30	0	38
	%	21.1	78.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	11	0	12
	%	8.3	91.7	0.0	100.0

Political characteristics

Proporns were more interested in politics than Conporns, as indicated in Table 21, but Conporns were considerably more interested in politics than the Controls. This finding again demonstrates that Proporns and Conporns generally tended to be more active in community affairs than the Controls. Some additional questionnaire items asked only of Midville respondents further illustrate this point. Proporns more often than Conporns, and Conporns more often than Controls: participated in precinct meetings (Table 22); donated money to political campaigns (Table 23); donated time to political campaigns (Table 24); and followed the campaigns in newspapers (Table 25). Respondents in both Midville and Southtown were asked how often they voted in local and national elections. The distribution of responses (Tables 26, 27, and 28) reveal that Proporns might be more interested in the national elections than Conporns, but Conporns were more interested in local elections than Proporns. The differences, however, were slight. The tables also reveal that Midvillians in general seemed to vote more regularly than Southtowners—a finding which fits the overall voter statistics for the two communities (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1971).

Table 29 indicates that more Proporns than Conporns reported "Democrat" political preference in the two cities, although these data are somewhat confounded by differences in the prevailing political ideology of the regional Democratic Party. However, more Proporns than Conporns reported themselves to be Independents in both communities. Conporns differed only slightly from the Controls in political preference.

The questionnaire item assessing the political liberalism or conservatism of the respondents helps to clarify the nature of their position with regard to political

ideology. As indicated in Table 30, and as hypothesized, Proporns in both cities considered themselves to be politically liberal, while most Conporns reported themselves to be politically conservative. Again the Controls were similar to the Conporns. Table 30a shows that most believe in our political system.

Table 21

How interested are you in politics? (Questionnaire item 14)

		Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Very much	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	0	7	13	29	0	49
	%	0.0	14.3	26.5	59.2	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	2	3	12	16	3	36
	%	5.6	8.3	33.3	44.4	8.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	1	0	5	20	0	26
	%	3.8	0.0	19.2	76.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	3	5	16	0	25
	%	4.0	12.0	20.0	64.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	3	16	17	0	38
	%	5.3	7.9	42.1	44.7	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	1	7	3	0	12
	%	8.3	8.3	58.3	25.0	0.0	100.0

Table 22

Do you participate in precinct meetings? (Questionnaire item 14a)

		Yes	No	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	10	24	2	36
	%	27.8	66.6	5.5	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	10	15	0	25
	%	40.0	60.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	2	8	2	12
	%	16.7	66.7	16.7	100.0

Table 23

Have you donated money to political campaigns? (Questionnaire item 14b)

		Yes	No	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	15	18	3	36
	%	41.7	50.0	8.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	16	9	0	25
	%	64.0	36.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	5	5	2	12
	%	41.7	41.7	16.7	100.0

Table 24

Have you donated time to political campaigns? (Questionnaire item 14c)

		Yes	No	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	18	15	3	36
	%	50.0	41.7	8.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	22	3	0	25
	%	88.0	12.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	4	6	2	12
	%	33.3	50.0	16.7	100.0

Table 25

Do you follow the campaigns in the newspaper? (Questionnaire item 14d)

		Yes	No	Sometimes	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	32	0	3	35
	%	91.4	0.0	8.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	23	3	0	25
	%	92.0	8.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	10	1	1	12
	%	83.3	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 26

Do you vote? (Questionnaire item 14e)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N			
	%			
Midville Conporns	N	36	0	36
	%	100.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N			
	%			
Midville Proporns	N	23	2	25
	%	92.0	8.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N			
	%			
Midville Controls	N	10	2	12
	%	83.3	16.6	100.0

Table 27

How often do you vote in local elections? (Questionnaire item 57)

		Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	0	48	0	1	0	0	49
	%	0.0	98.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	30	4	0	0	0	2	36
	%	83.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	24	0	2	0	0	26
	%	0.0	92.3	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	18	4	1	0	2	0	25
	%	72.0	16.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	6	26	4	1	0	1	38
	%	15.8	68.4	10.5	2.6	0.0	2.6	100.0
Midville Controls	N	10	2	0	0	0	0	12
	%	83.2	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 28

How often do you vote in national elections? (Questionnaire item 58)

		Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	0	48	0	1	0	0	49
	%	0.0	98.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	31	3	0	0	0	2	36
	%	86.1	8.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	25	0	1	0	0	26
	%	0.0	96.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	22	1	0	0	2	0	25
	%	88.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	6	30	0	1	0	1	38
	%	15.8	78.9	0.0	2.6	0.0	2.6	100.0
Midville Controls	N	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
	%	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 29

What is your political preference? (Questionnaire item 15)

		Democrat	Republican	Independent	Other	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	30	14	5	0	49
	%	61.2	28.6	10.2	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	4	20	11	1	36
	%	11.1	55.6	30.5	2.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	20	0	6	0	26
	%	76.9	0.0	23.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	15	2	8	0	25
	%	60.0	8.0	32.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	24	6	7	1	38
	%	63.2	15.8	18.4	2.6	100.0
Midville Controls	N	4	5	3	0	12
	%	33.3	41.7	25.0	0.0	100.0

Table 30

Do you consider yourself conservative or liberal? (Questionnaire item 16)

		Conservative	Liberal	Moderate	No set response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	34	11	3	1	49
	%	69.4	22.4	6.1	2.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	20	13	1	2	36
	%	55.6	36.1	2.8	5.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	23	3	0	26
	%	0.0	88.5	11.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	23	0	1	25
	%	4.0	92.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	27	7	1	3	38
	%	71.1	18.4	2.6	7.9	100.0
Midville Controls	N	5	6	1	0	12
	%	41.7	50.0	8.3	0.0	100.0

Table 30a

Does the person who is elected to office really make a difference in the way we live? (Questionnaire item 53)

		Yes	No	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	40	9	0	49
	%	81.6	18.4	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	25	6	5	36
	%	69.4	16.7	13.9	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	23	3	0	26
	%	88.5	11.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	18	7	0	25
	%	72.0	28.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	30	8	0	38
	%	78.9	21.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	11	1	0	12
	%	91.7	8.3	0.0	100.0

Membership characteristics in other voluntary associations

Proporns and Conporns, as indicated in Table 31, belonged to more community voluntary associations than Controls. Table 32 shows that the voluntary associations in which Conporns held membership met more often than those in which the Proporns held membership. However, the Conporns did not necessarily attend the meetings more faithfully, as revealed by Table 33. Table 34 shows that Conporns were officers of the voluntary associations more than Proporns, and that Proporns were officers more than Controls.

Table 31

Mean number of organizations to which respondent belongs (Questionnaire item 17)

	Mean	Total
Southtown Conporns	2.59	49
Midville Conporns	3.97	36
Southtown Proporns	4.00	26
Midville Proporns	3.00	25
Southtown Controls	1.55	38
Midville Controls	1.83	12

Table 32

How often do they schedule meetings? (Questionnaire item 13)

		Mean	Two or more meetings a week	One meeting a week	2-3 meetings a month	Once a month	2-10 meetings a year	One meeting a year	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N		3	28	12	55	9	6	113
	%	2-3/mo.	2.6	24.7	10.6	48.6	7.9	5.3	100.0
Midville Conporns	N		4	6	4	23	7	4	48
	%	2-3/mo.	8.3	12.5	8.3	47.9	14.5	8.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N		5	2	5	31	19	11	73
	%	1/mo.	6.8	2.7	6.8	42.4	26.0	15.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N		3	1	2	10	7	15	38
	%	1/mo.	7.8	2.6	5.2	26.3	18.4	39.4	100.0
Southtown Controls	N		3	18	3	16	6	2	48
	%	2-3/mo.	6.2	37.5	6.2	33.3	12.5	4.1	100.0
Midville Controls	N		0	2	3	5	2	1	13
	%	2-3/mo.	0.0	15.3	23.0	38.4	15.3	7.6	100.0

*This represents the total number of organizations mentioned.

Table 33

How often do you attend their meetings? (Questionnaire item 19)

		Mean	2 or more times a week	Once a week	2-3 times a month	Once a month	2-10 times a year	Once a year or less	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N		2	19	17	42	12	16	108
	%	2-3/mo.	1.8	17.5	15.7	38.8	11.1	14.8	100.0
Midville Conporns	N		2	8	4	26	13	14	67
	%	1/mo.	2.9	11.9	5.8	38.8	19.4	20.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N		3	2	8	24	19	13	69
	%	1/mo.	4.3	2.8	11.5	34.7	27.5	18.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N		2	1	5	3	1	1	13
	%	2-3/mo.	15.3	7.6	38.4	23.0	7.6	7.6	100.0
Southtown Controls	N		3	14	7	6	11	3	44
	%	2-3/mo.	6.8	31.8	15.9	13.6	25.0	6.8	100.0
Midville Controls	N		0	1	1	5	3	2	12
	%	2-3/mo.	0.0	8.3	8.3	41.6	25.0	16.6	100.0

*This represents the total number of organizations mentioned.

Table 34

Are you an officer of the organization? (Questionnaire item 20)

		Yes	No	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N	56	56	112
	%	50.0	50.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	58	17	75
	%	78.0	22.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	34	40	74
	%	45.0	55.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	12	17	29
	%	42.0	58.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	19	26	45
	%	42.0	58.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	4	8	12
	%	33.3	66.6	100.0

*This represents the total number of organizations mentioned.

Social-psychological characteristics

Table 35 (a summary table of the mean scores for Conporns, Proporns, and Controls on assorted social-psychological scales) showed that Conporns were much less "alienated" than the Controls, who in turn were less "alienated" than the Proporns. As used here, "alienation" is a total of "normlessness"—a feeling of being not closely bound by the norms or rules of society (Dean, 1961), and "powerlessness"—a feeling that one is impotent to influence the course of events in society. Conporns were much less "normless" than Controls, who were less "normless" than Proporns. In Midville, the Conporns felt much less "powerless" than the Proporns, who were quite similar to the Controls; in Southtown, the Proporns felt slightly less "powerless" than the Conporns, who in turn felt slightly less "powerless" than the Controls. Generally these results differed from the hypothesis. At the beginning of the study it was thought that participants in ad hoc antipornography organizations might feel more "alienated" in the face of what they perceived to be threatening changes in societal values and norms. However, it appears that the Conporns had a very clear view of societal norms, did not feel "powerless" in resisting the processes of social change (perhaps by virtue of their experience with the ad hoc antipornography organization), and consequently were alienated from societal processes to a very small degree. It must be remembered that both Midville and Southtown are conservative communities, where Proporns, not Conporns, are the exception. As used here, alienation is considered to be a syndrome of normlessness and powerlessness, including a feeling of separation from a group or isolation from group standards.

As hypothesized, Proporns in both Midville and Southtown were strikingly less "authoritarian" than either Conporns or Controls. In Midville, Conporns were less

Table 35

Summary table of mean scores by group for various scales

	Powerlessness (items 24-26)	Normlessness (items 27-28)	Alienation (items 24-28)	Authoritarianism (items 29-33)	Religiosity (items 34-39)	Traditional family ideology (items 40-44)	Political tolerance (items 45-47)	Alienation from mass culture (items 48-54)	Dogmatism (items 59-68)
Southtown Conporns	2.25	.63	1.60	2.62	4.45	3.27	3.11	.72	2.93
Midville Conporns	1.82	.75	1.38	2.06	3.95	2.56	2.47	.74	2.22
Southtown Proporns	2.09	1.48	1.85	.80	2.02	1.23	.38	.50	1.74
Midville Proporns	2.61	1.84	2.32	1.32	2.44	1.54	.34	.59	1.78
Southtown Controls	2.41	.97	1.84	2.49	4.04	2.97	2.85	.72	2.46
Midville Controls	2.61	1.20	2.05	2.40	4.00	3.25	2.45	.83	2.52

	Training for independence (items 69-78)	Traditional attitude toward sex (items 79-89)	Attitude toward homosexuals (items 89-91)	Attitude toward sex in the home (items 112-115)	Attitude toward censorship (items 92-111)	Total
Southtown Conporns	2.14	2.80	3.55	3.03	3.25	49
Midville Conporns	2.20	2.41	3.03	2.60	3.15	36
Southtown Proporns	2.11	1.49	1.14	1.37	1.47	26
Midville Proporns	2.17	1.69	1.01	1.48	1.45	25
Southtown Controls	2.32	2.72	3.07	2.83	3.17	38
Midville Controls	2.30	2.60	3.27	2.80	2.89	12

Information on scale ranges and direction of scores

Scale	Range	Direction
Powerlessness	0-6	Higher score, higher powerlessness
Normlessness	0-6	Higher score, higher normlessness
Alienation	0-6	Higher score, higher alienation
Authoritarianism	0-6	Higher score, higher authoritarianism
Religiosity	0-6	Higher score, higher religiosity
Traditional family ideology	0-6	Higher score, higher traditionalism
Political tolerance	0-6	Higher score, lower tolerance
Alienation from mass culture	0-1	Higher score, lower alienation
Dogmatism	0-6	Higher score, higher dogmatism
Training for independence	0-3	Higher score, higher urging for independence
Traditional attitude toward sex	0-6	Higher score, higher traditionalism
Attitude toward homosexuality	0-6	Higher score, higher severity
Attitude toward sex in the home	0-3	Higher score, higher traditionalism
Attitude toward censorship	0-6	Higher score, higher approval

Table 35a

What is your general position on censorship? (Questionnaire item 127)

		Censorship favored for everybody	Censorship favored for minors	Some materials should be censored	Legislative censorship favored	Industry self-censorship favored	Individual self-censorship favored	Censorship unnecessary	Censorship unnecessary for some	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N										
	%										
Midville Conporns	N	11	13	6	3	1	1	0	1	0	36
	%	30.5	36.0	16.6	8.3	2.7	2.7	0.0	2.7	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N										
	%										
Midville Proporns	N	0	0	1	1	0	3	16	4	0	25
	%	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	64.0	16.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N										
	%										
Midville Controls	N	0	4	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	12
	%	0.0	33.3	8.3	16.6	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	16.6	100.0

"authoritarian" than Controls, and in Southtown, Controls were less "authoritarian" than Conporns. Therefore, the Southtown group differences in "authoritarianism" closely followed the hypothesized distribution for the three groups—Controls assuming a midpoint between the extremes of Proporns and Conporns. That hypothesized distribution can be seen in most of the findings for Southtown respondents reported in Table 35. The distribution for Midville respondents, on the other hand, is sometimes reversed for Controls and Conporns—although the differences between Conporns and Proporns is usually quite clear. The fact that the Midville Control group was composed of only 12 respondents certainly makes interpretation more difficult, and possibly accounts for some of the reversals in the response distributions as hypothesized. As used here, authoritarianism is considered to be a measure of antidemocratic tendencies at the personality level (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950).

Table 35 also reveals that, as hypothesized, the Conporns generally manifested more "religiosity" than Controls, who in turn manifested more "religiosity" than Proporns. Religiosity is defined as a favorable attitude toward religious beliefs and a willingness to accept doctrinaire statements and values concerning religion (Kirkpatrick, 1949).

Proporns showed a much smaller tendency than Conporns or Controls to embrace a "traditional family ideology." In Midville, Conporns were less oriented toward "traditional family ideology" than Controls; in Southtown, Controls less than Conporns. The T.F.I. scale is defined as a global measure of democratic or autocratic attitudes toward family relations (Levinson & Huffman, 1955). The higher the score on the scale, the more autocratic the attitudes of the respondent are.

Conporns clearly were the least "politically tolerant" of the three groups (Table 35). Controls were more "politically tolerant" than Conporns, and the Proporns were by far the most "politically tolerant" respondents of the three groups (a higher score indicates less tolerance). This finding was as hypothesized. Political tolerance is defined as respect for the civil rights of radicals and nonconformists, even though the respondent may protest or disapprove their opinions (Stouffer, 1955; Straus & Nelson, 1960).

In Midville, Controls were less "alienated from mass culture" than Conporns, who in turn were less so than Proporns (a higher score indicates less alienation). In Southtown, the Controls and Conporns were equally "alienated from mass culture," and both of these groups were less so than the Proporns. This finding again indicates that it was the Proporns, not the Conporns, who felt themselves to be apart from the values and normative structure of society. Alienation from mass culture is defined as estrangement from, and negative feelings toward, one's society and its culture (Mettler, 1957).

Table 35 shows that Proporns were less "dogmatic" than either Conporns or Controls. In Southtown, Controls were less "dogmatic" than Conporns, supporting the pattern hypothesis for this variable. In Midville, Conporns were less "dogmatic" than Controls. As a concept, dogmatism is considered to be a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, provide a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others (Rokeach, 1960).

Although the differences were only slight, Proporns were less concerned about training their children for independence than were Conporns, who in turn were less concerned than Controls. Training for independence, as operationalized by the scale used in this study, consists of parental demands and rewards for early independence and mastery of behavior (Winterbottom, 1958). Such training is considered to be part of a more "traditional" family orientation, though the differences reflected among the groups here were not so striking as those reflected in the responses to the "traditional family ideology" scale (above).

Proporns, as hypothesized, had a far less "traditional attitude toward sexual activities" than Conporns or Controls. That is, they tended to view sexual activity in a less religious, less normatively rigid, and somewhat hedonistic framework. Also as hypothesized, Proporns were far less severe or punitive in their attitudes toward homosexuals than Conporns or Controls. Proporns, again as hypothesized and indicated in Table 35, were much less restrictive about discussions of sexual matters or personal nudity in their own homes than Conporns or Controls. On all three of these variables, the Southtown distribution among the groups was precisely as hypothesized—Proporns were less severe or restricting than Controls, who in turn were less severe or restricting than Conporns.

The last finding in Table 35 reveals, as hypothesized, that Proporns were considerably "less supportive of censorship" than Controls, who were less supportive than Conporns. The "censorship" scale studied the respondents' opinions of the moral, legal, and political implications of, and arguments surrounding, censorship (Rosander & Thurstone, 1931).

When asked to rank the activities which gave them most satisfaction, Proporns far more than Controls or Conporns indicated their first choices to be career or

occupation (Table 36). Controls indicated leisure time recreation as their first choice more than did Proporns, and Proporns indicated this as their first choice more than did Conporns (Table 37). This may reflect the general activity orientation of Conporns and Proporns as compared with Controls. As indicated in Tables 38 and 39, Conporns and Controls ranked family relationships or religious activities among their first choices more than did Proporns—a finding which supports the hypotheses and data on family and religious orientation presented above. Table 40 shows that Conporns and Proporns more often than Controls ranked participation in community affairs as yielding personal satisfaction—a result which is consistent with the data on actual participation presented above.

For leisure activity, Proporns much more often took pleasure from reading than Controls, who in turn enjoyed reading more than Conporns (Table 41). Proporns attended far more movies than Controls, and Controls attended more movies than Conporns (Table 42). Controls spent more hours watching television than Conporns, who in turn spent more hours watching than Proporns (Table 43). It is not surprising that Proporns, with their higher level of education, read for pleasure more often than Conporns. The fact that Conporns attended fewer movies than Proporns is consistent with some of the Conporns' condemnations of the sexual content of movies available to the general public (which they preferred not to attend). It is also interesting to note that many of the Conporns overtly passed judgment, and took action based upon that judgment, on films which they in fact did not see. The fact that Proporns and Conporns watched television fewer hours per week than Controls is consistent with their greater community activity.

History of sex education and contact with pornography

Proporns were more prone to discuss sex in the total family setting than Conporns, who in turn were slightly more prone to such discussions than Controls (Table 44). Proporns and Conporns talked to their children individually about sexual matters more often than Controls (Table 45). Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, talked about sexual matters with their spouses (Table 45a). Nudity in the home was more casually treated by Proporns than Controls, and Controls than Conporns, as revealed in Table 45b. Conporns and Proporns gave their children books or pamphlets on sexual subjects more than did Controls (Table 46). Respondents in Midville only were asked how they handled the situation when their children had viewed or read pornographic material. The data presented in Table 47 show that Proporns were less restrictive and punitive than Controls, who in turn were less punitive and restrictive than Conporns. Table 48 indicates that more of the Conporns' children had received sex education in the schools than the Controls' children, who in turn had received more sex education than the Proporns' children.

A greater proportion of Proporn and Conporn respondents than Controls had attended schools offering courses on sex education (Table 49). Most of the Proporns, Conporns, and Controls took the course if available (Table 50). Elaborating on that finding, Table 51 indicates that more Conporns than Controls, and more Controls than Proporns, volunteered to take a sex education course. The courses taken tended to contain more information on sexual intercourse than on birth control, as Tables 52 and 53 indicate. Proporns seemed

Table 36

Satisfaction rank given to career or occupation (Questionnaire item 21)

		1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	Not applicable	Total
	N	12	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	1	27	49
Southtown Conporns	%	24.0	2.0	8.0	2.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	55.0	100.0
	N	6	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	2	19	36
Midville Conporns	%	17.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	52.0	100.0
	N	11	2	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	6	26
Southtown Proporns	%	42.0	8.0	15.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	23.0	100.0
	N	8	0	5	0	2	0	1	1	3	5	25
Midville Proporns	%	32.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	12.0	20.0	100.0
	N	9	0	7	0	9	0	2	0	1	10	38
Southtown Controls	%	24.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	26.0	100.0
	N	1	0	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	12
Midville Controls	%	8.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	100.0

Table 37

Satisfaction rank given to leisure time recreational activity (Questionnaire item 21)

		1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	Not applicable	Total
	N	3	0	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	35	49
Southtown Conporns	%	6.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	8.0	71.0	100.0
	N	0	0	2	1	4	1	2	0	8	18	36
Midville Conporns	%	0.0	0.0	6.0	3.0	11.0	3.0	6.0	0.0	22.0	50.0	100.0
	N	3	0	2	0	8	0	2	0	2	9	26
Southtown Proporns	%	12.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	31.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	25.0	100.0
	N	2	1	3	0	8	0	4	0	2	5	25
Midville Proporns	%	8.0	4.0	12.0	0.0	32.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	8.0	20.0	100.0
	N	5	0	3	0	7	0	8	0	3	12	38
Southtown Controls	%	13.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	21.0	0.0	8.0	32.0	100.0
	N	2	0	3	0	2	0	3	0	0	2	12
Midville Controls	%	17.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	100.0

Table 38

Satisfaction rank given to family relationships (Questionnaire item 21)

		1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	Not applicable	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	20	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	25	49
	%	41.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	45.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	17	0	5	1	1	1	4	0	0	7	36
	%	47.0	0.0	14.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	6	1	5	0	3	0	1	1	0	9	26
	%	23.0	4.0	19.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	35.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	11	1	6	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	25
	%	44.0	4.0	24.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	19	1	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	38
	%	50.0	3.0	21.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	6	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
	%	50.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 39

Satisfaction rank given to religious beliefs and activities (Questionnaire item 21)

		1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	Not applicable	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	5	3	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	33	49
	%	10.0	6.0	8.0	2.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	67.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	4	0	6	1	3	1	3	0	3	15	36
	%	11.0	0.0	17.0	3.0	8.0	3.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	42.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	13	26
	%	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	27.0	50.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	0	2	0	2	0	4	1	10	6	25
	%	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	16.0	4.0	40.0	24.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	1	1	6	1	3	0	8	0	6	12	38
	%	3.0	3.0	15.7	3.0	8.0	0.0	21.0	0.0	16.0	31.5	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	1	2	12
	%	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	33.0	0.0	8.0	17.0	100.0

Table 40

Satisfaction rank given to participation in community affairs (Questionnaire item 21)

		1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	Not applicable	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	3	0	2	0	2	0	3	1	2	36	49
	%	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	2.0	4.0	73.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	4	0	3	1	4	1	6	0	2	15	36
	%	11.0	0.0	8.0	3.0	11.0	3.0	17.0	0.0	6.0	42.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	1	1	3	0	4	0	5	0	1	11	26
	%	4.0	4.0	12.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	19.0	0.0	4.0	42.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	2	0	2	0	6	0	7	0	2	6	25
	%	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	28.0	0.0	8.0	24.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	0	1	0	2	0	7	0	12	14	38
	%	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	32.0	37.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	8	2	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	67.0	17.0	100.0

Table 41

How often do you read for pleasure? (Questionnaire item 56)

		Usually once a week or more	At least once a month	Several times a year	Once a year or less	Never	Total
Southtown Conporns	N						
	%						
Midville Conporns	N	28	8	0	1	4	36
	%	77.8	8.3	0.0	2.8	11.1	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N						
	%						
Midville Proporns	N	23	1	0	1	0	25
	%	92.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N						
	%						
Midville Controls	N	10	1	1	0	0	12
	%	83.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 42

How often do you attend movies? (Questionnaire item 55)

		Usually once a week or more	At least once a month	Several times a year	Once a year or less	Never	Total
Southtown Conporns	N						
	%						
Midville Conporns	N	1	2	9	20	4	36
	%	2.8	5.6	25.0	55.6	11.1	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N						
	%						
Midville Proporns	N	2	5	14	4	0	25
	%	8.0	20.0	56.0	16.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N						
	%						
Midville Controls	N	0	2	4	6	0	12
	%	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0	100.0

Table 43

How many hours a week do you watch TV? (Questionnaire item 150a)

		6 hours or more a week	3-5 hours a week	Less than 3 hours a week	2 or more programs a week	Seldom or never	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N							
	%							
Midville Conporns	N	3	5	14	8	2	4	36
	%	8.0	14.0	39.0	22.0	6.0	11.4	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N							
	%							
Midville Proporns	N	2	2	7	9	4	1	25
	%	8.0	8.0	28.0	36.0	16.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N							
	%							
Midville Controls	N	0	5	4	2	0	1	12
	%	0.0	42.0	33.0	17.0	0.0	8.0	100.0

Table 44

How often is sex the topic of general family conversation? (Questionnaire item 113)

		Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	2	30	10	4	1	47
	%	4.2	63.8	21.2	8.5	2.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	7	14	5	4	2	32
	%	21.8	43.7	15.6	12.5	6.2	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	4	13	6	1	0	24
	%	16.6	54.1	25.0	4.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	6	12	4	0	0	22
	%	27.2	54.5	18.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	22	8	3	1	36
	%	5.5	61.1	22.2	8.3	2.7	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	4	3	0	1	10
	%	20.0	40.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	100.0

Table 45

How often do you talk to your children individually about sexual matters? (Questionnaire item 114)

		Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	4	28	3	9	1	45
	%	8.8	62.2	6.6	20.0	2.2	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	3	18	6	0	2	29
	%	10.3	62.0	20.6	0.0	6.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	2	15	2	1	0	20
	%	10.0	75.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	4	7	5	0	2	18
	%	22.2	38.8	27.7	0.0	11.1	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	17	6	5	0	30
	%	6.6	56.6	20.0	16.6	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	4	6	1	1	12
	%	0.0	33.3	50.0	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 45a

How often do you and your spouse talk about sexual matters? (Questionnaire item 115)

		Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	11	28	5	1	1	46
	%	23.9	60.8	10.8	2.1	2.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	7	12	5	1	4	29
	%	24.1	41.3	17.2	3.4	13.7	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	7	9	3	0	0	19
	%	36.8	47.3	15.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	12	7	2	0	0	21
	%	57.1	33.3	9.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	9	19	5	1	0	34
	%	26.4	55.8	14.7	2.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	4	3	3	1	1	12
	%	33.3	25.0	25.0	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 45b

What is the attitude towards nudity in your home? (Questionnaire item 112)

		Very casual, much nudity	Casual, some nudity	Concern that people are properly covered	Very concerned, no nudity whatever	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	3	15	19	9	1	47
	%	6.3	31.9	40.4	19.9	2.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	2	11	10	5	6	34
	%	5.8	32.3	29.4	14.7	17.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	2	19	3	1	0	25
	%	8.0	76.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	6	14	3	1	0	24
	%	25.0	58.3	12.5	4.1	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	14	14	7	0	37
	%	5.4	37.8	37.8	18.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	4	6	1	1	12
	%	0.0	33.3	50.0	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 46

Have you ever given your children books or pamphlets on sexual matters? (Questionnaire item 116)

		Yes	No	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	27	17	1	45
	%	60.0	37.7	2.2	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	18	9	2	29
	%	62.0	31.0	6.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	13	6	0	19
	%	68.4	31.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	9	6	2	17
	%	52.9	35.2	11.7	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	16	12	1	29
	%	55.1	41.3	3.4	100.0
Midville Controls	N	5	4	1	10
	%	50.0	40.0	10.0	100.0

Table 47

How do you handle things which you feel your children shouldn't read or see? (Questionnaire item 117)

		Indifferent: no encouragement, no restriction	Categorical restriction	Selective restriction	Censorship technique: objective discussion	Censorship technique: scold, threaten, etc. Have no problem	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N							
	%							
Midville Conporns	N	7	5	12	3	1	3	5	36
	%	19.4	13.9	33.3	8.3	2.8	8.3	13.9	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N							
	%							
Midville Proporns	N	7	1	3	2	0	6	6	25
	%	28.0	4.0	12.0	8.0	0.0	24.0	24.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N							
	%							
Midville Controls	N	2	1	2	1	2	0	4	12
	%	16.7	8.3	16.7	8.3	16.7	0.0	33.3	100.0

Table 48

Are your children now receiving or have they ever had formal sex education? (Questionnaire item 118)

		Yes	No	Some in other courses	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	23	17	5	45
	%	51.1	37.7	11.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	17	10	2	29
	%	58.6	34.4	6.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	10	6	2	18
	%	55.5	33.3	11.1	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	4	12	1	17
	%	23.5	70.5	5.8	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	15	12	2	29
	%	51.7	41.3	6.8	100.0
Midville Controls	N	5	4	1	10
	%	50.0	40.0	10.0	100.0

Table 49

Have you yourself ever attended a school that offered a course on sex education? (Questionnaire item 119)

		Yes	No	Don't remember	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	18	30	1	49
	%	36.7	61.2	2.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	11	21	4	36
	%	30.6	58.3	11.1	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	18	8	0	26
	%	69.2	30.8	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	5	19	1	25
	%	20.0	76.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	3	33	2	38
	%	7.9	86.8	5.3	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	9	1	12
	%	16.7	75.0	8.3	100.0

Table 50

Did you ever take the course? (Questionnaire item 120)

		Yes	No	Don't remember	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	14	4	1	19
	%	73.6	21.0	5.2	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	10	2	4	16
	%	62.5	12.5	25.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	12	6	0	18
	%	66.6	33.3	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	7	1	0	8
	%	87.5	12.5	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	4	0	1	5
	%	80.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	0	1	3
	%	66.6	0.0	33.3	100.0

Table 51

Did you ever volunteer to take a course on sex education? (Questionnaire item 121)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	9	5	14
	%	64.2	35.8	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	4	10
	%	60.0	40.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	6	6	12
	%	50.0	50.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	2	5	7
	%	28.5	71.5	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	3	1	4
	%	75.0	25.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	1	2
	%	50.0	50.0	100.0

Table 52

Did any course contain information on birth control? (Questionnaire item 122)

		Yes	No	Don't remember	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	6	7	1	14
	%	42.8	50.0	7.2	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	3	7	0	10
	%	30.0	70.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	4	8	0	12
	%	33.3	66.6	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	7	0	7
	%	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	2	2	0	4
	%	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	2	0	2
	%	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Table 53

Did any course contain information on the act of sexual intercourse? (Questionnaire item 123)

		Yes	No	Don't remember	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	5	8	1	14
	%	35.7	57.1	7.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	7	3	0	10
	%	70.0	30.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	11	1	0	12
	%	91.6	8.4	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	2	5	0	7
	%	28.5	71.5	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	3	1	0	4
	%	75.0	25.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	1	0	2
	%	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0

to have encountered less new information in the sex education courses than the Conporns (Table 54). Conporns did not, as hypothesized, have less sex education.

Data available from Midville only, presented in Tables 55 and 56, indicate that Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, were exposed to pornography during childhood. Most of the respondents' parents did not know that their children had been so exposed, but among those that did, the Proporns' parents reacted more indifferently than the parents of the Conporns or the Controls.

Perception of and participation in the ad hoc antipornography organization

As indicated in Table 57, most of the Conporns stated they were "directly" or "indirectly" associated with the ad hoc antipornography organization. A large number of the reported indirect associations were due to the fact that the antipornography endeavor was an organization of organizations, and several of the Conporns represented the constituent community groups. Many of the Midville Conporns claimed to be "not associated" with the antipornography organization at all because several of them feared becoming involved in the $1 million lawsuit (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1971).

Fewer of the Midville than Southtown Conporns accurately knew the name of their ad hoc antipornography organization (Table 58). This difference could in part be accounted for by the fact that the Midville name (Inter-Faith Citizens Committee for Decency, Inc.) was more difficult to remember than the Southtown name (Upsurge for Decency). In general, Controls knew the name of the antipornography organization less often than Proporns, who in turn knew the name less often than Conporns.

Table 59 reveals, not surprisingly, that there was more consensus among Conporns than Proporns, and among Proporns than Controls, regarding the key leaders of the antipornography activity. More Southtown Conporns than Midville Conporns named the chairman of the ad hoc organization as the key leader. Midville Conporns named board or committee members more often than did Southtowners—reflecting the fact that more persons served as leaders in the much larger and longer-operating Midville organization. The relationship of the Southtown organization to the Knights of Columbus is reflected in the relatively greater acknowledgement of church leadership. Similarly, the naming of politicians as leaders in Southtown manifests that organization's orientation—legislative change—which demanded close cooperation with local legislators.

There was some disparity among the Conporns in the two communities concerning the goals of the antipornography organizations (Table 60). The Midville Conporns often cited nonspecific restriction of the sale of pornographic materials and their specific target as the adult bookstores. Southtown Conporns, on the other hand, often cited legislative change to be their primary goal and their specific target to be local movie houses. Relevant to this was the finding that Midville Conporns more than Southtown Conporns elected a strategy of direct action against businesses which were thought to be selling pornographic materials (Table 61). In contrast, Southtown Conporns more often saw the strategy of the ad hoc organization to be arousing and enlisting community support for legislative change with regard to the distribution of pornographic materials in the

community and in the State. Conporns more than Proporns, and Proporns more than Controls, believed that these organizational goals could in fact be attained. Table 62 reveals that Southtown Conporns were more convinced than Midville Conporns of the possibility of attaining goals—probably a result of the greater specificity of the Southtown goals (Zurcher & Kirkpatrick, 1971).

More Southtown Conporns than Midville Conporns had attended at least one meeting of the local antipornography organization (Table 63). Both Southtown Conporns and Midville Conporns had joined the ad hoc organizations from a general sense of obligation and as a result of pressures from participating relatives, friends, and acquaintances (Table 64). Table 64a supports these findings by demonstrating that many of the participants were recruited by systematic efforts of the organization itself—especially in Southtown—and by direct personal contact from persons to whom the respondents felt a sense of obligation.

Tables 65 and 66 indicate that more of the Midville than Southtown Conporns held offices or sat on committees in the antipornography organizations. Of course, Midville's organization had more offices and committee positions available. More Southtown Conporns than Midville Conporns actively recruited members for the antipornography organization (Table 67). Again, the Southtown organization at the time of the study was in the height of its growth activity. Consequently, Southtown Conporns more often than Midville Conporns were talking about the organization's goals and activities outside the regularly scheduled meetings (Table 68).

Most of the Conporn respondents did not belong to any other antipornography organizations. However, as shown in Table 69, Southtown Conporns belonged to them less often than did Midville Conporns. Most of the Conporn respondents had not participated in antipornography organizations in the past (Table 70). Midville Conporns belonged to such organizations less often than Southtown Conporns. Many of the central participants of the Southtown antipornography endeavor were also members of the Knights of Columbus—a voluntary association which in recent years has placed antipornography activity high on its list of community action programs.

Table 71 reveals that Southtown Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, viewed the antipornography organization as one with a great future. (This and the following item were included only in the Southtown administration of the questionnaire.) Southtown Conporns also saw a future role for themselves in the antipornography organization—a result again influenced by the currency of the Southtown endeavors (Table 72). Both Conporns and Proporns, according to Table 73, had a realistic view of community support for their views and their activities. Proporns saw minimal support for the more liberal position they held with regard to restricting or "censoring" alleged pornography.

When asked to indicate who agreed with their position, Midville Conporns and Proporns varied in their responses (Table 74). Proporns more often than Conporns cited individuals with characteristics which could be classified as religio-moral (liberal, church groups, free thinkers, etc.), ideological (liberal, etc.), and diagnostic (open-minded, etc.). On the other hand, more Conporns than Proporns cited the characteristics of their allies by socio-economic class level (upper class, older, etc.), occupational category (high-status occupations, etc.), social role (parents, community leaders, etc.), and organizational affiliations (church

Table 54

Was the information covered by any of the courses generally known to you at the time or was it fairly new to you? (Questionnaire item 124)

		Mostly new information	About half and half	Little or no new information	Don't remember	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	1	6	7	0	14
	%	7.2	42.8	50.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	1	3	5	1	10
	%	10.0	30.0	50.0	10.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	1	4	7	0	12
	%	8.3	33.3	58.3	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	1	5	1	7
	%	0.0	14.2	71.5	14.2	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	0	2	2	0	4
	%	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	1	1	0	2
	%	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0

Table 55

Were you ever exposed to pornography as a child? How much? In what ways were you exposed to it? (Questionnaire item 125)

		Yes	No	Don't remember	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	15	18	3	36
	%	41.7	50.0	8.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	19	6	0	25
	%	76.0	24.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	6	5	1	12
	%	50.0	41.7	8.3	100.0

Table 56

How did your parents react when they learned of your exposure to pornography when you were a child? (Questionnaire item 126)

		Encouragement	Punishment	Verbal discouragement	No significant reaction	They never knew	Total
Southtown Conporns	N						
	%						
Midville Conporns	N	0	2	3	2	8	15
	%	0.0	13.3	20.0	13.3	53.3	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N						
	%						
Midville Proporns	N	2	1	3	6	7	19
	%	10.5	5.2	15.7	31.5	36.8	100.0
Southtown Controls	N						
	%						
Midville Controls	N	0	0	2	1	9	12
	%	0.0	0.0	16.6	8.3	75.0	100.0

Table 57

Are you associated with the anti-obscenity organization here in town? (Questionnaire item 131)

		Official member	Directly associated	Indirectly associated	Not associated	Opposed	Not associated and opposed	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	12	17	17	3	0	0	0	49
	%	24.4	34.6	34.6	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	10	3	12	11	0	0	0	36
	%	27.7	8.3	33.2	30.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	26
	%	0.0	0.0	3.8	96.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	0	1	7	17	0	0	25
	%	0.0	0.0	4.0	28.0	68.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	0	0	0	37	0	1	0	38
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	97.2	0.0	2.6	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	0	0	9	1	1	1	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 58

Could you tell me the name of the anti-obscenity organization here in town? (Questionnaire item 132)

		Organization accurately named	Named other voluntary organization	Said there was no organization	Didn't know	Named, but imprecisely	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	36	3	2	6	2	49
	%	73.4	6.1	4.0	12.2	4.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	21	2	1	8	4	36
	%	58.3	5.5	2.7	22.2	11.1	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	1	0	0	24	1	26
	%	3.8	0.0	0.0	92.4	3.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	5	0	14	5	25
	%	4.0	20.0	0.0	56.0	20.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	0	0	0	35	3	38
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.1	7.9	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	0	0	7	5	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	100.0

Table 59

Whom do you see as the key or most influential members in this group? (Questionnaire item 133)

		Chairman	Committee or board members	Local politicians	Church leaders	Other community leaders	Don't know by name	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N	29	8	8	17	10	5	77
	%	37.6	10.3	10.3	22.0	12.9	6.4	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	18	22	1	3	5	10	59
	%	30.5	37.2	1.6	5.0	8.4	16.9	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	3	0	0	1	26	30
	%	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	86.6	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	4	3	0	1	12	14	34
	%	11.7	8.8	0.0	2.9	35.2	41.1	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	0	0	0	0	0	38	38
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

Table 60

What are the goals of this organization? (Questionnaire item 134)

		Eliminate-restrict obscene-pornographic materials	Eliminate, etc. porn. movies	Eliminate, etc. porn. publications	Eliminate, etc. porn. theaters	Eliminate, etc. porn. bookstores	Influence legis-lation and law enforcement	Influence extra-legal goals	Other	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	8	10	4	0	0	14	10	0	3	49
	%	16.3	20.4	8.2	0.0	0.0	28.6	20.4	0.0	6.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	12	1	1	0	5	3	6	2	6	36
	%	33.3	2.8	2.8	0.0	13.9	8.3	16.7	5.6	16.7	100.0

Table 61

How exactly do you expect to accomplish these goals? (Questionnaire item 135)

		Direct action against businesses	Community support for legislative action	Arousing public attitudes	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	10	21	16	2	49
	%	20.4	42.8	32.6	4.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	14	8	7	7	36
	%	38.8	22.2	19.4	19.4	100.0

Table 62

How many of these goals do you really think will come about? (Questionnaire item 136)

		All or most	Some	Few	None	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	10	24	8	2	44
	%	22.7	54.5	18.1	4.5	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	3	17	5	5	30
	%	10.0	56.6	16.6	16.6	100.0

Table 63

How many meetings of the group have you attended? (Questionnaire item 137)

		None	One	Two	Three	Four	5-10	11-25	Once a month	All of them	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	6	9	8	13	8	1	1	0	3	0	49
	%	12.2	18.3	16.3	26.5	16.2	2.0	2.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	8	3	5	7	3	5	1	1	2	1	36
	%	22.2	8.3	13.8	19.2	8.3	13.8	2.7	2.7	5.5	2.7	100.0

Table 64

What are the reasons you joined this organization? (Questionnaire item 138)

		General sense of obligation	Protect youth from obscenity and pornography	Personal influence	Influenced by media	Influenced by speeches and meeting activities	Influenced by personal experience with pornography	Other	No usable response	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	14	9	15	0	1	4	6	0	49
	%	28.6	18.4	30.6	0.0	2.0	8.2	12.2	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	12	2	11	1	2	0	7	1	36
	%	33.3	5.6	30.5	2.8	5.6	0.0	20.0	2.8	100.0

Table 64a

Exactly how did you get involved in the present activity? (Questionnaire item 145)

		By organizational recruitment	Contact from friends and relatives	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	28	9	37
	%	75.6	24.3	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	9	7	16
	%	56.2	43.7	100.0

Table 65

Do you hold an office in this organization? (Questionnaire item 139)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	6	40	46
	%	13.0	86.9	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	5	17	22
	%	22.7	77.2	100.0

Table 66

Are you on committees? (Questionnaire item 140)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	9	38	47
	%	19.1	80.8	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	15	21
	%	28.5	71.4	100.0

Table 67

Are you trying to get additional members for this group? (Questionnaire item 141)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	43	3	46
	%	93.4	6.5	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	11	7	18
	%	61.1	38.8	100.0

Table 68

How often do you talk about the organization and its activities and goals outside the meetings, e.g., to business associates? (Questionnaire item 142)

		Quite a bit	Sometimes, if it comes up	Rarely	Never	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	30	13	4	0	47
	%	63.8	27.6	8.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	8	6	4	0	18
	%	44.4	33.3	22.2	0.0	100.0

Table 69

How many similar organizations do you belong to now? (Questionnaire item 143)

		None	One	Three	Belong to organizations partly concerned with pornography	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	45	1	1	2	49
	%	92.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	19	1	0	16	36
	%	53.0	3.0	0.0	45.0	100.0

Table 70

Have you been involved in similar activities or groups or activities having to do with the issue of pornography or censorship in the past? (Questionnaire item 144)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	12	35	47
	%	25.5	74.4	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	3	17	20
	%	15.0	85.0	100.0

Table 71

What do you see as the future of the organization? (Questionnaire item 157b)

		Will grow and succeed	Will fail	Censorship will disappear	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	30	2	0	17	49
	%	59.2	6.1	0.0	34.7	100.0
Midville Conporns	N					
	%					
Southtown Proporns	N	0	5	0	21	26
	%	0.0	19.2	0.0	80.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N					
	%					
Southtown Controls	N	4	6	1	27	38
	%	10.7	15.6	2.6	71.1	100.0

Table 72

What do you see as the future of yourself with regard to this organization? (Questionnaire item 157c)

		Continue to support organization	Continue to support fight against pornography	Continue to fight censorship	Indifference-inaction	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	15	21	0	2	11	49
	%	30.6	42.9	0.0	4.1	22.4	100.0
Midville Conporns	N						
	%						
Southtown Proporns	N	0	1	5	0	20	26
	%	0.0	3.8	19.2	0.0	76.9	100.0
Midville Proporns	N						
	%						
Southtown Controls	N	0	3	0	0	35	38
	%	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	92.1	100.0
Midville Controls	N						
	%						

Table 73

How does the community at large feel about your position on the pornography issue? (Questionnaire item 128)

		Apathetic	Disagree with you	Agree partly	Agree strongly	Agree no matter what	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	4	0	17	26	0	2	49
	%	8.2	0.0	34.7	53.1	0.0	4.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	4	2	11	14	3	2	36
	%	11.1	5.6	30.6	38.9	8.3	5.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	2	15	3	0	0	6	26
	%	7.7	57.7	11.5	0.0	0.0	23.1	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	4	15	5	0	0	1	25
	%	16.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	4	4	10	11	0	9	38
	%	10.5	10.5	26.3	28.9	0.0	23.7	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	1	7	0	1	2	12
	%	8.3	8.3	58.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	100.0

Table 74

What groups or people in the community tend to agree with you? (Questionnaire item 129)

		Religio-moral	Ideological	Diagnostic	Socio-economic level	Occupation	Social role	Organization affiliation	Other responses	Don't know	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N										
	%										
Midville Conporns	N	2	5	0	9	9	6	36	7	2	76
	%	2.6	6.6	0.0	11.8	11.8	7.9	47.2	9.2	2.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N										
	%										
Midville Proporns	N	6	7	8	6	3	3	16	1	2	52
	%	11.5	13.5	15.4	11.5	5.7	5.7	30.7	1.9	3.8	100.0
Southtown Controls	N										
	%										
Midville Controls	N	2	1	0	0	2	3	4	4	1	17
	%	11.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	11.8	17.6	23.5	23.5	5.9	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

Table 75

What groups or people in the community tend to disagree with you? (Questionnaire item 130)

		Religio-moral	Ideological	Diagnostic	Socio-economic level	Occupation category	Social role	Organization affiliation	Specific individuals	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N	10	12	18	1	16	3	14	1	75
	%	13.3	16.0	24.0	1.3	21.3	4.0	18.6	1.3	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	10	7	8	4	5	5	3	48
	%	12.5	20.8	14.5	16.6	8.3	10.4	10.4	6.2	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	4	6	13	0	0	0	13	3	39
	%	10.2	15.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	7.6	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	6	7	10	5	7	4	13	1	53
	%	11.3	13.2	18.8	9.4	13.2	7.5	24.5	1.8	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	3	7	7	4	2	7	4	0	34
	%	8.8	20.5	20.5	11.7	5.8	20.5	11.7	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	2	1	6	1	2	1	0	15
	%	13.3	13.3	6.6	40.0	6.6	13.3	6.0	0.0	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

members, PTA, clubs, groups, etc.). When Proporns mentioned a specific group to which their comrades in arms might belong, they usually specified the ACLU.

Respondents in both Midville and Southtown were asked what kinds of people they felt would disagree with their position on pornography. Table 75 indicates that more Conporns than Proporns typified their opponents according to characteristics which were religio-moral (atheists, agnostics, etc.), ideological (radicals, hippies, etc.), socio-economic (young, lower-class, etc.), occupational (professors, profit-oriented businessmen, etc.), and social (students, members of the underworld, etc.). Proporns more often than Conporns saw their opponents in terms of diagnostic characteristics (rigid, mentally ill, bigoted, hypocritical, sexually troubled, etc.). Conversely, Conporns saw people who were opposed to their point of view as being apathetic, users of pornography, misguided, afraid of legitimate authority, and unpatriotic. Proporns more than Conporns attributed general and specific organization affiliations to individuals who opposed their points of view (ad hoc organizations, John Birch Society, PTA's, Daughters of the American Revolution). Conporns specified the Anti-Defamation League and the American Civil Liberties Union as being prime among their opponents.

Perceptions and definitions of pornography and assumed correlates

When asked to define pornography or obscenity, Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, gave relativistic ("eye of the beholder") and cynical ("any movie John Wayne is in") responses (Table 76). Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, gave definitions which included religious judgments, the presence of nudity, the presence of sex activity, the presence of "abnormal" sexual content (sadomasochism, lesbianism, homosexuality, adultery), and the presence of stimuli which offended their aesthetic sensibilities. Both Proporns and Conporns, more than Controls, included in their definitions of pornography or obscenity the specification that the producer had contrived to include deliberately titillative content, and thereby hoped to make a profit.

As shown in Table 77, many of the respondents felt that there was essentially no difference in the definitions of "pornography" and "obscenity." Controls more than Proporns, and the Proporns more than Conporns, said that there was no difference in definition. Those respondents who did distinguish between the two terms generally concluded that pornography was written or pictorial, while obscenity was spoken, and that obscenity was the more general concept.

Some of the respondents indicated that they had never seen "pornographic" films or movies when they were asked to give examples of them (Table 78). Fewer Conporns than Proporns, and fewer Proporns than Controls, had seen such movies. Many of the judgments of allegedly "pornographic" films were based on hearsay; more Conporns than Controls, and more Controls than Proporns, had "heard" about the content of some films which they then concluded were objectionable. Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, felt that there were no such things as pornographic films or movies.

Conporns more than Proporns named specific types of films which they felt to be pornographic. A few Proporns named "stag" movies as falling into that category. Some Conporns named "art" films, "skin flicks," and "X"-rated films as

falling into the pornographic category. Several Conporns felt that "commercial movies" in general were pornographic. Conporns more than Proporns gave examples of pornographic films according to the content of the film. Conporns, for example, cited films which contained nudity or sex activity (primarily centered around coitus or coitus-like motions). Conporns, and to a lesser extent Proporns, felt that movies which contained "abnormal" sexual activity were pornographic (Proporns specified sadomasochism more often).

As shown in Table 79, Midville Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, were positively inclined toward the commercial "GMRX" movie rating scale. Many of the respondents, however, did not know much about the rating system; the Conporns knew more about the code than the Proporns, who in turn knew more about it than the Controls.

Several of the respondents had not actually read books which they would define as pornographic; Conporns had read such books less than Controls, and Controls less than Proporns. Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, felt that there were *no* pornographic books. Conporns more than Proporns, and Proporns more than Controls, knew that pornographic books existed, and what some of them were, because they had "heard about them" from others. These data are presented in Table 80.

Controls more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Proporns, were able to name specific types of books which they felt were pornographic. Conporns generally named specific titles, Proporns indicated categories, and some Controls felt that "best sellers" were examples of types of pornographic books. Proporns more than either Conporns or Controls gave specific kinds of content as examples of pornographic books—sexual activity, sadomasochism, abnormal sex, exploitative sex, and so on.

As indicated in Table 81, fewer Conporns and Controls than Proporns had read magazines which they would consider to be pornographic. Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, felt that there were no such things as pornographic magazines. Conporns more than Proporns, and Proporns more than Controls, named specific types of magazines as being pornographic. Conporns mentioned such magazine types as underground, nudist, girlie, popular (e.g., *Playboy*), scandal, and paperback. Proporns named such types as beaver, homosexual, tabloid, and stag magazines. Controls named such magazine types as girlie, action, popular (e.g., *Playboy*), and stag magazines. Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, named specific content as being the criterion for a pornographic label. Conporns specified nude, perverted, or sexual activity content as meeting that criterion; some Controls indicated sexual activity, and Proporns specified actual coitus as meeting it.

Controls more than Conporns, and Conporns far more than Proporns, felt that *Playboy* was obscene or pornographic (Table 82).

When responding to a question about what television programs are obscene (asked in Midville only), Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, indicated that no television programs could be defined in this manner (Table 83). Conporns, again more than the other two response groups, were able to name specific types of programs which they felt to be obscene—the comedy variety shows, nighttime talk shows, and some commercials. A few of the Proporns felt that western programs were obscene, primarily because of the

Table 76

Will you give us a definition of pornography or obscenity? (Questionnaire item 146a)

		Nudity	Sexual activity	Profit motive	Abnormal sexual content, activity	Relativistic definition	Unesthetic, vulgar	Religio-moral affront	Cynical response	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	10	5	6	14	1	6	6	0	1	49
	%	20.4	10.2	12.2	28.6	2.0	12.2	12.2	0.0	2.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	3	4	13	4	0	6	6	0	0	36
	%	8.4	11.1	36.1	11.1	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	3	3	6	0	10	1	1	2	0	26
	%	11.4	11.4	23.1	0.0	38.5	3.8	3.8	7.7	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	1	3	2	9	3	2	5	0	25
	%	0.0	4.0	12.0	8.2	36.0	12.0	8.0	20.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	16	3	6	1	2	5	3	0	2	38
	%	42.1	7.9	15.8	2.6	5.3	13.2	7.9	0.0	5.3	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	2	3	2	0	1	1	1	1	12
	%	8.3	16.6	24.9	16.6	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	100.0

Table 77

Is there a difference between "obscenity" and "pornography?" If so, what is it? (Questionnaire item 146b)

		Pornography is pictorial	Pornography is written	Pornography involves sexual activity	Obscenity is spoken	Obscenity is written	Obscenity involves sexual activity	Obscenity is a less general concept	Obscenity is a more general concept	Obscenity is more severe than pornography	Obscenity is less severe than pornography	There is no difference between pornography and obscenity	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	6	2	0	4	1	5	1	2	3	3	11	38
	%	15.7	5.2	0.0	10.5	2.6	13.1	2.6	5.2	7.8	7.8	28.9	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	2	3	3	0	0	2	4	1	1	9	31
	%	19.3	6.4	9.6	9.6	0.0	0.0	6.4	12.9	3.2	3.2	29.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	10	21
	%	14.2	4.7	9.5	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	14.2	4.7	0.0	47.6	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	22
	%	0.0	18.1	18.1	13.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	9.0	4.5	31.8	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	6	1	0	4	3	0	0	1	1	1	14	31
	%	19.3	3.2	0.0	12.9	9.6	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	3.2	45.1	100.0
Midville Controls	N	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	9
	%	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.5	100.0

Table 78

Can you give some examples of what you feel are pornographic movies or films? (Questionnaire item 147a)

		Specific content mentioned	Specific types mentioned	Heard about them	Have not seen pornographic-obscene movies	There are no pornographic-obscene movies	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	11	24	4	4	0	43
	%	25.5	55.8	9.3	9.3	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	16	1	10	0	33
	%	18.1	48.4	3.0	30.3	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	2	9	0	3	8	22
	%	9.0	40.9	0.0	13.6	36.3	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	9	9	0	2	4	24
	%	37.5	37.5	0.0	8.3	16.6	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	5	11	1	2	0	19
	%	26.3	57.8	5.2	10.5	0.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	4	0	1	1	8
	%	25.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	100.0

Table 79

What do you thing of the GMRX rating scale? (Questionnaire item 147b)

		Positive response	Negative response	Don't know what it is	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	18	5	13	36
	%	50.0	13.9	36.1	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	3	6	16	25
	%	12.0	24.0	64.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	3	0	9	12
	%	25.0	0.0	75.0	100.0

Table 80

Can you give some examples of what you feel to be pornographic books? (Questionnaire item 148)

		Specific content mentioned	Specific types mentioned	Have heard about pornographic books	Have not read pornographic books	There are no pornographic books	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	3	13	16	12	0	44
	%	6.8	29.5	36.3	27.2	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	4	6	17	8	0	35
	%	11.4	17.1	48.5	22.8	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	7	7	2	4	5	25
	%	28.0	28.0	8.0	16.0	20.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	5	2	10	3	3	23
	%	21.7	8.6	43.4	13.0	13.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	5	6	10	14	2	37
	%	13.5	16.2	27.0	37.8	5.4	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	4	1	1	1	8
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	100.00

Table 81

Now about magazines. Which ones do you feel to be obscene? (Questionnaire item 149a)

		Specific con-tent mentioned	Specific type mentioned	Have not read	No obscene magazines	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	9	24	15	1	0	49
	%	18.3	48.9	30.6	2.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	11	19	6	0	0	36
	%	30.5	52.7	16.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	7	2	16	1	26
	%	0.0	26.9	7.6	61.5	3.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	2	6	4	11	2	25
	%	8.0	24.0	16.0	44.0	8.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	3	13	11	5	6	38
	%	7.8	34.2	28.9	13.1	15.7	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	1	3	0	6	12
	%	16.6	8.3	25.0	0.0	50.0	100.0

Table 82

Is *Playboy* obscene? (Questionnaire item 149b)

		Yes	No	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	29	13	42
	%	69.0	30.9	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	16	13	29
	%	55.1	44.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	4	16	20
	%	20.0	80.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	22	23
	%	4.3	95.6	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	18	6	24
	%	75.0	25.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	5	2	7
	%	71.4	28.5	100.0

Table 83

Now about TV. Are there any programs you feel to be obscene? (Questionnaire item 150)

		Specific content mentioned	Specific type mentioned	No obscene programs	Total
Southtown Conporns	N				
	%				
Midville Conporns	N	12	11	6	29
	%	41.3	37.9	20.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N				
	%				
Midville Proporns	N	6	2	14	22
	%	27.2	9.0	63.6	100.0
Southtown Controls	N				
	%				
Midville Controls	N	2	2	4	8
	%	25.0	25.0	50.0	100.0

violence. Similarly, Conporns were able to name specific types of content in television programs which they felt to be obscene–violence, language and jokes, certain sex-related themes, and alcohol. Proporns, when giving examples of television obscenity by program content, generally specified violence.

Table 84 reports the respondents' opinions about the kinds of people who produce pornography. Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, evaluated the producers in religio-moral terms. Conporns assessed the producers as immoral, atheistic, and irresponsible; Controls mostly assessed them simply as immoral. Conporns more than Proporns, and Proporns more than Controls, attributed ideological characteristics to the producers. Conporns assessed them to be Communists, hippies, and radicals; Proporns assessed them to be rebels; and Controls assessed them to be radicals. Conporns more than Proporns or Controls "diagnosed" the producers–Conporns viewing them as mentally ill, profit-oriented, deviant, and having no self-respect; Proporns assessing them as profit-oriented, immature, clever, "arty," lonely, and having different tastes; Controls assessing them as profit-oriented, sick, apathetic, unambitious, lonely, and weak. Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, assessed pornography producers according to socio-economic level, but the data here are thin. Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, assessed pornography makers according to occupational category –Proporns seeing them as businessmen and as rather low-talented entrepreneurs. Conporns saw them as criminal-like businessmen, and Controls generally saw them simply as "smut dealers.". Finally, Controls more than either Proporns or Conporns assessed pornography makers according to some sort of arbitrary social role, although all three respondent groups seemed to assess pornography makers as exploiters of other people.

Conporns more than Controls, and Controls far more than Proporns, felt that organized crime was associated with the distribution of pornography (Table 85). As hypothesized, Conporns more than Controls, and Controls far more than Proporns, felt that a Communist conspiracy was associated with the distribution of pornography (Table 86).

The respondents in both communities were asked to describe what kinds of people they thought might be attracted to pornography. A summary of the distribution of responses is presented in Table 87. Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, assessed such persons in religio-moral terms–Conporns saw them as atheists, agnostics, and adherents of weak religions. Controls saw them as atheists and adherents of weak religions. The major response category to the question was centered around respondent diagnoses of pornography users, with Conporns making diagnoses more than either Controls or Proporns. Conporns saw the users as being mentally ill, sexually troubled, deviant, anomic, insecure, and looking for sexual stimulation. Controls viewed them as insecure, mentally ill, and immature. Proporns, on the other hand, mostly saw them as being healthy, frustrated, or immature. Conporns and Controls more than Proporns assessed the users according to socio-economic level–lower class. Conporns saw users as being young persons; Proporns saw them as being young or old, but especially adolescent; Controls primarily saw them as simply being young. Not many respondents assessed the users by occupational category, although Controls did so more often than Proporns, and Proporns more than

Conporns; professors, military personnel, and businessmen were named most often. Proporns more than either Controls or Conporns assessed users according to some sort of social role—Conporns saw them as being illiterates, bums, and males; Proporns saw them as single, male, but not as any set kind of individual; Controls saw them for the most part as being males and students.

When the respondents were asked how they, as individuals, were different from people who were attracted to or would use pornography, Proporns more than either Controls or Conporns felt that there was, in fact, no difference (Table 88). Among those respondents who did feel that they differed from pornography users, Controls more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Proporns, saw the differences as being religio-moral—Conporns felt that they were more religious, Christian, moral, self-disciplined, and had better home backgrounds than pornography users; Proporns felt that they had a different value system, and perhaps were more mature; Controls felt that they had a different value system, and that they might have had better home backgrounds. Proporns more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Controls, expressed the differences between themselves and pornography users in diagnostic terms. Conporns felt themselves to be better adjusted sexually, more normal, to have better mental health and family life, and not to be attracted to, excited by, or in need of pornography. Proporns also felt themselves to be in a better state of mental health than pornography users, better adjusted sexually, to have different interests than users, and to enjoy pornography but not seek it out. Some Proporns indicated that they would rather perform the sexual acts than look at pictures of them. Controls felt they had better mental health and family life, and did not need and were not excited by or attracted to pornography.

More Conporns and Controls than Proporns assessed differences between themselves and pornography users in terms of socio-economic level—Conporns and Controls reporting themselves as being older, better educated, and higher class. Very few respondents indicated differences having to do with ideology, occupational category, social role, or organization affiliation.

Table 89 reports the response distribution to the question "What are the effects of pornography?" Proporns far more often than Controls and Conporns felt that there were no significant effects at all from exposure to or use of pornography. Similarly, Proporns far more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, felt that there might even be positive effects from exposure to or use of pornography. In contrast, Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, felt rather strongly that exposure to or use of pornography could encourage violence, crime, and sexual deviance, cause undue sexual arousal, and degrade and abuse the individual. These findings are as hypothesized. Conporns more than Proporns felt family and educational teachings about sex were interfered with.

Conporns more than Proporns, and Proporns more than Controls, felt that a sexual revolution was going on (Table 90). To Conporns, the sexual revolution was related to the use of pornography, and many of them thought the relationship was causal. To the Proporns, pornography generally was unrelated to the sexual revolution, except tangentially as part of an increasing liberality in sexual mores.

Table 91 reveals that Proporns and Conporns more than Controls felt that the "pill" was primarily responsible for the present sexual scene being different from

Table 84

What kinds of people do you think make pornography? (Questionnaire item 151)

		Religio-moral	Ideological	Diagnostic	Socio-economic level	Occupation	Social role	Organization affiliation	Don't know	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N	12	3	77	0	4	15	0	3	114
	%	10.5	2.6	67.5	0.0	3.5	13.1	0.0	2.6	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	8	2	47	0	1	2	0	2	62
	%	12.9	3.2	75.8	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.0	3.2	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	1	26	2	11	3	0	0	43
	%	0.0	2.3	60.4	4.6	25.5	6.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	0	31	2	5	5	0	0	43
	%	0.0	0.0	72.0	4.6	11.6	11.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	8	1	45	3	4	10	0	1	72
	%	11.0	1.4	62.4	4.1	5.5	13.8	0.0	1.4	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	0	14	0	0	3	0	2	20
	%	5.0	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	10.0	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

Table 85

Do you think organized crime is connected with pornography? (Questionnaire item 152a)

		Very much	Somewhat or indirectly	Not at all	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	28	13	4	4	49
	%	57.1	26.5	8.1	8.1	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	19	13	3	1	36
	%	53.0	37.0	8.0	3.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	16	6	4	26
	%	0.0	61.5	23.0	15.3	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	3	4	17	1	25
	%	12.0	16.0	68.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	17	17	2	2	38
	%	44.7	44.7	5.2	5.2	100.0
Midville Controls	N	5	6	0	1	12
	%	42.0	50.0	0.0	8.0	100.0

Table 86

Do you think Communists are connected with pornography? (Questionnaire item 152b)

		Very much	Somewhat or indirectly	Not at all	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	7	21	21	0	49
	%	14.2	42.8	42.8	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	11	12	12	1	36
	%	31.0	33.0	33.0	3.0	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	6	20	0	26
	%	0.0	23.1	76.9	0.0	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	0	1	24	0	25
	%	0.0	4.0	96.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	4	14	15	5	38
	%	10.5	36.8	39.4	13.1	100.0
Midville Controls	N	2	4	3	3	12
	%	17.0	33.0	25.0	25.0	100.0

Table 87

What kinds of people are attracted to or use pornography? (Questionnaire item 153)

		Religio-moral	Ideological	Diagnostic	Socio-economic level	Occupation	Social role	Organization affiliation	Don't know	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N	11	0	72	27	0	17	0	0	127
	%	8.6	0.0	56.2	21.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	6	1	52	15	1	8	0	2	83
	%	7.0	1.1	60.9	17.6	1.1	9.4	0.0	2.2	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	0	27	9	2	15	0	1	54
	%	0.0	0.0	50.0	16.6	3.7	27.7	0.0	1.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	0	27	6	0	16	0	0	50
	%	2.0	0.0	54.0	12.0	0.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	1	0	49	28	3	14	0	3	98
	%	1.0	0.0	50.0	28.2	3.0	14.4	0.0	3.0	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	0	12	3	0	3	0	3	22
	%	4.5	0.0	54.5	13.6	0.0	13.6	0.0	13.6	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

Table 88

In what ways are you different from those who are attracted to or use pornography (Questionnaire item 155)

		Religio-moral	Ideological	Diagnostic	Socio-economic level	Occupation	Social role	Organization affiliation	I am not different	Don't know	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N	53	0	46	8	0	1	0	4	6	118
	%	45.8	0.0	39.6	6.9	0.0	.9	0.0	3.4	5.2	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	38	0	43	1	0	0	0	2	5	89
	%	42.6	0.0	48.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.6	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	8	0	27	0	0	0	0	13	3	51
	%	15.7	0.0	52.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.5	5.9	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	21	0	28	1	0	0	0	8	0	58
	%	36.2	0.0	48.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	33	0	41	6	0	0	0	5	7	92
	%	35.8	0.0	44.3	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	7.6	100.0
Midville Controls	N	21	1	7	3	1	1	0	0	2	36
	%	58.2	2.8	19.4	8.3	2.8	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.5	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

Table 89

What are the effects of pornography? (Questionnaire item 155)

		Encourages violence	Encourages crime	Encourages sexual deviance	Causes undue sexual arousal	Interferes with family sex education	Degrades and abuses individual	No significant reaction	Positive effects	Other negative responses	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	9	4	3	4	16	12	0	0	0	1	49
	%	18.4	8.2	6.1	8.2	32.7	24.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	8	1	4	9	7	5	0	1	0	1	36
	%	22.2	2.8	11.1	25.0	19.4	13.9	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	0	0	2	2	3	1	12	5	0	1	26
	%	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	11.5	3.8	46.2	19.2	0.0	3.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	1	0	1	0	2	2	13	4	1	1	25
	%	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	8.0	52.0	16.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	1	2	3	5	11	8	6	1	0	1	38
	%	2.6	5.3	7.9	13.2	28.9	21.1	15.8	2.6	0.0	2.6	100.0
Midville Controls	N	1	0	1	0	4	0	2	1	0	3	12
	%	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	8.3	0.0	25.0	100.0

Table 90

Is there a sexual revolution going on? (If "yes," is pornography related to this?) (Questionnaire item 156)

		No	Yes—pornography is the cause	Yes—pornography is the effect	Yes—pornography is related	Yes—pornography is *not* related	Yes—but no response to relation to pornography	Yes—pornography both cause and effect	Don't know	Total
	N	10	9	8	14	3	3	0	2	49
Southtown Conporns	%	20.4	18.4	16.3	28.6	6.1	6.1	0.0	4.0	100.0
	N	8	6	4	10	1	4	1	2	36
Midville Conporns	%	22.2	16.7	11.1	27.8	2.8	11.1	2.8	5.6	100.0
	N	7	2	1	2	7	2	0	2	26
Southtown Proporns	%	26.9	7.7	15.4	7.7	26.9	7.7	0.0	7.7	100.0
	N	7	1	1	3	4	6	0	3	25
Midville Proporns	%	28.0	4.0	4.0	12.0	16.0	24.0	0.0	12.0	100.0
	N	12	5	4	8	3	2	0	4	38
Southtown Controls	%	31.6	13.2	10.5	21.1	7.9	5.3	0.0	10.6	100.0
	N	4	1	0	2	1	1	0	3	12
Midville Controls	%	33.3	8.3	0.0	16.7	8.3	8.3	0.0	25.0	100.0

Table 91

Why is the present sexual scene different from when you were young? (Questionnaire item 156c)

		The Pill	Family change	Better sex education	Population explosion	Affluence	Influence of media	Breakdown of morals	Don't know, not applicable	Total
	N	5	1	0	2	1	2	2	35	49
Southtown Conporns	%	10.2	4.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	71.4	100.0
	N	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	27	36
Midville Conporns	%	11.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	5.5	75.0	100.0
	N	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	22	26
Southtown Proporns	%	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	84.6	100.0
	N	3	0	1	0	0	3	1	17	25
Midville Proporns	%	12.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	4.0	68.0	100.0
	N	3	3	1	3	0	1	0	27	38
Southtown Controls	%	7.8	7.8	2.6	7.8	0.0	2.6	0.0	71.0	100.0
	N	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	9	12
Midville Controls	%	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	75.0	100.0

that of their youth. Controls more than Proporns, and Proporns more than Conporns, felt that better sex education accounted for the difference. Only a few Conporns, Proporns, and Controls felt the increased sexual content of media accounted for the difference between the contemporary sexual scene and that of their youth. Controls more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Proporns, felt that the differences could be accounted for by changes in the way the parents socialized their children in the family setting.

More Proporns than Conporns, and more Conporns than Controls, felt that the present sexual scene differs from that of their youth in that there has been an increase in sexual activity. Controls more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Proporns, felt that the primary difference was more sexual content in popular culture. Proporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Conporns, felt the major difference was a general increase in liberality toward sexual activities. These data are presented in Table 92.

Table 93 reports the opinions of respondents concerning the future of obscenity and pornography in the United States. Controls more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Proporns, felt that the availability of such materials would increase in the future. Conporns amended this to say that such would be the case *if* action wasn't taken by concerned citizens. Proporns more than Conporns, and Conporns more than Controls, felt that the availability would decrease. Proporns justified this mostly in terms of their feeling that pornography a. present is really just a kind of fad with which people will soon grow tired.

As shown in Table 94, Conporns more than Controls, and Controls more than Proporns, felt that pornography was a social problem—the Conporns feeling that it was causally related to all sorts of social pathology (sexual deviance, prostitution, illegitimacy, venereal disease, race riots, crime, violence, divorce, etc.). Many Conporns felt that it was a more serious social problem than, for example, race riots, air pollution, poverty, war, the population explosion, and alcoholism.

DISCUSSION

The Introduction stated that a major purpose of the research was to describe some of the characteristics of Conporns—people who become centrally involved in ad hoc antipornography organizations. The results indicate that Conporns in two such organizations manifest characteristics which were consistently different from Proporns but not substantially different from Controls. Based upon the relative indices drawn from questionnaire responses, a tentative profile of the Conporns may be attempted.

Conporns were middle-aged, reared in small towns, religiously oriented, and religiously active. They were also occupationally active, usually in nonprofessional white-collar or small business jobs, and tended to like their work. They had at least some college experience, and had achieved material comfort and easily fell within middle-class affluence. Conporns had been married for many years, had several children, had a stable marriage history, and were satisfied with and oriented toward marriage and family life. Conporns were just as likely to be males as females, contrary to the common stereotype of antipornography activists as women.

Conporns were politically active, participating in precinct meetings, donating

Table 92

How is the present sexual scene different from when you were young? (Questionnaire item 180b)

		Increase in sex activity	More sex in popular culture	Increased liberality in sex attitudes	More disease (e.g., VD)	Less emphasis on sex	Don't know	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	21	10	7	3	1	7	49
	%	42.9	20.4	14.3	6.1	2.0	14.3	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	19	3	4	0	0	10	36
	%	52.8	8.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	27.8	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	16	1	7	0	0	2	26
	%	61.5	3.8	26.9	0.0	0.0	7.7	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	12	2	4	2	0	5	25
	%	48.0	8.0	16.0	8.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	1	10	8	1	1	5	38
	%	34.6	26.3	21.1	2.6	2.6	13.2	100.0
Midville Controls	N	3	2	2	0	0	5	12
	%	25.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	41.6	100.0

Table 93

What do you see as the future of obscenity and pornography in the nation? (Questionnaire item 157a)

		Availability—use of material will increase	Availability—use of material will decrease	More citizen conporn campaigns will be held	Pornographic availability will remain the same	Don't know, it depends	Total
Southtown Conporns	N	15	18	3	1	12	49
	%	30.5	36.7	6.1	2.0	24.5	100.0
Midville Conporns	N	23	4	1	0	8	36
	%	63.9	11.1	2.8	0.0	22.2	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N	11	6	1	0	8	26
	%	42.5	23.1	3.8	0.0	30.8	100.0
Midville Proporns	N	9	9	0	2	5	25
	%	36.0	36.0	0.0	8.0	20.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N	19	9	3	0	7	38
	%	50.0	23.7	7.9	0.0	18.4	100.0
Midville Controls	N	6	2	0	1	3	12
	%	50.0	16.6	0.0	8.3	25.0	100.0

Table 94

Do you believe that pornography is a social problem?How serious is it as compared with other social problems? (Questionnaire item 158)

		No	Yes	Causes social pathology	More serious	Less serious	Don't know	No usable response	Total*
Southtown Conporns	N								
	%								
Midville Conporns	N	4	31	18	21	36	0	1	111
	%	3.6	27.9	16.2	18.9	32.4	0.0	0.1	100.0
Southtown Proporns	N								
	%								
Midville Proporns	N	16	9	0	1	18	0	0	44
	%	36.3	20.4	0.0	2.2	40.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Southtown Controls	N								
	%								
Midville Controls	N	2	4	1	0	6	3	3	19
	%	10.5	21.0	5.2	0.0	31.5	15.7	15.7	100.0

*Total equals number of multiple responses.

time and money to campaigns, following campaigns in the newspaper, and voting (especially in local elections). They were either Democrats or Republicans, depending upon the regional ideologies of the parties, but they consistently tended toward a conservative political point of view.

Hence, with regard to demographic characteristics, Conporns were quite similar to the active participants in temperance organizations described by Gusfield (1963)—rural, middle-class, middle-aged, politically active, religiously active, family-oriented, and conservative.

Although Proporns and Conporns were similar in average family income, they were strikingly different in other demographic characteristics. Proporns were better educated, younger, less family and religiously oriented, reared in larger cities, and tended toward a liberal political ideology. Compared with the Controls, Conporns were considerably more religious, political, family-oriented, and politically conservative.

Contrary to expectations, Conporns did not feel a sense of powerlessness, normlessness, or alienation. Indeed, they felt very much a part of American society, as they defined it, and were basically satisfied with what they perceived to be the dominant societal values and norms. However, their views of those values and norms tended to be somewhat rigid, as indicated by their relatively high scores on the authoritarianism and dogmatism scales. Similarly, they tended to be intolerant of individuals whose political values were different from theirs—particularly if that difference was in a radical or liberal direction. Conporns maintained traditional and restrictive views of sexual behavior, both in public and in the home, and favored censorship to service and to protect those

views.

Proporns by contrast were considerably less authoritarian, dogmatic, politically intolerant, and traditional in their view of sexual behavior. They opposed censorship for any purpose. However, they felt considerably more powerless, normless, and alienated than Conporns. In contrast to the Conporns, Proporns were a minority in their communities. The field data and questionnaire data from Conporns and Controls indicate that conservatism and traditionalism prevailed in the political, educational, economic, and religious institutions of both Midville and Southtown. To have been uncomfortable with conservatism and traditionalism, as were the Proporns, could have encouraged a feeling of distance from and powerlessness within either community.

Clearly, Conporns believed that the norms and values of their community and of the society at large were akin to theirs and that they could effectively counter threats to those norms and values by political or legal action. The Conporns possessed this sense of identification and efficacy not only more than Proporns, but more than Controls as well.

Gusfield (1963, p. 88) has pointed out that individuals who have built their self-conceptions on traditional values and who conduct their everyday behavior according to traditional norms are vulnerable to the inevitable processes of social change in modern societies. Change upsets old hierarchies, develops new collective aspirations, and challenges long-established values and norms with potential obsolescence. When the individual is threatened with the impact of social change upon his self-conception, especially upon the prestige and respect he has enjoyed and has come to expect as associated with his espousal of traditional values and norms, he will resist both the change and those he perceives to be the agents of change. According to Gusfield, such individuals are concerned about the status of a style of life into which they have been socialized, and they will strive to preserve, defend, or enhance the dominance and prestige of that style (1963, p.3). One method of defending one's style of life is to engage in a moral crusade against the perceived threat and against individuals whose style of life differs and whose actions are threatening.

In contemporary American society, counter-cultures and cross-cultural pressures are challenging traditional values and norms concerning education, religion, authority, government, war, work, marriage, children, patriotism, and sexual behavior. If these components of an individual's life style are being challenged, the moral crusade, as a means of demonstrating, at least symbolically, the universality and power of traditional values, may provide a means of dissent. That demonstration can most effectively be conducted by focusing on a specific moral issue. Gusfield (1963) has described the temperance movement as such an issue, and Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1971) have described the antipornography movement as such an issue.

Primarily because the courses were not available to them, most of the Conporns had not had formal sex education in schools. However, the fact that Conporns' children were obtaining such education could lead to value and perceptual conflicts between the parents and offspring in regard to sexual activity. Generally, Conporns themselves had not been exposed to pornography when young and were rather severe if they learned that their children were coming in contact with it. The Proporns had somewhat more exposure to pornography as youth and tended

to be more relaxed with regard to their children's exposure to pornography. Conporns and Proporns were similar in the degree to which they talked to their children about sexual topics, but the content of such talk, and the associated moral imperatives, were quite dissimilar.

Conporns generally had not belonged to ad hoc antipornography organizations before their present membership, nor were they concurrently involved in other such groups. However, some were members of formal voluntary associations whose concerns included pornography. Conporns did feel that antipornography activity would increase in the future in order to meet what they perceived to be the rising tide of pornography.

Conporns took their participation in the ad hoc antipornography organization very seriously. They expended a great deal of energy and many hours as regular members, officers, and members of committees. Generally, they joined the organization because they had a sense of moral obligation and because of the personal influence of members of the organization who were important to them. Conporns' views of the goals and strategies of the ad hoc antipornography organizations were somewhat vague in Midville, but less so in Southtown. The staff's observations suggest that one really need not have known the specific goals and strategies of the organization in order to benefit from participation. The symbolic nature of participation and organizational accomplishment may be, as Gusfield (1963) has pointed out, the most vital part of the moral crusade. Conporns were able to categorize more clearly those who agreed with them than those who disagreed. Those who agreed were seen to be affiliated with other conservative and traditional civic and religious voluntary associations. Those who disagreed were categorized negatively into various religio-moral, ideological, socio-economic, occupational, social, and diagnostic types. The "foe" was perceived in more vague and diffuse terms than the "friend." On the whole, however, Conporns saw the community in agreement with their point of view concerning pornography—an accurate assessment. In contrast, Proporns correctly saw the community as opposed to their more liberal point of view.

We were impressed by the failure of the Conporns to provide consensual definitions of pornography and obscenity. The definitions given were diverse, including pronouncements of religious judgment, indictments of profit motive, and condemnation of specific sexual behavior and "abnormality." Essentially, the Conporn definitions of obscenity and pornography were value judgments contrasting their traditional set of accepted values and norms with those manifested in various elements of social change. Proporn definitions of obscentiy and pornography were less diverse, mostly concentrating within a relativistic "eye of the beholder" frame of reference.

Some Conporns had never seen what they would define as pornographic movies and had never read what they would define as pornographic books or magazines. Yet, nearly all of them had opinions, expressed in terms of type and content, about the nature of such movies, books, and magazines. Apparently, much of the knowledge concerning pornographic materials was hearsay from "opinion leaders." The range of the examples of pornographic materials provided by the Conporns was extremely diverse. Their inability to specifically define pornographic materials reflects the lack of focus in their definitions of obscenity and pornography in general. Essentially, Conporns were participating in the

antipornography effort with definitions and perceptions of pornography that varied widely. The variation probably reflects the symbolic and status protest aspects of the antipornography crusade. Pornography represented other more sweeping threats (from elements of social change) to those values, norms, and life style which they cherished. By contrast, some Proporns felt there were no pornographic movies, books, or magazines (only "pornographic people"). However, many Proporns did name by type or content specific examples of pornographic materials. Their examples were more focused on what could be called hard-core pornography (stag films, sex books, beaver magazines). Further, most Proporns had actually had some exposure to such materials.

Although most of the Proporns felt that no television programs were pornographic or obscene, most of the Conporns gave examples, by content and type, of the programs they felt were obscene. In general, Conporns felt that examples of pornography or obscenity could be found in all the commercial media.

Conporns harshly judged individuals who produced pornographic material for sale, along with those who used or were attracted to it, and classified them according to diverse characteristics—mostly diagnostic. Conporns considered themselves different in many ways from individuals who used pornography, but the primary differences were expressed in terms of religio-moral and diagnostic characteristics. Again, the lack of specificity concerning the producers and users of pornography, and the value-laden responses, reflect the importance of pornography as an issue which symbolically represents a wide spectrum of value, norm, and status threats. Proporns were somewhat more specific in their labeling of individuals who produced and used pornography, but nonetheless were quite diverse in their classifications. This diversity was a pattern throughout respondent definitions of pornography and obscenity, examples of pornographic materials, and descriptions of those who agreed or disagreed with them. The diversity of Proporn responses indicates that they, as well as Conporns, were speaking less to pornography as a single issue than as a symbolic representation of a far broader value complex—one opposed to that of the Conporns.

Many of the Conporns believed that organized crime and/or a Communist conspiracy were connected with the production and distribution of pornography. This finding supports Gusfield's (1963) and Hofstadter's (1965) assertion that moral crusades generally manifest belief in a theory of conspiracy. Conporns also saw university people, liberals, and radicals as an active part of, or dupes of, that same conspiracy.

According to Conporns, the distribution and use of pornography was associated with a variety of social pathologies. But again, the diversity of responses reflects the symbolic nature of pornography as an issue for status discontents. Of particular interest from the value threat perspective was the high percentage of Conporns who complained that pornography has interfered with the family prerogative to educate their children about the moral imperatives of sexual behavior. Proporns, in contrast to Conporns, felt that there was no significant reaction from exposure to pornography. Some Proporns even felt there were positive effects from such exposure.

Conporns perceived the presence of a sexual revolution, to some extent "caused by the pill," which was related to the availability of pornography and

which involved more sexual activity, an increased liberality toward sexual behavior, and more sexual content in the popular culture than when they were young. Conporn perceptions of a sexual revolution and its dynamics again suggest their concern was not so much with a change in sexual activity itself as with the violation of the network of values and norms—a total life style—of which sexual behavior was a part. Proporns possessed a similar conception of the sexual revolution. However, the difference was that Conporns looked upon change negatively, while the Proporns looked upon the change positively. The value systems of Conporns were threatened by the perceived changes and the pressures toward change. The Proporns' value systems accommodated or encouraged such changes.

The Conporns were divided as to whether obscenity and pornography in the United States would decrease or increase in the future. The division centered around differing views regarding the efficacy of citizen action against pornography and whether more citizens would become involved in such activity. In addition, Proporns differed in their forecast about the future availability of pornography. Some felt restrictions would eventually be lifted, making pornographic material more available. Others felt that people would become bored with pornography, resulting in less demand, and hence, less availability.

Nearly all of the Conporns felt that pornography was a social problem. Several thought it was more serious than any other social problem. Interestingly, other social problems mentioned by the Conporns were among those that would not significantly challenge their life styles: air pollution, poverty, war, overpopulation, alcoholism. Most Proporns felt that pornography was a social problem, but less significant or urgent than other social problems.

Most of the expectations concerning the characteristics of Conporns stated in the Introduction were supported by the questionnaire findings. More importantly, the conclusions reached by Zurcher and Kirkpatrick (1971) that the participants in the ad hoc antipornography organizations were status discontents, individuals whose life style was being challenged by pressures toward social change, were generally supported by the questionnaire data presented above. Conporns are middle-class, middle-aged, religious, conservative, and traditional individuals who felt that their value and norm systems represented the majority of United States citizens (the "Silent Majority") and that these norms and value systems were under attack. Consequently, they have taken steps to counteract the attack. They have organized direct action to restrict "pornography" and to punish "pornography producers" and to rescue individuals who might become "pornography users." The ambiguity in their definitions of what pornography is, who produces it, and who uses it, and the actual content of those definitions, reflect the broader, underlying issue of the "righteousness" of the value and norm systems espoused by the Conporns themselves. The goals of the ad hoc antipornography organization, as reported by the Conporns, clearly indicated the importance of symbolic accomplishments (perhaps even more than utilitarian accomplishments), which would demonstrate that the Conporns' style of life was still dominant, prestigeful, and powerful.

In summary, Gusfield (1963) has pointed out that when individuals, perceiving themselves to be a group, feel that their prestige is less than they expect, that their self-esteem is challenged by the failure of others to grant the respect,

approval, admiration and deference they feel that they justly deserve as people who have pledged themselves to a previously prestigeful and dominant set of values, beliefs, and behaviors, they are motivated to engage in public and symbolic acts which serve to raise or maintain their social status vis-a-vis other groups in the society. In the past, examples of such public and symbolic actions have been those directed against alcohol, fluoridation, domestic Communism, school curricula, the United Nations, and sex education. Based upon the staff's observations and questionnaire data, it can be concluded that antipornography activities, and the ad hoc antipornography organizations which conduct them, can be added to the list.

REFERENCES

Abcarian, G., & Stanage, S. M. Alienation and the radical right. *Journal of Politics,* 1965, *27*, 776-796.

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, N. R. *The authoritarian personality.* New York: Harper and Row, 1950.

Apter, D. E. (Ed.). *Ideology and discontent.* New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Bell, D. (Ed.). *The new American right.* New York: Criterion, 1955.

Bell, D. (Ed.). *The radical right.* New York: Doubleday, 1963.

Dean, D. G. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. *American Sociological Review,* 1961, *26*, 753-758.

Gusfield, J. R. *Symbolic crusade: Status politics and the American temperance movement.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Hofstadter, R. *The paranoid style in American politics.* New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Kirkpatrick, C. Religion and humanitarianism: A study of institutional implications. *Psychological Monographs,* 1949, *63.*

Ladd, E. C. The radical right: The white-collar extremism. *The South Atlantic Quarterly,* 1966, *65*, 314-324.

Levinson, D. J., & Huffman, P. E. Traditional family ideology and its relation to personality. *Journal of Personality,* 1955, *23*, 251-273.

Lipset, S. M. The sources of the radical right. In D. Bell (Ed.). *The radical right.* New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Neal, A. G., & Rettig, S. Dimensions of alienation among manual and non-manual workers. *American Sociological Review,* 1963, *28*, 599-608.

Nettler, G. A measure of alienation. *American Sociological Review,* 1957, *22*, 670-677.

Rohter, I. S. Radical rightists: *An empirical study.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Rokeach, M. *The open and closed mind.* New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rosander, A., & Thurston, L. L. Scale of attitudes toward censorship: Scale number twenty-eight. In L. L. Thurston (Ed.). *The measurement of social attitudes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Sanford, F. H., & Older, H. J. *A short authoritarian-egalitarian scale.* Progress Report Number 6, Series A. Philadelphia: Institute for Research and Human Relations, 1950.

Stouffer, S. *Communism, conformity and civil liberties.* New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Straus, M. A., & Nelson, J. I. *Sociological analysis: An empirical approach through replication.* New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Troldahl, V. C., & Powell, F. A. A short form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. *Social Forces,* 1965, *44,* 211-214.

Winterbottom, M. The relation of need for achievement to learning experience in independence and mastery. In J. W. Atkinson (Ed.), *Motives in phantasy, action and society.* Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Zurcher, L. A., & Bowman, C. K. The natural history of an ad hoc antipornography organization in Southtown, U.S.A. Unpublished report in the files of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in the U.S. Archives, 1970.

Zurcher, L. A., & Kirkpatrick, R. G. Collective dynamics of ad hoc antipornography organizations. *Technical reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography,* Vol. V. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Zurcher, L. A., & Kirkpatrick, R. G. The natural history of an ad hoc antipornography organization in Midville, U.S.A. Unpublished report in files of Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in the U.S. Archives, 1970.

Industry Self-Regulation

Classification by the Motion Picture Industry

RICHARD S. RANDALL
New York University

FOUNDING—ONE CENSORSHIP AMONG MANY

The establishment of a film-rating system by the American motion picture industry in November 1968 was both an innovative and a conventional act. On the one hand, it represented almost a complete turnabout from the industry's adamant and long standing opposition to any binding classification of its own films. At the same time, it was an attempt to breathe new life into institutional self-regulation which had been operating for nearly four decades, albeit with declining effectiveness in recent years.

Self-regulation in the industry dates to the 1920's and a series of resolutions awkwardly but straightforwardly known as "Don'ts" and "Be Carefuls." Later, with increasing public criticism of the content of films, the industry, through the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (today, the Motion Picture Association of America), drew up the Motion Picture Production Code, setting out systematic guidelines with regard to cinematic content. However, it was not until 1934, when American Catholic bishops formed the Legion of Decency to review and rate films and at the same time threatened the industry with a general boycott by Catholic patrons, that real teeth were put into the Code. That year the industry set up the Production Code Administration, a quasi-independent, self-supporting body charged with enforcing and interpreting the Code.[1]

What followed, for better or worse, was a period of censorial stability lasting nearly a generation. The Production Code was administered with considerable effectiveness, due in no small part to extra-industry censorship in the form of continuing pressure from private groups (particularly Catholics through the Legion of Decency) and to the presence of a multitude of State and local prior censorship boards. The industry discovered that it could live quite easily with these varied censorial burdens, largely because of the extraordinary profit realized from the so-called family film, the chief product of a medium that addressed itself to an almost undifferentiated mass audience in the 1930's and 1940's.

This equilibrium was upset in the fifties. Governmental prior censorship, successfully attacked in the Miracle Case[2] in 1952, began to be circumscribed by the courts in both its procedural and substantive aspects. In one line of cases, censorial standards were eliminated, one by one, until only that of obscenity remained. In another and even more striking series of decisions, the Supreme Court narrowed the concept of obscenity as a proscriptive category. At the same time, television was gradually usurping the movies as the prime supplier of American "family" entertainment, with devastating economic result for the film industry. Moreover, American film companies now found that they also had to compete with an increasing number of inexpensively made foreign films which were often more daring and imaginative in content (and which, in many cases, were also barred to youth in their country of origin). American movies were, in effect, acquiring new freedom at the same time they were losing much of their audience and a good deal of their solvency.

These developments alone would have been enough to weaken self-regulation, but authority of the Production Code was further undermined by the outcome of an antitrust decree in 1948, which eventually forced production companies to divest themselves of interest in theaters.[3] Previously, the MPPDA, and hence its creature, the Production Code Administration, had been dominated by the five largest production companies in the industry—the "majors." These companies, controlling 70% of the first-run theaters in major cities and about 45% of all film rentals in the country, possessed tremendous economic leverage on all other elements in the industry. In unhinging this power and forcing a decentralization of the industry, the decree indirectly undercut the power of the Production Code.

The capacity of a decentralized industry to regulate itself effectively is one of the major questions today with regard to the film-rating system. The Code itself underwent several amendments in 1956 and was rewritten entirely in 1966, yet its authority appears to have declined steadily. Though several factors are involved in this, the major one is that theaters can no longer be forced to limit their bookings to films having the Code's seal of approval. Any attempt today to support the new rating system by economic coercion—probably no longer practical on any extensive scale anyway—would almost surely raise antitrust questions anew.

Though the film industry had not attempted binding classification before the present rating system, it had previously been involved in two efforts to provide advisory information on the suitability of films for youth. One of these was the ratings of the Film Board of National Organizations, published as *Film Reports* (formerly *The Green Sheet*). This publication was coordinated in the office of the Motion Picture Association in New York and its cost was underwritten in part by the Association. Before the MPAA decided to drop this project early in 1970, these evaluations—the composite opinion of reviewers of member organizations—had been a model for other private film ratings. In recent years the industry has been criticized for not putting greater effort into the publicizing and distribution of these ratings.

When the Production Code was redrafted in 1966, the Production Code Administration was given authority to designate certain films as "suggested for mature audiences." Distributors of such films were asked by the PCA to carry the designation (which had no binding effect) in their first-run advertising. A remarkable increase in the number of films receiving the "mature audience"

designation in 1968 was one of the factors leading to creation of the present rating system.

The industry's previous and long standing opposition to binding classification rested largely on economic considerations. An effective classification system inevitably cuts the audience for many films, including the large-budget productions which need a vast audience in order to show a profit. To be sure, some opposition to classification has been based on other considerations, including those of freedom of speech and artistic sovereignty—principles held very strongly in some quarters of the industry. But at the highest decision-making levels, the opposition has been almost entirely economic in character.

Why and how, then, has it been overcome? The answer simply, and not unfairly, is that most of the powers in the industry became convinced that binding, industry-administered classification was the *only* alternative to some new or at least more stringent form of extra-industry censorship. In its genesis, then, the rating system is no different from other regulation of content undertaken by the industry in the past. Statements occasionally emitting from the industry that the rating system was formed primarily to advise parents and protect children can be discounted as attempts to make public relations capital. The same can be said for the claim that the industry's major interest was preserving as much artistic freedom as possible. On the other hand, overly cynical claims that the rating system was a device by which the major companies could isolate and undermine their independent competition by pinning X labels on the latter's product or, on the contrary, that it would allow the major companies to make "sex" films by having an "open" (X) category, can probably be discounted also. In a decentralized industry, various individual considerations may have been present in decisions to support a rating system, but the prime one unquestionably was fear of outside censorship.

By the mid-1960's, censorial pressures on the industry began to focus more and more on a supposed need to protect young moviegoers from excesses of erotica and violence. The new freedoms in the medium resulted, and indeed continue to result, in ever-greater exploration of sex and sexual themes, particularly aberrations, as well as an increasing frankness in their cinematic representation. Though much of the rising clamor about such films has been general and undiscriminating in character, often demanding that they not be shown at all, much more of it has been narrowly directed to the ends of classification and protection of youth. Two legal developments have been responsive to these pressures. One was the passage and later judicial affirmation in many States of so-called Ginsberg laws—statutes setting out certain penalties for selling, distributing, and displaying obscene material to youth.[4] These laws rested on a concept of "variable" obscenity, that is, the idea that obscenity is a broader proscriptive category in some circumstances than in others, and that it is broader when applied to youth than to adults. The second was the appearance of governmental prior censorship boards with powers to classify films. In addition to these legal developments, exhibitors in many communities were finding themselves increasingly the object of assorted harassments by local groups and officials.

By 1968, there was growing talk of Federal classification—the ultimate evil as far as the industry was concerned—and Senator Margaret Chase Smith had proposed a Senate study of the possibility of such classification. Of greater

importance, perhaps, was the Supreme Court's decision in *Interstate Circuit, Inc.* v. *Dallas,*[5] in April, in which Dallas' film classification board, the first such in the country, was challenged by the industry. Though the city lost the case, the Supreme Court did not hold the classification power invalid, and the decision was thought by many in the industry to offer encouragement to municipalities to set up classification boards. Additional pressure on the medium, at least with respect to violence, came as a result of reaction to the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King and Senator Robert Kennedy.

Some pressures were also building up within the industry from concern about the increasing depiction of sex and violence. It was revealed that the number of films designated as "suggested for mature audiences" had increased more than fourfold, from 11 in the last six months of 1967 to 50 in the first six months of 1968.[6] A growing number of rejections of advertising material was also reported by the industry's Advertising Code Office.[7] Moreover, several theater chains and many individual exhibitors were beginning, on their own, to classify the films which played at their theaters. In Washington, D.C., a number of the city's exhibitors entered into an agreement to label films according to *Green Sheet* designations.[8] And in the wake of the Dallas decision, the National Association of Theatre Owners of Florida actually took the heretical step of asking the State legislature for new guidelines "with teeth in them" to aid exhibitors in restricting youth with regard to the "recent-day trend of adult motion pictures."[9] Early in 1968, two trade papers also began to include audience ratings with their film reviews. Later, two respected figures from different sectors of the industry went on record as favoring some kind of public censorship. Geoffrey Shurlock, then director of the Production Code Administration, suggested not only that the industry classify films itself, but that its "adults only" ratings in such classification be enforced through Federal licensing of the nation's theaters.[10] Actor Gregory Peck advocated an American version of the British censorship system.[11]

A full-scale rating system was first proposed in May 1968, by Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association, after several weeks of consultations with member production companies and with leaders of the National Association of Theatre Owners (NATO), the largest exhibitor organization in the country. In spite of support for classification in some sectors of the industry, much of the industry was either skeptical or outrightly hostile to the idea. The task of persuading the unpersuaded fell mainly to Jack Valenti, Louis Nizer, general counsel for the MPAA, and Julian Rifkin, then president of NATO. In several months of conferences, one group in the medium after another—production companies, distributors, importers of foreign films, exhibitors, guilds, and other labor groups—endorsed the idea of a rating system. This remarkable consensus, a prerequisite for action in a decentralized industry, was an impressive personal triumph for Mr. Valenti. That it was held together by fear did not mean that it was easy to achieve. Finally, on November 1, 1968, the United States became probably the last major nation of the Western world to adopt a plan of binding classification of motion pictures.

The officially stated objectives of the new code and rating system are: "(1) to encourage artistic expression by expanding creative freedom, and (2) to assure that the freedom which encourages the artist remains responsible and sensitive to

the standards of the larger society."[12] The declaration of principles reaffirms the industry's opposition to governmental censorship and its belief that parents have the primary responsibility for the kind of movies to which their children are exposed. But the industry acknowledged a responsibility of its own, not only for making available pertinent information about films to aid parents, but also an "obligation to the public, and most especially to parents," to undertake a national voluntary rating program "which has as its prime objective a sensitive concern for children."[13]

In the rating system, films are classified by four categories designated by the letters G, GP, R, and X.[14] According to the industry's official statement, these ratings are:

> G—All Ages Admitted. General Audiences. This category includes motion pictures that in the opinion of the Code and Rating Administration would be acceptable for all audiences, without consideration of age.
>
> GP—All Ages Admitted. Parental Guidance Suggested. This category includes motion pictures that in the opinion of the Code and Rating Administration, because of their theme, content, and treatment, might require more mature judgment by viewers, and about which parents should exercise discretion.
>
> R—Restricted. Persons under 17 not admitted, unless accompanied by parent or adult guardian. This category includes motion pictures that in the opinion of the Code and Rating Administration, because of their theme, content, or treatment, should not be presented to persons under 17 unless accompanied by a parent or adult guardian.
>
> X—Persons Under 17 Not Admitted. This category includes motion pictures which in the opinion of the Code and Rating Administration, because of their treatment of sex, violence, crime, and/or profanity, should not be presented at all to persons under 17. Pictures rated X do not qualify for a Code Seal.[15]

An X rating may also be self-applied by the distributor of a film without submitting the film to the Code and Rating Administration. However, a film not submitted may not bear any other rating.

Announcement of the formation of the rating system was followed by an extensive publicity campaign conducted by the MPAA with the help of NATO and the Independent Film Importers and Distributors Association (IFIDA). Workshops were held for exhibitors to help them explain the rating system to their patrons, and MPAA staff personnel spoke to numerous community groups around the country. The organization also produced a 10-minute, 16-mm. film, entitled "The Movie Experience: A Matter of Choice," and made it available to clubs and other organizations. According to the MPAA, its promotional budget for the initial publicity for the system totaled $75,000, not including salaries of staff personnel assigned to the task. In addition to these efforts, the National Screen Service, a company that has a near monopoly on theater promotional supplies, made available at cost a rating kit consisting of a large box office rating sign, a billboard-sized lobby sign explaining the rating symbols, a newspaper mat, and a 45-second screen trailer also explaining the ratings. According to an estimate made by the company, about 40% of the nation's exhibitors acquired these kits.

In spite of these efforts, a number of observers outside the industry have viewed the promotion as being insufficient to the task of explaining a new program of consequence. Additional criticism of the explanation of particular ratings has come from some quarters within the industry. It has been charged, for example, that the MPAA allowed the G rating to become associated in the public mind with a "Disney-type" film, and that the X rating was inadequately explained, the result being an identification of that rating with "dirty" films. The writer has no way of judging, at least by means of this study, either the adequacy of the MPAA's original promotional effort or the merits of the more specific criticisms. The matter is merely reported here.

THE RATING PROCESS

Submission

Under the regulations of the rating system, all films produced or distributed by members of the Motion Picture Association, which includes most of the large American production and distribution companies, must be submitted to the MPAA's Code and Rating Office for Code approval and rating. When the Production Code was the only element of industry self-regulation, member companies failing to obtain the Code seal of approval could often avoid making the necessary changes in the film by releasing it through wholly-owned subsidiary companies. In this way, a company could remain an MPAA member in good standing and still bypass the Production Code. Circumvention of this kind, which contributed to a certain degree of cynicism about industry self-regulation, is expressly forbidden by the rating regulations, which require that any films handled by subsidiary companies also be submitted for rating.

Nonmember companies are invited to submit their films for Code approval and rating or for rating alone. All film proprietors are urged to submit in advance the scripts of films they are planning to have rated, so that the Code and Rating Administration (CRA) can give an early opinion on the probable rating. Final decision on a rating is made by the CRA only upon viewing the completed film, however. A film may be given an X rating by its proprietor without submitting it to the CRA, but no other rating categories may be self-applied. A film with an X rating, whether self-applied or given by the CRA, cannot bear the Code seal of approval.

All advertising and publicity—pressbooks, still photographs, newspaper copy and display, posters, lobby displays, outdoor ads, throwaways, and radio and television copy—for rated films must be submitted to the MPAA's director of the Code for Advertising. Titles for rated films must be submitted for approval to the director of the Code for Titles. Once a rating has been given, the appropriate rating symbol must appear on the introductory frame of all prints of the film and be manifest in all advertising and publicity.

The rating fees range from $150 to $3,000 per film and correspond roughly to an ability to pay measured by the negative cost of the film and the distributor's aggregate domestic gross film rental for the previous year. However, in a case of a clearly impecunious proprietor, the MPAA may reduce the fee to as low as $50, which means a clear operating loss in the rating process.

Viewing

More than 90% of feature films rated are viewed in the Los Angeles CRA office, while the remainder are screened and rated in New York by a member of the MPAA staff. New York rated films are usually those of very small distributors or foreign films headed for a rush opening which would not allow time for a review in Los Angeles. A number of short subjects are also viewed in New York. All films of MPAA member companies, however, must be viewed at the CRA office in Los Angeles.

The viewing staff in the Los Angeles office consists of four full-time viewers and the CRA director, Eugene G. Dougherty. In addition, Geoffrey Shurlock, former director of the Production Code Administration and now retired, serves as a consultant. Usually two reviewers are assigned to a film, whether it is being considered in script or as a finished print. In the case of an X film or any other that may present a problem of rating assignment, the finished print is viewed by Dougherty and, in many cases, by the entire staff. All films under review are discussed in the morning "huddle," a meeting of the entire viewing staff which begins each day at the rating office. Much of the remainder of the day is taken up with screenings, which are held in the CRA offices. In the case of a problem film—one about which there is some question as to which of two ratings should apply or one which the reviewers believe, in its present form, cannot be given the rating which the proprietor company would like to have—specific changes in visual treatment, dialogue, or even story line are suggested by the reviewers. These are relayed to the company as necessary for the less restrictive rating. Where these changes are made by the company, the film has, in effect, been censored by the CRA.[16] Where the suggested changes are not acceptable to the proprietor and the CRA cannot be persuaded to modify them, the options left to the company are either to release the film with the more restrictive rating or appeal the CRA ruling. (This process is described in the next subsection.)

Of the five-member regular CRA viewing staff, three, Dougherty, Albert E. Van Schmus, and Richard R. Mathison, were on the staff of the Production Code Administration. Dougherty joined the organization in 1941, Van Schmus in 1949, and Mathison in 1965. Dougherty and Van Schmus both had experience in the production side of the movie industry; Van Schmus, in fact, had received assistant-director credits for a number of feature films. Dougherty attended La Salle College and the Harvard School of Business Administration. Van Schmus is a graduate of the University of Chicago. Mathison has a journalist's background, having served on the staff of Associated Press, the Los Angeles *Times,* and *Newsweek.* He attended the University of Idaho and George Washington University.

A fourth reviewer, Mrs. Jacqueline C. Bouhoutsos, who joined the staff in 1968, is a clinical psychologist and formerly had a private practice. She has also taught at UCLA and has written a number of scholarly articles. She has a Ph.D. from University of Innsbruck, Austria. The fifth reviewer, Richard McKay, was appointed to the staff in 1969. He has had varied experience in movie exhibition, having served several theater chains as a manager-booker, film buyer, and director of publicity. He is a graduate of the University of Richmond. All five members of the viewing staff are married and are parents. The reviewing in New York is done

by James C. Bouras, who joined the legal staff of the MPAA in 1966. Bouras graduated from Cornell University and New York University School of Law and has published research on the legal aspects of obscenity.

Organizationally, all reviewers are directly responsible to the MPAA president.

Appeal

A proprietor dissatisfied with a rating may appeal the CRA decision to the Code and Rating Appeals Board in New York. The board consists of the MPAA president, 12 MPAA members chosen by the president from the MPAA board of directors and executive officers of member companies, eight exhibitors chosen by the National Association of Theatre Owners from its board of directors, two producers chosen from the Producers Guild of America, and two distributors chosen by the International Film Importers and Distributors of America. The MPAA president is chairman of the board. No member of the board may sit on an appeal involving a film in which he, or any company with which he is associated, has a financial interest.

At the appeal hearing, the film in question is screened and the party taking the appeal may present oral or written statements. Normally not more than one-half hour is allowed for oral argument by the appealing party. Oral presentation of not more than one-half hour as well as written argument is also allowed to Dougherty, CRA director, or to his representative. After Times Film Company's unsuccessful appeal of the X rating for *Miracle of Love* in December 1968, at which the company offered testimony of two psychiatrists and several other presumably expert witnesses, the hearing rules were modified to limit to two the number of persons who could present oral argument. Appeals of G, GP, or R ratings are decided by a majority vote of the board. For an X rating, a vote of two-thirds of the board is required to sustain the rating. Should the CRA rating not be sustained, the board itself then proceeds to rate the film by majority vote.

In the first 14 months of the rating system (November 1, 1968 through December 31, 1969), four appeal hearings were held, and in each case, the appeals board upheld the CRA rating. The films and ratings were *Miracle of Love,* X; *If...,* X; *Chastity,* R; and *Paint Your Wagon,* GP. In each case the proprietor had sought the next least restrictive rating. In the case of *If...,* the film was later re-edited to receive an R. This early support of the CRA by the appeals board has undoubtedly strengthened the former agency's hand in discussions with producers during the viewing process. It was precisely the lack of such consistent support that eventually weakened the Production Code Administration.

Films rated

In the first 14 months of the rating system, a total of 446 new feature releases were rated by the CRA. Of these, 129 or 28.9% were G, 183 or 41.0% were M (now GP), 107 or 24.0% were R, and 27 or 6.1% were X[17] (Table 1). In addition, 47 older features, already in release when the rating system was introduced or later reissued, were also rated. Of these, 27 received a G, 12 an M (now GP), seven an R, and one an X. If the new releases and older features are combined, ratings were given to 493 films in the first 14 months of the rating

Table 1

NEW FEATURE RELEASES RATED BY THE CODE AND RATING ADMINISTRATION

November 1, 1968-December 31, 1969, by 10-week periods[i]

MPAA Rating Bulletin Numbers[a]	Rating G	%	M	%	R	%	X	%	Total	Restrictiveness Index[b]
1-10[c]	49	37.9	45	34.8	30	23.3	5	3.9	129	1.93
11-20[d]	16	28.5	24	42.8	13	23.2	3	5.4	56	2.05
21-30[e]	22	31.9	27	39.1	15	21.7	5	7.4	69	2.05
31-40[f]	8	13.7	33	56.8	15	26.2	2	3.4	58	2.20
41-50[g]	19	27.8	25	36.2	17	24.6	8	11.6	69	2.20
51-60[h]	15	23.1	29	44.6	17	26.2	4	6.2	65	2.16
Total	129	28.9	183	41.0	107	24.0	27	6.1	446	2.07

a. The Rating Bulletin, listing new ratings, has been published weekly since the rating system was instituted with the exception of November 11, 1968.

b. Based on an average of a weight of one for each percentage point of G rating, two for each of M, three for each of R, and four for each of X.

c. November 1, 1968-January 13, 1969.

d. January 20-March 24, 1969.

e. March 31-June 2, 1969.

f. June 9-August 11, 1969.

g. August 18-October 20, 1969.

h. October 27-December 29, 1969.

i. The new ratings for 12 films re-edited and rerated after going into release are included in this table.

Table 2

NEW FEATURE RELEASES RATED BY THE CODE AND RATING ADMINISTRATION

November 1, 1968-December 31, 1969, by 30-week periods[a]

MPAA Rating Bulletin Numbers[b]	Rating G	%	M	%	R	%	X	%	Total	Restrictiveness Index[c]
1-30[d]	87	34.2	96	37.8	58	22.8	13	5.1	254	1.99
31-60[e]	42	21.9	87	45.3	49	25.5	14	7.3	192	2.18
Totals	129	28.9	183	41.0	107	24.0	27	6.1	446	2.07

a. The new ratings for 12 films re-edited and rerated after going into release are included in this table.

b. The Rating Bulletin, listing new ratings, has been published weekly since the rating system was instituted with the exception of November 11, 1968.

c. Based on an average of a weight of one for each percentage point of G rating, two for each of M, three for each of R, and four for each of X.

d. November 1, 1968-June 2, 1969.

e. June 9-December 29, 1969.

system. The respective percentages for each of the rating categories for this total are G, 31.6%; M (now GP), 39.6%; R, 23.1%; and X, 5.7%.

No marked short-term trends in the ratings are apparent, except for some decline in the percentage of G films. However, the rating totals do suggest the possibility of a developing longer-term trend toward a higher percentage of restrictive ratings. If the first 60 weeks of the rating system are divided into two 30-week periods (Table 2), the decline in the percentage G ratings is marked. The percentage of films receiving age-restriction ratings (R or X) increased from 27.9% to 32.8%, and a simple index of overall restrictiveness—giving a weight of one for each percentage point of G, two for each of M (now GP), three for each of R, and four for each of X—shows an increase from 1.99 for the first 30 weeks to 2.18 for the second 30.

If CRA rating criteria remained constant during the 60 weeks, these figures probably indicate a marked increase in erotica and violence, the two chief concerns of the CRA. To the extent that CRA criteria have been modified at all during this period, it is likely they have become more permissive rather than less so. If this is so, then the increase in the number of age-restriction ratings and the decline in the number of G ratings probably indicates an even greater change in the content of films than the figures above suggest.

RATING CRITERIA

Aside perhaps from the problem of enforcement, there is no more controversial aspect to the rating system than the standards used in applying ratings to individual films. Yet data on standards is not easy to obtain. Neither the Motion Picture Association nor its Code and Rating Administration has ever published any rating standards. In contrast, criteria used in awarding the seal of approval, Standards for Production, were set out in the old Production Code and have been carried over into the present code and rating program. These standards, which are very general, are embodied in 11 brief paragraphs:

> The basic dignity and value of human life shall be respected and upheld. Restraint shall be exercised in portraying the taking of life.
>
> Evil, sin, crime, and wrong-doing shall not be justified.
>
> Special restraint shall be exercised in portraying criminal or antisocial activities in which minors participate or are involved.
>
> Detailed and protracted acts of brutality, cruelty, physical violence, torture, and abuse shall not be presented.
>
> Indecent or undue exposure of the human body shall not be presented.
>
> Illicit sex relationships shall not be justified. Intimate sex scenes violating common standards of decency shall not be portrayed.
>
> Restraint and care shall be exercised in presentations dealing with sex aberrations.
>
> Obscene speech, gestures, or movements shall not be presented. Undue profanity shall not be permitted.
>
> Religion shall not be demeaned.

Words or symbols contemptuous of racial, religious, or national groups shall not be used so as to incite bigotry or hatred.

Excessive cruelty to animals shall not be portrayed, and animals shall not be treated inhumanely.[18]

Since X films cannot bear the seal of approval, they apparently do not meet the above standards for production. By the same reasoning, then, these standards must be met by G, GP, and R films. Apparently no film has received any of these ratings and at the same time been refused a seal of approval though, theoretically at least, it is possible for a company not a member of MPAA to submit a film for rating only.

The Standards for Production do not say anything about distinguishing the G, GP, and R ratings from one another and, in fact, do not say with any precision what would constitute an X rating. For this information we must look elsewhere.

The MPAA's official reason for the absence of written rating standards is its desire to remain flexible and not be bound by absolutes. The organization is also somewhat vague on how the original rating criteria were developed. Apparently, there was some consultation with critics, clergymen, exhibitors, and others before the rating system got underway. According to Jack Valenti, MPAA president, "We tried to put ourselves in place of a parent and, as with the G, tried to figure out whether there was anything in a film that would disturb a parent with a child."[19] As will be clear in the discussion of "mistakes" in ratings, below, much of the shaping of rating standards, at least at the outer limits, has come through feedback from the public and from the industry, especially exhibitors. The underlying frame of reference for rating standards appears to be public acceptability rather than the possible harmfulness of the material; that is, the reference is to the effect the film has on the parent rather than the possible harmfulness of the material; that is, the reference is to the effect the film has on the parent rather than on the child. If this is so, it is still another reflection on the rather thoroughgoing relationship between self-regulation and censorial pressure. The CRA office was, of course, not totally without experience in considering the suitability of films for youth, since it had (as the Production Code Administration) designated films as "suggested for mature audiences" for two years prior to the rating system. However, even for that low-level classification, the MPAA never had any official written standards.

The ratings

Most of the remainder of this section consists of an attempt to detail the criteria used by the CRA in applying its four ratings. The sources of information are interviews with Jack Valenti, Louis Nizer, general counsel for the MPAA, and Eugene Dougherty, Code and Rating Administrator, as well as an interoffice MPAA memorandum written by Dougherty in the first months of the rating system, and this writer's observations during several days at the CRA office. It must be noted that CRA standards may have undergone change at various points since the middle and latter part of 1969 when most of the data for this section was gathered and analyzed. Not all of the specific observations in this section, therefore, may be relevant in 1970 and after. It should also be stated at the

outset, obvious as it may be, that most of the information obtained would not have been gained without full MPAA cooperation. The openness and candor of the organization on the rating system mark the departure from past MPAA practice in which the real workings of self-regulation were closed to any and all public scrutiny.

In general terms, the G rating requires restraint in treatment, temperance in language, and a clear resolution in the story itself of any moral problems raised. According to Doughtery, in the

> . . . treatment[20] of any subject or theme, regardless of its moral importance, it is up to us—we of the Code staff—to hone, sandpaper, chisel, chip, scour, scrape, and polish . . . rough ingredients until their ragged edges are smooth, and the stark contrasts of black and white are blended into a chiaroscuro of shadings subtle enough to carry a strong message in the sort of language suitable to the G rating.[21]

As to what "resolution" of a moral problem is, Dougherty admits that the frame of reference is probably that of conventional morality.

Subjects dealing with sexual deviation—homosexuality, sadomasochism, sexual criminality[22] and "kindred bizarre malfunctions of the human psyche"—are likely to be excluded altogether from the G category.

As to language, the "crude, coarse, vulgar, scatological, profane, and obscene" are unacceptable for the G. This includes such expressions as "son-of-a-bitch," "Goddamn," and the epithetical "Christ" and "Jesus." However, "hell," "damn," and even "bastard" may be acceptable in particular circumstances, but they must not be used "excessively or with such broad crudity as to be offensive."[23]

Other matter ruled out of G films are "nudity, indecency of dress or costume, lewd or leering reactions to suggested nudity . . . detailed scenes of sexual passion, erotic kissing, embracing or postures of the human body suggesting sexual intimacies."[24]

Violence which goes beyond the

> necessities of proper plot motivation and enters the area of savagery, excessive brutality, sadism or masochism, likewise, will be the subject of the most sensitive possible handling, and only that violence of action which we feel is absolutely essential will be permitted.[25]

For the GP, R, and X ratings, treatment rather than subject is the chief concern. Dougherty believes that almost any subject, with the possible exception of bestiality, could be accommodated in the GP and R ratings, with the difference between the two being largely the character of the "visuals."[26] Homosexuality, for example, taboo for a G, could be dealt with "purely at the intellectual level" in a GP film. Depiction of, say, the "amorous advances of the homosexual" would place the film in the R category, while the "more lurid and sensationalized aspects of the homosexual's character, habits and behavior" would require an X rating.[27]

According to Valenti, the R and X ratings are similar except that the X "goes a little further" in its treatment. In the R, the sex scenes are apt to be shorter and not dwelled upon as much. According to Dougherty, the X film is simply one that it is not possible to place in any other category. In 1969, at least, explicit intercourse, simulated or real, would make a film an X. Genital nudity of either

sex will also result in an X rating. This was the case with the initial versions of *If...* and *The Illustrated Man,* which were both re-edited to remove the nudity, the former becoming an R and the latter jumping all the way to M (now GP) as a result. An X rating would not follow where the exposed person was a baby or young child, *The Loves of Isadora,* a GP, being an example. Use of "fuck" or its variations will also put a film in the X category.

With regard to violence, to which the CRA has often been accused of paying too little attention, it is said that any more than a conventional fist-fight will take a film out of the G realm.[28] Savagery or personalized violence, which Dougherty calls brutality, are unsuitable for G, and, depending upon degree, perhaps also for the GP and R ratings. Spectacular personalized violence, "such as a kick in the head or groin," would very likely place a film in the X category.[29] According to Dougherty, over 20 minutes of extreme violence were cut from *The Wild Bunch* before that film could receive even an R rating. Cuts were made in a scene where a man, tied face down to the rear bumper of a car, was dragged interminably along the ground. When released he was shown completely bloodied, with his skin in shreds. He was then tied to a post and his throat slashed. Blood was shown gushing down his body and spewing from his mouth.

Four films

While visiting the CRA office, the writer observed the screening and rating discussion of four films—*Topaz, The Virgin Soldiers, Sweet Dreams,* and *The Wild Scene*—which illustrate specific application of several rating principles. The first two have been released with GP and R ratings, respectively. The latter two had not been released by early 1970, to the writer's knowledge, nor was a final rating decision made on them while the writer was at the CRA office.

The problem in *Topaz* involved a single scene between a French diplomat, spying for the United States in Cuba, and a girl who is his Cuban contact. They are shown kissing, and he then undoes the straps of her dress. Next they are shown in a horizontal embrace and it is clear that they are partly or completely nude. The reviewers decided that the scene from the point of the undoing of the dress straps would have to be cut in order to give the film a G rating.

In *The Virgin Soldiers,* set in a British army base in Malaya in the late 1940's, the problem was whether certain conversations among the soldiers would put the film into the X category. The dialogue in question involved phrases like "three strokes and you're done," "getting it in," reference to a "blue vein" on part of the body inferred to be the penis, and additional discussion of lesbianism and venereal disease.

Sweet Dreams and *The Wild Scene,* both independent low-budget productions, illustrate the headaches that can arise in rating movies and also perhaps some fundamental shortcomings in the current standards of the rating system as well as the assumptions upon which they are based. The former, described by one of the reviewers as "going further" than either *Can Hieronymous Merkin Ever Forget Mercy Humppe and Find True Happiness?* and *I Am Curious (Yellow),* appeared, to the writer at least, to be a film of considerable originality and technical competence. It deals with a young man who works in a brokerage firm in a big city, has a nice, spacious home in the country, and an apparently happy wife and

child. He represents, of course, a rising, well-off, somewhat programmed and insulated establishment type. The element of drama is in the conflict of this life with his fantasies of a wilder and freer life with a fun-loving group of exotic hippie-like characters. The opening scenes are of sustained, explicit, and rather joyful love play between the hero and his wife in which there is extensive caressing and breast kissing and in which she appears entirely nude. Later the couple's very young child is brought to bed with his parents. In one of the fantasy scenes a girl is astride a flagpole in a masturbation parody. In another, one of the characters says, "The Mafia owns everything," and a girl replies, "They don't own my box!" Elsewhere in the fantasy scenes there is other explicit sex talk. The hero's dilemma is resolved when he decides that he prefers the love of his wife and the more ordered life that he has been leading. The reviewers thought the film was clearly an X, and that perhaps Valenti should be informed of it, since it would probably be a subject of some censorial controversy upon release. They did seem to realize the incongruity of the X, since all of the explicit love play and most of the nudity was in a marital context and, in fact, had a complely unsalacious and even touching quality to it. Moreover, the moral problem presented was "solved" by the hero making an accommodation with his established real world—a more conventional and convincing resolution could hardly be imagined.

The Wild Scene, a poorly made, poorly written, and badly acted film of the exploitation genre, is in many ways the obverse of *Sweet Dreams.* The film is a series of panels held together by a very thin plot line and designed mainly for their subject shock effect. This tour de force includes incest, a nonvirgin club, illegitimate pregnancy, nymphomania, birth control pills, drugs, adultery, orgy, student protest, and so on. The sexual scenes—most of the film—all have a leering quality to them, reinforced by the cardboard character of the persons in them. However, each scene is discreetly and sometimes abruptly ended as soon as nudity, detailed caressing, or other explicit sex play (for example, a father climbing into bed with his daughter) is reached. The dialogue is studied titillation, but care is taken to avoid vulgarisms and blatant double entendres. In the final few minutes, all of the moral problems are "resolved" with the wicked being punished and the good rewarded. The reviewers agreed that in terms of "visuals" and dialogue, there was nothing in the film that would put it into the X category by rating standards now employed. There was some talk of giving an X on the basis of the sheer accumulation of questionable material, but this matter was left unresolved. In fact, one of the reviewers speculated that the print screened might actually be the "cool" version of a dual-version film in which the "hot" print would have visual continuation of the sex scenes that had been so discreetly ended. There was concern that if this were so, and the film were to be rated R, both versions might play under that label.

"Mistakes"

Has the CRA had any second thoughts about its ratings? Dougherty lists five "mistakes" during the first nine months of work. These films and ratings were *Candy*, R (a rating that surprised even the proprietor of the film);[30] *The Impossible Years,* G; *If It's Tuesday, It Must Be Belgium,* G; *Winning,* G; and *Popi,* G. The "mistake" in each of these cases was a too permissive rating. *Winning*

was "corrected" when the MPAA persuaded the proprietors to voluntarily accept an M (now GP) after the film was in release.

Whether or not a "mistake" has been made apparently depends on whether the MPAA and the CRA get a "rumble," that is, a lot of complaints. These may come in the form of letters directly to the CRA office or to the MPAA in New York, letters to newspapers or criticism by the press or by lawmakers, and complaints from exhibitors, themselves often the object of protest about particular ratings. Dougherty refused to specify which sources of complaint would be taken more seriously than others, except to dismiss some of them as "crackpot." The conception of "mistake" described here illustrates the point noted earlier that the primary frame of reference for rating criteria appears to be public acceptability

Table 3

CODE AND RATING ADMINISTRATION OBJECTIONS TO FILMS LATER RE-EDITED TO ELIMINATE OBJECTIONS

November 1, 1968-July 31, 1969

Objections[a]	Rating after re-editing			
	G	M	R	Total
Nudity	1	9	6	16
Explicit sex	2	5	6	13
Violence		1	1	2
Brutality		3		3
Profanity	1			1
Vulgar dialogue	1	5	2	8
Gruesomeness		1		1
Nude sex scenes		1		1
Rape scene		1		1
Objectionable sex scenes			1	1
Graphic fornication			1	1
Excessive killing			1	1
Nudity and brutality	1			1
Nudity and vulgar dialogue		3	1	4
Nudity and vulgarity		1		1
Nudity and gruesomeness		1		1
Nudity and explicit sex		5	4	9
Nudity and violence		3		3
Nudity and illicit sex			1	1
Nudity, violence, and explicit sex			1	1
Nudity, violence, and vulgarity			1	1
Nudity, explicit sex, vulgarity, and sadism			1	1
Violence and brutality		1		1
Violence and vulgar dialogue		1		1
Violence and rape scene		1		1
Violence and explicit sex			1	1
Explicit sex and brutality		2	1	3
Explicit sex and rape			1	1
Vulgar dialogue and details of homosexuality			2	2
Vulgar dialogue and brutality			1	1
Vulgar dialogue and explicit rape			1	1
Totals	6	44	34	84

a. Subject categories are those listed by the Code and Rating Administration for each film.

Table 4

REGROUPED CODE AND RATING ADMINISTRATION OBJECTIONS IN FILMS LATER RE-EDITED TO ELIMINATE OBJECTIONS

November 1, 1968-July 31, 1969

	Rating after re-editing				
	G	M	R	Total	Percent
Nudity[a]	2	23	15	40	32.8
Explicit sex[b]	2	15	18	35	28.7
Illicit sex			1	1	0.8
Details of homosexuality			2	2	1.6
Sadism			1	1	0.8
Vulgar dialogue	1	9	6	16	13.1
Vulgarity		1	2	3	2.5
Profanity	1			1	0.8
Violence[c]		7	5	12	9.8
Brutality	1	6	2	9	7.4
Gruesomeness		2		2	1.6
Totals	7	63	52	122	

a. Includes "nude sex scene."
b. Includes "rape scene," "objectionable sex scene," "graphic fornication."
c. Includes "excessive killing."

rather than protection of youth from harm. It also illustrates, again, the dynamic relationship between censorial pressure and self-regulation, with private pressure here actually setting some of the limits of the rating categories. Comparison of MPAA ratings with those of other sources will be dealt with in Section Four.

Quantitative Aspects

Some quantitative data on rating standards were made available to the writer by the CRA in the form of a list of films re-edited to receive less restrictive rating. This data also gives the reasons why re-editing was necessary, but these reasons are in the form of general content categories only. The list, covering 84 films in the first nine months of the rating system, is analyzed and the data rearranged in tabular form in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 is a compilation of objections that were met for the 84 G, M (now GP), and R films using the exact descriptive categories the CRA has supplied. Table 4 analyzes the data using only 11 content categories to eliminate the combinations of categories in Table 3 and to set up more or less mutually exclusive categories. This resulted in a tabulation of 122 content category objections for the 84 films. "Nudity" accounted for more objections than any other category, 32.8%. "Explicit sex" was second with 28.7% and was the most frequently listed objection for films later re-edited to R. "Vulgar dialogue" was third, accounting for 13.1% of the objections.

If the 11 categories in Table 4 are regrouped into three more general

categories, "Sex," "Violence," and "Offensiveness" (without necessarily sex or violence), the percentages are as follows: Sex (excluding "sadism," "vulgar dialogue," "vulgarity," and "profanity"), 63.9%; Violence (including "brutality" but excluding "sadism" and "gruesomeness"), 18.0%; and Offensiveness (including "gruesomeness," "profanity," "vulgarity," and "vulgar dialogue"), also 18.0%. If a dichotomization is made, using only the Sex and Violence categories, by placing "gruesomeness" under Violence, and "profanity," "vulgarity," and "vulgar dialogue" under Sex, the percentages of the 122 objections are Sex, 81.1%, and Violence, 18.9%.

COMPARATIVE RATINGS

Comparison of MPAA ratings of individual films with those of other rating programs, undertaken in this section, can indicate something about both the degree of representativeness and degree of restrictiveness of the industry's classificatory efforts. This, of course, will not tell us whether the MPAA is doing a good job in locating and labeling harmful material in films—only more knowledge about the effects of movies, which we do not yet have, can tell us that—but we will at least be able to see how MPAA ratings measure against the *opinion* of other professional raters on what is or is not harmful to youth.

A comparative rating inquiry, however, also presents some difficulties. For one thing, criteria for judging content in some rating programs are likely to differ in many respects from the MPAA's criteria. Also, age categories in many rating programs do not correspond exactly to the age categories set out in the MPAA program. Finally, at least in the case of the British Board of Film Censors, a few films may not be seen in the same version as they were by the MPAA which, of course, rates only for American consumption.

Nevertheless, certain rough comparisons can be made. Here, these are confined to the age-suitability ratings for individual films rather than the substantive criteria upon which age-suitability judgments themselves are made, since the former are quantifiable, at least to an extent, while the latter are not readily so. In other words, only the end product of rating programs is being compared here.

Three types of rating programs are examined: governmental and quasi-governmental classification systems, nationally known nongovernmental rating programs, and local nongovernmental programs. Ratings were obtained from eight sources: the Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board, the Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission, the British Board of Film Censors, *Film Reports* (formerly *The Green Sheet*), a publication of the Film Board of National Organizations, *Parents' Magazine, PTA Magazine,* the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures, and the Southern California Motion Picture Council.

In addition to comparisons involving these eight rating organizations, this section also examines evaluations by American newspaper film critics and movie editors of MPAA ratings for 31 selected films. These evaluations were obtained through a questionnaire survey.

Eight rating programs

The Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board, established in 1965, was the

first governmental age classification board in the United States. The Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission is a quasi-official body. Its members are appointed by the mayor and the board receives some public funds, but it has no statutory power to compel submission of films. However, local exhibitors have a long standing record of cooperation with the agency, and since local officials have brought obscenity charges against exhibitors who ignored its rating restrictions, it functions very much like an official classification board. The National Catholic Office, *Film Reports*, *Parents' Magazine*, and *PTA Magazine* are probably the four leading national rating agencies, and their ratings probably have the widest circulation of any ratings except those of the MPAA itself. As already mentioned in Section One, publication of *Film Reports (The Green Sheet)* was discontinued early in 1970. The Southern California Motion Picture Council is a local nongovernmental rating organization. Ratings were also obtained from the Chicago Film Review Section, a governmental body, but were deemed unsuitable for comparative measure because of their form. Letters requesting ratings were also sent to eight other leading nongovernmental local motion picture councils,[31] but no ratings or replies of any kind were received from them.

The inquiry here covers all films rated by the MPAA's Code and Rating Administration during the first nine months of the rating system—November 1, 1968 through July 31, 1969. A total of 332 films were rated by the industry during this period; 303 were new features and 29 were reissues or films released before November 1, 1968.

Before comparisons with MPAA ratings can be made, the rating categories of each of the eight rating programs need some explication.

The Dallas board uses only two categories, Suitable and Not Suitable, with the age line being the 16th birthday. However, only a small percentage of films exhibited in the city are actually screened by the board. Under the board's procedures, exhibitors themselves propose a Suitable or Not Suitable classification for each film they are booking. If the board, on the basis of information provided by the exhibitor or other information available to it, decides that the proposed classification is a proper one, the film is not viewed at all. The board usually views films only when it questions the exhibitor's proposed Suitable classification. In effect, then, the Dallas ratings are actually a product of the board *and* of the city's exhibitors.

The Milwaukee commission rates films according to four categories: General Audience, Mature Entertainment, Adults Only, and Not To Be Shown. The Adults Only rating means that no one under 18 can be admitted to the film. Occasionally, a film may be given a less restrictive rating where its proprietor agrees to make a cut suggested by the commission. As in the case of Dallas, not all films rated are actually viewed prior to exhibition. The commission's executive secretary, who is also a member, rates many films on the basis of advance notices in the trade press, reviews in other cities, advertising, information supplied by the distributor, and so forth. Those films that are viewed before exhibition are usually ones the executive secretary believes will present a rating problem. All films not screened prior to exhibition are seen by at least one or more commission members after they open. A film not viewed before exhibition may be screened later where it is believed the advance rating was an inappropriate one. A few films are judged unfit for any exhibition whatever.

Rating symbols and categories used by the British Board of Film Censors are U–Passed for General Exhibition, A–More Suitable for Adult Audiences, and X–Adults Only. If a movie is rated A, persons under 16 are permitted to attend only if accompanied by a person over 16; if a movie is rated X, no persons under 16 are admitted at all. The board itself is actually a self-supporting private agency. Its president, who is usually a man well-known in public life, is selected by the British film industry. But the board, in effect, actually functions as a governmental agency, since its ratings are given legal effect through local ordinances relating to exhibition.

During its life, *Film Reports* (or *The Green Sheet)* used five categories of ascending restrictiveness: (1) Children (unaccompanied by adults); (2) General Audience; (3) Adults-Mature Young People-Young People; (4) Adults-Mature Young People; and (5) Adults. No exact age lines were used but, in general terms, children were considered to be those in elementary school; young people, those in junior high school; and mature young people, those in high school. The rating for each film was actually the composite of the ratings of 10 member organizations.[32] The ratings were coordinated by the MPAA and the costs of distributing the reports were underwritten by the industry organization.

The National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures uses six categories: A-1, Morally Unobjectionable for General Patronage; A-2, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults and Adolescents; A-3, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults; A-4, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults, with Reservations; B, Morally Objectionable in Part for All; and C, Condemned. The A-4 rating is given to films which, while not morally offensive in themselves, still require "caution and some analysis and explanation as a protection to the uninformed against wrongful interpretations and false conclusions." The term adolescent, the key to the A-2 and A-3 categories, corresponds roughly to the period between the onset of puberty and senior year in high school, though high school seniors may be considered adults.

Parents' Magazine uses an apparent eightfold classification, though the various categories do not have specific names. Films are rated as suitable or not suitable for "children" (ages 8 to 12) and for "young people" (ages 13 to 17). "Mature children" are considered to be those in the upper reaches of the children category–those between 10 and 12. A rating suitable for mature children, however, does not necessarily mean that the film is unsuitable for all children below 10. If a film is described as suitable for "mature young people" and "very mature young people," a considerable amount of parental discretion is in order. These classifications refer to the upper reaches of the young people range–ages 15 to 17. These ratings, however, do not mean that a film is necessarily unsuitable for all persons below 15. The ratings, then, can be divided into the following categories: (1) suitable for children and young people; (2) suitable for mature children and young people; (3) suitable for young people but not for children; (4) suitable for mature young people but not for children; (5) suitable for very mature young people but not for children; (6) suitable for those over 15 only; (7) suitable for those over 16 only; and (8) suitable for adults only (those over 18).

The *PTA Magazine* uses the categories "children" and "adolescents." The former refers to persons between 8 and 12, while the latter refers to persons between 12 and 17 or 18 or through the senior year in high school. "Mature children" are those between 10 and 12. "Mature adolescents" refers roughly to

juniors and seniors in high school, while "very mature adolescents" refers roughly to seniors in high school. From these categories, a sixfold classification results: (1) suitable for children and adolescents; (2) suitable for mature children and adolescents (that is, those 10 or over); (3) suitable for adolescents but not for children (that is, for those 12 or over); (4) suitable for mature adolescents; (5) suitable for very mature adolescents; and (6) suitable for neither children nor adolescents. Occasionally, more descriptive terms are used, such as "sophisticated" or "older" in place of "mature."

The Southern California Motion Picture Council uses five rating categories: (1) Family—All Ages; (2) Youth-Mature Youth-Adults; (3) Mature Youth-Adults; (4) Adults; and (5) Erotica and Borderline. Youth refers to those over 12, and Mature Youth, to those over 18.

Analysis of MPAA ratings by the rating categories of the eight rating programs described above is made in Table 5, below. This includes the number and percentage of G, M, R, and X films rated during the first nine months of the MPAA rating system falling into each of the categories in each of the other rating programs.

Using the raw data in Table 5, a more exact comparison of MPAA ratings with those of the other programs can be attempted by establishing rough categoric equivalents for the rating classifications used in the eight programs and the MPAA's G, M, R, and X classifications. There are several obvious difficulties in doing this. First, some of the rating program categories do not have specific age referents, for example, those of *Film Reports* which have education-level referents. Second, even where there are specific age-level referents, they do not correspond in all instances to the age limit of 16 (now 17) drawn by the MPAA for the R and X categories. Third, the MPAA's own M rating (now GP) has indefinite meaning. The writer has tried to overcome, or at least to minimize, these difficulties by consulting with directors of the various rating programs where this seemed necessary,[33] and to resolve questions of doubt about equivalent categories in such ways as to maximize consistency with MPAA ratings. The latter was done in the interest of conservatism, since it was anticipated that general findings in rating comparison would indicate consistency with MPAA ratings, and that those ratings that were inconsistent would indicate that the eight programs were more rather than less restrictive than the MPAA. In other words, where there was doubt about equivalent categories, the doubt was resolved *against* a finding that the program ratings were inconsistent with and, more particularly, more restrictive than those of the MPAA. In effect, then, all doubts were resolved in favor of the MPAA as a *restrictive* and *representative* censorial agency.

With regard to the MPAA's M rating, this category was interpreted as equivalent to rating categories which indicated unsuitability for some class of children, but which did not necessarily indicate unsuitability for adolescents below 16, the age level for the R rating at the time the inquiry was made in 1969. The MPAA G rating was interpreted as equivalent to categories indicating suitability of films for children of any moviegoing age, that is, for "general audiences."

In the case of Dallas' dichotomous classification of Suitable and Not Suitable, with age 16 as the line of division, the G and M ratings were interpreted as equivalent to the Suitable category and the R and X as equivalent to the Not Suitable category.

Table 5

RATINGS OF EIGHT FILM RATING PROGRAMS FOR FILMS RATED BY MPAA

November 1, 1968-July 31, 1969

	MPAA rating									
	G		M		R		X		Total	
Program rating	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board										
Suitable	48	100.0	40	72.7	2	7.7	0	0.0	90	67.7
Not suitable	0	0.0	15	27.3	24	92.3	4	100.0	43	32.3
Total	48	36.1	55	41.4	26	19.6	4	3.0	133	100.0
Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission										
General audience	50	86.2	4	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	54	30.0
Mature entertainment	8	13.8	57	79.2	5	11.1	0	0.0	70	38.9
Adults only	0	0.0	10	13.9	35[a]	77.8	1	20.0	46	25.6
Not to be shown	0	0.0	1[b]	1.4	5[c]	11.1	4[d]	80.0	10	5.6
Total	58	32.2	72	40.0	45	25.0	5	2.8	180	100.0
British Board of Film Censors										
U—General exhibition	27	58.7	3	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	20.3
A—More suitable for adult audiencies	16	34.8	29	50.9	2	5.4	0	0.0	47	31.8
X—Adults only	3	6.5	25	43.9	35	94.6	8	100.0	71	48.0
Total	46	31.1	57	38.5	37	25.0	8	5.5	148	100.0
Film Reports (The Green Sheet)										
Children	8	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	5.8
General audience	14	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	9.4
Adults-mature young people-young people	21	36.5	3	5.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	15.8
Adults-mature young people	12	23.1	52	84.5	7	24.0	1	25.0	72	48.9
Adults	0	0.0	7	10.3	21	76.0	3	75.0	31	20.1
Total	55	37.4	62	41.7	28	18.0	4	2.9	149	100.0
National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures[e]										
A-1	40	48.2	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	16.6
A-2	31	37.4	7	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	38	15.4
A-3	12	14.5	62	66.0	12	20.7	0	0.0	86	34.8
A-4	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	24.1	1	8.3	15	6.1
B	0	0.0	23	24.5	18	31.0	2	16.7	43	17.4
Condemned	0	0.0	1	1.1	14	24.1	9	75.0	24	9.7
Total	83	33.6	94	38.1	58	23.5	12	4.9	247	100.0

Table 5 (Continued)

Program rating	MPAA rating G No.	G %	M No.	M %	R No.	R %	X No.	X %	Total No.	Total %
Parents' Magazine										
Children, young people	29	40.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	12.6
Mature children, young people	22	30.6	7	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	12.6
Young people	2	2.8	3	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	2.2
Mature young people	14	19.4	39	41.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	53	23.0
Very mature young people	1	1.4	13	13.8	2	3.6	0	0.0	16	7.0
Young people not under 15	0	0.0	7	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	3.0
Young people not under 16	0	0.0	6	6.4	10	18.2	0	0.0	16	7.0
Adults	4	5.6	19	20.2	43	78.2	9	100.0	75	32.6
Total	72	31.3	94	40.9	55	23.9	9	3.9	230	100.0
PTA Magazine										
Children, adolescents	17	53.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	21.3
Mature children, adolescents	4	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.0
Adolescents	7	21.9	5	14.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	15.0
Mature adolescents	3	9.4	26	76.5	2	14.3	0	0.0	31	38.8
Very mature adolescents	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	1.3
Adults	1	3.1	3	8.8	11	78.6	0	0.0	15	18.8
Total	32	40.0	34	42.5	14	17.5	0	0.0	80	100.0
Southern California Motion Picture Council										
Family— all ages	23	74.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	35.4
Youth-mature youth-adults	2	6.5	1	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.6
Mature youth and adults	6	19.4	13	61.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	29.2
Adults	0	0.0	6	28.6	6	54.6	0	0.0	12	18.5
Erotica and borderline	0	0.0	1	4.8	5	45.5	2	100.0	8	12.3
Total	31	47.7	21	32.3	11	16.9	2	3.1	65	100.0
All programs										
Total	425	34.5	489	39.7	274	22.2	44	3.6	1232	100.0

Note.—Margin percentages are percentages of the total number of films rated by the rating program as recorded in the matrix. Cell percentages are column percentages.

a. Includes one film rated Mature Entertainment after cuts were made at the request of the commission, hence for analytic purposes it has been placed in the next most restrictive cell.

b. This film was rated Adults Only after cuts were made in it. See note a, above.

c. Includes four films rated Adults Only after cuts were made in them. See note a, above.

d. Includes one film rated Adults Only after cuts were made in it. See note a, above.

e. The full rating category names are A-1, Morally Unobjectionable for General Patronage; A-2, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults and Adolescents; A-3, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults; A-4, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults, with Reservations; B, Morally Objectionable in Part for All; C, Condemned.

For Milwaukee, General Audience was judged equivalent to G; Mature Entertainment, to M; and Adults Only (which actually has a more restrictive age limit of 18), to R. Seven of the films rated by the commission were rated after cuts had been made. For purposes of comparison with MPAA ratings, each of these films was considered to have the next most restrictive rating, which, presumably, they would have received had cuts not been made.

In the case of the British Board of Film Censors, the U category was interpreted as equivalent to G; the A category to M; and the X category to R and X. Although a few films are rated by the board after requested cuts have been made, data on their identity could not be obtained. However, the net effect of such practice is probably to make British rating decisions even more restrictive than the data presented in Table 6 would indicate. As noted earlier, in the case of a few films, a different version may have been produced for British consumption than for American, but no data could be obtained on this matter either, except that it was not believed to affect many films.

For *Film Reports,* the categories Children (unaccompanied by adults) and General Audience were equated with the G rating; the categories Adults-Mature Young People-Young People and Adults-Mature Young People were equated with the M rating, even though Mature Young People, referring to the high school years, includes some persons over 16; and Adults was equated with the R and X ratings.

In the case of *Parents' Magazine,* suitability for children was equated with G; suitability for either mature children, mature young people, very mature young people, or young people over 15 was equated with M; suitability for young people over 16, with R; and nonsuitability for young people, with R and X.

For *PTA Magazine,* suitability for children was equated with G; suitability for either mature children, adolescents, mature adolescents, or very mature adolescents was equated with M; nonsuitability for children and adolescents, with R and X.

For the Southern California Motion Picture Council, Family—All Ages was equated with G; Youth-Mature Youth-Adults and Mature Youth-Adults, with M; Adults, with R; and Erotica and Borderline, with X.

With these category matchings, a degree of consistency or inconsistency of the ratings of each of the rating programs with those of the MPAA can be measured. An analysis of the "inconsistent" cells in Table 5 is made in Table 6. As the latter table indicates, inconsistency with MPAA ratings is not limited to ratings of the eight programs being more restrictive. Inconsistency can have magnitude in either of two directions.

The inconsistency percentages for each of the programs are:

National Catholic Office	33.6%
British Board of Film Censors	33.1%
So. Calif. M. P. Council	30.8%
Film Reports	26.9%
Parents' Magazine	23.0%
PTA Magazine	22.5%
Milwaukee M. P. Commission	20.6%
Dallas Classification Board	12.8%

If the few films in which program ratings were more permissive than those of the MPAA are eliminated, the percentages of films in which each of the rating programs was more restrictive than the MPAA are:

National Catholic Office	32.4%
So. Calif. M. P. Council	30.8%
British Board of Film Censors	29.7%
Film Reports	26.9%
PTA Magazine	22.5%
Parents' Magazine	20.0%
Milwaukee M. P. Commission	15.6%
Dallas Classification Board	11.3%

If the films in which ratings were more permissive than those of the MPAA are *subtracted from* those in which ratings are more restrictive, the percentages of all ratings for each program represented by the excess of more restrictive over more permissive ones are:

National Catholic Office	31.6%
So. Calif. M. P. Council	30.8%
Film Reports	26.9%
British Board of Film Censors	26.4%
PTA Magazine	22.5%
Parents' Magazine	17.0%
Milwaukee M. P. Commission	10.6%
Dallas Classification Board	9.8%

Two significant observations can be made from the various listings above and from the more extensive breakdown of rating percentages in Table 6. First, each of the eight programs was more restrictive than the MPAA *in general terms.* Adding the figures for all eight programs together, ratings that were more restrictive outnumbered those that were more permissive, 292 to 25. In other words, 92.1% of inconsistency was accounted for by more restrictive ratings. Second, the ratings of the two American governmental or quasi-governmental rating programs—those in Dallas and Milwaukee—were by far the most consistent with those of the MPAA and also, therefore, the most permissive of the eight programs. This element of permissiveness is probably related to the fact that both programs are tied to legal enforcement and, therefore, the relatively permissive legal standards of film content are probably an operating factor in rating decisions. Their relative consistency with MPAA ratings may indicate that MPAA rating decisions tend to be somewhat more finely attuned to the relative permissiveness allowed by *legal doctrine* than to the relative restrictiveness of *opinion* as opinion is represented by the other rating programs, though this, of course, is speculative.

Two further useful analyses can be made from the data in Table 6: the percentage of G films rated unsuitable for children, or at least unsuitable for children of some ages, and the percentage of M films found unsuitable for persons under 16. The breakdown for unsuitable G films in number and in percentage of all G films reviewed by each of the eight programs is as follows:

Table 6

PROGRAM RATINGS INCONSISTENT WITH THOSE OF MPAA

Program rating (Inconsistent cells from Table 5)	Relation to MPAA rating: More permissive No.	%	More restrictive No.	%	Total No.	%
Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board						
R—Suitable	2	7.7			2	7.7
M—Not Suitable			15	27.3	15	27.3
Matrix total	2	1.5	15	11.3	17	12.8
Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission						
G—Mature entertainment			8	13.8	8	13.8
M—General audience	4	5.6				
M—Adults only			10	13.9		
M—Not to be shown			1	1.4		
Total	4	5.6	11	15.3	15	20.8
R—Mature entertainment	5	11.1				
R—Not to be shown			5	11.1		
Total	5	11.1	5	11.1	10	22.2
X—Not to be shown			4	80.0	4	80.0
Matrix total	9	5.0	28	15.6	37	20.6
British Board of Film Censors						
G—A, More suitable for adult			16	34.8		
G—X, Adults only			3	6.5		
Total			19	41.3	19	41.3
M—U, General exhibition	3	5.3				
M—X, Adults only			25	43.9		
Total	3	5.3	25	43.9	28	49.1
R—A, More suitable for adult	2	5.4			2	5.4
Matrix total	5	3.4	44	29.7	49	33.1
Film Reports (The Green Sheet)						
G—Adults-Mature young people-young people			21	36.5		
G—Adults-Mature young people			12	23.1		
Total			33	59.6	33	59.6
M—Adults			7	10.3	7	10.3
Matrix total	0	0.0	40	26.9	40	26.9
National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures[a]						
G—A-2			31	37.4		
G—A-3			12	14.5		
Total			43	51.8	43	51.8
M—A-1	1	1.1				
M—B			23	24.5		
M—Condemned			1	1.1		
Total	1	1.1	24	25.5	25	26.6
R—Condemned			14	24.1	14	24.1
X—A-4	1	8.3			1	8.3
Matrix total	2	0.8	81	32.4	83	33.6

Table 6 (Continued)

Program rating (Inconsistent cells from Table 5)	Relation to MPAA rating: More permissive No.	%	More restrictive No.	%	Total No.	%
PTA Magazine						
G—Mature children, adolescents			4	12.5		
G—Adolescents			7	21.9		
G—Mature adolescents			3	9.4		
G—Adults			1	3.1		
Total			15	46.9	15	46.9
M—Adults			3	8.8	3	8.8
Matrix total	0	0.0	18	22.5	18	22.5
Parents' Magazine						
G—Young people			2	2.8		
G—Mature young people			14	19.4		
G—Very mature young people			1	1.4		
G—Adults			4	5.6		
Total			21	29.2	21	29.2
M—Mature children, young people	7	7.5				
M—Young people not under 16			6	6.4		
M—Adults			19	20.2		
Total	7	7.5	25	26.6	32	34.0
Matrix total	7	3.0	46	20.0	53	23.0
Southern California Motion Picture Council						
G—Youth			2	6.5		
G—Mature youth			6	19.4		
Total			8	25.8	8	25.8
M—Adults			6	28.6		
M—Erotica and borderline			1	4.8		
Total			7	33.3	7	33.3
R—Erotica and borderline			5	45.5	5	45.5
Matrix total	0	0.0	20	30.8	30	30.8
All programs						
Matrices total	25	2.0	292	23.7	317	25.7

Note.—Matrix total row percentages are percentages of the total number of films rated by the rating program. All other percentages are those of the number of MPAA-category films rated by the program.

a. The full rating category names are A-1, Morally Unobjectionable for General Patronage; A-2, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults and Adolescents; A-3, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults; A-4, Morally Unobjectionable for Adults, with Reservations; B, Morally Objectionable in Part for All; C, Condemned.

Film Reports	33	59.6%
National Catholic Office	43	51.8%
PTA Magazine	15	46.9%
British Board of Film Censors	19	41.3%
Parents' Magazine	21	29.2%
So. Calif. M. P. Council	8	25.8%
Milwaukee M. P. Commission	8	13.8%
Dallas Classification Board	0	0.0%

The breakdown for unsuitable M films by number and by percentage of all M films reviewed is as follows:

British Board of Film Censors	25	43.9%
So. Calif. M. P. Council	7	33.3%
Dallas Classification Board	15	27.3%
Parents' Magazine	25	26.6%
National Catholic Office	24	25.5%
Milwaukee M. P. Commission	11	15.3%
Film Reports	7	10.3%
PTA Magazine	3	8.8%

These findings indicate that the G rating is the major source of inconsistency, at least with the nongovernmental rating programs. G films accounted for 34.4% of all ratings of the eight programs, but for 50.3% of all ratings that were more restrictive than the MPAA's. If the Dallas ratings, which do not involve determination of suitability for children alone, are excluded, the respective percentages are 34.3% and 53.1%. In a few instances, the G films were also found to be unsuitable for adolescents. In contrast, M films account for 39.7% of all ratings of the programs and for 40.1% of the more restrictive ratings. If all the ratings for G films for the eight programs are taken together, 34.6% of the ratings for these films indicated unsuitability for children of at least some age ranges. If the Dallas ratings are excluded again, the percentage of G films found unsuitable is 39.0%. In the case of M films, 23.9% of the ratings in the programs found them to be unsuitable for adolescents, while 3.1% of the ratings for M films found the particular films to be suitable for children of all ages.

If the ratings for all eight programs are combined, 915 or 74.3% were consistent with those of the MPAA, while 317 or 25.7% were inconsistent. Of the inconsistent ratings, 292 or 23.7% were more restrictive than those of the MPAA, while 25 or 2.0% were more permissive.

Of the 332 films rated by the MPAA, 34 were not rated by any of the eight programs at the time the data was collected. In most cases, this was due to delayed release of the films by their proprietors. Of the 298 MPAA-rated films that were rated by one or more of the eight rating programs, 171 or 57.4% had one or more inconsistent ratings. A total of 127 films or 42.6% had no inconsistent ratings. The films that had one or more inconsistent ratings averaged 4.5 ratings per film, while those that had no inconsistent ratings averaged 3.7 ratings per film. If the 44 films which had only one rating (26 of which were consistent and 18 of which were inconsistent) are eliminated from the calculations, then 153 or 60.2% of the remaining 254 films had at least one inconsistent rating, while 101 or 39.8% had no inconsistent rating.

Of the 171 films with one or more inconsistent ratings, 155, or 52.0% of all films rated by one or more of the programs, had one or more more restrictive ratings, while 21 or 7.1% had one or more more permissive ratings than those of the MPAA. Five films—*Assignment to Kill, Heaven With a Gun, MacKenna's Gold, Strategy of Terror,* and *Southern Star*—had both one or more more restrictive and one or more more permissive ratings than those of the MPAA.

Which films showed the most frequent disparity between the judgments of the MPAA and those of the eight programs? Of 82 films which received two or more inconsistent ratings, 42 received a greater number of inconsistent than consistent ratings. Each of seven others received an equal number of inconsistent and consistent ratings. These 49 films and all of the various ratings they received are listed in Table 7. For 44 of these films, *all* of the inconsistent ratings were more restrictive. Of the remaining five films, the more restrictive ratings outnumbered the more permissive in one; in two, the inconsistent ratings were evenly divided between those more restrictive and those more permissive; and in two, all of the inconsistent ratings were more permissive.

In 14 of the 49 films, *all* the ratings received were inconsistent. In 13 of these—*The Big Cube, Dr. Glas, A Fistful of Dollars, The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly, Grazie Zia, Les Gauloises Bleues, The Last Shot You Hear, The Marriage Came Tumbling Down, Psycho, The Salesman, The Sea Gull, The Subject Was Roses,* and *The Witchmaker*—all of the inconsistent ratings were more restrictive.

The 49 films account for 48.7% of all the inconsistent ratings and for 50.3% of all the more restrictive ratings. These films of maximum inconsistency provide additional evidence that the G film is the major source of dispute with the industry's ratings. Of the 49 films, 25 are G's, 23 are M's, and three are R's. Among all the ratings of those G films receiving one or more inconsistent ratings, 49.7% were inconsistent and, since they were G's, more restrictive. In contrast, the percentage of more restrictive ratings for M films was 33.7% and for R films, 22.9% (Table 8).

Evaluations by newspaper movie editors

An additional comparison of MPAA ratings was obtained through a questionnaire survey of newspaper movie editors in the United States. The questionnaire, which also contained other inquiries analyzed elsewhere in this report, was sent to 584 movie editors listed in the *1969 Film Daily Yearbook of Motion Pictures.*[34] These editors were affiliated with 533 papers in 437 cities in 50 States and the District of Columbia. Returns were obtained from 287 editors on 261 papers in 231 cities in 46 States and the District of Columbia. Of the 287 editors returning questionnaires, 260 completed the section on evaluation of MPAA ratings.

The evaluation question listed 31 MPAA-rated films and asked the respondent to indicate, for those films which he had seen, whether he thought (1) the MPAA rating was the *most appropriate one* for the film; (2) the film should have been given a *less restrictive rating;* (3) the film should have been given a *more restrictive rating;* or (4) the film *should not have been allowed exhibition at all.* The complete tabulation for this inquiry is set out in Table 9. The number of evaluations per film ranged from 73 to 200 and averaged 147.2. For the 31 films taken together, 69.5% of the evaluations were that the MPAA rating was the most

Table 7

FILMS WITH 50% OR MORE PROGRAM RATINGS INCONSISTENT WITH MPAA RATING

Film and MPAA rating	Program rating: Dallas	Milw.	BBFC	Film Rep'ts	NCOMP	Parents' Mag.	PTA Mag.	So. Calif.
Ace High (M)			(A)	A	(A-2)	A		
Alexander (G)		ME		(GA)	A-2	YP	YP	
Assignment to Kill (M)	NS	GA*			(A-3)	(MYP)		
The Big Cube (M)	NS	NTBS	X		B			
Birthday Party, The (G)		(GA)			A-3	A		
Brute and the Beast, The (M)	NS	(ME)			(A-3)	A		
Comic, The (M)		GA*	(A)			MC-YP*		
Dr. Glas (M)				A	B	A		
First Time, The (M)	NS	AO	X	(A-MY)	B	(YP15)	(MYP)	A
Fistful of Dollars (M)	NS				B	A		
Fox, The (R)				(A)	C			EB
Fraulein Doktor (M)	(S)	(ME)		A	(A-3)	A	A	A
Ghosts Italian Style (G)		(GA)	A	A-MY		MYP	MYP	
God Forgives, I Don't (M)	NS	(ME)			B	A		
Good, the Bad, and the Ugly, The (M)				A	B			
Grazie Zia (M)		AO			B	A		
Guns of the Magnificent Seven, The (G)	(S)	(GA)	A	A-MY	A-2	MYP	A	
Guru, The (G)		ME	(U)	A-MY-Y	A-2	MYP	MC-YP	
Heaven with a Gun (M)	(S)	GA*	X	A	(A-3)	(MYP)	A	A
Hell in the Pacific (G)	(S)	(GA)	(U)	A-MY-Y	A-2	MYP	YP	
Here's Your Life (M)		AO			(A-3)	A		
House of Cards (G)	(S)			A-MY	A-3	MYP	YP	MY
If It's Tuesday, It Must Be Belgium (G)		(GA)	A	A-MY-Y	A-3	(MC-YP)	MC-YP	MY
Impossible Years, The (G)	(S)			A-MY	A-3	(MC-YP)	YP	
Kenner (G)		(GA)		A-MY-Y	A-2	(MC-YP)	YP	
Killers Three (M)	NS	(ME)	X		B	(MYP)		
Lady on the Tracks (G)		ME			A-2	(MC-YP)		
Les Gauloises Bleues (M)		ME	A		A-3	A		
Last Shot You Hear, The (M)		AO			B			
Madwoman of Chaillot, The (G)		(GA)	(U)		A-3	MYP		
Maltese Bippy, The (G)		(GA)	A	A-MY-Y	A-2	(C-YP)		
Marriage Came Tumbling Down, The (G)		ME			A-2	MYP		
Midas Run(M)	NS	AO		(A-MY)	B	(VMYP)		
1,000 Plane Raid (G)		ME	(U)	A-MY-Y		MYP		
Popi (G)	(S)	(GA)	A	A-MY	A-2	MYP		MY
Psycho (M)					B	A		
Salesman, The (G)		ME		A-MY	A-2	A		
Sea Gull, The (G)		ME		A-MY	A-3	VMYP	MYP	
Seven Golden Men (G)	(S)	(GA)			A-2	MYP		
Strategy of Terror(M)	NS				A-1*			
Subject Was Roses (G)				A-MY	A-3	MYP		MY
Sweet Body of Deborah (R)	(NS)	NTBS			C	(A)		
They Came to Rob Las Vegas (R)	S*	ME*	A*		(A-3)	(YP-16)		
Twisted Nerve (M)	(S)	AO		A	(A-3)	YP-16	A	
Wanderer, The (G)		(GA)		A-MY-Y	A-2	A		
Where's Jack? (G)		(GA)	(U)	A-MY-Y	A-2	(MC-YP)		MY
Witchmaker, The (M)	NS					A		
You Only Love Once (G)		(GA)		A-MY	A-2	MYP		
Young Billy Young (G)				A-MY-Y	A-2	(MC-YP)		

Table 7 (Continued)

Note.—Table includes only those films receiving ratings from three or more rating programs and having at least two ratings inconsistent with the MPAA's.

Ratings in parentheses are judged to be consistent with the MPAA rating. Those not in parentheses are judged to be inconsistent.

Asterisk indicates the inconsistent rating was judged to be more permissive than the MPAA rating.

Rating symbols used in this table:

Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board:
S—Suitable
NS—Not suitable

Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission:
GA—General audience
ME—Mature entertainment
AO—Adults only
NTBS—Not to be shown

British Board of Film Censors:
U—General exhibition
A—More suitable for adult audiences
X—Adults only

Film Reports:
C—Children
GA—General audience
A-MY-Y—Adults, mature young people, and young people
A-MY—Adults and mature young people
A—Adults

National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures:
A-1—Morally unobjectionable for general patronage
A-2—Morally unobjectionable for adults and adolescents
A-3—Morally unobjectionable for adults
A-4—Morally unobjectionable for adults, with reservations
B—Objectionable in part for all
C—Condemned

Parents' Magazine:
C-YP—Children and young people
MC-YP—Mature children and young people
YP—Young people
MYP—Mature young people
YP-15—Young people not under 15
YP-16—Young people not under 16
A—Adults

PTA Magazine:
C-YP—Children and adolescents
MC-YP—Mature children and adolescents
YP—Adolescents
MYP—Mature adolescents
VMYP—Very mature adolescents
A—Adults

Southern California Motion Picture Council:
F—Family—all ages
Y-MY-A—Youth, mature youth, and adults
MY-A—Mature youth and adults
A—Adults
EB—Erotica and borderline

Table 8

RATINGS OF FILMS WITH ONE OR MORE INCONSISTENT RATINGS ANALYZED BY MPAA RATING CATEGORY

MPAA category	No. of films	Relation to MPAA rating: Consistent No.	Consistent %	More permissive No.	More permissive %	More restrictive No.	More restrictive %	Total no. of ratings
G	68	149	50.4	-	-	147	49.7	297
M	72	215	62.0	15	4.3	117	33.7	347
R	26	72	68.6	9	8.6	24	22.9	105
X	5	15	75.0	1	5.0	4	20.0	19
Total	171	451	58.7	25	3.3	292	38.0	768

Note.—Percentages are raw percentages.

appropriate one, 16.9% that the MPAA rating was too restrictive, 12.0% that the MPAA rating was too permissive, and 1.6% that the film should not have been allowed exhibition at all. In the cases of only two films, *Candy* and *If...*, were the MPAA ratings judged appropriate by less than half of the respondents, but in both cases the "most appropriate" category still had the highest number of responses, 47.8% for *Candy* and 46.6% for *If....* In the case of the former film, 42.2% thought the R rating was too permissive and an additional 4.4% thought the film should not have been shown at all. In the case of *If...*, 45.9% thought the R rating was too restrictive.

The breakdown by MPAA rating indicates that the G film had the highest percentage of "most appropriate" responses, but also the highest percentage of responses that the rating was too permissive (Table 10). The R film, in contrast, had the lowest number of "most appropriate" responses, but the highest number of responses that the rating was too restrictive.

Unfortunately, the choice of the 31 films was such that comparisons of evaluations of them with ratings of the eight rating programs must be somewhat limited. Only 19 of the 31 films received one or more inconsistent ratings from the eight rating progams, and only five of the 31 are among the 49 films of maximum inconsistency listed in Table 7. This relatively low "overlap" of the two groups of films is due to the fact that the 31 questionnaire films contain a high percentage of R films and a low percentage of G's. The breakdown for the 31 films is G, 5; M, 9; R, 14; and X, 3. The choice of the 31 films was made by the writer *before* the analysis of the ratings of the eight programs was completed and before that analysis revealed that the G film was by far the source of the greatest inconsistency with MPAA ratings. The choice of the 31 films and the high incidence of R and M films among them was, instead, based on the general controversy over the content of those films, at least as those films were discussed in the trade press and general press.

Nevertheless, certain valuable comparisons can be made. First, the newspaper editors are more permissive in their evaluations than the reviewers in the eight rating systems are in their ratings, though perhaps not by as much as might first appear. Second, the editors are somewhat more likely to agree with the reviewers

Table 9

EVALUATIONS OF 31 MPAA-RATED FILMS BY AMERICAN NEWSPAPER MOTION PICTURE EDITORS

Film and MPAA rating	Evaluation of MPAA rating: Most appropriate one No.	%	Too restrictive No.	%	Too permissive No.	%	Film should not be shown No.	%	Total no. of responses
Alice's Restaurant (R)	101	56.1	72	40.0	6	3.3	1	0.6	180
April Fools (M)	115	84.6	16	11.8	5	3.7	0	0.0	136
Best House in London, The (X)	65	60.8	35	32.7	2	1.9	5	4.7	107
Brotherhood, The (M)	95	76.6	14	11.3	15	12.1	0	0.0	124
Bullit (M)	159	80.3	21	10.6	18	9.0	0	0.0	198
Buona Sera, Mrs. Campbell (M)	106	76.3	29	20.9	4	2.9	0	0.0	139
Candy (R)	86	47.8	10	5.6	76	42.2	8	4.4	180
Can Hieronymous Merkin Ever Forget Mercy Humppe (X)	111	74.5	15	10.1	2	1.3	21	14.1	149
Castle Keep (R)	74	56.5	53	40.5	4	3.1	0	0.0	131
Fistful of Dollars, A (M)	100	62.9	15	9.4	42	26.4	2	1.3	159
Fox, The (R)	113	63.1	18	10.1	47	26.3	1	0.6	179
Goodbye, Columbus (R)	127	63.5	56	28.0	16	8.0	1	0.5	200
Greetings (X)	42	57.5	28	38.4	0	0.0	3	4.1	73
Gypsy Moths, The (M)	98	77.8	11	8.7	17	13.5	0	0.0	126
Hard Contract (R)	74	70.5	27	25.7	4	3.8	0	0.0	105
If . . . (R)	62	46.6	61	45.9	9	6.8	1	0.8	133
If It's Tuesday, It Must Be Belgium (G)	126	79.3	9	5.7	23	14.5	1	0.6	159
Impossible Years, The (G)	103	76.9	1	0.8	27	20.2	3	2.2	134
Magus, The (R)	62	61.4	35	34.7	2	2.0	2	2.0	101
Night They Raided Minsky's, The (M)	125	77.6	29	18.0	7	4.4	0	0.0	161
100 Rifles (R)	96	68.1	38	27.0	7	5.0	0	0.0	141
Popi (G)	114	85.7	2	1.6	17	12.8	0	0.0	133
Prime of Miss Jean Brodie, The (M)	125	79.6	22	14.0	9	5.7	1	0.6	157
Sergeant, The (R)	95	65.1	36	24.7	15	10.3	0	0.0	146
Staircase (R)	93	67.9	27	19.7	14	10.2	3	2.2	137
Sweet Charity (G)	126	78.8	3	1.9	30	18.8	1	0.6	160
That Cold Day in the Park (R)	97	65.5	22	14.9	27	18.2	2	1.4	148
Three in the Attic (R)	105	62.9	22	13.2	36	21.6	4	2.4	167
True Grit (G)	158	82.3	4	2.1	27	14.1	3	1.6	192
Wild Bunch, The (R)	94	57.7	29	17.8	30	18.4	10	6.1	163
Winning (M)	128	85.3	14	9.3	8	5.3	0	0.0	150
Total	3175	69.5	774	16.9	546	12.0	73	1.6	4568

Table 10

EVALUATIONS OF 31 MPAA-RATED FILMS BY AMERICAN NEWSPAPER MOTION PICTURE EDITORS ANALYZED BY MPAA RATING CATEGORY

MPAA category	No. of films	Evaluation of MPAA Rating: Most appropriate one No.	%	Too restrictive No.	%	Too permissive No.	%	Film should not be shown No.	%	Total no. of evaluations
G	5	627	80.6	19	2.4	124	16.0	8	1.0	778
M	9	1051	77.9	171	12.7	125	9.3	3	0.2	1350
R	14	1279	60.6	506	24.0	293	13.9	33	1.6	2111
X	3	218	66.3	78	23.7	4	1.2	29	8.8	329
Total	31	3175	69.5	774	16.9	546	12.0	73	1.6	4568

that films of more controversial content merit their particular restrictive rating than to agree that those of less controversial content merit their unrestricted rating. Third, the films for which there is the greatest inconsistency between the ratings of the eight programs and those of the MPAA are also films in which the editors have most often evaluated MPAA ratings as being too permissive.

In Table 11, evaluations of the editors are compared with ratings of the eight programs for (1) the 12 films on the questionnaire which received no inconsistent ratings from the eight rating programs, (2) the 18 films on the questionnaire which received one or more more restrictive ratings than those of the MPAA, and (3) the five films on the questionnaire which are also among the 49 films of "maximum inconsistency" in Table 7, that is, films with half or more of their ratings being inconsistent with those of the MPAA (for each of these five films, the inconsistent ratings were all more restrictive). As Table 11 indicates, there is a marked progressive decline in editor evaluations of MPAA ratings being too restrictive and a corresponding marked progressive increase in their evaluations of MPAA ratings being too permissive, as one moves from the first through the third grouping above.

FILM COVERAGE

Coverage is a measure of magnitude of self-regulation and refers here to the extent to which commercial feature films are within the rating system. It can be gauged in at least three ways: (1) the percentage of commercially released features rated, (2) the percentage of commercial exhibitions accounted for by rated films, and (3) the percentage of box office admissions accounted for by rated films. This section of the report offers a rough measure of the first and a fairly precise one of the second. Short of obtaining reliable data on gross receipts for individual features from distributors—a most unpromising quest, given the secrecy surrounding financial returns in the industry—there is no precise way of taking the third measure, that of the moviegoing audience. Nevertheless, a reasonably accurate estimate of box office or audience coverage can probably be made on the basis of the measures of feature and exhibition coverage.

In addition to its obvious importance as a measure of the magnitude of self-regulation, coverage is also likely to be closely related to the functioning of

Table 11

COMPARISON OF EVALUATIONS BY NEWSPAPER MOTION PICTURE EDITORS WITH THOSE OF EIGHT RATING PROGRAMS BY SELECTED FILM GROUPINGS

		Evaluation of MPAA ratings by editors						
Ratings by 8 rating programs	No. of films	Most appropriate one No.	%	Too restrictive No.	%	Too permissive[a] No.	%	Total no. of evaluations
None inconsistent with MPAA	12	1232	67.8	403	22.2	181	10.0	1,816
One or more more restrictive than MPAA	18	1848	70.3	357	13.6	413	16.1	2,628
50% or more more restrictive than MPAA	5	556	72.8	45	5.9	163	21.3	764

[a]Category includes responses that the rating should have been more restrictive, as well as those that the film should not be allowed to be shown at all.

the rating system as an alternate form of censorship in the medium. The general proposition here would be that the greater the coverage of the rating system, the more successful the system will be in allaying censorial pressure and censorial interest generally.

The essential voluntary character of the rating system should be mentioned again. Motion picture companies that are members of the MPAA are required, as a condition of their membership, to submit all of their films for ratings. But, of course, a company could free itself of this requirement simply by giving up its membership in the organization. The fact that the rating system is entirely voluntary may mean that, over the long run, coverage may be somewhat unstable. The period under survey here—the first 10 months of the rating system, is, of course, far too short to indicate much, if anything at all, about stability.

As noted in the first section, Jack Valenti, MPAA president, and several other industry leaders working with him, were able to obtain a remarkable degree of initial consensus for a rating system and enlist the cooperation of almost all of the industry's major production, distribution, and exhibition companies. There is, at present at least, only one major holdout against the ratings, Walter Reade, Jr., who is both an exhibitor and a distributor. Reade, however, is influential, particularly in the former capacity, because many of his 70-odd theaters are important first-run houses in the New York metropolitan area. Though outspoken in his opposition to the system, Reade has sometimes been forced to employ the ratings as an exhibitor when a film's distributor has insisted that they be used, and also occasionally as a distributor when an important exhibitor, such as the Radio City Music Hall in New York, has insisted upon their use. How many Walter Reades the rating system can withstand and remain viable is a matter of considerable interest and not a little concern in the industry. At present, though, there is only one.

Whether a film is rated or not, and therefore whether it is within or outside of

the rating system, would seem to be a simple and straightforward enough determination. However, a difficulty arises with the self-rated X film. The rating system provides that a film may be given an X rating by its proprietor without his submitting it for actual rating by the MPAA's Code and Rating Administration. In one sense, such films can be considered part of the rating system, since their rating advertisement and other presentation to the public may not differ from a rated X film. On the other hand, such films not only have not been viewed by the industry's rating apparatus, but also many of them are advertised as X films only part of the time, being presented with no rating at all, that is, as unrated films, at other times. The writer has not tried to resolve this fish-or-fowl dilemma, but instead has offered a separate tally for self-rated X films, so that these may or may not be considered to be "covered."

Features

It is not possible to determine with exactness the percentage of feature releases that are rated, simply because it is not possible, to the writer's knowledge, to obtain any complete listing or tabulation of all feature releases. Some organs of the trade press list new releases, but these listings are not complete, since the trade press lists only new releases likely to have some commercial significance. Not listed are many foreign language imports, such as those in Chinese from Hong Kong, that will have only a handful of exhibitions in a few large cities to ethnic audiences. These films are almost never rated.

However, it is possible to determine with some precision the percentage of commercially significant feature releases—that is, those that are listed by the trade presses—that are rated. The calculations below are based on a survey of trade press listings from November 1, 1968 through August 31, 1969 (the first 10 months of the rating system). During this period, 460 new feature releases were listed. Of these, 363 or 78.9% were rated by the MPAA Code and Rating Administration, and 97 or 21.1% were not rated. As will be evident in the subsection on exhibitions, below, most of these unrated films are minor ones, having limited distribution and relatively few play dates. There are some exceptions, of course—*I, a Woman, II, I Am Curious (Yellow),* and *Faces* are leading examples. Many of the nonrated films (including *I, a Woman II,* and *Faces*), were occasionally advertised as X-rated, transforming them, in effect, into self-rated X films. There is no practical way of determining which of the 97 nonrated films were given an X by their proprietors, or for those that were, how often they were. For this reason, among several others, the analysis of exhibitions below is probably a more satisfactory measure of coverage than that of the percentage of features rated. As will also be noted below in the subsection on pseudo-coverage, a few of the unrated films were sometimes given a G, M, or R rating by their proprietors.

Exhibitions

Data on the number and percentage of exhibitions accounted for by rated films were obtained as part of a systematic survey of newspaper movie advertising in 20 metropolitan areas[35] and in 20 smaller cities[36] during the first eight months of

1969. Advertisement of the ratings themselves is analyzed separately in a later part of this report. Movie ads were surveyed in the 20 metropolitan areas every fourth Friday from January 24 through August 8, eight dates in all.[37] In the 20 smaller cities, ranging in population from 50,000 to 144,000 (1960 census), ads were surveyed every third Friday from May 16 through July 18, four dates in all.[38] A total of 26,297 advertised exhibitions were surveyed, 18,198 of which were of features released after the rating system went into effect on November 1, 1968, or of features released earlier but which had been submitted for rating.[39] These ads were placed by 2,351 theaters. The average number of theaters surveyed per date was 2,259 or 16.1% of the approximately 14,000 theaters in the country. Since use of newspaper advertising is near-universal in the film industry, it would be very unlikely that the survey missed any commercial exhibition in the 20 metropolitan areas and the 20 smaller cities on the dates surveyed. The one possible exception would have occurred when a newspaper used in the survey had refused to accept ads for X-rated films or other exploitation films, as several papers in the country have come to do. However, a check failed to reveal that any of the 40 papers used in the survey refused to accept X ads as a matter of standing policy during the period covered. This does not mean, of course, that a paper may not have occasionally refused an X ad. Because of this possibility, the survey findings may slightly understate the number of X exhibitions, but in the judgment of the writer, any such understatement is likely to be so small as to be insignificant in the arithmetic analysis made here.

The striking finding of the survey of exhibitions is the very high percentage accounted for by MPAA-rated films—92.6% in the 20 metropolitan areas and 91.9% in the 20 smaller cities (Table 12). If exhibitions of self-rated X films are included as covered films, the percentages climb to 96.3% and 97.0%, respectively. Moreover, this high percentage of coverage appears to be remarkably consistent from one location to another. Not only is there little variation between the metropolitan areas as a group and the smaller cities as a group, but there is relatively little variation among the individual metropolitan areas (Table 13). The percentage for MPAA-rated films ranges from 79.1% in Birmingham to 96.6% in Boston. In only two of the 20 areas, Birmingham and Atlanta, is the percentage below 89.0%.[40] Consistency in the high percentage of coverage is even more striking if self-rated X films are included as rated films. Coverage is then 96.3%, ranging from 91.8% in San Francisco to 98.5% in St. Louis, with only four metropolitan areas below 96.0%.[41]

Another interesting finding presented in Table 13 is that Milwaukee was the only metropolitan area with no self-rated X exhibitions. Since six MPAA-rated X exhibitions were recorded for Milwaukee (1.0% of all post-November 1968 feature exhibitions in the city, and about the same percentage as the average for the 20 metropolitan areas), there are probably two explanations, both having to do with the existence of the Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission, a quasi-governmental classification body. One is that since the commission has its own classification labels which it encourages exhibitors to use in their advertisements, local exhibitors have not bothered to self-apply the X to any unrated features. The other is that since the commission labels some films "Not To Be Shown" and has some informal coercive power to back up this rating, no films of the sort that might ordinarily be self-rated X have played in the city.

Table 12

EXHIBITIONS OF FEATURE FILMS RELEASED AFTER NOVEMBER 1, 1968, AS ADVERTISED IN DAILY NEWSPAPERS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969[a]

Rating	Large cities[b] No.	%	Small cities[c] No.	%	Total No.	%
G	6,162	35.1	276	42.5	6,438	35.4
M	6,676	38.1	225	34.6	6,901	37.9
R	3,213	18.3	89	13.7	3,302	18.1
X	194	1.1	7	1.1	201	1.1
Total	16,245	92.6	597	91.9	16,842	92.5
Self-rated	647	3.7	33	5.1	680	3.7
Total	16,892	96.3	630	97.0	17,552	96.3
Unrated[d]	654	3.7	20	3.1	674	3.7
Total	17,546	100.0	650	100.1[e]	18,196	100.0

a. The table includes exhibitions of a few features already in circulation on November 1, 1968 as well as a few earlier releases reissued after November 1, 1968, which were submitted to the Code and Rating Administration for rating or which were given an X rating by their proprietors. These represent approximately 8% of the features and probably less than 2% of the exhibitions.

b. Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C. The dates surveyed were January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

c. Bakersfield, Calif., Billings, Mont., Binghamton, N. Y., Cedar Rapids, Ia., Duluth, Minn., Fayetteville, N. C., Jackson, Miss., Huntington, W. Va., Johnstown, Pa., Lewiston, Me., Little Rock, Ark., Mesa, Ariz., Ogden, Utah, Pensacola, Fla., Pittsfield, Mass., San Angelo, Tex., Sioux Falls, S. D., Springfield, Ohio, Terre Haute, Ind., and Topeka, Kans. The dates surveyed were May 16, June 6, June 27, and July 18, 1969.

d. Includes no exhibitions of films released prior to November 1, 1968.

e. Total does not add up to 100.0 because of rounding.

Consistency is also evident among the eight dates surveyed for the metropolitan areas. Coverage for MPAA-rated films ranged from 90.0 to 94.5% on these dates (Table 14). If self-rated X films are included, the range was narrower still, from 95.0 to 97.7%. No trends in coverage are discernable in the eight survey dates for the metropolitan areas, though eight dates each four weeks apart are probably not a suitable test for checking trends over time. If the average coverage for MPAA-rated films for the first four dates is compared to the average coverage for the second four dates, there is no difference at all, both are 92.5%. The percentages for self-rated X films are 3.5% for the first four dates and 3.9% for the second four. For post-November 1968 unrated films, the percentages are 4.1% and 3.6%, respectively. To the extent that these two changes are meaningful at all, they may indicate either a slightly increasing tendency to label X-type films not submitted to the Code and Rating Administration, or possibly an increasing tendency of proprietors who normally submit their films to anticipate an MPAA X rating on a particular film and therefore to label it themselves, rather than bothering to submit it.

An additional striking figure in Table 14 indicates that coverage for MPAA-rated films was 94.4% on January 24, just 12 weeks after the rating system began. Achievement of so high a percentage on so early a date is probably another indication of the MPAA's success in obtaining a high degree of consensus for rating in the industry as well as the massive initial effort at getting the rating system underway.

Table 13

ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF FEATURE FILMS RELEASED AFTER NOVEMBER 1, 1968, IN 20 LARGE CITIES, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969[a]

	MPAA-rated (G, M, R, X)		Self-rated X		Unrated[b]		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Atlanta	351	86.7	40	9.9	14	3.5	405
Baltimore	563	89.8	45	7.2	19	3.0	627
Birmingham	87	79.1	20	18.2	3	2.7	110
Boston	920	96.6	15	1.6	17	1.8	952
Chicago	1,461	93.1	70	4.5	39	2.5	1,570
Cleveland	654	95.6	18	2.6	12	1.8	684
Dallas	475	95.2	5	1.0	19	3.8	499
Denver	384	95.5	6	1.5	12	3.0	402
Detroit	1,081	89.5	104	8.6	23	1.9	1,208
Los Angeles	2,718	95.2	58	2.0	78	2.8	2,854
Miami	479	93.2	19	3.7	16	3.1	514
Milwaukee	535	92.6	0	—	43	7.4	578
New Orleans	376	93.8	11	2.7	14	3.5	401
New York	2,100	91.6	102	4.5	91	4.0	2,293
Philadelphia	1,223	91.5	27	2.0	86	6.4	1,336
Portland, Ore.	322	94.2	9	2.6	11	3.2	342
St. Louis	393	94.9	15	3.6	6	1.5	414
San Francisco	1,066	89.9	23	1.9	97	8.2	1,186
Seattle	315	93.5	11	3.3	11	3.3	337
Washington, D.C.	742	89.0	49	5.9	43	5.2	834
Total	16,245	92.6	647	3.7	654	3.7	17,546

a. The table includes exhibitions of a few features already in circulation on November 1, 1968 as well as a few earlier releases reissued after November 1, 1968, which were submitted to the Code and Rating Administration for rating or which were given an X rating by their proprietors. These represent approximately 8% of the features and probably less than 2% of the exhibitions.

The exhibitions listed for each city are actually those playing in the greater metropolitan area of each city, that is, in the circulation area of the city's leading newspaper, since all movie ads in the newspaper were surveyed and not merely those of films playing within the city limits.

The dates surveyed are January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

b. Includes no exhibitions of films released prior to November 1, 1968.

Analysis of coverage by theater type, indoor and drive-in (Table 15), reveals a higher percentage for the latter than for the former (with or without inclusion of self-rated X films), a finding somewhat at odds with the popular image of the drive-in as the den of cinematic erotica and violence.

Audience

As indicated earlier, no measure of coverage by audience or by box office receipts has been undertaken in this study, nor is precise information likely to be available at all. However, some speculation can be made on the basis of the measure of the percentage of features (78.9%) and exhibitions (92.6%) accounted for by MPAA-rated films. As indicated by these percentages, MPAA-rated films tend to have more bookings as a group than do nonrated films or even self-rated X

Table 14

ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF FEATURE FILMS RELEASED AFTER NOVEMBER 1, 1968, ON EIGHT DATES IN 20 METROPOLITAN AREAS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969[a]

Date	MPAA-rated (G, M, R, X)		Self-rated X		Unrated[b]		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
January 24	1,289	94.4	28	2.1	49	3.6	1,366
February 21	1,311	90.0	73	5.0	72	5.0	1,456
March 21	1,692	94.3	53	3.0	49	2.7	1,794
April 18	1,681	91.4	68	3.7	90	4.9	1,834
May 16	2,378	91.3	118	4.5	108	4.2	2,604
June 13	2,433	90.5	126	4.7	128	4.8	2,687
July 11	2,586	93.8	83	3.0	88	3.2	2,757
August 8	2,875	94.5	98	3.2	70	2.3	3,043
Total	16,245	92.6	647	3.7	654	3.7	17,546

a. The table includes exhibitions of a few features already in circulation on November 1, 1968 as well as a few earlier releases reissued after November 1, 1968, which were submitted to the Code and Rating Administration for rating or which were given an X rating by their proprietors. These represent approximately 8% of the features and probably less than 2% of the exhibitions.

The metropolitan areas include those of Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C.

b. Includes no exhibitions of films released prior to November 1, 1968.

Table 15

ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF FEATURE FILMS RELEASED AFTER NOVEMBER 1, 1968, AT INDOOR AND DRIVE-IN THEATERS IN 20 METROPOLITAN AREAS AND 20 SMALL CITIES, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969[a]

Theaters	MPAA-rated (G, M, R, X)		Self-rated X		Unrated[b]		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Indoor	12,304	91.7	586	4.4	527	3.9	13,417
Drive-in	4,379	95.3	92	2.0	122	2.7	4,593
Total	16,683	92.6	678	3.8	649	3.6	18,010

a. The table includes exhibitions of a few features already in circulation on November 1, 1968 as well as a few earlier releases reissued after November 1, 1968, which were submitted to the Code and Rating Administration for rating or which were given an X rating by their proprietors. These represent approximately 8% of the features and probably less than 2% of the exhibitions.

The metropolitan areas include those of Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C. The dates surveyed were January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

The small cities include Bakersfield, Calif., Billings, Mont., Binghamton, N. Y., Cedar Rapids, Ia., Duluth, Minn., Fayetteville, N. C., Jackson, Miss., Huntington, W. Va., Johnstown, Pa., Lewiston, Me., Little Rock, Ark., Mesa, Ariz., Ogden, Utah, Pensacola, Fla., Pittsfield, Mass., San Angelo, Tex., Sioux Falls, S. D., Springfield, Ohio, Terre Haute, Ind., and Topeka, Kans. The dates surveyed were May 16, June 6, June 27, and July 18, 1969.

b. Includes no exhibitions of films released prior to November 1, 1968.

films. This is hardly surprising, since MPAA-rated films include most of the major American and foreign productions, which are likely to have well-known actors and actresses in them and to be designed in theme and budget for the large audience. The fact that they are rated may, of course, also be a factor in getting bookings, but these films would have more than their share of bookings on the basis of their wide appeal alone. As already mentioned, there have been widely circulated nonrated films, such as *I Am Curious (Yellow),* and widely circulated self-rated X films, such as *I, a Woman, II,* but these are exceptions within their classes. Most of the nonrated and self-rated X films have relatively few bookings. For these reasons, it can probably be assumed, without any direct supporting evidence, that the MPAA-rated films tend to play in larger theaters and to bigger audiences than either nonrated or self-rated X films. If this is so, then the percentage of the total moviegoing audience viewing MPAA-rated films must be considerably higher than the 92.6% coverage for exhibitions. How much higher is purely guesswork on the basis of available data. In the writer's opinion, 95 or 96% coverage would be a conservative estimate. If self-rated X films are included, the coverage percentage for audience might very well approach or exceed 99%.

Pseudo-coverage

Although the MPAA has tried to discourage the practice, many exhibitors have themselves given the MPAA G, M (now GP), or R ratings to films already in circulation before the MPAA rating system went into effect on November 1, 1968. The aim of exhibitors here seems to be that of extending the advisory function of the ratings to earlier releases and, as such, it represents a zealous attitude toward film rating. As mentioned in the first section, many exhibitors were classifying films as to their suitability for youth before the rating system was inaugurated and, in some places, before it was even proposed. In the ad survey here, the self-rated G's, M's, and R's accounted for 1,686 exhibitions (621 were G's, 908 were M's, and 157 were R's), or 20.8% of the 8,101 exhibitions of pre-rating-system releases. Even though the number of these self-rated films tended to decrease with each survey date, the *percentage* of pre-rating-system releases which were self-rated actually increased from 13.0% on January 24 to 55.8% on August 8, indicating perhaps that the longer the rating system had been in effect, the more many exhibitors saw the need for not playing a film without a rating. There was considerable variation among the 20 metropolitan areas on the percentage of self-rated G's, M's, and R's among the pre-rating-system releases, with a range of 0.2% in San Francisco to 78.5% in Birmingham.

Another and closely related aberration in the rating system is the occasional bestowing of a G, M, or R rating on unrated features appearing after November 1968. This occurred in 44, or 6.5%, of the 674 exhibitions of post-November 1968 unrated releases. Of these 44, three were given G's; 25, M's; and 16, R's.

Exhibition distribution by MPAA rating

The analysis of coverage by exhibitions also reveals an interesting distribution among the four MPAA ratings (not including self-rated X's) when compared with

the distribution of ratings among features, analyzed in Table 1. The list below compares the percentage of MPAA-rated features rated through August 11, accounted for by the four rating categories (the top four rows of Table 1), and the percentage of exhibitions surveyed through August 8, accounted for by each of the four rating categories. (Percentage totals do not equal 100.0 because of rounding.)

	Features	Exhibitions
G	30.4%	38.2%
M	41.3%	41.0%
R	23.4%	19.6%
X	4.8%	1.2%
	99.9%	100.0%

The comparison indicates that G films, as a group, tend to have more than their share of exhibitions, and that X films tend to have a markedly constricted range of exhibition considering their numbers. The data, of course, do not explain these differences. One may speculate that exhibitors and film bookers tend to find G films more attractive on the average, either because of the level of community acceptability or because of box office potential, or both. The apparent difficulty in obtaining bookings for X films may be due to the low quality of many of those features or to censorial pressures or interest that may be present in many communities, or to a poor box office which may or may not result from these two factors.

Applying the index of restrictiveness (see Tables 1 and 2) to evaluate the total rating effort of the Code and Rating Administration (based on value of one for every percentage point of G rating, two for every point of M, three for R, and four for X), the index for features listed above is 2.02, while that for exhibitions is only 1.84. Another measure of the contrast between the features and the exhibitions is that the percentage of features for which box office restriction is required (that is, R and X films), is 28.2%, while that for the exhibitions is only 21.1%.

ADVERTISEMENT OF RATINGS

Informing the public, particularly parents, of the relative suitability of a film for children and youth is perhaps the key element in the entire rating system. This advisory function is especially important not only because of the pious claims the industry makes and has always made that parents bear the chief responsibility for the moviegoing habits of children and adolescents, but also because the noncoercive character of advisory ratings has a special problem-solving appeal in a political culture that holds censorship in considerable suspicion.

Though informing may take place through various channels—box office and lobby signs, the marquee, reviews, and the screen itself in the form of trailers—its main vehicle is the advertisement of local exhibitions. Such advertising employs various media—newspapers, radio, television, billboards, and so on—but only one, newspapers, is used near-universally by the industry. As a result, more American

moviegoers learn what is playing at their local theaters and consequently what the ratings are for the films through daily newspapers than any other medium of communication. For this reason, and also because they are by far the easiest (and perhaps the only practical) movie advertising medium to monitor, newspaper ads were surveyed as a measure of the informing function of the rating system.

Unlike most of the other dimensions of the rating system—development of discriminating rating criteria, scope of coverage, enforcement of admission restrictions, and so on—which all involve factors and difficulties not entirely within control of the industry, the informing function, at least through advertising, is something that is absolutely within control of film proprietors.[42] Not only can exhibitors or distributors advertise the ratings whenever they choose, but inclusion of the rating in an advertisement is apt to cost nothing at all. Therefore, it would appear that any failure of the rating system in this informing or advertising function is a much less excusable one than a failure in any of its other dimensions.

Under the MPAA's Advertising Code Regulations, set up to implement the code and rating system, all MPAA member companies and their subsidiaries are required to carry the MPAA rating letter in all advertising. Nonmember companies, in submitting films for rating and advertising material for approval of the MPAA's director of the Code for Advertising, are also required to display the rating letter in their advertising.[43]

MPAA regulations also provide that in all display and poster advertising the rating letter should be "reasonably prominent, commensurate with the overall size of the advertisement. As a broad rule-of-thumb, it should be approximately 25% of the letter height of the main title."[44] In ads of less than 150 lines (approximately 11 newspaper column inches), the rating letter must appear next to the main title. In ads of more than 150 lines, the definition of each rating must be carried with the rating letter. In all such ads, the rating and definition "shall be given reasonable emphasis in placement. Every attempt should be made to avoid burying it in the billings credits."[45] In radio and television ads, including spots, the MPAA also requires that the rating be announced or be manifest.

As was noted under "Film Coverage," the systematic survey of advertising, described below, was undertaken to measure both the coverage and informing functions of the rating system. Ads of movie exhibitions were examined in 20 metropolitan areas every fourth Friday from January 24 through August 8, 1969, and in 20 smaller cities, ranging in population from 50,000 to 144,000 (1960 census), every third Friday from May 16 through July 18, 1969.[46] In all, 26,297 advertised exhibitions were surveyed, 18,198 of which were of features released after the rating system went into effect, November 1, 1968, or features released earlier, but which had been submitted for rating (about 25). These ads were placed by 2,351 theaters. The average number of theaters surveyed per date for the metropolitan areas was 2,259, or 16.1% of the approximately 14,000 theaters in the country.

The major independent variables in the survey were (1) location: metropolitan areas and smaller cities; (2) location: individual metropolitan areas and individual smaller cities; (3) date; (4) individual theater; (5) theater type: indoor and drive-in; (6) film by category of rating: G, M, R, X, and self-rated X; (7) individual film; and (8) ad type: display, directory, and neighborhood movie guide. Systematic data

were collected for three major dependent variables: (1) absence of the rating letter in the ad (2) incorrect rating letter in the ad and (3) graphic defectiveness of the rating letter in the ad. In addition, some data were collected on the presence or absence of the rating definition in the ad. The survey data are compiled in Tables 16-22.

The major finding is that for 34.1% of the 16,831[47] advertised exhibitions of rated films the rating was missing from the ad (Table 16). On the other hand, where a rating appeared, accuracy was high. Of 11,103 advertised exhibitions in which a rating appeared, only 2.2% were in error (Table 17). Graphic defects in ratings that did appear, however, were numerous. Defects of size, placement, or readability were found in 1,512 or 12.8% of 11,783 advertised exhibitions with ratings (including 680 with a self-applied X) (Table 18). If the figures for these three dependent variables—missing, incorrect, and graphically defective ratings—are combined, then the informing function failed altogether or was below MPAA standards in 44.3% of all advertised exhibitions of rated films.[48] If compilations had also been made of missing rating definitions in ads larger than 150 lines or 11 column inches, the insufficiency percentage would be even higher, since scattered

Table 16

RATING INSUFFICIENCIES IN ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969, ANALYZED BY RATING CATEGORY[a]

Rating of Film	Rating missing from ad		Incorrect rating in ad		Rating visually defective in ad[b]	
	No.	%[c]	No.	%[d]	No.	%[d]
G	2,271	35.3	92	2.2	783	19.0
M	2,394	34.7	110	2.4	418	9.3
R	1,009	30.3	44	1.9	266	11.6
X (MPAA)	57	28.5	2	1.4	7	4.8
Self-rated X[e]	—	—	—	—	38	5.4
Total	5,731	34.1	248	2.2	1,512	12.8

a. Exhibitions surveyed were those appearing in daily newspapers in 20 metropolitan areas and in 20 smaller cities. The metropolitan areas were Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C. The survey dates for these areas were January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

The 20 smaller cities were Bakersfield, Calif., Billings, Mont., Binghamton, N. Y., Cedar Rapids, Ia., Duluth, Minn., Fayetteville, N. C., Jackson, Miss., Huntington, W. Va., Johnstown, Pa., Lewiston, Me., Little Rock, Ark., Mesa, Ariz., Ogden, Utah, Pensacola, Fla., Pittsfield, Mass., San Angelo, Tex., Sioux Falls, S. D., Springfield, Ohio, Terre Haute, Ind., and Topeka, Kans. The dates surveyed were May 16, June 6, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

b. The rating was either buried in the credits, too small (less than 25% of the height of the main titles), unreadable, or any combination of these three measures.

c. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of films in the rating category, e.g., the total number of exhibitions of films given a G rating by the MPAA.

d. The percentages are of the total number of exhibitions in the rating category advertised with a rating in the ad, e.g., the total number of exhibitions of films rated G by MPAA having some rating in the ad.

e. No tabulations are made in the Rating Missing and Incorrect Rating columns, because a self-rated X film is one defined as advertised with an X (non-MPAA) rating.

Table 17

INCORRECT RATINGS IN ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF MPAA-RATED FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969

	Incorrect rating in ad									
Rated film	G		M		R		X		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
G	--		80		8		4		92	37.1
M	54		--		48		8		110	44.4
R	5		26		--		13		44	17.7
X	0		0		2		--		2	0.8
Total	59	23.8	106	42.7	58	23.4	25	10.1	248	100.0

Note.—Percentages are those of the matrix total, 248.

Table 18

VISUAL DEFECTIVENESS IN RATINGS OF ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969, ANALYZED BY RATING CATEGORY AND DEFECT

	Defect in ad				
Rating in ad	Buried	Too small	Unreadable	Total	
G	488	464	190	1,142	55.4
M	253	135	149	537	26.1
R	135	89	100	324	15.7
X	2	6	0	8	0.4
Self-rated X	15	32	3	50	2.4
Total	893	43.3	726	35.2	442	21.4	2,061	100.0

Notes.—The 2,061 defects compiled in the table involved 1,512 ads. Two defects were found in 435 ads (87 were small and unreadable, 85 were buried and unreadable, and 266 were buried and too small) while all three defects were found in 57 advertised exhibitions.

Percentages are those of the matrix total, 2,061.

survey data on definitions and ad size indicate the definition was often either missing or unreadable.

The insufficiency percentage of 44.8% is even more noteworthy because of the already mentioned near-absolute control the film proprietor has over advertising and because of the ease with with ratings—ones that are both correct and graphically nondefective—can be included in ads.[49] An additional significant fact is that most of the advertising insufficiency—76.5%—is accounted for by missing ratings rather than by incorrect or graphically deficient ones, indicating that the breakdown in advertising of ratings is more fundamental.

The percentage of exhibitions with ratings missing varies with ad type and, consequently, with ad size. Ad type data—neighborhood movie guide, directory, and display—were collected for all advertised exhibitions of rated films (Table 19). The display ad, which almost always contains some pictorial matter, is the classic movie advertisement and accounted for 57.7% of all exhibitions in the survey. The directory ad is defined for the purposes of the survey as one of several

Table 19

RATING INSUFFICIENCIES IN ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF MPAA-RATED FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969, IN METROPOLITAN AREAS AND SMALLER CITIES, ANALYZED BY AD TYPE

Ad Type	Advertised exhibitions		Rating missing from ad		Rating visually defective in ad[a]	
	No.	%[b]	No.	%[b]	No.	%[c]
Neighborhood movie guide	4,321	25.7	2,554	59.1	28	1.4
Directory	2,783	16.6	1,472	52.8	30	2.2
Display, one theater	2,880	17.1	1,080	37.5	336	16.5
Display, two or more theaters	6,828	40.6	646	9.5	1,115	17.4
Total display	9,708	57.7	1,726	17.7	1,451	17.2
Total, all ads	16,812	100.0	5,752	34.2	1,509	12.8

a. The rating was either buried in the credits, too small (less than 25% of the height of the main title), unreadable, or any combination of two or more of these measures.

The column includes self-rated X films.

b. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films.

c. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films in which some rating appeared in the ad and of self-rated X films.

ads of different theaters under the same ownership or management that are grouped together in the newspaper. Individually, these are usually small ads, sometimes less than one column inch. Neighborhood movie guide ads are those that are systematically arranged, usually by location, by the newspaper, and grouped under the heading "neighborhood movie guide" or some similarly worded rubric. These ads are quite small, usually less than a column inch and often containing not much more than the name of the theater and title of the film. However, for many theaters, they are the only ads regularly placed in the newspaper. As Table 19 indicates, the percentage of missing ratings in neighborhood movie guide and directory exhibitions is very high, 59.1% and 52.8%, respectively, in contrast with only 17.7% for exhibitions in display ads. When display exhibitions are analyzed by multiple listing and nonmultiple listing ads, that is, those that are for two or more theaters and those that are for only a single theater, the difference in the percentage of exhibitions without ratings is striking—37.5% for the single theater and 9.5% for the multiple listing. Since ad size tends to vary with ad type—from neighborhood movie guide (usually the smallest), to directory, to one-theater display, to multiple listing display ads (usually the largest)—there would appear to be a clear relationship between ad size and the absence of a rating. Though the survey data do not explain this relationship, the writer would suggest that the reason is less a factor of ad size than the fact that the formats for display ads usually come from mats in pressbooks which have been made up by the distributor of the film, rather than originating with the local exhibitor. As noted earlier, these pressbook materials

have been subject to approval by the MPAA's director of the Advertising Code and therefore include the rating letter. On the other hand, directory and neighborhood movie guide ads are usually composed by the newspaper itself at the direction of the local exhibitor or the local exhibitor's theater chain. Also, ads for first-run exhibitions, which are usually paid for and arranged by the distributor rather than the exhibitor, are almost always display ads.

It should be further noted that the smallness of an ad presents little or no obstacle to inclusion of the rating. Ratings that do appear in neighborhood movie guide and directory ads, for example, rarely have defects, their respective percentages being 1.4% and 2.2%, compared with 17.2% for display ads. This finding lends support to the speculation, above, that the absence of a rating is not dependent upon ad size but is more apt to be a function of who places the ad and what source material it is based upon.

Analysis of incorrect ratings reveals that a high percentage of the errors were in the direction of greater restrictiveness, indicating caution or conservatism on the part of the film proprietor, assuming the incorrect rating was intentional (Table 17). Of 248 such ratings, 161 or 64.9% were more restrictive than the rating given the film by the MPAA, while 35.1% were less restrictive. If the errors are analyzed by whether or not they affected box office admission restriction (in terms of the requirements of the rating system), that is, a G or M film advertised as an R or X, or vice-versa, then 27.4% of the errors involved taking on a box office restriction rating, while 12.5% involved dropping a box office restriction rating—a further indication of the generally conservative character of the incorrect ratings. Changes of G's to M's accounted for 32.3% of all incorrect ratings, while M's to G's, the next most frequent change, accounted for 21.8% of all incorrect ratings.

Three rating defects, each related to an MPAA advertising standard noted earlier, were also analyzed (Table 18). If the rating was placed among the billing credits in the ad, it was judged to be buried. If the height of the rating symbol was less than 25% of that of the main title, it was judged to be too small. If the symbol could not be made out by a person of normal vision, it was judged to be unreadable. Of the 11,783 advertised exhibitions in which a rating appeared, 1,512 had one or more defects, with the total number of defects being 2,061. Buried ratings accounted for 43.3% of the defects; ratings that were too small, for 35.2%, and those that were unreadable, for 21.4%. Of 435 advertised exhibitions with two defects, the rating was buried and too small in 61.1%. In 57 exhibitions, all three defects were found. G ratings accounted for the greatest number of defects, 55.4%.

Analysis of rating insufficiency by rating category suggests that, in general terms at least, the more restrictive the rating category, the less likely there is to be an insufficiency, whether it is a missing rating or an incorrect or a defective one (Table 16). Film proprietors appear to be somewhat more casual, intentionally or otherwise, about the informing function with G films than with those of any other rating, and to be least so with X films.

Ratings are more likely to be missing from ads in the metropolitan areas than those in the smaller cities, the respective percentages being 34.3% and 26.6% (Table 20). On the other hand, incorrect ratings and defective ones are more likely in the smaller cities than in the larger areas.

Among the 20 metropolitan areas, there is considerable variation in all three

measures of insufficiency. The percentage of missing ratings ranged from a low of 2.3% in Birmingham to 81.6% in San Francisco, where the informing function appears to have broken down to a considerable degree (Table 21). In three other areas, ratings were missing from more than half of the advertised exhibitions. These were Milwaukee, 72.9%; Portland, Ore., 68.6%; and Dallas, 57.9%. The high percentages in Milwaukee and Dallas are very likely due, in part, to the operation of governmental or quasi-governmental local classification boards which have their own ratings. In Milwaukee these are used voluntarily by many exhibitors, while in Dallas their use is required by law. Atlanta was the only city other than Birmingham whose percentage of missing ratings was below 10% (8.4%). Miami, with 10.2%, and New York, with 11.7%, had the third and fourth lowest percentages. The range in percentage of incorrect ratings was also wide, from 0.2% in Boston, where only one such rating was found in the eight dates of the survey, to 8.2% in Birmingham. In rating defects, Dallas and Milwaukee had the two highest percentages, 36.8% and 22.8%, respectively, indicating, again, the probable influence of classification boards in those cities. Excluding those two areas, the range for rating defects, 0.8% in Baltimore to 21.0% in Cleveland, was somewhat narrower than that for missing or incorrect ratings.

Analysis of rating insufficiencies by date reveals a rather narrow range for all three dependent variables (Table 22). If the average of the averages for each of the first four dates is compared to the average of the averages for each of the second four, some change is discernible. In the case of the missing ratings, the change is slight, declining from 35.4 to 34.2%. For defective ratings, the difference is somewhat greater, declining from 14.2 to 11.5%. For incorrect ratings, the

Table 20

RATING INSUFFICIENCIES IN ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF MPAA-RATED FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24–AUGUST 8, 1969, IN METROPOLITAN AREAS AND IN SMALLER CITIES

Location	Rating missing from ad		Incorrect rating in ad		Rating visually defective in ad[a]	
	No.	%[b]	No.	%[c]	No.	%[c]
Metropolitan areas[d]	5,572	34.3	223	2.1	1,428	12.6
Smaller cities[e]	159	26.6	25	5.7	84	18.4
Total	5,731	34.1	248	2.2	1,512	12.8

a. The rating was either buried among the credits, too small (less than 25 percent of the height of the main title), unreadable, or any combination of these three measures.
The column includes self-rated X films.

b. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films.

c. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films in which some rating appeared in the ad.

d. Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. The dates surveyed were January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

e. Bakersfield, Calif., Billings, Mont., Binghamton, N.Y., Cedar Rapids, Ia., Duluth, Minn., Fayetteville, N.C., Jackson, Miss., Huntington, W. Va., Johnstown, Pa., Lewiston, Me., Little Rock, Arkansas, Mesa, Ariz., Ogden, Utah, Pensacola, Fla., Pittsfield, Mass., San Angelo, Tex., Sioux Falls, S. D., Springfield, Ohio, Terre Haute, Ind., and Topeka, Kans. The dates surveyed were May 16, June 6, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

Table 21

RATING INSUFFICIENCIES IN ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF MPAA-RATED FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24-AUGUST 8, 1969, IN 20 METROPOLITAN AREAS[a]

Metropolitan area	Rating missing from ad		Incorrect rating in ad		Rating visually defective in ad[b]	
	No.	%[c]	No.	%[d]	No.	%[d]
Atlanta	26	8.4	11	3.4	47	12.9
Baltimore	120	21.4	7	1.6	4	0.8
Birmingham	2	2.3	7	8.2	10	9.5
Boston	357	38.8	1	0.2	104	18.0
Chicago	577	39.5	38	4.3	133	13.9
Cleveland	263	40.2	4	1.0	86	21.0
Dallas	275	57.9	2	1.0	75	36.8
Denver	168	43.8	5	2.3	46	20.7
Detroit	393	36.4	20	2.9	89	11.3
Los Angeles	783	28.8	16	0.8	121	6.1
Miami	49	10.2	19	4.4	52	11.6
Milwaukee	390	72.9	2	1.4	33	22.8
New Orleans	112	29.8	9	3.4	42	15.3
New York	245	11.7	18	1.0	259	13.2
Philadelphia	386	31.6	15	1.8	119	13.8
Portland, Ore.	221	68.6	3	3.0	20	18.2
St. Louis	94	23.9	13	4.3	24	7.6
San Francisco	870	81.6	1	0.5	41	19.1
Seattle	109	34.6	12	5.8	42	19.4
Washington, D. C.	131	17.7	20	3.3	81	12.3
Total	5,572	34.3	223	2.1	1,428	12.6

a. The dates surveyed were January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

b. The rating was either buried among the credits, too small (less than 25% of the height of the main title), unreadable, or any combination of two or more of these measures.

The column includes self-rated X films.

c. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films.

d. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films in which some rating appeared in the ad.

difference is an increasing one, from 1.6 to 2.4%. The percentage of incorrect ratings in which the error was in the direction of less restrictiveness declined slightly, from 36.0% for the first four dates, to 35.1% for the second four. The writer again suggests caution with regard to using the eight months covered by the eight survey dates as the basis for conclusions about trends over time. Perhaps the most that can be said is that the changes in the percentages for missing and defective ratings would not be inconsistent with a long-term trend toward an improved informing function for the rating system.

Thus far, the informing function has been examined only for insufficiency. Another dimension of malfunctioning is hyperinforming—the apparent exploitative use of the ratings. Except for the rule that the rating letter, in being reasonably prominent, shall also be "commensurate with the overall size of the advertisement," the MPAA Advertising Code Regulations say nothing about exploitation. But it is clear that exploitative use of rating violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the rating system. No attempt was made in the survey to quantify exploitative use of the ratings, but obvious instances of hyperinforming were recorded in the course of data collection.

Table 22

RATING INSUFFICIENCIES IN ADVERTISED EXHIBITIONS OF MPAA-RATED FEATURE FILMS, JANUARY 24 - AUGUST 8, 1969, ANALYZED BY DATE FOR METROPOLITAN AREAS[a]

Date	Rating missing from ad		Incorrect rating in ad		Rating visually defective in ad[b]	
	No.	%[c]	No.	%[d]	No.	%[d]
January 24	478	37.1	6	0.7	83	9.9
February 21	495	37.8	10	1.2	169	19.0
March 21	515	30.4	29	2.5	189	15.4
April 18	611	36.4	19	1.8	141	12.4
May 16	845	35.5	49	3.2	153	9.3
June 13	936	38.5	36	2.4	127	7.8
July 11	817	31.6	50	2.8	298	16.1
August 8	901	31.3	24	1.2	267	12.9
Total	5,598	34.5	223	2.1	1,427	12.6

a. The metropolitan areas are Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Oreg., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C.

b. The rating was either buried among the credits, too small (less than 25% of the height of the main title), unreadable, or any combination of these three measures.

The column includes self-rated X films.

c. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films.

d. The percentages are of the total number of advertised exhibitions of MPAA-rated films in which some rating appeared in the ad.

Not surprisingly, the X rating was the one most often involved in exploitation. Typographically, outsized X's were the most common exploitation. In several ads X's were up to five times larger than the main title of the film! In other ads, the X appeared in fancy, eye-catching type. In Atlanta, some ads for *Brand of Shame, Taming,* and *Taste of Flesh* appeared with a large X superimposed over the photograph of a woman. Ad copy was also involved in exploiting the X rating, as the following examples illustrate.

"X-rated" (*Greetings*, Atlanta)

"X-Rating, Male Film Festival!" (*Love's Labyrinth* and *Steps*, Cleveland)

"X–Restricted–X" (*Can Hieronymous Merkin Ever Forget Mercy Humppe?* Cleveland)

"XXX–So Adult One X Not Enough!"(*Starlet*, San Angelo, Texas)

"Two X Pictures!" (*Girl Pusher* and *Motel Wives,* Topeka, Kans.)

"Two Hot Ones–X!" (*Barbarella* and *Benjamin,* Topeka, Kans.)

"The Film That Goes Beyond X!" (*Lady Godiva Rides,* Miami)

"Very X!" (*Switcheroo,* Los Angeles)

"It's X-tra Special!" (*Woman of Kicks,* Los Angeles)

Occasional use of the X in copy such as "X Rating for Mature Audiences" raises the possibility of the X being confused with the M rating in the minds of moviegoers.

In a few instances, the X was applied to theaters themselves, mainly in Los Angeles and Atlanta, with X's placed next to the name of the theater or through the use of "X-Theater."

The R rating was also involved in exploitation, though not nearly as often as the X. A few outsized R's were observed, but most of the exploitation appeared to be in ad copy. A few examples:

"You'll See Why It's R-Rated" (*Last Summer,* Los Angeles)

"Rough and Restricted (R)" (*Run, Angel, Run,* Los Angeles)

"Parents: Only You Can Judge If Your Children Are Mature and Intelligent Enough to View This Revealing Film." (*Michael and Helga,* several cities)

In several ads of R-rated films, ad copy suggested that the film was, in fact, less restricted.

"Children under 12 always free" (*Corruption* and *Payment in Blood,* Terre Haute)

"Suggested for Mature Audiences" (*Man Called Gannon,* Ogden, Utah)

Except for a rare outsized G or M, these two ratings were seldom involved in hyperinforming.

The label "Adults Only," once thought to be a come-on, but probably functioning much less as such since the rating system went into effect, appeared in many ads. In most instances, it was in connection with post-November 1968 unrated films or with self-rated X films, though it also appeared with some R and M films and once with a G (*The Longest Day,* Chicago). Other wording referring to age and admission practices was observed in some ads. These legends included "ID Required," "Proof of Age Required," "You Must Be 18 and Prove It," "No Children," and "Only the Very Mature Will Be Admitted–Restriction Will Be Rigidly Enforced."

All in all, exploitative use of the ratings does not appear to be common, the one exception being X films and the use of outsized letters and their superprominent location in the ads.

RESTRICTION OF ADMISSION TO R AND X FILMS

Direct observation of theater admission practices for R and X films was conducted at 40 theaters in the three-state New York metropolitan area during July and August 1969. Twenty-one of these theaters were in northern New Jersey, in Essex, Bergen, Hudson, Morris, and Union Counties. Thirteen were in Nassau County, Long Island, New York, and the remaining six were in Fairfield County, Connecticut. The observations were conducted by a graduate student in political science with special training in methodology and by the writer. At each theater, the observer stationed himself in such a way that he could see the theater patrons purchase their tickets and enter the theater and, in most cases, overhear conversations between the patron and the ticketseller, doorman, or other theater employees. Where it appeared doubtful that the patron was of sufficient age, note was made of his success or failure to gain admission and whether he was "clearly under," "probably under," "marginal," or "probably over" in relation to the age

limit. In the case of R films, note was also made of the patron's apparent relationship to any accompanying adults. After a period of observation, an attempt was made to interview casually one or more of the theater employees present without the observer identifying himself or revealing the purpose of his interrogation.

Observations were conducted on all evenings of the week, the breakdown being as follows: Sunday, 9; Monday, 2; Tuesday, 5; Wednesday, 2; Thursday, 4; Friday, 8; and Saturday, 10. Observation times ranged from 5:15 to 11:20 p.m. and from 2:00 to 3:40 p.m. for a Sunday matinee. Most observing was done between 7 and 9 p.m. The total number of patrons observed at a single theater ranged from 25 to about 350, and averaged about 95. Of the 40 observations, 31 were of admission to R films, two to films rated X by the Code and Rating Office, and seven were to self-rated X films. The films involved and the number of observations for each were:

Goodbye, Columbus (R)	10
Hard Contract (R)	6
The Wild Bunch (R)	6
I, a Woman, II (X)	6
If... (R)	4
Wild Wheels (R)	2
Run, Angel, Run (R)	1
Last Summer (R)	1
Lady in Cement (R)	1
Midnight Cowboy (X)	1
Greetings (X)	1
99 Women (X)	1

Of the theaters observed, 22 were classified as "downtown," six as "neighborhood," five were drive-ins, two were in shopping centers, and five other indoor theaters were left unclassified because of difficulty in categorizing the area in which they were located. Theater size ranged from medium to large, except in the "neighborhood" class where three of the theaters were considered "small."

In 22 of the 40 theaters only a single feature played. In the 18 theaters with double features, admission to an R film was observed in 15 and to an X in three. Of the former 15, the R film played with a nonrated, pre-rating-system release in seven, with another R in five, and with an M (now GP) in three. All three of the X films played with M (now GP) films.

Publication of the ratings

Rating information provided by the theater on current features is an important element in self-enforcement (patron enforcement) of the rating system, and indirectly affects enforcement by the theater itself. Newspaper ads were examined for the films in 36 of the observations, and in 30 of these, ratings appeared in the ad. Telephone calls were made to 20 of the theaters, and for 11 of these the rating was mentioned either in a recorded announcement or volunteered by the theater employee answering the phone. At the remaining nine theaters no mention of the rating was made. In 28 of the 40 theaters, a box office sign with the rating was in evidence. Usually these signs included the age restriction. In four other theaters there was a box office sign with the age restriction but no rating. In most cases,

these signs were those made available to exhibitors by National Screen Service in its rating kit, already noted in the first section. Likewise, at about two-thirds of the theaters, a larger poster-size kit sign explaining all of the ratings was in evidence. At four theaters, the rating appeared on the marquee (three R's and one X), and at a fourth, "Adults Only" appeared on the marquee with the title of the film.

The admission and enforcement process

At the typical theater observed, a patron purchases a ticket from one theater employee (the ticket seller) and some distance beyond, hands it to another employee (a doorman or usher), and enters the theater. At most theaters the prime responsibility for enforcement of the R and X ratings (that is, the checking of age and, in the case of an R film, the relationship between youthful patrons and older persons with them) is that of the ticket seller, at least in the first instance. This responsibility may be shared with the ticket taker or doorman, though in some theaters the doorman disclaimed any responsibility for enforcement. In many theaters, particularly the larger ones, and especially on weekend nights, other theater employees were present in the lobby. These included the manager, assistant manager or managers, an usher or ushers, a second or assistant ticket seller, a concessionaire, or a uniformed policeman or security guard. Occasionally, these personnel assisted in the admission process but rarely in enforcement (that is, in checking). However, managerial personnel were appealed to occasionally by the ticket seller or by a patron whose age was questioned. Their occasional presence in the lobby may have been in part to supplement enforcement. In only one instance were police observed taking a direct part in enforcement. If present, police have usually been hired by the theater to prevent rowdyism, discourage box office robbery, handle drunks, and so on. The presence of a uniformed policeman, however, may have an effect of increasing self-enforcement at the theater. In two or three instances, regular city police were observed, but they had come into the theater to watch the movie—apparently not an uncommon practice.

Where patrons were questioned about their age, the checking often stopped with the interrogation, that is, the patron was admitted *on his word* that he was over the age limit. Where identification was requested, a driver's license was usually proffered and accepted as evidence of being of age. In most instances, the theater employee had no certain way of knowing whether the driver's license in fact belonged to the bearer, unless some of the descriptive data on the license, such as year of birth, seemed not to correspond to the bearer. Some ticket sellers said they looked for such information, others concluded that mere possession of the license was sufficient evidence of being over the age limit. At some theaters where the age limit had been set at 18, youthful-appearing males were asked to show a draft card.

Some quantitative aspects

The major finding of the direct observation was the rather casual enforcement and, in some instances, nonenforcement of the ratings by the theaters. This is a

general finding, there being some exceptions which will be described in a separate subsection, below. Evidence of casualness is both quantitative and qualitative. The latter, based on interviews with theater employees, will be described in a subsection below, while the former, based on a fairly accurate count of patrons at 34 theaters, is presented here. The five drive-ins as well as one indoor theater in the study were excluded because observational difficulties made an accurate count or estimate of the total number of patrons difficult.

Tables 23-25 include the number of patrons observed in each of four age-relation categories described earlier, and the admission decision made with regard to them. The age-relation categories are governed by standards set up by the MPAA itself. Since an age limit of 16, 17, or 18 was allowed for X films at the time of the study, the age test for X films was whichever of the three ages the theater itself had chosen. Since the MPAA had set 16 as the limit for R films at the time of the study, the age-relation categories were geared to that age in observations for R films, even though the theaters, in some instances, had raised the age to 17 or 18. In other words, for R films, the observations may in some instances have held theaters to an easier test than the one they had actually established for themselves.

Three models of enforcement systems–rigorous, moderate, and minimal–can be set up in order to measure the effectiveness of the rating restrictions. For example, a rigorous enforcement system with no element of laxity at all would question every patron who could reasonably be thought to be possibly underage, that is, those in all four age-relation categories. A moderate enforcement system with no element of laxity would question all patrons in the "clearly under,"

Table 23

PATRONS OF QUESTIONABLE AGE OBSERVED AT R AND X FILMS

Enforcement model and percent questioned[a]: Rigorous - 21.2; Moderate - 33.6; Minimal - 50.0

	Clearly under	Probably under	Marginal	Probably over	Total
Admitted without questioning	12	6	77	117	212
Admitted after questioning	5	5	14	8	32
Not admitted after questioning	8	0	16	1	25
Total	25	11	107	126	269

a. Percentage is the number of patrons questioned (those in "admitted after questioning" and "not admitted after questioning" categories) in relation to the number of patrons observed (those in "admitted without questioning," "admitted after questioning," and "not admitted after questioning" categories) for the age-relation categories in the enforcement model.

Table 24

PATRONS OF QUESTIONABLE AGE OBSERVED AT X FILMS

Enforcement model and percent questioned[a]

Rigorous - 30.5

Moderate - 53.2

Minimal - 66.7

	Clearly under	Probably under	Marginal	Probably over	Total
Admitted without questioning	0	3	19	44	66
Admitted after questioning	0	1	13	4	18
Not admitted after questioning	5	0	6	0	11
Total	5	4	38	48	95

a. Percentage is the number of patrons questioned (those in "admitted after questioning" and "not admitted after questioning" categories) in relation to the number of patrons observed (those in "admitted without questioning," "admitted after questioning," and "not admitted after questioning" categories) for the age-relation categories in the enforcement model.

Table 25

PATRONS OF QUESTIONABLE AGE OBSERVED AT R FILMS

Enforcement model and percent questioned[a]

Rigorous - 16.1

Moderate - 24.0

Minimal - 44.4

	Clearly under	Probably under	Marginal	Probably over	Total
Admitted without questioning	12	3	58	73	146
Admitted after questioning	5	4	1	4	14
Not admitted after questioning	3	0	10	1	14
Total	20	7	69	78	174

a. Percentage is the number of patrons questioned (those in "admitted after questioning" and "not admitted after questioning" categories) in relation to the number of patrons observed (those in "admitted without questioning," "admitted after questioning," and "not admitted after questioning" categories) for the age-relation categories in the enforcement model.

"probably under," and "marginal" categories. A system of minimal enforcement would question all patrons in the "clearly under" and "probably under" categories. In the study, a rigorous enforcement system would have meant that every patron in Table 23–269 in all–would have been questioned. In a moderate enforcement system, 143 patrons would have been questioned, while in a minimal enforcement system, 36 would have been questioned. Given the actual total checking done by the theaters for R and X films together[50] (Table 23), the theaters questioned only 21.2% of the patrons they should have questioned in order to adhere to the rigorous enforcement model. Measured against the moderate enforcement model, they questioned 33.6% of those they should have questioned, and against the minimal enforcement model, 50%.

If observations for X films are considered separately (Table 24), the enforcement rate increases. Applying the rigorous enforcement model, 30.5% of those patrons possibly underage were questioned. With the moderate enforcement model, 53.2% were questioned, and with the minimal enforcement model, 66.7% were checked.

If observations for R films are tabulated separately (Table 25), the enforcement percentages are as follows: rigorous, 16.1; moderate, 24.0; and minimal, 44.4. The considerably higher enforcement rates for X films than for R's–100% higher in some instances–may be due to the fact that some of the theaters playing X films play such films regularly, or at least often, and for this reason their enforcement machinery may be more refined. As will be described below, the difference is probably also due to a greater fear of legal sanctions.

Self-enforcement

Self-enforcement–where an underage patron does not come to the theater, comes but does not try to enter or, in the case of an R film, appears only with a parent or adult guardian–is an important part of the viability of the rating system. Although this direct observation study has no way of measuring this kind of enforcement, the percentage of all persons observed who fell into each of the four age-relation categories can be calculated. Of slightly more than 3,100 patrons observed at the 34 theaters at which accurate counts could be made, 0.8% fell into the "clearly under" category, 0.4% into the "probably under" category, 3.5% into the "marginal" category, and 4.1% into the "probably over" category. This means that a system of minimal enforcement was challenged by only 1.2% of all patrons. On the other hand, a system of moderate enforcement was challenged by 4.6%, and a system of rigorous enforcement by 8.7%.

Theater employees

The inattention to enforcement revealed in the quantitative data, above, was even more strikingly indicated in interviews of theater personnel. Almost every ticket seller interviewed claimed that ages were checked where patrons appeared to be of questionable age–a practice clearly not borne out in most cases according to the direct observation of practices. At every theater, the ticket seller and in some cases the doorman or manager was asked whether a younger brother, age 15, could be brought in. In all cases of the R films and in about half of the X films,

the answer was affirmative. At all but two or three of the 31 R films, the employees said, upon further questioning, that admission of an underage patron was permissible as long as he was with *any* adult over the age limit—a clear misinterpretation of the R rating, but one which allows dates to enter where one of the two is underage.

Employee understanding of the rating system and the meaning of individual ratings was generally imperfect and often garbled. This was true at all personnel levels, though somewhat less so among managerial employees. Many ticket sellers and most doormen misunderstood the R rating as indicated above, and many could not adequately distinguish the R from the X rating, or misunderstood the X rating also. Misunderstanding of the X was observed even at theaters that were playing an X film. Many believed the rating system was governmental in origin or, at least, had the force of law. One ticket seller believed that it had originated with the Legion of Decency (now the National Catholic Office for ~~Motion~~ Pictures)! It is evident from their direct comment and also by implication that many employees have been poorly instructed by theater management on the meaning of the ratings and on enforcement policy.

The age of employees and their attitude toward their work are two other factors contributing to casual enforcement. Many ushers, doormen, ticket sellers, and concessionaires are in their late teens and, in effect, have been charged with enforcing the rating system against patrons who in many cases are only a year or two their juniors and in some instances are their friends. Many other doormen are elderly, some probably in their late sixties or seventies. In at least one case, incoherency and quivering were observed. Lack of interest in their job appeared to be a factor in the cases of several ticket sellers and doormen. One ticket seller who volunteered that she did not get along with the theater manager also volunteered that she enforced the ratings only when the manager was present. A doorman in his early twenties, when asked whether he ever went to the trouble of barring anyone because of their being underage, replied, "For $1.50 an hour, are you kidding?" At least two ticket sellers appeared to base their attention to enforcement on whether they, personally, believed the film to be harmful to youth. One doorman offered to let the observer and his hypothetical and yet-to-arrive younger friends in without any tickets at all if a rolled up dollar bill were passed to him for each patron.

Although checking ages in many theaters involved a showing of official identification of some sort, usually a driver's license or draft card, the age-checking criteria employed by many ticket sellers and doormen were decidedly "sloppy." For example, checking often went no further than an asking how old the patron was and accepting his answer. At two or three theaters, ticket sellers said they looked to see whether the patron was wearing a high school ring. In two instances, ticket sellers appeared inhibited about interrogating patrons because of the embarrassment of having asked the ages of patrons who had turned out to be over the age limit and, in one case, married. In at least two theaters, the doormen had withdrawn from the enforcement process altogether and simply did not look up while tearing tickets. Though some employees were enthusiastic about the rating system and the responsibility taken by the theater and the industry, as will be described below, others thought it unnecessary, "a lot of trouble," or a "lot of baloney." (On the other hand, *rigorous* enforcement of

another admission standard—the wearing of shoes—was observed at three theaters, a policy apparently designed, at least in part, to prevent lawsuits resulting from cut feet.)

Drive-in theaters

Drive-in theaters presented a special problem in observation. In each of the five included in the study, the observer found that he could not station himself inconspicuously in such a way that patrons in incoming cars could be easily observed. Therefore, quantitative data for these theaters could not be obtained with any degree of accuracy. However, from observation that was possible and from interviews of theater employees, it is clear that drive-ins present a special problem in enforcement of the ratings. Checking ages or the relationship of an underage patron to the person or persons he is with is more difficult at a drive-in because of the poorer visability and greater distance between the ticket seller and the patrons and also because passing identification in and out of a car is a relatively cumbersome process. Still another consideration is the "back up" hazard of cars waiting on the highway if the admission process is slowed up. For these reasons there is probably somewhat less disposition to check carefully than there would be at indoor theaters. Observations indicated that almost all of the checking that was done was that of age, even though the films at all five drive-ins were R's where relationship should also have been a factor. In fact, most of the ticket sellers seemed to assume that underage persons in cars with adults were, in fact, with their parents or adult guardians. Another reason for the apparent lesser disposition to check ages is the belief among ticket sellers that at least the drivers of incoming cars are of age or else they would not be driving. At one of the theaters, however, it was said that an off-duty uniformed policeman was hired for X films and that age-checking was one of his duties.

The law factor

Enforcement often appears to be related, at least in part, to the possibility of legal sactions. At eight theaters, employees talked of police raids and arrests at another theater or other theaters in the area. From this study, it is not possible to say precisely to what extent these actions may have affected enforcement. But it is significant that the reference to police action was volunteered by the employee in almost every instance. At several other theaters, employees (in two cases, managers) remarked that they might "get into trouble" if it became known that underage persons were being admitted. Not surprisingly, the fear seemed related more to X than to R films. Some employees believed the police occasionally had undercover agents on the theater premises.[51]

Strict enforcement

At five or six theaters, there was considerable evidence of determined enforcement of the ratings. These exceptional situations should be described in more detail, since they reveal whatever realized or unrealized potential there may be for effective administration of the rating system at the theater. At two theaters

showing an M film with an R feature and at one showing an M with an X, admission to the M was controlled by the stricter rating of the co-feature. Strict enforcement also seemed to be associated with general theater policy rather than with the particular film playing during the observation period. One of the few theaters observed to be strictly enforcing the R rating had recently played a number of X films. Another theater had a policy of not admitting anyone under 18 for *any* film. This policy was enforced in the case of an R film over the objection of two parents—the only example of over-enforcement observed in the entire study. Such strict enforcement or over-enforcement as a matter of standing theater policy no doubt also results in a considerable degree of self-enforcement in a community. At three of the strict-enforcement theaters, theater personnel—a manager and two ticket sellers—warned parents with children about the content of the current R film.

At strict-enforcement theaters, the information level of the employees was higher and their general attitude toward the rating system was more sanguine. A manager at a Connecticut theater, for example, who told the observer that he might bring his younger brother to see the current R feature, also told him he would not be allowed to do that with "our next film which is an X." The same manager referred to the entire rating system with pride as "something our own industry has done." Finally, as already indicated in the preceding subsection, employees at most of the strict-enforcement theaters in New Jersey and Nassau County, New York, mentioned police raids and arrests at other theaters.

Some conclusions

On the basis of the 40 theaters observed in the three-state area, it cannot be said that the rating system was being well enforced at the box office. Even using the minimal enforcement model of age-checking, only half of all patrons appearing to be of doubtful age were even questioned. It can probably be said that *as a general matter* the rating system is effectively enforced only at an age level of 12 or 13, rather than at the 16, 17, or 18 year line drawn by the system itself.

Several factors appear to account for the casualness or inattention. Some of these can probably be overcome but others may be beyond remedy, and it is the latter, of course, which raise serious doubts about the viability of box office enforcement of a rating system at all. The weakest link in the chain of enforcement are the theater personnel, particularly those who sell the tickets and admit the patrons. Their information level, work attitude, and sometimes age, are all negative factors. However, given traditional movie theater employment policies (and perhaps the economics upon which they are based), it would seem unlikely that much improvement in personnel can be expected. If this is indeed the case, then the quality of theater personnel will remain a major factor militating against effective industry self-regulation.

Another factor is inadequate instruction of theater personnel as to what the rating system means. Interviews repeatedly revealed misunderstanding of the ratings, in some instances misunderstanding by managerial persons themselves. The interviews also revealed that communication between managerial personnel and theater employees about the theater's enforcement of the ratings was often

lax and, in some cases, remarkably so. This factor is largely a problem of managerial will and attentiveness and, presumably, is one somewhat more easily overcome than that of incompetency of theater employees. Whether the requisite managerial attentiveness is more likely to result from intra-industry encouragement or from extra-industry censorial pressure is, of course, another question.

A third factor is purely situational. At most drive-in theaters and at many indoor theaters on busy weekend nights, patron traffic and the need to expedite it become practical matters tending to inhibit enforcement. Additional personnel to check ages, particularly a uniformed policeman, would probably be an effective remedy here.

Any workable system of industry self-regulation would mean a close relationship between theater enforcement and patron self-enforcement. By this measure, a more extensive publicizing of the ratings by the theater would be in order. Though signs usually were in evidence in the lobby and around the box office, greater use of the ratings on the telephone, in newspaper ads, and perhaps on the marquee itself could be undertaken. Likewise, the presence of a uniformed policeman, even one who did not directly take part in age-checking, would probably be another factor that would increase the degree of self-enforcement. Laws making it a misdemeanor to represent one's age fraudulently, which the movie industry has successfully lobbied for in a number of States, would also be likely to increase self-enforcement, though such laws might also by that very measure, encourage a further degree of casualness on the part of exhibitors.

Finally, as the interviews revealed, fear of legal sanctions, especially of police raids and arrest, has apparently been a factor in enforcement. It seems fair to say that enforcement would be even less impressive than it has been revealed to be were it not for the presence of this "gun behind the door." It cannot be said from the evidence at hand that theater enforcement is kept "honest" by this threat, but the threat does seem to be an integral part of the enforcement equation, and probably merits consideration in any future discussion of the viability of an effective rating system at the theater level.

THE RATINGS AND CENSORSHIP

As already pointed out, the rating system came into being mainly as an alternative to governmental classification. The ultimate measure of its success as far as the film industry is concerned is whether it does, in fact, perform its defense function as an alternative censorship and, consequently, whether the industry is freer with ratings than it would be without them.

This is a difficult function to assess and the data presented here are not conclusive, though they do shed a good deal of light on the matter. In its defense function, the rating system can be evaluated in relation to (and its seeming effect upon) other forms of censorship or control, and also in the extent to which it, or aspects of it, are actually used by nonindustry forces for nonindustry censorship of the medium. Both of these measures will be considered.

The rating system can be a stimulus to and can be exploited by other forms of censorship both because it has established classes for films and because it has a super-restrictive classification—the X rating. Though the rating system does not, in itself, appear to create censorial pressures against cinematic erotica, it can and

does facilitate the focusing of these pressures on certain films or combinations of films, simply because those films are labeled. This, of course, is particularly true of the X film. There has been long-standing objection in the industry to the rating and to the use of X to designate it, on the ground that the rating and the letter have become associated in the public mind with outright pornography and, therefore, act as an invitation to censorship. These critics believe that the X will become some sort of censorial Frankenstein for the industry if it has not already done so. Whether or not the rating has had quite this effect is not clear, but there is no doubt that the X film has been a target of some types of censorial pressure. Some of these will be described below, along with more general attempts to use the rating system to enhance other censorships of the medium.

Various attempts have been made at the State and local level to "reinforce" the rating system through law. The most thoroughgoing of these have been proposals simply to incorporate the entire system into law by requiring that all films be rated and that exhibitors enforce the ratings under penalty of law. As of early 1970, no such comprehensive proposals had been enacted.

A scheme more frequently suggested involves some kind of taxation of exhibitions according to rating, graduated from G to X. A typical bill introduced in several State legislatures places a tax of $.50 per ticket on admission to X films, $.25 on R films, $.15 on GP's, and $.05 or no tax at all on G's.[52] A variation would impose a tax of 50% of the normal admission price on exhibitions of X films.[53] A bill introduced in the Michigan legislature would tax each showing of a GP, R, or X film in the amount of $50, $75, and $100, respectively.[54] In Pawtucket, Rhode Island, the city council passed an ordinance requiring theaters to pay a $100 tax for each showing of an X film,[55] and in Hooksett, New Hampshire, voters at the annual town meeting enacted legislation requiring drive-in theaters to pay a $500 tax for each showing of an X film, an amount that, as a practical matter, would probably bar X films altogether.[56] A similar effect is the likely result of Chatham County, Georgia County Commission requiring exhibitors who wish to show either X or R films to pay an annual $10,000 license fee. Another section of the same law provides for a $300 annual fee for the showing of M films. And, in case an exhibitor would still want to book an X or R film, he is required to pay an additional $250 for each seven days that such a film plays.[57] Several towns and cities have barred or have attempted to bar the showing of X films at drive-ins, X films on Sundays, and exhibition of two X films at any theater on two successive weekends.

Other restrictive legislation is aimed at publication of the ratings or at isolating X and R films from G's and GP's. A measure introduced in New York State would require the rating letters of films in current programs to be displayed on the theater marquees, violation of which would be a misdemeanor.[58] Measures in several States and cities would bar the showing of trailers (previews of coming films) of X films or of X or R films during any exhibition of G or GP films. Proposals such as these address one of the common complaints about the rating system—the fact that an audience that has gone to see a G film may suddenly find itself viewing an X-rated trailer of an X film. Complaints were so great during the first few weeks of the rating system that the industry, largely through National Screen Service, a company that manufactures and distributes most trailers in the United States, offered two trailers for each R and X film—the usual "hot" one

and a "cool" one that would be sufficiently toned down so that it might be shown with a G or GP feature. Even though the latter trailers are available and the MPAA requires their use with G and GP films, many exhibitors have still apparently failed to use them, and complaints have continued if not increased.

The rating system has also been a factor in the editing and rejection of movie advertising by newspapers. Though rejection or editing of certain ads was well established on a few papers before the rating system began, it has now often come to focus on the X film. A few newspapers limit the content of ads for such films to the title of the film, name of the theater, and the program times, other descriptive matter being forbidden. Some papers have now gone beyond rejecting advertising material they deem offensive in itself and have established policies of rejecting all ads for X movies, regardless of the character of the ads. A few papers have gone further still and have also refused ads for R films. The number of papers, including large city dailies, with restrictive ad policies of one sort or another for X films appears to be increasing. Responses of newspaper movie editors to the question of whether their papers refused ads for X films, included on the questionnaire sent to them in December 1969 (see page 246), indicated that 10.4% of 261 papers were refusing such ads.

As is clear from the exploitation by censorial forces described above, the rating system has more than a little potential for dysfunctional operation in its defense of the industry from "outside" control. Perhaps a more telling evaluation of the ratings as a defense mechanism is in the apparent effect their inception and continued operation have had upon other forms of control, such as governmental classification boards, obscenity legislation, private rating systems, and prosecutions and other police action against exhibitors.

The threat of Federal classification, a major goad to the creation of the rating system, has not materialized in the 20 months since the system was founded, though it probably has not died as a threat. At the State level in 1969, 30 proposals for classification boards were introduced in legislatures then in session. All were voted down.[59] The writer has no data on the number of local governmental classification boards created since ratings began. On the other hand, the two leading classification boards at the time of the inception of the rating system—the Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board and the Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission (a quasi-governmental body)—have remained in operation.

The writer also has no data on the number of State or local anti-obscenity laws that include movies within their provisions so that a comparison could be made of periods before and after inception of the rating system. The MPAA, however, credits the ratings with preventing legislative action in a number of States.[60]

Of the leading private rating organizations, only *Film Reports (The Green Sheet)*, subsidized and coordinated by the MPAA itself, has been discontinued. As a result of this MPAA decision, the Daughters of the American Revolution, one of the 10 member groups whose individual ratings made up the composite ratings of *Film Reports*, has discontinued its rating work.[61]

One measure of censorial force for which extensive data have been collected is that of reported prosecutorial, police, or other official action against local exhibitors. These data have been compiled from a systematic reading of six leading trade publications for the period beginning January 1, 1968 through August 31, 1969, covering the 10 months preceding and the 10 months following

inception of the rating system, November 1, 1968.[62]

This survey yielded two major findings: first, reported actions against exhibitors were more than three times higher during the first 10 months of the rating system than in the first 10 months prior to the system, and, second, during the last 10 months of the rating system, MPAA-rated films were involved in very few of the actions against exhibitors.

In the 10-month pre-rating-system period, there were 26 reported police or prosecutorial actions against exhibitors in 22 cities and towns in 18 States. These involved at least 29 films and at least 26 theaters.[63] In contrast, there were 89 reported police or prosecutorial actions in 72 locations in 34 States in the first 10 months of the rating system (Table 26). These involved at least 100 theaters and at least 129 films. Reported actions categorized here as police or prosecutorial usually involved seizure of a film or arrest of an exhibitor or both.

Reports of other official action, formal and informal, against exhibitors were tabulated separately. These actions covered a variety of official behavior including informal agreements reached between exhibitors and officials resulting in the cutting of a film or its withdrawal from the theater, revocation or threatened revocation of the exhibitor's business license, censure resolutions passed by town or city councils, police enforcement of age restriction policy, creation of investigatory committees or commissions, members of a police force acting as a "random group" to decide whether a film violates community standards, invocation of obsolete curfew ordinances, arrest of members of the audience on charges of visiting a disorderly house, and so forth. In the 10 months before the rating system, there were 15 reported actions in this category in 15 cities and towns in 10 States, involving at least 15 theaters and at least 17 films. In the first 10 months of the rating system, on the other hand, there were 35 such actions reported, in 33 cities and towns in 19 States, involving at least 38 films and at least 43 theaters.

If the police and prosecutorial actions are tabulated with the other official actions just mentioned, then in the pre-rating-system period there was a total of

Table 26

OFFICIAL ACTIONS AGAINST EXHIBITORS 10 MONTHS BEFORE AND 10 MONTHS AFTER FOUNDING OF THE RATING SYSTEM, AS REPORTED IN THE MOTION PICTURE TRADE PRESS[a]

Action	Before rating system[b]	After rating system[c]	Total
Police and prosecutorial	26	89	115
Other[d]	15	35	50
Total	124	41	165

a. The table is based on survey of the following publications: Boxoffice, Daily Variety, Film and Television Daily, Independent Film Journal, Motion Picture Daily, Motion Picture Herald, and Variety.

b. January 1-October 31, 1968.

c. November 1, 1968-August 31, 1969.

d. Includes informal agreements reached between exhibitors and officials resulting in the cutting of a film or its withdrawal from the theater, revocation or threatened revocation of the exhibitor's business license, censure resolutions passed by town or city councils, police enforcement of age restriction policy, creation of investigatory commissions, invocation of obsolete curfew ordinances, arrest of members of the audience on charge of visiting a disorderly house, etc.

41 reported actions against exhibitors, taking place in 35 cities and towns in 22 States, and involving at least 46 films and at least 41 theaters. In contrast, in the first 10 months of the rating system, there was a total of 124 reported actions in 98 cities and towns in 35 States, involving at least 168 films and at least 143 theaters.

The extraordinary increase, which amounts to more than 200%, was consistently progressive. If the 20-month survey period is broken down into five four-month periods, the number of reported actions in each of the four-month periods, beginning with January-April 1968, were:

January-April 1968	14
May-August 1968	22
September-December 1968	32
January-April 1969	44
May-August 1969	53

Unless the reporting standards of the trade press were altered during the survey period so that official action against exhibitors was given more attention in the latter portions of the 20-month period than in the former portions—an event the writer regards as very unlikely—the steady marked increase in action against exhibitors reflects a stronger censorial interest and an increasingly active censorial force in American communities, one that may signify a truly striking reaction to cinematic content. It is also most likely that the trade press reporting actually catches only a fraction of community action against exhibitors. For example, a San Jose, California exhibitor alleged in a legal brief at his own trial that *I Am Curious (Yellow)* had been the object of 107 prosecutions in the State of California alone.[64] None of these were reported in the trade press surveyed.

From the data in the paragraphs above, it is not possible to say what effect, if any, the rating system has had on community censorial activity other than the obvious, that such activity has not decreased but increased with the advent of the ratings or, to be more precise, has continued to increase with their advent. A closer examination of which films have been involved in these actions may provide a clearer indication of the role of the ratings.

The overwhelming majority of films involved in the reported actions against exhibitors were *not* rated by the MPAA. Of 86 films mentioned by name in the reports during the first 10 months of the rating system, only five or 5.8% were MPAA-rated films. These were *Bullit, Can Hieronymous Merkin Ever Forget Mercy Humppe and Find True Happiness?, Candy, The Fox,* and *100 Rifles.* In 18 of 124 reported actions during the period, the film or films involved were not named in the reports. Since involvement of a rated film in an official action is likely to be a highly newsworthy element, the writer would speculate that none of these unnamed films were MPAA-rated. If this is so, then the actual percentage of MPAA-rated films involved in actions is likely to be lower than the 5.8, perhaps as low as 4.0. If tabulation is made by reported action rather than by mentioned film, then rated films were involved in only 18 of 124 actions or 14.5%.

Furthermore, three of the five rated films mentioned above—*Bullit, Hieronymous Merkin,* and *100 Rifles*—were involved in only one reported action each, none involving an arrest or seizure. In the case of *Bullit* and *Hieronymous Merkin,* local officials had stationed police at the theaters to make certain the rating age limits were enforced. For *Bullit,* the officials in Medford, Massachusetts had either

misunderstood or ignored the film's M rating which, of course, did not require age restriction. In the case of *100 Rifles,* the mayor of Chicopee, Mass. refused to issue the local theater a weekly license, a power which mayors in the State have under a statute dating to the 1930's. Only *Candy* and *The Fox* were involved in more than one action and in seizures and arrests. The former was the object of 11 actions, eight of them involving seizure of the film or arrest of the manager or both. *The Fox,* which was released prior to the rating system but which was among the first group of films rated when the system went into effect, was the object of three seizures and arrests. In a fourth action, the exhibitor withdrew the film after a prosecution was threatened.[65]

It is not possible to say how many of the non-MPAA-rated films were self-rated X's, or how many were presented as self-rated X's at the time of the action against them, which is the more important question. None of the trade press reports mentioned self-applied X ratings, but this should not be taken as hard evidence that none of the films bore such a rating. On the contrary, a check of the 81 non-MPAA-rated films against a list of self-rated X films developed from the survey of newspaper movie advertising (fifth section) indicates that 19 or 22.9% were advertised with an X rating at least some of the time. These 19 films were involved in 36 or 29.0% of the 124 reported actions during the first 10 months of the rating system. Again, two points should be stressed: first, that these 19 films may not have been presented as X films at the time of the action against them, and, second, that of the 62 other non-MPAA-rated films, some or even many may have carried a self-applied X at the time of the action against them.

Although the cases of *Candy* and *The Fox* indicate that the rating system can suffer a serious breakdown in its defense function, these two films are clearly exceptions to the apparent general rule that MPAA-rated films are not often the object of official action against exhibitors, at least not often relative to non-MPAA-rated films, a fact made more striking by the extraordinary high coverage of commercial exhibitions by the rating system (fifth section).

Since the overwhelming number of films involved in the reported censorial actions are outside the MPAA rating apparatus, what relationship, then, does the rating system have to the kinds of censorial interest and force so evident in the increasing number of community incidents? This question cannot be answered fully unless we know to what extent the reported actions were the result of a censorial interest primarily to classify, that is, to restrict showings to adults only, or were, instead, the result of an interest to bar exhibition altogether. In most cases, the data available do not supply this answer. In several of the reports, such as the ones involving *Bullit* and *Hieronymous Merkin,* the chief interest appeared to be that of making sure age restrictions were enforced by the theaters. In a few instances of seizure or arrest, later reports indicated that the action taken and subsequent prosecution were under so-called Ginsberg laws, that is, under statutes which allow a State to bar the dissemination of material to persons under 17 or 18 when it is felt to be obscene to them, even though the same material would not be obscene to adults. The number of trade press reports in which such laws were mentioned or detailed were relatively few, however. Because accuracy of trade press reporting with regard to legal complexities is not high, it is quite possible that many other arrests or seizures were carried out under Ginsberg-type sanctions.

Nevertheless, the writer would speculate that the overwhelming number of reported actions against exhibitors were taken with the aim of general prohibition rather than that of age restriction. For one thing, most of the films involved—many having titles like *Artists' Models, Hollywood Nude Report, The Lesbian Parade, Fannie Hill Meets Dr. Erotico, Rent-A-Girl, Whip's Women*—are clearly of the nudist or exploitation variety and, in all likelihood, most often played at theaters enforcing an adults only policy. The fact that a number of self-rated X films were involved in the actions lends additional support to this speculation. Moreover, many incidents of official action were later reported to have led to withdrawal of the film in question rather than to its playing only to restricted audiences. These facts would appear to indicate that the aim of most community censorial interest reflected in the reported actions was that of general prohibition and, as such, probably would not have been satisfied by age restriction alone.

If this were not the case and if most of the censorial action was aimed at enforcing some kind of classification, then it could be said that the rating system was failing to perform its avowed function of rating films for youth and enforcing that rating at the box office, since the system would not be reaching many of the films that were the object of classification pressures.

On the other hand, if the censorial aim is mainly that of general prohibition, as it would seem, then it can be said that the rating system is not directly related to the censorial interest and force represented by these actions. Not only does it not reach these films at the present time, but as far as the system functioning as an alternative censorship is concerned, it would probably make little difference even if it were to reach them.

In the larger and more complex system of censorship of the movies, public policy must address itself not only to the operation of the rating system, but also to the question of what is to be done with censorial interest and force that is not met by the system. Given the various political, social, and artistic values to be preserved and enhanced, is such censorship interest and force best met by the nonindustry controls now being exercised?

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Since the early 1960's the movies have undergone and, indeed, are continuing to undergo a massive transformation in content. This change has been so dramatic that the movies have probably provided one of the few actual revolutions of the present age. At the same time, they have remained essentially a mass medium, though not quite so much so as in the pre-1960 period. Most of the considerable censorship interest and activity involving movies today is the product of tension arising from the liberation of a mass medium. Functionally, the rating system of the Motion Picture Association attempts to reduce that tension not so much by altering the content of films as by stratifying the moviegoing audience, so that the film, by that measure, becomes somewhat less of a mass medium.

The rating system can neither be sensibly understood nor evaluated without recognition of the fact that, as all movie industry self-regulation has ever been, it is in a dynamic relationship with other, nonindustry controls on the medium. Without other, outside censorships or the threat of them, there would be no rating system at all and, should these outside censorships diminish in force or be

perceived as doing so by the industry, the rating system would very likely disintegrate from the effect of its own internal (intra-industry) tensions.

Though preferred to any other kind of regulation by most persons in the industry, self-regulation is still regarded as a burden. It is seen by some as inhibiting artistry in the film, while others object to it in principle. The strongest disapprobation, however, is based on economics. In warning some parents about some films and in actually restricing admission of youth to others, the system is seen by many in the industry as a major financial liability, one that is tolerable only in the face of the even greater costs and inconveniences of not having it, namely, some other kind of censorship imposed upon the medium.

A second fundamental point also needs to be stressed: the film industry is highly decentralized. The days when a few large companies and their trade association, the MPAA, could make and even dictate a regulatory policy for the entire industry are gone. Any attempt by the MPAA and its major corporate supporters to induce compliance with the rating system through extensive economic pressure would very likely raise the antitrust issue, a specter which has haunted the industry since the *Paramount* decree[66] divorced production and exhibition interests in 1948. The rating system, then, is and must continue to be a voluntary enterprise, somewhat delicately and precariously held together. Being both voluntary and generally unloved, it bears within it the seeds of its own demise. That it was put together at all is remarkable, and indicates the strength of the threat of outside controls and, to no small degree, the organizational and political skills of its founders.

The system itself performs or may perform at least five recognizable functions. Stated positively, these are (1) the singling out of cinematic material harmful to youth and identifying those films that may contain it; (2) administering the rating criteria evenhandedly and consistently with respect to diverse elements within the industry and to diverse films; (3) informing the public, especially parents, of the ratings; (4) enforcement of the ratings, that is, restriction of admission to R and X films; and (5) providing a defense against other controls, thereby relieving the medium of much censorial pressure.

With regard to the first function, this study is able to offer little data and, consequently, not much evaluation. The chief difficulty here is that, by early 1970 at least, scientific knowledge about the harmfulness or lack of harmfulness of particular cinematic content had not progressed far enough to come close to providing criteria by which to measure the industry's efforts. The MPAA has shown some, but hardly overwhelming, concern for the scientific problem. One of its reviewers in the Code and Rating Administration is a clinical psychologist, and the organization has occasionally consulted with persons who might have some kind of scientific opinion on the effects of film content. Beyond this, however, the industry has not gone far. The CRA's other reviewers are distinguished chiefly for their previous industry or media experience. This background is not without value in holding the rating process together politically and in making its rulings somewhat more palatable to film proprietors, but it is not the sort of experience that would necessarily address the problem of identifying harmful material (Section on "Rating Process").

This study, however, does reveal two characteristics of the ratings having some bearing on the problem. The first is that the CRA appears to be much more

concerned with erotica than with violence. More than 80% of its stated objections to giving specific films less restrictive rating have to do with erotica, while less than 20% are concerned with violence (Section on "Rating Criteria"). The second is that the ratings are considerably more permissive in their matching of content to age groupings than are evaluations made by other film reviewing agencies, both public and private (Section on "Comparative Ratings"). Some of the private groups were more restrictive than the CRA on 30% or more of the films reviewed. The reviewing groups that showed the least inconsistency with the CRA ratings were two governmental or quasi-governmental classification boards, a finding that may indicate CRA standards are somewhat more finely attuned to the relative permissiveness allowed by *legal doctrine* (a major frame of reference for the public boards) than to the relatively more restrictive *opinion* of other rating groups. Whether or not these two characteristics—the greater concern with erotica than violence and the relative permissiveness of the ratings—afford less rather than more protection for youth cannot, of course, be answered from this study.

Administration of the self-regulatory apparatus has always been a matter of controversy within the industry and often with the public as well. Allegations of hypocrisy and expediency leading to inconsistency and favoritism eventually came to cast such a long shadow over the Motion Picture Code that both public and industry confidence in it were seriously impaired. The period covered by this study is too short to determine whether the same fate will overtake the rating system. The MPAA has taken several steps to allay suspicion and doubt, such as barring release of unrated films by member companies through nonmember subsidiaries, setting up an elaborate appeals procedure, and establishing a reviewing fee schedule to accommodate film proprietors of modest means (Section on "The Rating Process"). Yet within the industry misgivings remain, particularly about the X rating and the possibility that it may be used to throttle competition offered major companies by the smaller independents. Whether these suspicions will prove well-founded or not, a key element in administering the rating system is the relative independence and integrity of the Code and Rating Administration and support rather than subversion of it by the powers in the industry. By early 1970, the CRA had been backed up on all but one of eight appeals taken from its rulings to the appeal board. The independence issue, which dogged the old Production Code Administration, is likely to remain alive, particularly since the CRA has liberalized its rating standards (even since this study began) and because there are no written rating criteria at all (Section on "Rating Criteria"). In addition to this, its decisions, like those of its predecessor, are not made public. More public information on both rating criteria and rating decisions would probably reinforce public confidence in and understanding of the rating system and remove some of the smoke-filled-room image which self-regulation has had in the past. Some observers have suggested that the CRA, or an equivalent of it, should be completely independent of the industtry, in much the same way that the British Board of Film Censors is of the British film industry. This suggestion has much merit in the writer's view, but whether it is compatible with an all-voluntary system is doubtful.[6 7]

In its informing function, that is, making the ratings of individual films known to the public, the system operates far short of its capacity. In this study, newspaper advertising, the chief and near-universal channel for informing the

public about local exhibitions, was systematically examined in newspapers in 20 metropolitan areas and in 20 smaller cities, covering more than 16% of American theaters (Section on "Advertisement of Ratings"). In more than a third of the advertised exhibitions of rated films, the rating was missing from the ad. And in an eighth of the advertised exhibitions in which the rating did appear, it was either smaller than MPAA standards allow, buried among the credits, unreadable, or a combination of two or more of these defects. If the number of missing, defective, and inaccurate ratings are taken together, the informing function broke down, entirely or in part, in nearly 45% of the advertised exhibitions. In the writer's view, this is a major failure of the rating sytem to date, particularly since the *appearance* of an *accurate* and *nondefective* rating in an ad is something completely within control of film proprietors. Even the best-operating system would defeat its own purposes if it inadequately informed moviegoers of ratings nearly half of the time. On the other hand, though some exploitation of ratings, particularly the X rating, was found, such hyper-informing was not common.

In its enforcement function, that is, in restricting admission to R and X films, the system also appears to have produced checkered results. This observation is made with more caution than the one evaluating the informing function, because the data upon which it is based—observation of admission practices and interviews of personnel at 40 theaters in the New York metropolitan area—is far less extensive than the national survey of movie advertising. Nonetheless, the data do indicate a marked inattention to the checking of ages and restriction of admission at many theaters (Section on "Restriction of Admission to R and X Films"). Though some theaters were quite strict in their policies, the overall finding was that only half of the patrons who appeared to be clearly under or probably under 16 were questioned at all. If patrons appearing to be of marginal age are included, questioning took place in only a third of all cases, and if those appearing to be above the age line but about whom an observer might still have doubts are included, questioning took place in only a fifth of all cases. Overall, enforcement seemed to operate effectively only at age levels of 12 or 13 and below, rather than the 16, 17, or 18 year-old levels drawn by the rating system itself. Except in the case of drive-in theaters where there are physical difficulties involved in checking ages, the casualness observed appeared to be due mainly to uninterested, uninformed, or undirected theater personnel. Interviews with theater employees also revealed that the degree of enforcement may be connected with the possibility, or at least the probability, of legal sanctions or police action against the employees or against the theater. Whether enforcement at the box office can be tightened up in the light of the quality of line personnel and theater management practices is uncertain. If it cannot, the rating system is likely to be weakened seriously as an alternative censorship, given the content of today's films. Worse still, it could become itself a stimulus to local action.

On the positive side, there appeared to be a high incidence of patron self-enforcement (underage patrons not showing up or not attempting to gain admission) at many theaters. Overall, the percentage of all patrons who should have been questioned ranged from only 1.2, if only those appearing to be clearly or probably underage are included, to 8.7, if those appearing near the age limit and possibly over it (but about whom there may still be some doubt) are included.

As a defense against other censorships, the rating system appears to have had a mixed effect. There seems to be little doubt that it has stilled much, though by no means all, of the pressure for governmental classification. That it has done this at all in the face of the still-accelerating emphasis on erotica and violence in cinematic content is no small accomplishment. Though the system reaches only 80% of commerical features having significant distribution in the country, it reaches more than 92% of all exhibitions, and more than 96% if self-rated X films are included. On this basis, it is very likely that 98 or 99% of the moviegoing audience watches MPAA-rated films (Section on "Film Coverage").

Very few MPAA-rated films are reported to be the object of prosecutions or other police or official action (Section on "The Ratings and Censorship"). On the other hand, the number of reported official actions against exhibitors, already on the rise before the rating system, has continued to increase markedly and steadily since the rating system. The overwhelming number of these films are simply not reached by the system. Since the censorial objective in most of the cases appears to be that of general prohibition rather than mere age restriction, inclusion of these films in the system, with their probable X rating, would very likely make little or no censorial difference. On the other hand, since the censorship interest is often an undiscriminating one, the provocation of these non-MPAA-rated films may actually contribute to the various censorial attempts to "use" or exploit the rating system, such as the taxing or otherwise penalizing of exhibition of X or of X and R films.

For these various reasons, the rating system only partially defends the film medium from censorship and control. As such, it is only one control among several that operates on the medium and only one element in the public policy problem of managing the tension between freedom of speech and censorship in the medium.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to call attention to the considerable help and cooperation he received in execution of this study. A great deal of data on the rating system was provided by the Motion Picture Association, and the writer is particularly indebted to Barbara Scott, an attorney for the MPAA and also a member of the Commission, for coordinating various inquiries which were made. Information was asked for freely and was supplied in the same manner. Several other members of the MPAA—Jack Valenti, Louis Nizer, Ralph Hetzel, T. Manning Clagett, Sidney Schreiber, Michael Linden, Taylor Mills, Margaret Twyman, and James Bouras—were helpful on various specific points of inquiry. Eugene Dougherty and other members of the MPAA's Code and Rating Administration in Los Angeles were especially helpful in describing their work during the writer's visit to the rating office.

Several other persons within or close to the film industry were interviewed, and the writer is indebted to them for information and insights provided. They are Walter Reade, Jr.; Julian Rifkin, National Association of Theater Owners; Martin Quigley, Jr., Quigley Publications; Robert Aldrich; Lou Greenspan, Journal of the Screen Producers Guild; Robert Vogel, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer; Robert Radnitz; Joseph Strick; Felix Bilgrey, Times Film Corporation; Paul Lazarus, National

Screen Service; and the Rev. Patrick J. Sullivan and Henry Herx, National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures.

For supplying useful data on other rating systems, the writer also wishes to thank John Trevelyan, British Board of Film Censors; Judith Ripp, *Parents' Magazine;* Edith Whitehorn, *PTA Magazine;* Marie Hamilton, *Film Reports;* Valentine Wells, Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission; Harold G. Shank, Dallas Motion Picture Classification Board; Marvin Aspen, Chicago Film Review Section; and Mrs. David S. Coburn, Southern California Motion Picture Council. Special thanks are also due to 287 newspaper movie editors and critics across the country who filled out and returned a questionnaire sent to them.

Finally, a number of very able and conscientious assistants worked on this study, and their help was particularly valuable. They were John Soper, University of Wisconsin; Joan Gordon; Barbara Hilkevitch; Susan White; Carolyn Shelley; and Michael Brustein and Attila Ilkson, New York University. James Horwitz, New York University, designed the computer program used to analyze the advertising survey data. Marilyn La Porte, New York University, typed the manuscript and provided valuable assistance at a number of other points during the study.

The writer accepts sole responsibility for the facts and analysis contained in this report.

NOTES

1. For a general background of self-regulation by the industry, see Richard S. Randall, *Censorship of the Movies: The Social and Political Control of a Mass Medium* (Madison, Wisc., 1968), pp. 179-224.

2. *Burstyn* v. *Wilson,* 343 U.S. 495 (1952).

3. *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures,* 334 U.S. 131 (1948).

4. Such laws received the informal "Ginsberg" appellation after the U.S. Supreme Court first upheld a law of the sort in *Ginsberg* v. *New York,* 390 U.S. 629 (1968).

5. 390 U.S. 676 (1968).

6. *Film and Television Daily,* July 2, 1968, p. 1. The sharp increase was attributed by some industry spokesmen more to a tightening of Code standards than to a change in the content of films. Ibid.

7. *Motion Picture Daily,* March 13, 1969, p. 1.

8. *Film and Television Daily,* April 26, 1968, p. 1.

9. *Motion Picture Daily,* May 15, 1968, p. 7.

10. *Motion Picture Daily,* April 18, 1968, p. 1.

11. *Film and Television Daily,* June 10, 1968, p. 4.

12. *The Motion Picture Code and Rating Program,* published by the Motion Picture Association of America, New York, N.Y., p. 2.

13. Ibid., at 2-3.

14. The GP rating—"All ages Admitted. Parental Guidance Suggested."—was substituted for the M rating—"Suggested for Mature Audiences. Adults and Mature Young People."—in January, 1970. At the same time, the age limits for the R and X ratings were raised from 16 to 17.

15. *Motion Picture Code and Rating Program,* p. 3.

16. Data made available by the CRA for the period November 1, 1968, through July 30, 1969, the first nine months of the rating system, indicate that 84 films viewed during that time were re-edited by their proprietors at the CRA's suggestion in order to obtain a less restrictive rating. This accounts for about 25% of the features viewed by the CRA during this period. CRA objections in these films are analyzed in Tables 3 and 4.

17. These figures take into account rating changes in 12 films after going into release or after the initial rating was announced and release of the film was held up by its proprietor. In most of these cases, the film was re-edited. In all but two instances, the new rating was the next least restrictive one, the most frequent change being X to R. In the case of *Winning* and *Gypsy Moths,* the new rating was the next most restrictive one. The problem of rerating after a film has gone into release became the subject of a policy statement by the MPAA, declaring that the CRA would refuse to consider a film for rerating "where circumstances indicate abuse of the rating program or the possibility of confusion among the public if the picture and its rating are changed." Copy of a memorandum to the members of the Code and Rating Appeals Board from Jack Valenti, MPAA President and Chairman of the Appeals Board, dated December 5, 1968.

18. *The Motion Picture Code and Rating Program,* published by the Motion Picture Association of America, New York, N.Y., (undated), p. 5.

19. Interview, New York, N.Y., August 26, 1969.

20. According to Dougherty, treatment consists of the "choice of language, dress, and costume, the handling of nudity, love making, scenes of passion, postures of the body simulating sexual actions; violence which departs from valid action and becomes savagery or excessive brutality; and the delicacy or restraint with which aberrations or deviations from the norm are presented." Interoffice Memo to Kenneth Clark from E.G. Dougherty, February 13, 1969, p. 5.

21. Ibid., at 2-3.

22. Dougherty believes that a well-made film about child molestation, "warning children to avoid the deviate who lurks near the school yard or the community swimming pool; a film which well might serve a worthy purpose in education of young children in helping them to avoid such dangers," might be given a G rating. Ibid., at 1-2.

23. Ibid., at 1.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

26. The GP (formerly M) category corresponds roughly to the old "Suggested for Mature Audiences" classification used prior to the rating system, except that a few "SMA's" would probably fall into the R classification, according to Dougherty.

27. Interoffice Memo, pp. 4-5.

28. However, in *True Grit,* Dennis Hopper's finger is quite clearly chopped off with a meat cleaver.

29. However, *Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid* received an M despite a very clear kick in the groin delivered by Paul Newman.

30. According to Selig J. Seligman, executive producer of the film, "I would have given $100 to $1 that it would have gotten an X rating. When they gave it an R, I was amazed. I didn't expect them to be so intelligent about it. They all complimented me on the good taste. That means we achieved what we had set out to do. The picture is not pornography, not sensationalism. It is a spoof. It is just a funny picture." *Film and Television Daily,* December 17, 1968, p. 1.

31. They were the Atlanta Better Films Council, the Columbus and Franklin County (Ohio) Motion Picture Council, the Greater Detroit Motion Picture Council, the Memphis Better Films Council, the Better Films Council of the Milwaukee Area, the Philadelphia Motion Picture Preview Group, the Better Films Council of Greater St. Louis, and the Motion Picture and Television Council of the District of Columbia.

32. They were the American Jewish Committee, the American Library Association, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Federation of Motion Picture Councils, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Council of Parents and Teachers, the National Council of Women of the U.S.A., the National Federation of Music Clubs, the Protestant Motion Picture Council, and the Schools Motion Picture Committee.

33. Those consulted were Valentine Wells, Executive Secretary, Milwaukee Motion Picture Commission; John Trevelyan, Secretary, British Board of Film Censors; Mrs. Marie Hamilton, Editor, *Film Reports;* The Rev. Patrick J. Sullivan, Executive Director, National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures; Miss Judith Ripp, Movie Editor, *Parents' Magazine;* and Mrs. Edith Whitehorn, Preview Editor, *PTA Magazine.*

34. *1969 Film Daily Yearbook of Motion Pictures* (New York, 1969), pp. 679-687.

35. Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C.

36. Bakersfield, Calif., Billings, Mont., Binghamton, N.Y., Cedar Rapids, Ia., Duluth, Minn., Fayetteville, N.C., Jackson, Miss., Huntington, W. Va., Johnstown, Pa., Lewiston, Me., Little Rock, Ark., Mesa, Ariz., Ogden, Utah, Pensacola, Fla., Pittsfield, Mass., San Angelo, Tex., Sioux Falls, S.D., Springfield, Ohio, Terre Haute, Ind., and Topeka, Kans.

37. January 24, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, June 13, July 11, and August 8, 1969.

38. May 16, June 6, June 27, and July 18, 1969.

39. Features already in circulation when the rating system went into effect on November 1, 1968, are not included in any of the tables or analyses of this section. Their percentage of all advertised exhibitions surveyed dropped from 56.2% on January 24, 1969 to 7.6% on August 8, 1969, reflecting the natural exhaustion of their commercial appeal. Only about 25 of these older features were eventually submitted for rating. When they were rated, their later exhibitions were then considered to be those of rated films for purposes of the survey.

40. The relatively low percentage in those two cities is accounted for by a high percentage of self-rated X films, 18.2% and 9.9% respectively. The writer would speculate that these high self-rated X percentages are the result of a generous application of the self-rated X to *pre-rating-system* releases, which would actually reflect conservatism in exhibition policy rather

than a liberal booking of X-type films. This speculation is supported by the fact that no MPAA-rated X films played in Birmingham on the survey dates and only nine played in Atlanta, accounting for only 2.2% of the exhibitions recorded for that city in Table 13.

41. The high percentage of exhibition coverage of rated films is also borne out by replies to a question on the questionnaire survey of newspaper movie editors. To the question of whether nonrated exploitation films had played in their circulation areas during the last 12 months, that is, during 1969, 34.5% of 246 respondents said that such films played either rarely or not at all. To similar questions about X films and R films, the percentage replying that such films played either rarely or not at all was 11.1% and 2.1%, respectively.

42. Most ads for first runs are bought by the film's distributor; later ones, by the exhibitor.

43. The single exception to the requirement that a rated film have its rating displayed or be manifest in all of its advertising are so-called teaser ads, which are usually placed well in advance of the opening of a film and usually do not mention the film's title or otherwise identify it in any definite way. Often the local theater is not mentioned in such ads either.

44. Memorandum, "Supplement to Advertising Code Regulations (Revised)," Motion Picture Association of America, New York, N.Y., February 24, 1969 (mimeographed), p. 2.

45. Ibid.

46. The newspapers used in the metropolitan areas were the Atlanta *Constitution,* the Baltimore *Sun,* Birmingham *News,* Boston *Herald,* Chicago *Tribune,* Cleveland *Plain Dealer,* Dallas *Morning News,* Denver *Rocky Mountain News,* Detroit *News,* Los Angeles *Times,* Miami *Herald,* Milwaukee *Journal,* New Orleans *Times-Picayune,* Philadelphia *Inquirer,* Portland, Ore. *Oregonian,* St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* San Francisco *Chronicle,* Seattle *Daily Times,* Washington, D.C. *Post and Times-Herald,* and the New York *Times.*

Newspapers used in the smaller cities were Bakersfield, Calif. *Californian,* Billings, Mont. *Gazette,* Binghamton, N.Y. *Press,* Cedar Rapids, Ia. *Gazette,* Duluth, Minn. *News-Tribune,* Fayetteville, N.C. *Observer,* Jackson, Miss. *Clarion-Ledger,* Huntington, W. Va. *Herald-Dispatch,* Johnstown, Pa. *Tribune-Democrat,* Lewiston, Me. *Sun,* Little Rock, Ark. *Gazette,* Mesa, Ariz. *Tribune,* Ogden, Utah *Standard-Examiner,* Pensacola, Fla. *Journal,* Pittsfield, Mass. *Berkshire Eagle,* San Angelo, Tex. *Standard-Times,* Sioux Falls, S.D. *Argus-Leader,* Springfield, Ohio *News,* Terre Haute *Tribune,* and Topeka, Kans. *Capitol.*

47. Self-rated X films are not included.

48. This percentage figure may actually be a fraction of one percentage point lower, since there *may* be some overlap between those ads with an incorrect rating and those with a graphically defective one. However, even with a 100% overlap of the 248 incorrect ratings—a most improbable condition—the insufficiency percentage, above, would not be lower than 42.8%.

49. In a rare instance, the unreadability defect may have been due to typographical defects arising in the newspaper composing room or on the press itself and, therefore, not the fault of the film proprietor. But this is likely to be rare. Where unreadability was observed, it was almost always due to a combination of extremely small type and the particular type style chosen for the rating letter.

50. Questioning the case of an R film may have included not only the factor of age, but also that of relationship between possibly underaged patron and older persons with him.

51. Two ticket sellers also believed that the particular chain of which their theaters were a part "sent checkers around" to observe enforcement. But given their somewhat garbled understanding of the rating system itself, it was not clear whether these "checkers" were observing enforcement or whether they had been hired to check on the honesty of the theater in recording box office admissions, a regular practice of distribution companies in the movie industry.

52. *Film and Television Daily,* January 8, 1970, p. 1.

53. *Film and Television Daily,* January 21, 1970, p. 7.

54. *Film and Television Daily,* March 16, 1970, p. 1.

55. *Film and Television Daily,* December 15, 1969, p. 1.

56. New York *Times,* April 5, 1970, p. 60.

57. *Film and Television Daily,* January 6, 1970, p. 1.

58. *Boxoffice,* February 24, 1969, p. E-1.

59. *Film and Television Daily,* December 30, 1969, p. 1.

60. *Film and Television Daily,* December 30, 1969, p. 1.

61. *Film and Television Daily,* April 24, 1970, p. 1.

62. The publications were *Boxoffice* and *Variety,* weeklies; *Daily Variety, Film and Television Daily,* and *Motion Picture Daily,* dailies; and the *Independent Film Journal,* and *Motion Picture Herald,* biweeklies.

63. In several of the trade press reports the film or films or theater or theaters involved were not named. For conservatism in tabulation, it was assumed that where the plural was used, there were only two films or only two theaters, and that where "several" was the description that there were only three films or only three theaters.

64. *Film and Television Daily,* March 18, 1970.

65. The film had been involved in four reported actions in the 10-month period preceding the rating system.

66. *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures,* 334 U. S. 131 (1948).

67. Ratings of the British Board of Film Censors have legal effect through local ordinances relating to exhibition.

Sex Education

Sex Education Programs in the Public Schools of the United States

QUALITY EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

The following report is in response to a request from the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography to conduct a survey examining the nature of sex education programs in the public schools of the United States. Included are the results of examination of research literature as it affects programs, curriculum materials and guides, common goals and purposes of sex education programs, and methods employed. Interest was expressed by the Commission in the examination of programs for their potential for reducing adolescent or later interest in nonlegitimate sexual materials (pornography); this is reported in the form of compilation of subjective opinions only. Incorporated in the report are limited studies of problems commonly involved in implementation of programs.

Report statements are quotations or are based on survey results and do not necessarily reflect opinions held by either Quality Educational Development, Inc., or the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

STUDY DESIGN

Goals

The primary intent of this study is to examine the range of instructional materials and programs available for inclusion in sex education courses in the public schools. Its secondary aim is to examine the possibility that a positive relationship may exist between effective sex education programs and the reduction of adolescent or later interest in explicit sexual materials.

Preliminary inquiries indicated that major problems exist in effecting implementation of sex education programs in public schools. It seemed useful to document some of these problems, including the apparent quantitative lack of adequate teacher training, the efforts of pressure groups opposed to sex education, and controls exercised by governmental agencies. It was agreed to include a case study of a single community, deomonstrating an attempt to construct and implement a program amid growing community opposition and the subsequent elimination of sex education from the curriculum.

The study thus includes an examination of existing programs, curricula, and materials, noting programmatic concern for the issue of obscenity and pornography; a compilation of subjective opinions concerning the relationship between sex education in schools and the reduction of interest in pornography; a limited examination of teacher training in sex education; and a review of obstacles to be anticipated in the implementation of sex education programs.

Methods

Comprehensive requests for information concerning State recommendations and curriculum guidelines, existing programs within the State, and research in sex education within the State were sent to each of the 50 State departments of education. Separate requests were sent in each case to the assistant superintendent for curriculum, the assistant superintendent for instruction, and the Title III coordinator. At least one response has been received from 33 of the 50 State departments of education, and information has been received concerning State policies from five additional States; 38 States are represented in our summary.

Questionnaires examining the existence, status, grade levels, teacher training, topic emphases, and implementation techniques of sex education programs at the local school system level were sent to 250 school systems across the nation, including at least four to each State. Summary statistics are based on a return of slightly over 50%. Included in the questionnaires and the summary are opinions expressed concerning the relationship between sex education and interest in pornography.

Requests for information concerning programs, curriculum guides and suggestions, materials, and relevant research were addressed to all regional educational laboratories and research and development centers; health and family agencies; resource centers; the Ministries of Education of the Scandinavian countries; SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States); NEA (National Education Association) and its relevant subdivisions (the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Rights and Responsibilities Commission, the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education, the School Health Education Study, and the Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education); the Institute for Sex Research; the AMA (American Medical Association); the American School Health Association; a number of relevant Title III projects, museums, planned parenthood groups, religious groups, and family counseling agencies; and several of the agencies identified with the groups opposing sex education, such as the John Birch Society and the Christian Crusade.

Instructional materials, program rationales. catalogs, descriptive brochures, and

teacher guides were gathered from over 150 commercial publishers, together with any information the producers could provide as to use of their products in school instructional programs. These were examined for unique characteristics, topic range, mode of concept presentation, and aid provided the instructor. No evaluation of these materials was attempted, beyond that provided by recurrent recommendation in curriculum guides, and by stated inclusion or exclusion in agency policy statements.

An examination of offerings in sex education by teacher training institutions was conducted, for inclusion with questionnaire findings concerning preservice and inservice training.

A limited search of recent research literature was conducted, supplementing a 1968 report by Kirkendall and Miles in the *Review of Educational Research*. The survey was based on searches conducted for the investigator by the ERIC Clearinghouses on Counseling and Personnel Services and on Teacher Education. Examination of research reports centered on those studies emphasizing instructional materials development or selection, and studies examining the process of program implementation.

RESEARCH

"In perusing the sex education literature since 1956 as it pertains directly to formal school education, one finds an amazing paucity of research on structure, content, and results. That which is available is for the most part simplistic and often narrow in scope" (Kirkendall & Miles, 1968). This statement is still applicable. Kirkendall and Miles' review of the literature indicated that most of the studies conducted through 1968 fell primarily into three categories.

The first area widely studied was the need for sex education in the public schools, with concurrent investigation of potential acceptance of the program by the school administration and community. This area was explored through polls, surveys, interviews, and questionnaires. These investigations usually included questions regarding subject area interests, appropriate ages for the introduction of specific topics, and identification of concepts for inclusion in curriculum guides and instructional materials.

The second area of research was that of methods most effective in teaching sex education. Methods such as sex-role identification techniques, small and large group discussion activities, and role-playing practices were studied. Teacher selection and preservice and inservice training practices were consistently examined.

The third research category concerned effective evaluation procedures and the process of continuing examination and revision of established courses.

Since Kirkendall and Miles' report (1968), two additional categories of study have received increasing attention—reviews of available instructional materials in sex education and examination of programs appropriate for exceptional children. The following discussion thus covers primarily these five areas of research, as reported since their 1968 article.

The majority of studies have continued to be primarily concerned with the first category—the determination of the need for sex education in schools. One such study, by McIntire (1969), involved the polling of teachers and administrators for

opinions concerning the need for sex education and appropriate levels for the introduction of specific concepts. Part of the survey checked the availability and effectiveness of existent programs. The teachers polled expressed a need for sex instruction, and although the administrators generally agreed that the need was unquestioned, many indicated surprise at the relative ease with which such courses had been accepted in their communities.

Other investigators (Benell, 1969; Furstenberg et al., 1969) interviewed or surveyed students, primarily of high school and college age, to determine the degree of their factual understanding of sex education topics and to learn the sources of this knowledge. The extent of ignorance and misinformation was found to be greater than theorized, and the primary source of knowledge was consistently found to be the peer group. A study by Elias and Gebhard (1969) corroborated this finding and noted that less factual information existed among "lower-class" groups.

Several studies attempted to define appropriate ages at which sex education subjects should be introduced; proposed levels were based on students' interests as stated in surveys and on studies examining realistic levels of heterosexual relationships during adolescent years. Although general age ranges were identified as appropriate for the introduction of various concepts, it was obviously difficult to be specific.

In Benell's (1969) study, student personality factors were analyzed to determine whether attitudes considered unacceptable (e.g., sexual aggression or irresponsibility) were subject to educational influence. Significant attitudinal changes were apparent after appropriate instruction, providing a seldom-offered rationale for the inclusion of sex education in school curricula. The investigator determined that reluctance on the part of teachers and parents to support sex education was often based upon their belief that only factual information would be taught, in contradistinction to their feelings that effecting changes in student attitudes was the more important need. Although recognizing the crudity of techniques for measurement of attitudes, the investigators felt that significant changes had occurred. Luckey (1969a) also found attitude change to be the important factor in education in sexuality.

Research studies by Elias and Gebhard (1969), Juhasz (1969), and Lee and Stith (1969) examined attitudes toward sex instruction, sex information, and sexual behavior of certain groups classified according to socio-economic level, religion, nationality, and parent-student status. Some differences among groups were found, but ignorance and misinformation were apparent in all groups. Lower income families seemed somewhat more reluctant to accept the school's role in sex education as appropriate. Generational differences appeared, as might be expected, with the young tending to want more specific information at earlier ages than parent groups thought appropriate.

A survey (Gudridge, 1969, p. 31) found parents and students in disagreement as to whether or not a sex education program existed in their school—parents said "yes," and students said "no." Some courses are apparently so antiseptic that the children are not aware of the presence of sex education. Another researcher (Scriven, 1968) entitled his report "Putting the sex back into sex education." He indicated that often the original goals of programs are not met because of parental pressure to reduce or omit sensitive content.

A recent study at Purdue University (Gudridge, 1969) showed that teenagers receive their sex education primarily from friends. Studies by Juhasz (1969) and Koontz (1969) corroborate this finding. Peer groups, first, and printed materials, second, were identified as the most frequent sources of sex information. The results of these studies confirmed the need for intelligent adult sources of instruction.

Children's interests and needs, as children themselves perceive them, comprise another frequently examined area. The Connecticut State Board of Education has published a book called *Teach Us What We Want To Know*, a detailed report of extensive interviews with 5,000 children from kindergarten through grade 12, examining their expressed interests, concerns, and problems in the field of health education. The investigators felt that, as in other subject areas, the children should be an important source of identification of subject matter. There was a wide range of interests expressed, but only general groupings of age levels and topics appeared.

A committee of the School Health Education Study conducted a survey in 1962 involving 18,000 elementary and high school students (Gudridge, 1969). This survey examined the extent of factual information held by the students and revealed many distortions, myths, commonly-held misconceptions, and a general lack of knowledge. It again indicated that peers and printed matter, rather than parents, were primary sources of information.

School-conducted surveys often precede the formation of committees to construct curricula, and these local surveys have indicated a high degree of interest and acceptance by parents (Mamaroneck Pilot Study, 1969).

Programs have often been based, at least in part, on published articles by recognized authorities in the medical and educational professions. Some of these experts identified subject areas from personal experience with children. One such article (Kirkendall & Levin, 1969) described several cases in which teenagers came to physicians with their problems concerning premarital chastity.

The inclusion of issues in ethics and morality in sex education courses in the public schools has been frequently defended and/or attacked by professionals in the field; the inclusion of birth control information is also a frequently debated topic (Hoyman, 1969; Kirkendall & Levin, 1969; Meyerstein, 1969; "Too much too soon?...," 1969). Scriven (1968), as previously mentioned, indicated that a fear of offending parents and the public has made programs too conservative.

An interesting report (Toohey, 1969) maintained that the current opposition to sex education is based on American "anti-intellectualism," and the consequent rejection of the opinions of "experts" in the field. Toohey concluded that "sex is such a phenomenon that educators cannot expect to repeal it by ignoring it." As substantiation, he reported a Wayne State University experiment in which 250 students in an Introductory Psychology class reported their thoughts and moods at the sound of a gun fired 21 times at random during a nine-week period. Results indicated that at each instance, 20% of the students, both male and female, were thinking about sex. (Incidentally, only 20% were paying attention to the lecture.) It was concluded that at any given instant in the college lecture hall, a significant proportion of the class is contemplating sex. The investigator inferred that, despite expressed opposition, interest in sex exists, and teachers cannot ignore it; sex education deserves a place in the curriculum.

The second commonly investigated category, that of methods of approach to sex education, is most often examined by local school staff and community committees. Most curriculum guides suggest materials to use, varieties of presentation, discussion and role-playing techniques, approved audio and visual media, and teacher preparation guidelines. The literature, however, offered very little in the way of controlled studies with regard to the effectiveness of any particular method of teaching or of training teachers. It is perhaps assumed that general teaching theory is applicable in the sex education field, although no studies appeared to support this assumption.

Case studies of successful and unsuccessful programs have demonstrated both positive and negative influences on program development and implementation (Luckey, 1969b; Toohey, 1969). Parent involvement, careful planning, constant review, and continued community participation are stressed as necessary to successful programs.

Most agency guidelines propose methods for implementing courses, but these suggestions are rarely based on legitimate research findings. Instead, the opinions usually have been based on experiences in local pilot programs or on what was assumed to be "expert opinion."

A common basis for determination of ongoing instructional methods is a survey conducted after the completion of initial sex education courses. Parents, teachers, and students are asked to indicate what they felt were the most successful methods employed. Post facto evaluation of pilot courses and committee review of courses used in other communities are the most frequent determinants in revision or modification of programs.

Regarding program evaluation, some researchers have tried to create objective methods of testing knowledge gained as well as attitudinal and behavioral changes (Juhasz, 1969). Acquisition of facts has been found relatively easy to measure; the studies have also indicated some success in measuring changes in attitude and behavior. Most reports, however, made use of subjective teacher evaluations and evaluative surveys of parents and students. Kilander (1970, p. 157) gave as one of many criteria which would enable the teacher to ascertain the success of his program "the frequency of pornography brought to class," and as another, "the incidence of toilet markings with obscene themes."

Most evaluation criteria include measures of openness of interpersonal relationships, ability to express sexual concerns, and use of an appropriate and accurate vocabulary. Vocabulary instruction, in addition to enabling growth in objective knowledge and permitting effective discussion, is seen as especially useful in that it also provides a measurable quantity for evaluation.

Media evalutation, a fourth research category, has been attempted primarily by local school systems. Many have reviewed curriculum guides, audiovisual materials, texts, and teacher aids, and have formulated criteria for adoption of approved materials (Michigan State Department of Education, 1969; Singer-Magdoff, 1969). They have used parent-teacher-medical committees to aid in evaluation and selection. National agencies, such as the NEA and the AMA, provide bibliographies of materials which meet their approval, and some State departments of education have extensive lists of recommended materials. These sources are further described in the section of this report entitled "Curriculum Materials."

The fifth category of investigation—sex education for exceptional children—has revealed some interesting results. Bloom (1969) studied two groups of children—one physically handicapped and the other emotionally disturbed. She found both groups benefited significantly from sex education courses. The levels of both factual knowledge and anxiety were measured, and she noted that the two groups showed similar improvement in both areas. She felt this indicated that children handicapped in any way were culturally deprived as well, and therefore needed instruction in family living even more than normal children. Gordon (1969) corroborated this belief that handicapped children need sex education and pointed out that asking questions may be more difficult for them. His book is primarily a guide for parents.

The literature includes studies that attempted to evaluate and survey materials. A dissertation by Richard Auerbach (1968) attempted to determine the amount of instructional assistance afforded teachers and pupils by health and science textbooks. He examined 106 such texts in print in 1966, checking for supportive factors in both affective and cognitive domains. He found the majority inadequate as bases for a comprehensive instructional program in each of his three major categories, instructional materials, instructional methods, and measurement. Watt (1966) categorized sex education materials and gave critical reviews of relevant books and guides. Singer-Magdoff (1969) reviewed sex education materials currently in use.

Two other studies should be noted. Kerckhoff (1970) reviewed the current status of community patterns in implementing sex education courses in public school curricula. Cases cited note implementation problems; the John Birch Society and its associated groups were identified with those who create opposition to programs. "Legitimate" and "nonlegitimate" opposition was described. The report recorded a number of similar case histories appearing throughout the literature. Another study attempted to relate sex education statistically to a decrease in illegitimacy, divorce, and premarital conception. The study, titled "Effects of the Marriage and Family Course in Keokuk Senior High School on the Illegitimacy Rate in Keokuk, Iowa, 1947 through 1966," by James D. Lockett, compared control groups who had not received the course in sex education with groups who had completed the course. The study reported significant differences between the two groups. Those who took the course produced significantly fewer illegitimate children, obtained fewer divorces, and were less frequently involved in premarital conception than those who had not taken the course. The study indicated that the Marriage and Family Course (a high school program) could be a positive force in the prevention of these social ills.

No study directly relating pornography and obscenity to the presence or absence of sex education has been reported. An investigation, "An Evaluation of Sex Education, Its Sources and Effects," in progress at the Institute for Sex Research, Indiana University, may include information concerning this relationship.

In summary, it would seem that studies attempting to define the need for sex education and family living courses generally provide support for the premise that sex education in the schools has an appropriate place in today's society, although a definite minority opposition to this conclusion exists. The methods and

techniques best suited for implementation of sex education programs, effective presentation, choice of materials, evaluation procedures, and program directions for specific student groups would appear to need further study. Local evaluation of specific programs has been the most frequently used method for refinement of ongoing programs and the best tool for planning further courses.

Program-oriented research and evaluation currently being conducted may suggest a relationship between sex education programs and interest in pornography or obscenity; instruments that can accurately measure influence in these areas must be developed, and longitudinal studies conducted.

Much of the present research has been encouraged and supported by the United States Office of Education, which since 1966 has offered Federal grants to those communities, schools, and State agencies wishing to establish or improve programs in sex and family life education (Gudridge, 1969). Funds available under Title III, ESEA, 1965, have provided support for research in the field, as well as for program development.

It is interesting to note that there seem to be fewer discrepancies between the findings in sex education, as reported in the literature, and their application than are usual in some other educational subject areas. Much of the investigation is being conducted by the school systems themselves, rather than at the university level, and results are incorporated into programs in the planning and development stages. University personnel are sometimes called upon to serve as consultants or as speakers to parent or teacher groups. Some studies of program needs are being cited by State departments of education to promote adoption of courses; survey and poll reports are being derived as outcomes of courses and are being used in program revision and implementation; and pilot program findings and reviews of materials are quickly incorporated into courses. Interest area studies (e.g., the Connecticut study previously cited) and the results of student polls, particularly at the high school level (Koontz, 1969), are used in the planning and revision of courses.

Appropriate methods of instruction are apparently often assumed to be the same as those effective in other teaching areas, including small discussion groups, role-playing, and use of audiovisual materials. This premise may or may not be true for this sensitive content area. Additional research might suggest a more effective balance between the use of individual and program-unique materials and the use of commercially-developed materials and programs. School systems now weight these approaches in quite different proportions. Relatively conservative systems, and those systems which have not encountered community acceptance problems, seem to rely more heavily on commercial programs. Others place the major responsibility on the individual teacher, hoping to forestall controversy over content, as well as to provide the flexibility necessary to handle individual differences and differing maturity levels.

The primary need in sex education research at the moment appears to be in the field of teacher training; this is apparent from individual responses to this study, from questionnaire results, and from reviews of the literature. This need is treated in a separate section of this report entitled "Teacher Training."

Although the results of studies in the sex education field are more readily applied and tested than in other fields, the fact that much of the research is conducted at local levels has some adverse effects. There exists a lack of regional

coordination of development activities. The area of teaching methods is not being critically studied, since one school system tends to adopt another's methods or accepts methods from other teaching areas. Evaluation is conducted on unique populations, but investigation of general program theory and accompanying basic research have often suffered. Some agencies have attempted comprehensive evaluation programs, but university or State level involvement has been primarily in research, and resultant training and implementation efforts have generally been minimal.

TEACHER TRAINING

Some authorities believe that in every school system there are teachers with the qualities of personal stability, warmth, ability to establish rapport with youngsters, and interest in the subject who can easily be trained for the task of teaching sex education. Eleanor B. Luckey, Professor and Director of Child Development and Family Relations, University of Connecticut, says that, "The ideal would be to have teachers of every field so well prepared in human relations that there would be no necessity for singling out any one area or 'course' that would be called 'family life and/or sex education'." Many other authorities concur with this concept, including Helen Manley, former Executive Director of Social Health Association of St. Louis, who believes, "Complete honest information, appropriate to the child's growth and interests, should be provided continuously throughout his school life."

There is much written material on those qualities necessary for an effective teacher, and a proportionate amount on attributes essential for sex education teachers. The majority of opinions indicates that a "good teacher," with the added ability to discuss in uninhibited fashion the subjects of sex education curricula with children, is the ideal. Difference of opinion centers on whether this teacher needs to be a specially trained instructor, a member of the medical profession, a social worker, a psychologist, or a religious leader, and on whether or not these experts should serve as consultants only, with the regular classroom teacher doing the classroom sex instruction. Several communities, for example, offer no sex education as such through their classroom teachers but devote from one to several days each year to student seminars or special courses in sex education, conducted by doctors and nurses of the community. Most thought currently indicates the program should be handled by the classroom teacher, who should know and communicate best with his class. Integrating the sex and family living courses into the normal curriculum, with the same teachers, has been the usual approach. However, nearly every set of guidelines has required that this teacher be given some degree of specific training. In the upper levels, secondary schools, and team teaching schools, where more than one teacher has everyday contact with a group of children, it is felt that all teachers should be exposed to this training. This instructional arrangement offers the advantage that the children will be exposed to more than one teacher's attitudes concerning the subject.

One argument against offering sex education in the schools is based upon the apparent lack of teachers adequately prepared to handle the subject. The basic premise that a crucial factor in general education is the quality of the teacher is indisputable. In sex education, a sensitive, personal, and controversial field,

trained teachers are especially important. Though educators in general have endorsed sex and family living as appropriate curriculum topics in public schools, teacher training institutions have seldom included these topics in their curricula. Gudridge (1969, p. 28) cites a survey conducted in 1967 by James L. Malfetti of Teachers College, Columbia University, and Arline M. Rubin of Brooklyn College of the City University of New York. They found that only 8% of the teacher training institutions responding to the survey offered specific courses to train teachers in the field of sex education. Moreover, of the 229 colleges in the survey which offered no courses in sex education, only six had plans to provide courses in the future.

As part of the present study, the course offerings of 100 teacher training institutions—comprised of a representative sampling of private and small State institutions, major universities with large education departments, and summer workshops or institutes—were analyzed. The review revealed that still only 13% offer any type of specific training for teachers of sex education in elementary and/or high school.

Responses to questionnaires used in this study reveal that most schools and school systems find their teachers inadequately prepared to deal with sex education. In response to a question as to sources of teacher preparation in the field, 50.4% indicate inservice training as the primary source; only 17.1% note undergraduate or graduate training in specifically sex- or family living-oriented courses as part of their teachers' preparation; and less than a third feel that the majority of their teachers were prepared for the field by such courses as physical education and biology at teacher training institutions. Of those responding school systems offering programs in sex education, 60.7% also offer inservice training programs for their teachers.

A new graduate program in sex education for the elementary school was offered as a pilot program in 1968 by New York University's School of Education, in cooperation with the United States Office of Education, as authorized by Title V, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965. A one-year fellowship program for experienced teachers, successfully completed, leads to a master's degree in Health Education with specialization in sex education.

SIECUS reports that approximately 30 summer institutes carrying graduate credit were planned for 1968. Apart from inservice training, this approach remains the most usual teacher training offered; our limited review indicates that it accounts for nearly half the college offerings devoted specifically to sex education.

Of the colleges contacted, Teachers College at Columbia University has the most extensive program. They list a variety of courses which are specifically directed to sex education; they have a comprehensive list of assigned readings, audiovisual aids, and texts for review, and encourage the review of many commercial and noncommercial materials. They offer lists of agencies to consult for advice and aid. "Clinical Aspects of Human Reproduction and Sexuality" is offered in conjunction wtih Lenox Hill Hospital, with hospital personnel assisting in instruction.

A rather different approach is taken at the University of Minnesota, which offers a course listed as "Family Studies 100—Human Sexual Behavior." Though many in the class are there to understand their own sexuality, this is offered

officially to "juniors and seniors who plan professions dealing with the sex problems of others." This course is designed to provide education at the college level, not as a training session for teachers. Its purpose is to help the student understand and feel at home with vocabulary and concepts in the field and to give the student a better understanding of himself. Professor Neubeck, the instructor, is quoted as telling his class, "Somewhere along the way, sexuality got separated from the rest of life. I want to integrate it again. As soon as you try to hide something that is essentially normal, people overreact." Reading assignments include analyses of the Bible, classic novels and current fiction, and journals in the education, health, and sex fields. One of the items that Dr. Neubeck lists with reasons for the importance of courses such as his is, "We regard sex as something to be treated delicately, yet by not talking about it ourselves, we encourage those who deal with it grossly." The course is being studied by many involved in teacher training.

Other courses in sociology, psychology, anthropology, and science, as well as courses in health education and other disciplines, provide some background and are exploring techniques employed in the University of Minnesota course.

The New York University graduate pilot program featured "marathon sensitivity training sessions." One example of this, cited by Gudridge (1969), is an "all-night, topic-centered discussion in which fellows seek to understand their own personal attitudes, opinions, and beliefs about sexuality and interpersonal relationships, how they develop, what conflicts exist, and ways and means of coping with them. Out of such sessions," says Mrs. Hamberg, Associate Professor of Education, "quickly grows a climate of friendliness and freedom to discuss controversial issues in subsequent class sessions." This sensitivity training idea is not unique to the field of sex education and has received controversial evaluation. Some communities appear to find such programs frightening and objectionable prerequisities to teaching their children and especially objectionable when keyed to sex education. Others have used the group approach, or modifications, with great success and feel it is educationally sound.

The University of Illinois Graduate School of Education offers H. ED. 404, "Trends and Issues in Sex Education." This course, prepared by H. S. Hoyman, explores human psychosexual development and relates sex education to family life, preparing teachers to introduce appropriate attitudes and concepts at each grade level. Although this course is given at the graduate level and is most often taken by experienced teachers who have returned to college to prepare for program introduction at their own schools, it appears to be both specific and practical, providing the necessary orientation and background that teachers should have in preservice training. It is noteworthy that the Illinois legislature prescribes that the State of Illinois shall encourage preservice as well as inservice teacher preparation in sex education.

As part of a regular undergraduate teacher training program, sex education is almost completely ignored, even as a part of health education. The only other reporting State which legislatively supports preservice sex education for teachers is Michigan.

Besides university and college courses offered for inservice and preservice teaching, many types of inservice training are being designed by local and State agencies. These programs serve the general goals of helping teachers feel

comfortable with their own sexuality, giving them the ability to use the language of sex easily, alerting them to changing attitudes toward sex, and making them aware of the tremendous influence of the individual's sexuality on many aspects of his life. Other workshops include discussion techniques, specific methods and content, and exposure to the many materials available. Communities which have designed their own curriculum guides, outlining in detail topics, appropriate age levels, and exemplary methods, have also often created detailed inservice training courses with assigned readings and viewing of materials. One example of this is a course which was outlined to begin in the fall of 1969 for the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools, North Carolina. This is a 10-week evening course which meets for three hours once a week and uses a variety of community professionals in different disciplines, in large lectures and in small group discussions. Family service and youth service agencies provide discussion leaders, with adult and parent adjunct courses. Though this is one of the more carefully designed programs, it is illustrative of current suggested approaches and trends which appear in many communities.

Nearly every community curriculum committee includes specific plans for teacher training in an inservice program as a vital part of the program's implementation. Some of the publishing companies and other commerical media producers have also entered the field of teacher training. Many of the materials produced for students have accompanying teacher guides and suggested manuals; others, such as Ealing Corporation's *Starting Tomorrow* program,[1] have been designed specifically for inservice teacher training courses. Specific materials (e.g., Dr. Duvall's *Dating Relationship* film series,[2] and the Margolis-Fleming *Sex Education* film series[3]) are designed primarily for or are most useful in teacher training.

STATE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

State departments of education, often in conjunction with State health departments or other State agencies, have responded to current demands for a stand on sex education in a variety of ways. Few have ignored the subject entirely; some have left it up to local communities by setting policy statements which allow the establishment of programs without providing State department guidelines and without requiring State department endorsement. Some have directed that certain topics be included and others have specified topics that must be excluded. Some States have written guidelines that are quite explicit as to appropriate subjects to be taught at each age level, who is to teach them, content outlines and materials to be included, as well as plans for community participation and procedures for implementation defined in detail. The range of involvement is wide, and State departments of education have been individualistic in the interpretation of their role.

In some cases, State legislation has been involved. Laws banning sex education have been introduced in several States, but few have passed (e.g., Massachusetts and New York); many passed have been relatively limited in demands for actual change in practice (e.g., Tennessee). Louisiana had a federally-funded program operating in New Orleans but has dropped the program since the legislature has banned sex education in the State. The State is undertaking a program to

determine appropriate policies, but until their findings are reported no courses will be allowed. Illinois presents an example of enacted legislation which is permissive, not mandatory, allowing communities to develop programs if there is sufficient local support.

Occasionally, legislation states that proposed local programs and materials must have the approval of the State board of education. Few have stringent restrictions aside from that. In California, Nevada, Utah, and more recently in New Jersey, the legislatures have banned all SIECUS materials from school curricula. SIECUS is primarily an information bureau, providing assistance, suggestions, and reference materials to communities planning to introduce sex education in their schools. Since it does not produce classroom materials, such legislation is unncessary. However, SIECUS has been under attack by agencies aligned with the extremist right to such an extent that both State officials and school systems in which there has been controversy over sex education have apparently concluded that any reference to SIECUS provides a threat to planned courses.

Most legal attacks against sex education programs, including suits against specific films and other materials, have been uncussessful in the courts. They have, however, influenced local or State departments to proceed slowly and occasionally to withdraw programs, at least temporarily. For example, Alaska met with community controversy to the extent that the curriculum guide was withdrawn and is being revised. Since the controversy quieted, the course has again been included in pilot curricula in some intermediate-level programs. This sequence of events is more frequent at the community level but has occurred at the State level on occasion.

Table 1 depicts State department responses to inquiries (described in the section, "Study Design: Methods"). Community positions will be noted separately; this segment is limited to answers from State-level personnel. Thirty-three of the 50 States responded directly; five additional States were represented by references in local community responses, indicating the status of those five States' direction of programs.

Categories may appear duplicated (for example, Massachusetts' position, leaving curriculum questions to the local communities' discretion, could be construed as a statement of policy). Only when a published policy statement was received were States classified in this category. When responses indicated that no positive action had been taken at the State level, but that the State department of education was aware of local program activity, the position was categorized as granting local option.

The majority of States that have developed written guidelines also have policy statements (e.g., Oregon and Colorado), but some have developed detailed guidelines with no stated recommendation or policy; the implication of State approval exists by inference. Wisconsin publishes a broad policy statement pointing out that the schools have a role in family life education and suggesting that communities "look at the American School Health Association's *Growth Patterns and Sex Education* as a guide when they plan their own programs." Therefore, Wisconsin is included in the category of States that have published guidelines, although it is the only reporting State approving a guide not prepared by its own staff.

Guidelines and policy statements present a differentiation problem. Some

Table 1

STATE LEVEL POLICIES AS DESCRIBED IN WRITTEN RESPONSES

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Provides curriculum guidelines	Policy or position statement	Program at local discretion	Program being developed	Response not clear	No program or plans
Alabama			xxxxxxxxxx			
Alaska				xxxxxxxxxx		
California	xxxxxxxxxx					
Colorado	xxxxxxxxxx					
Connecticut	xxxxxxxxxx					
Delaware					xxxxxxxxxx	
Florida		xxxxxxxxxx				
Georgia				xxxxxxxxxx		
Hawaii		xxxxxxxxxx				
Illinois	xxxxxxxxxx					
Indiana					xxxxxxxxxx	
Iowa	xxxxxxxxxx					
Kentucky			xxxxxxxxxx			
Louisiana			xxxxxxxxxx			
Maine			xxxxxxxxxx			
Maryland	xxxxxxxxxx					
Michigan	xxxxxxxxxx					
Mississippi						xxxxxxxxxx
Montana		xxxxxxxxxx				
Nevada	xxxxxxxxxx					
New York	xxxxxxxxxx					
North Carolina		xxxxxxxxxx				
Ohio	xxxxxxxxxx					
Oklahoma		xxxxxxxxxx				
Oregon	xxxxxxxxxx					
Pennsylvania	xxxxxxxxxx					
Tennessee		xxxxxxxxxx				
Texas	xxxxxxxxxx					
Utah			xxxxxxxxxx			
Virginia			xxxxxxxxxx			
Washington		xxxxxxxxxx				
West Virginia			xxxxxxxxxx			
Wisconsin	xxxxxxxxxx					
*Kansas			xxxxxxxxxx			
*Massachusetts			xxxxxxxxxx			
*Minnesota	xxxxxxxxx					
*Missouri			xxxxxxxxxx			
*New Jersey			xxxxxxxxxx			
Totals	15	7	11	2	2	1

*State department of education did not respond; information received from local sources.

policy statements, so entitled, are so detailed and specific that they are interpreted as guidelines for this tabulation. Some guidelines are so vague and general that they are placed in the statement category.

It is concluded that most States have taken a position on sex education at this point in time. Table 2 shows that 24 of the 38 reporting States (63%) fall into categories A, B, or D from Table 1, providing either guidelines or policy statements or being in the process of developing them at a State level. Eleven State departments (29%) have left the program entirely up to communities, with

Table 2

STATE INVOLVEMENT VS. LOCAL CONTROL

	Number of States	Percentage
State involvement by policy or guideline statements, current or planned	24	63
No state involvement, community level programs only	11	29
Totals	35	92

no State guidelines and occasionally with no State-level official recognition of program content or procedures.

It should be noted that some State departments reported concern about committing themselves with regard to sex education. Where there has been controversy or attack, there is understandable hesitancy about adopting definite program statements. A noteworthy reply from Oregon enclosed guidelines and quite explicit materials but stated, "We do not dictate to the local districts which material they should utilize. We provide the resources and recommend they survey their needs before selection is completed. We have utmost confidence in the local districts' professional and moral capacities in solving the problems of pornography within their own structure." Though Oregon was categorized as having State level guidelines, it is obvious that they respect local adoption prerogatives. Connecticut chose not to give names of local communities for reference. "Although many of our school systems are planning very carefully and integrating units on family life education in their schools, our Department follows the policy of protecting the schools from the many, many requests for information, observation and research, by not identifying them in any way."

Additional information concerning State policies is provided in the section examining State curriculum guides.

CURRICULUM GUIDELINES

Copies of guidelines were received from 13 States. New York did not submit a copy because portions of their sex education program are integrated into their various curriculum guides, comprising 42 volumes. Texas reported it had no more copies available; the other 13 publications offered a wide range of guidelines. They vary from an annotated bibliography with no further curriculum information (Minnesota) to broad concept guides (Oregon) to detailed curriculum outlines (Iowa). It was difficult to compare quantitatively such diverse approaches, but content analysis revealed some relevant bases of comparison. Only those areas which are expressly stated are included in Table 3. Intent is discussed in a following section. Selection of categories was not in any way indicative of areas of emphasis within the framework of the guidelines, but was instead based on areas felt to be of most interest to the Commission. Minnesota's guide was not included because of its solely bibliographic nature.

Table 3

12 STATE LEVEL GUIDELINES AND COMPARATIVE CONTENT

State	Teacher inservice training available	Students may be excused from sex education courses	Grade levels specified	Integrated into curriculum, not separate courses	Controversial topics specifically included**	Controversial topics specifically excluded
*Alaska	yes	not stated	K-12	not stated	1, 2, 3, 4	none
California	yes	not stated	K-12	not stated	1, 2, 3, 4	SIECUS materials; reproduction before age 9.
Colorado	yes	not stated	K-12	not stated	1, 2, 3	none
Connecticut	yes	local option	K-12	yes, lower grades	not stated	none
Illinois	yes, required and preservice	local option	1-12	broad framework	1, 2, 3, 4 and obscenity and pornography	"Booby traps" such as specific techniques in sensitive areas
Iowa	yes	local option	K-12	yes, at least correlated	1, 2, 3, 4	none
Ohio	yes	yes	K-12	yes	not stated	birth control (refer to parents)
Oregon	yes required	yes	K-12	K-6, part of health; 7-12, separate	not stated	none
Maryland	yes required	yes	all grades	not stated	2, 3, 4	Reproduction before age 10 or after age 12; erotic techniques of sexual intercourse
Michigan	yes, and preservice recommended	yes, by law	nursery-college	yes, by law	1, 2, 3, 4	Specific advice on contraception and sex practices; surveys of student activity; methods of VD prophylaxis
Pennsylvania	yes	not stated	K-13	yes	1, 2, 3, 4 (all in grade 13)	Sex techniques; birth control methods; VD prophylaxis
Nevada	yes	not stated	K-12	both, when desirable	not stated	none

*Guide withdrawn from circulation. No longer used.

**Key to topics: 1. masturbation; 2. homosexuality; 3. premarital intercourse or relations; 4. birth control, population control, or contraception.

Inservice training

Inservice training was mentioned in every guideline. Two States, Michigan and Illinois, specified that it is required for any teacher in the field, because it is included in State laws regulating sex education. They both also emphasize the importance of preservice training, and their laws encourage the incorporation of appropriate curricula at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Maryland and Oregon offer mandates in the teacher training field, rather than stating that it is desirable or recommended. Some guidelines spend as much time describing teacher training in detail, specifying content and technique, as they do for the student curriculum, though local curriculum guides are more specific than any of the State guides. Most guides offer broad criteria for teacher selection and recommended training. The importance of the factor of teacher preparation is emphasized by its universal inclusion.

Elective vs. compulsory

The second category, regarding the elective or compulsory nature of the programs, was treated in varied approaches. Michigan requires, by State law, that students be excused on parents' written request. The Illinois law states that local school systems must express a position in writing, but does not recommend either policy. Connecticut and Iowa leave this decision to local communities, but imply a preference for parental option, and suggest that alternate programs be available for those students who elect to avoid the courses. Michigan and Maryland insist that alternate programs be provided; they also state that those students who do not participate in the regular program must be given sex information in specified areas either by individual counseling or other means. Ohio stipulates that no student is obligated to take any sex education course or any course where sex education material is presented, and that parents must be informed of this policy.

Grade levels

The area of grade level inclusions in the curriculum is interesting; several noteworthy policies appear. Michigan supports sex education from nursery school through college and adulthood. Many other States suggest adult education, in parallel with earlier school programs, but without the continuum Michigan suggests. Pennsylvania includes grade 13 and only at this grade level introduces the more controversial topics. The guide seems to suggest that it is appropriate that the teacher borrow content from the higher grade levels (as in other curricula) if he feels the maturity of the student or students suggests its use. Though certain subject matter generally seems consistently offered between grades 1-4, 5-7, and 8-12, there is still controversy over the appropriate levels to offer subject matter.

Controversial topics

The final two categories are indicative of the varying approaches to controversial topics. It should be noted that some guides are so general that no

specific topics are named, but the concepts are so discussed that the guides permit local systems to include or exclude sensitive areas. Oregon and Connecticut intentionally outline objectives allowing for local option in degree of permissiveness. They relinquish State authority to the degree that they offer position statements marked by noninterference policies. Ohio, on the other hand, stresses local decision; the position is apparently prompted by local problems, and attempts to allow sufficient flexibility so that the State position is not vulnerable to attack. Several specific topic areas are excluded, apparently because of potential controversy. The Ohio State guide requires that birth control not be discussed in the classroom; if the subject arises it is to be referred to parent, physician, or clergyman. Ohio also outlaws the distribution to students of duplicated diagrammatic drawings of the reproductive system or of vacabulary lists concerned with reproduction. It is suggested that any such lists used should be removed from chalkboards immediately after classroom sessions.

California is among those excluding SIECUS materials from offered curricula in the State. It also specifies that discussion programs or instructional materials based on reproduction shall not be introduced before age nine. Maryland specifies that "The specific timing shall be a matter of local option, but direct teaching of human reproduction shall not begin earlier than age ten nor later than age twelve." (*Standards and Procedures for Family Life and Human Development Programs,* Maryland State Department of Education.)

Three States, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, all of which have detailed topic outlines which seem all-inclusive, attempt to limit and direct discussions in the controversial areas. Illinois asks its systems to avoid "booby traps" such as discussions of specific sex techniques, or recommendations of methods of contraception or venereal disease prophylaxis. It is not required that these areas be ignored, but rather suggested that they be diverted into comprehensive approaches, and not emphasized as major topics. The last of a nine-point set of "Guiding Principles of Family Life and Sex Education" in the Illinois policy statement discusses these areas and goes on to state, "However, it is desirable that appropriate instruction be included on topics such as petting, premarital chastity versus premarital sexual intercourse, masturbation, VD education, pornography and obscenity, the dangers of world population explosion, and selected legal aspects of sexual behavior." Michigan makes a similar statement and Pennsylvania and Maryland advise avoiding "erotic techniques of sexual intercourse" and similar inappropriate topics.

Illinois is the only State which discusses the topic of pornography and obscenity specifically in its guide, but many of the guides allude to the subject. Ohio lists several arguments for sex education; among them is stated, "Relaxed censorship has flooded the market with sexually stimulating materials . . . ." Oregon implies that the availability of pornography is an influential factor, and several States express belief in the theory that exposure to accurate and authoritatively approved material will alleviate interest in exaggerated and exploitive materials. Every guide states or implies this intent, though sometimes obliquely.

The category of coeducational versus segregated instruction is deleted in this survey, because all but one State ignores it. Only Maryland mentions this point; the choice is left to the community, but any community which decides to

segregate the sexes, at any level, is obliged to teach the same material to both groups.

Content comparisons

Striking similarities in both State and local programs are apparent. A number of basic tenets concerning sex education in public schools appear to be universally accepted. Interpretations of issues may vary, but these seven major topics are generally agreed on as areas of positive concern:

1. *The program must react to community individuality.* Whether sophistication or inhibition, the general community attitude should be a major consideration and should guide the planning.

2. *Sequence of basic concepts.* Most programs first introduce the concept of self and the child's family relationships, and then maturation and puberty, heterosexual relations, marriage and adult family relationships.

3. *Methods.* Consistent use of self-written materials, audiovisual techniques; emphasis on dialog and small group discussion.

4. *Emphasis on vocabulary.* The importance of vocabulary study, as a tool to present facts, and as a method of establishing ease of discussion.

5. *Teacher-training.* Adequate teacher preparation with stress on inservice training to achieve minimal instructional capability.

6. *Family-living framework.* Inclusion of psychological, sociological, and physiological aspects (never anatomical facts in isolation)—stress on sexual education rather than sex education.

7. *Evaluation.* Some means of continual evaluation of programs is consistently recommended.

Areas of controversy are also consistently apparent. Most of these factors have been left to local option, and communities differ in their decisions as to how to treat them, as clearly indicated in the results of the questionnaire survey. There are seven major areas that create controversy or question in implementation of most programs.

1. *Segregation of sexes vs. coed instruction.* Most communities segregate for puberty discussions and controversial issues. Most offer coed classes for most of the program so as not to make it appear unlike other instructional areas.

2. *Voluntary participation.* Most communities allow students to be excused. Some communities treat it as any other subject and offer no option for withdrawal from classes.

3. *Sex education as a separate course, or integrated into other topics.* Most communities integrate to some extent, but there is a distinct difference of opinion as to which method is best.

4. *Teacher-training.* Opinions as to how much training and what type of training is needed differ widely. Some schools employ professional medical personnel to

present the subject apart from the rest of the curriculum. The area of teacher preparation needs more research.

5. *The "morals" issue.* Religious and ethical problems, treatment of chastity, approach to deviations, and the teaching of moral values are areas often under attack and are still controversial in most systems.

6. *Sensitive content areas.* Sensitive areas of content such as masturbation, homosexuality, premarital intercourse, and birth control are usually quite controversial; most States make position statements concerning them.

7. *Appropriate grade levels.* The time to teach specific concepts presents a challenge to most communities. Research has given several differing answers; authorities are not in agreement. Each community must decide on appropriate approaches.

The State guides which seem most positive and complete are those of Maryland, Michigan, and Illinois. These present careful analyses of the many problems and clearly define methods of approach. California's guide is in the format of a collection of independent studies of separate areas of curriculum and implementation. Local responses representing active, effective programs reflect the State position. San Francisco, San Diego, San Mateo County, Contra Costa County, and Hayward are among those having outlined careful guides and having currently active programs. In Maryland, the Anne Arundel County curriculum guide is outstanding in its comprehension; a complete teacher training program is included. States taking the firm position that the community should exercise full autonomy, such as Oregon and North Carolina, have elicited equally effective programs. Raleigh and Winston-Salem have prepared extensive programs, as have many communities in Oregon. In Massachusetts, where a sex education ban has just been defeated in the legislature, some localities are struggling for program acceptance, while others have had well established programs for a number of years. Bedford and Newton appear to have effective programs, while Lexington is still in the planning stages. Evanston, Illinois is often given credit for the first sex education program, over 25 years old and still flourishing. Other communities which submitted comprehensive guides include: Bexley, Columbus, and Trotwood, Ohio; Lankenau County, Pennsylvania; Hurst and Dallas, Texas; Logan City, Utah; Wassau County, Wisconsin; Denver, Colorado; Fayette County, Kentucky; Topeka, Kansas; and Ferguson-Florissant District, Missouri.

Geographic distribution is scattered apart from the Southern States. Georgia's State department of education indicates that a State curriculum guide is being prepared and will be completed by 1971. Louisiana has had some pilot programs and some legislative debate, but no sex education is currently offered. Tennessee has recently passed limiting legislation. Alabama has some courses included in the health education curriculum for the 11th and 12th grades. Mississippi offers no guide nor any current plans for the development of guidelines.

The national status of program development is further reflected in sections reporting results of the community questionnaires.

CURRICULUM MATERIALS

An appended bibliography (Appendix A) lists the most comprehensive materials from agencies, States, and local communities. Many are annotated, and many specify recommended grade levels and presentation formats. The bibliography also lists separately a sampling of materials available from commercial suppliers.

The materials available range from conservative to extremely frank and explicit; from Kimberly Clark's[4] to Sterling's[5] film series at about $4,000; from simple charts to video-tape presentations and color microphotographs of ovum and sperm. Materials exist to suit the taste of every school system.

The commercial materials are often prepared under the direction of professionals in medicine, psychology, and psychiatry. They reflect a more frank and sometimes more clinical approach than is usual in locally prepared materials, and many appear to be in conflict with the apparent community trend to emphasize *sexuality* rather than *sex*.

Few comprehensive all-level programs are produced commercially, however, and the existing ones rarely appear to be adopted as published. The norm is the careful selection of materials to fit the locally prepared or modified guide, relying on the teacher to clarify concepts and to supplement the initial presentation.

Curriculum material selection for sex education programs is keyed to the program philosophy adopted by the school system and the community. Illustrative of the varying philosophical frameworks set by school systems are the titles chosen for their courses; over 60% of this study's public school questionnaire sample offering a separate course in sex education termed it "Family Living." Only 8% title their program "Sex Education," and only three other title variants refer to the term sex: "Sex, Love, and Marriage," "Human Sexuality," and "Human Sexuality and Family Living." Other titles reported are:

Social Development and Physical Maturation
Education for Parenthood
Education for Life
Growth and Development
Human Relations
Family Life Education
Growing Toward Maturity
Human Growth and Development
Life Science
Social Health

The majority of respondents do not offer separate courses, but include sex education as a part of other courses. Of 117 systems reporting such combined courses, 59 include sex education as part of health, 47 as part of science, 26 as part of physical education, 25 as part of home economics, and 4 as part of sociology. Other courses reported to include sex education were social studies, social sciences, psychology, theology (a private school), and guidance. Course placement and program philosophy to some extent dictate materials selection.

Of those questionnaire respondents offering programs, 72.8% indicate that their system either involved parents directly or kept them informed of planning

during development of the program. This process presents another selection factor, since the recommended and common practice is to present instructional materials, particularly audiovisual and visual materials, to parent groups and parent committees for preliminary review. Some limiting criteria often must be used, such as another system's guides or State guidelines.

Beyond general patterns for selection set by these initial influences, specific limitations may be set. For example, Anne Arundel County, Maryland mentions specific audiovisual materials that will be excluded from the program at a stated grade level; the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County, North Carolina guide states that only films from a provided list will be used at stated grade levels. Some States insist that materials be approved by the State Level Board after selection at the local level.

A third selection factor is keyed to teaching techniques. It is generally agreed currently that the lecture by an outside speaker, formerly much used in sex education, is not the most useful technique if used as an isolated program. It is recommended that every attempt be made to treat sex education as a routine and commonly accepted program, marked by as little departure as possible from usual practice. At the same time, it appears to be a general opinion that few teachers are adequately prepared to present concepts in sex education (see "Teacher Training"). Therefore, most systems turn to texts or audiovisual materials for extensive help in initial presentations; these are then followed by teacher-directed group discussion.

The chief problem of most school systems in the planning stages has been selection of those materials of the highest quality and those most appropriate for the specific local community.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Communities contemplating the inclusion of programs concerned with sex education in the curriculum can turn to a number of sources for encouragement and substantive aid. The National Education Association and its various subgroups strongly support the movement to install effective programs in sex education in schools and provide guides, materials, resource units, survey reports, and policy statements. The NEA groups actively involved are the Professional Rights and Responsibilities Commission, which recently published *Suggestions for Defense Against Extremist Attack: Sex Education in the Public Schools;* the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education; the Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education; the School Health Education Study; and the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Other supportive educational organizations are the Child Study Association of America; the National School Public Relations Association; the National Council of the Urban Education Association; Urban Executive Directors Association; American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors; the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (PTA); the National School Boards Association and American Association of School Administrators; and the American School Health Association.

Health organizations providing support are the American Medical Association, which has given strong support in statements, resolutions, and bibliographic

materials, and has initiated the development of sex education curriculum in medical schools; the American Social Health Association; the American Academy of Pediatrics; the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Committee on Maternal Health; and the American Public Health Association, Governing Council.

A number of agencies concerned with family living and family relations provide material and program support; included are the National Council on Family Relations; the Family Service Association of America; the General Committee on Family Life, United Methodist Churches; the American Institute of Family Relations; and the Planned Parenthood Association.

Religious organizations providing support to groups preparing sex education programs include the National Council of Churches; the Synagogue Council of America; the United States Catholic Conference; the Unitarian Universalist Association; and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Among those Federal agencies providing support to sex education programs are the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education; the Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth; and the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The SIECUS position has been documented in other portions of this report. It is perhaps the most influential supportive group and at the same time the most frequently attacked.

The Institute for American Democracy, Inc., accepts a role similar to that of the NEA's Rights and Responsibilities Commission in this field, primarily providing aid in reacting to extremist groups.

An unusual and effective source of support for programs, primarily as a materials resource center, is the Cleveland Health Museum. In addition to presenting excellent programs, it provides curriculum advice and consultant resources.

While acknowledging the responsibility of home and church in providing education about sexuality, these groups provide support to those organizations that feel the schools also have a role to play in sex education.

At the same time, it is apparent that any community planning a sex education program may expect opposition from one or several of the following groups: MOTOREDE (Movement to Restore Decency), a group affiliated directly with the John Birch Society; the Christian Crusade, with Gordon Drake as spokesman (particularly active in Oklahoma); the Conservative Society of America, Voice of America, and the Herald of Freedom—all affiliated with the John Birch Society. In many communities, local citizens' action groups, with acronyms, have been formed. Some of them are:

SOS	Sanity on Sex
MOMS	Mothers Organized for Moral Stability
CPR	Citizens for Parents' Rights
PAUSE	People Against Unconstitutional Sex Education
CCCI	Citizens Committee of California, Inc.
MDA	Mothers for Decency in Action
CCIC	Concerned Citizens Information Council
POSE	Parents Opposed to Sex Education
CHIDE	Committee to Halt Indoctrination and Demoralization in Education

ACRE Associate Citizens for Responsible Education
PURE Parents United for Responsible Education
PRIDE Parents and Residents Interested in Decent Education

For example, our questionnaire elicited the following statements:

Kansas:

"A pilot study was proposed for upper elementary grades but groups quickly formed to oppose it."

Montana:

"We fear the influence of John Birchers."

Oklahoma:

"A group called Sanity on Sex interfered."

Nashville, Tennessee

Illustrative of the effective campaigns conducted by the latter groups is the sequence of events in Nashville, Tennessee when the public school system attempted to develop a sex education program.

On July 22, 1968, the Public Schools of Metropolitan Nashville, Davidson County, received a Federal grant under Title III, ESEA, in the amount of $20,461 for "development of a curriculum guide in family life and sex education." The official curriculum committee, as noted in the school board minutes of July 23, 1968, was to be chaired by Mrs. Margaret Kerr; Mr. H. B. McDonough was named program director. The official curriculum committee included:

Sister Mary Bonaventure	St. Bernard Academy Convent
Miss Eugenia Dudley	Guidance Teacher East Nashville Junior High School
Fred Forehand	Science and Physical Education Teacher North Nashville High School
Sister Mary George	Overbrook School
Mrs. Carmelia D. Gregory	Guidance Teacher North Nashville High School
Mrs. Dorothy Hodges	Science Teacher Washington Junior High School
Arthur Irwin	Principal Amqui School
Mrs. Dorothy Mason	Third Grade Teacher John Early School
Mrs. Beatrice Roberts	WEEP Program Rose Park Junior High School
Mrs. Beulah Robinson	Principal Stanford Elementary School
Richard Roche	Sociology Teacher Madison High School

Mrs. Louise Smith	Health Teacher Channel 2 (NET)
Mrs. Valeira Smithson	Home Economics Teacher Hillsboro High School
Howard Wolery	Guidance Teacher Madison High School

At the same time, a citizens' advisory committee was named to support and review the work of the curriculum committee, consisting of:

Dr. Robert Bjork	Sociologist, Peabody College
George R. Bratton	Juvenile Court
Dr. Dorothy Brown	Physician
Mrs. Eleanor Jean	Nashville Mental Health Association
Mrs. Camilla Caldwell	Director, Metro Welfare Department
Rabbi Randall Falk	Family and Children's Service
Dr. Dan Sanders	Family and Children's Service
Mrs. Bruce McGinn	Family and Children's Service
Reverend Bob Mowrey	Pastor, Park Avenue Baptist Church
Mrs. Clyde Norris	Representing the PTA
Mrs. Marvin Hill	Representing the PTA
Mrs. E. C. Miller	Chairman, Metro Council of PTA
John D. Whalley	Attorney, representing Nashville area Chamber of Commerce
Father James Zralek	Holy Name Church
Tandy W. Wilson III	Metro Councilman and Chairman of the Council School Committee
George H. Cate, Jr. (Former Vice Mayor)	Representing Civic Committee on Public Education
Mrs. Lyman B. Burbank	Planned Parenthood Association
Frank Weir	Methodist Publishing House
Mrs. Irwin B. Eskind	Member, Metro Board of Education

A chronological notation of subsequent events follows, listing reports appearing chiefly in the *Nashville Tennessean* and the *Nashville Banner* as the work of the committee proceeded. The headline quotations are italicized.

October 26, 1968

Students May See Film on Pregnancy. A straightforward report of the program being developed by the school system *(Tennessean).*

February 27, 1969

'Sexually Illiterate' Soviet Tied to Prudish Teachers. A UPI report, from Moscow, reporting that a Soviet psychiatrist is concerned that Soviet children do not know about sex, and that he feels that greater knowledge would improve their 'morality quotient' *(Tennessean).*

March 9, 1969

Letter to the Editor. A woman wrote the *Tennessean* expressing concern that children would turn out badly if they had sex education from K to 12 *(Tennessean).*

March 11, 1969

Warren Scores Sex Education. Metropolitan Nashville Councilman-at-Large James Warren said he was opposed to sex education in the schools unless it was to be approved by a public referendum. The article indicated that he was completely against sex education installed without public referendum *(Tennessean).*

March 12, 1969

Funds Set for Gym Teachers. The chairman of Movement to Restore Decency (MOTOREDE), M. L. Peters, was refused an opportunity to deliver a speech about the proposed "Family Life and Sex Education" program to the Board of Education. The board chairman said he would have to wait until the committee doing the study to develop the program made its proposal to the Board of Education *(Tennessean).*

Incidentally, a one-page mimeographed sheet entitled "Pitfalls in Sex Education" was handed out to those attending the Council of Parent-Teacher Associations Meeting on March 4, 1969 (see Appendix B).

March 14, 1969

The *Nashville Tennessean* announced in an editorial that a smear campaign appeared to have started to block a proposed program of sex education in the schools. It called the campaign irrational.

March 18, 1969

The chairman of the Metropolitan Nashville Board of Education stated that the Board would not approve any program that did not have "broad community support" *(Nashville Banner).*

March 21, 1969

The *Banner* reported that Dr. Gordon V. Drake would be speaking at the Free Will Baptist Bible College auditorium. Dr. Drake was, at that time, the Director of Education for the Christian Crusade. This organization is led by Billy James Hargis, and is known for its attempts to relate sex education with Communism. Drake's appearance was being sponsored by MOTOREDE.

March 21, 1969

The Nashville Education Association charged that the opposition to the proposed sex education program originated with extremist groups *(Tennessean).*

March 21, 1969

Councilman Warren called for the resignation of the Director of Schools, Dr. John H. Harris, because of the proposed sex education program. It was noted that this attack on Harris by Warren was possibly a rekindling of a standing feud between the two men.

March 24, 1969

Many Parents Shocked on Hearing Details of Sex Education Plan Here. The *Banner* reported:

"An unbelievable threat is hanging over the heads of mothers and fathers who are concerned about the future of their children attending classes in the Nashville public schools.

"It exists not merely because a program of 'family life and sex education' has been developed for use in the classrooms, but rather because of the kind of curriculum—complete with raw and ugly references written by nationally-known authors of smut—which has been prepared for the Nashville schools. Parents declared they have found some of the source material obscene and cynical."

March 25, 1969

The *Banner* published a report from the Copley News Service which attempted to relate sex education to a Communist plot. It stated that sex education programs in our schools are based on the "conditioned reflex" discovery of Ivan Pavlov, a Russian physiologist. Further generalization included "sensitivity training" as another extension of the Communist-Russian plot to decay our "moral values," also based on Pavlov's Theory.

March 25, 1969

The *Tennessean* reported that Dr. Drake of the Christian Crusade attacked SIECUS and Billy Graham in a speech, while the *Banner* reported that Drake attacked SIECUS, NEA, and HEW, and stated that sex education in the schools will drive a wedge between parents, children, and God.

March 25, 1969

A public hearing on sex education was held today at 7:00 p.m. at the War Memorial Auditorium. It was called by the Metropolitan Council, under a resolution sponsored by Councilman James Warren.

March 25, 1969

The *Banner* reported that Dr. William L. Scholes (D-Nashville) today introduced a resolution in the (Tennessee) House of Representatives calling "for education officials to leave the teaching of sex education within the province of the home and use monies programmed for such purpose to provide for additional teachers."

March 26, 1969

Dr. John H. Harris received the March 25 report and resubmitted it to his three District Superintendents for "more study." It appeared to be a move to shelve the report.

March 26, 1969

The *Tennessean* compared the local community atmosphere to that of Salem, Massachusetts, in 1692, in an editorial report.

March 26, 1969

The *Banner* carried an article entitled *Smut Sale Fine Hike Bill Passes* on the same page reporting its story on sex education.

March 26, 1969

The *Tennessean* reported that at a public hearing it was announced that the public was against sex education 6-1, while the *Banner* reports a 10-1 public reaction.

March 27, 1969

The *Tennessean* carried an editorial entitled *Hysteria Hurts Education,* evidencing the paper's continuing support of the planned program.

March 30, 1969

The *Tennessean* carried an article entitled *Smears, Ignorance Cloud Issue of Sex Education.*

March 31, 1969

NEA Consultant, Robert Bogen, in an article in the *Tennessean,* indicated that the Birch-sponsored materials appeared to be more pornographic than the curriculum guide. The materials described were being distributed by the Tom Anderson Bookstore, an American Opinion bookstore, and a John Birch Society outlet.

March 31, 1969

The *Banner* printed an article stating that Superintendent Harris had submitted two separate proposals for the sex education study.

April 1, 1970

The *Banner* printed an article stating that the original sex education proposal indicated that the study might provide a sex education guide for the entire State.

April 3, 1969

With the initial report appearing April 3, the *Tennessean* published, in over seventy daily installments, the proposed sex education curriculum guide. This was an effort to eliminate uninformed speculation by making the materials in question public information.

April 16, 1969

The *Banner* reported that the Metropolitan Council asked the Board of Education to drop sex education. A parliamentary stalling action was reported which was expected to do no more than delay introduction of prohibitive legislation another three weeks.

April 17, 1969

An editorial in the *Banner* praised the Metropolitan Nashville Council for its action of the previous day.

April 17, 1969

The *Banner* reported that Representative W. L. Scholes and Senator James

Roberson have introduced a bill to the legislature asking for a ban on sex education.

May 1, 1969

The *Tennessean* reports that the State Senate has passed a bill to curb sex education in schools. House Representative Scholes stated that the Senate had removed important elements from his bill.

May 7, 1969

Accoding to the *Tennessean,* Councilman C. W. Warren made a parliamentary move that "inadvertently killed his own anti-sex education resolution." The error was passed unanimously.

May 9, 1969

The *Banner* reported that the legislature had voted 81 to 7 to ban sex education in schools. They quoted Scholes as stating that there are three institutions: the church, the home, and the schools, of which the first two were instituted by God Himself.

May 9, 1969

Councilman Warren submitted another anti-sex education bill, reported by the *Banner.*

May 21, 1969

The *Banner* reported that Councilman Warren's new bill, prohibiting sex education from being taught in Nashville, was passed 25 to 11.

A concluding event is the passage of Senate Bill Number 656, stated as follows:

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, that it shall be unlawful for any person in any manner to teach courses in sex education pertaining to homo sapiens in the public, elementary, junior high, or high schools in the State of Tennessee unless the courses are approved by the State Board of Education and the local school board involved and taught by qualified instructors as determined by the local school board involved. 'Provided, however, physiology, health, physical education or home economics taught to classes.'

SECTION 2. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that it shall be a misdemeanor for anyone to violate provisions of this Act, and shall be punishable as such.

SECTION 3. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that this Act shall take effect upon its passage, the public welfare requiring it.

The interesting points of the Nashville situation involve the following facts:

The sex education program was developed by Nashville teachers, using Federal funds, with parent and community involvement from its inception.

The materials, as reported in the *Tennessean,* represented a relatively conservative program. The program, as presented in the curriculum guide, was not complete or final. It was to be introduced only after a series of revisions and committee approvals. Most of the procedures suggested by agencies influential in the field for successful implementation of a program were followed.

By apparent coincidence, Dr. Drake appeared in Nashville at the time the *Banner* initially printed a major condemnation of the sex education curriculum then in preparation.

Resistance to the program was primarily organized by national rather than local forces. The polarization of the two local newspapers appeared to be an influential factor in the controversy. Whether this factor represents cause or effect is still open to question.

Rational discussion of the planned program, with the possibility of mutually determined revisions and modifications, seemed to disappear as a possibility, once opposing national groups evidenced an interest in the fate of the program.

SEX EDUCATION VS. INTEREST IN PORNOGRAPHY

As reported in the Study Design section, no study has yet established a positive relationship between the implementation of effective sex education programs and a subsequent reduction of interest in pornography. This report attempts only a subjective examination of the relationship, based on questionnaire results.

Of the respondents reporting an existent sex education program, 35.5% stated that the hope of reducing interest in pornography was part of the original rationale for the program; 40% stated that this relationship had not been considered, with several questioning the wisdom of attempting to infer the possibility of such a relationship; and 24.5% had no opinion, did not know, or had not thought of the possible relationship.

In contrast, 57.7% of respondents felt that effective sex education programs *would* result in a subsequent reduction of interest in pornography; 12.2% did not feel that it would, and 30.1% did not know.

Asked if it was possible that sex education might result in an increased interest in pornography, only 4.4% felt that it might; 78.8% felt that it would not; and 16.7% did not know.

The following comments were received from local school systems within the noted States, supporting their questionnaire responses.

New York

> "Noted increase in mature attitude toward human sexuality . . . giggling, embarrassment, etc., disappear."

Texas

> "Publicizing pornography increases interest, *not* sex education courses." (Emphasis theirs)
>
> "Classroom climate is not usually sufficiently emotional [to increase interest in pornography]."
>
> "Studies should be done on 'reasons for interest in pornography.' Many of the present studies are inaccurate."

Montana

> "Interest in pornography thrives on lack of knowledge, and curiosity."

Missouri

"I believe it [sex education] is our best avenue for combatting pornography."

"More likely to result in a more healthy attitude *toward* pornography." (Emphasis theirs)

"A woman from the Kinsey Institute made a flat statement at a meeting that the relationship [between sex education classes and increased interest in pornography] had been proven and congress was about to step into the sex education picture in a positive way."

California

"Very noticeable reduction in four-letter words used in writing on walls, etc."

Maine

"Absolutely not! Can interest be any higher than now [in pornography]?"

Alabama

"We did not know about drugs or have any problem until they taught us about them in school."

Connecticut

"The Swedish experience seems to indicate that unrestricted pornography reduces interest."

These subjective reports clearly indicate that the majority of those now involved in sex education programs feel their efforts are resulting, or will result, in reduced interest in pornography, although many had not originally anticipated this result. Additional research is necessary in this area.

REFERENCES

Auerback, R. C. *An analysis of science and health textbooks relative to objectives of sex education.* State University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.

Bell, A. P. Adolescent sexuality and the schools. *North Central Association Quarterly,* Spring 1969, *43* (4), 342-347.

Benell, F. B. Frequency of misconceptions and reluctance to teach controversial topics related to sex among teachers. *Research Quarterly, AAHPER,* March 1969, *40* (1), 11-16.

Bloom, J. L. Sex education for handicapped adolescents. *Journal of School Health,* June 1969, *39* (6), 363-367.

Broderick, C. B., et al. *The individual, sex and society* (A SIECUS handbook). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

Broderick, C. B., et al. *Sex education. Kaleidoscope.* Stony Brook, New York: SCOPE–Suffolk Educational Center, 1968.

Calderone, M. S. Sexuality and the college student. *Journal of American College Health, 17* (3), 189-193.

Child Study Association of America, Inc. *Sex education and the new morality. A search for a meaningful social ethic.* New York: 1967.

Darden, J. S. The report to the governing council of the study committee on

health guidance in sex education. *Journal of School Health,* March 1969, *39* (3), 189-190.
Elias, J., & Gebhard, P. Sexuality and sexual learning in childhood. *Phi Delta Kappan,* March 1969, *50* (7), 401-405.
Family Life Education. *A guide to curriculum. Metropolitan effort toward regional opportunity, Wethersfield, Connecticut.* Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Education, 1967.
Furstenberg, F., Jr., et al. Birth control knowledge and attitudes among unmarried pregnant adolescents: A preliminary report. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* February 1969, *31* (1), 34-42.
Gordon, S. *Facts about sex for exceptional youth.* East Orange, N. J.: New Jersey Association for Brain Injured Children, 1969.
Gudridge, B. M. *Sex education in schools. EDUCATION U.S.A. Special Report (9th).* Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1969.
Harter, C. L., & Parrish, V. W., Jr. Maternal preference of socialization agent for sex education. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 1968, *30* (3), 418-426.
Hoyman, H. S. Should we teach about birth control in high school sex education? *Educational Digest,* February 1969.
Juhasz, A. M. Background factors, extent of sex knowledge and source of information. *Journal of School Health,* January 1969, *39* (1), 32-39.
Kerckhoff, R. K., et al. Community experiences with the 1969 attack on sex education. *The Family Coordinator.* January 1970, *19* (1).
Kilander, H. F. *Sex Education in the Schools.* New York: Macmillan, 1970.
Kirkendall, L. A., & Levin, M. D. Sex education and the physician: A comment and a reply. *Independent School Bulletin,* May 1969, *28* (4), 7-9.
Kirkendall, L. A., & Miles, G. S. Sex education research. *Review of Educational Research,* December 1968, *38* (5).
Koontz, E. Teen-agers speak out about sex: A symposium of high school students and a reaction by Elizabeth Koontz. *Today's Education,* March 1969, *58* (3), 23-26.
Lee, I. K., & Stith, M. Opinions about sex education held by low-income Negro mothers. *Journal of Home Economics,* May 1969, *51* (5), 359-362.
Lonsway, F. A. The developing literature on occupational choice. *High School Journal,* February 1969, *52* (5), 260-269.
Luckey, E. B. Sex education: Develop an attitude before you develop a program. *American School Board Journal,* April 1969, *156* (10), 20-22. (a)
Luckey, E. B. Sex education stop, look, and listen. *Journal of Home Economics,* January 1969, *61* (1), 31-34. (b)
Mamaroneck Pilot Study. Sex education in the sixth grade. *Educational Digest,* February 1969.
McGuigan, F. E. Social revolution and sex education. *Clearing House,* March 1969, *43* (7), 421-424.
McIntire, W. G. Attitudes of Connecticut principals towards family life education. *Journal of School Health,* March 1969, *39* (3), 183-185.
Michigan State Department of Education. *A broadly representative bibliography of materials on sex education.* Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education, 1969.
Meyerstein, A. N. Agreed, Dr. Hoyman, but... *Journal of School Health,* April

1969, *39* (4), 252-253.
New York City Board of Education. *Family living including sex education.* Brooklyn: New York City Board of Education, 1967.
Pieretti, G. *A guide for teaching personal and family relationships, a book of teaching plans.* Carson City: Nevada State Department of Education, 1963.
Pohlman, E. Premarital contraception and the school. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1968, *49* (9), 495-500.
Lloyd, H. M., & Wrightstone, J. W. *Family living, including sex education, final report.* Brooklyn: New York City Board of Education, 1968.
Montagu, A. The pill, the sexual revolution, and the schools. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1968, *49* (9), 480-484.
Rovetch, W. *SMSA America and the urbanized campus.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1969.
Rubin, I., & Kirkendall, L. A. (Eds.) *Sex in the adolescent years: New directions in guiding and teaching youth.* New York: Association Press, 1968.
Sara, N. G., et al. *A teaching program in health and sex education, parts I, II, and III.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1968.
Schiller, P. Sex education that makes sense. *NEA Journal,* 1968, *57* (2), 17-19.
Schlaretzki, E. C. Incubation and sex education. *Children,* April 1969, *6* (7), 9-10.
Scriven, M. Putting the sex back into sex education. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1968, *49* (9), 485-489.
SIECUS Study Guides, NOS 1-8. New York: Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, 1968.
Singer-Magdoff, L. *Sex education materials.* New York: Film News Company, 1969.
Thompson, A. G., & DeRoche, E. F. Sex education: Parent involvement in decision making. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1968, *49* (9), 501-503.
Toohey, J. V. Sex education, water fluoridation and Dr. Sigmund Freud. *Journal of School Health,* January 1969, *39* (1), 70-73.
Too much too soon? 'New style' sex education on the defensive everywhere. *Nation's Schools,* August 1969, *84* (2), 19,22,24.
United Church of Canada. *Some guides for sex education and marriage preparation.* Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1968.
Watt, L. B. *Family life and sex education. A bibliography.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1966.
Wiechmann, G. Marriage preparation in education for health. *The Journal of the American College Health Association,* 1968, *17* (2), 100-106.
Williams, S. R. Family life and sex education. *NASSP BULLETIN,* 1968, *52* (326), 49-55.
Withrow, F. B., & Lisensky, R. *The development of a sex education curriculum for a state residential school for the deaf.* Jacksonville, Illinois School for Deaf, 1966.

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agency bibliographies

American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (NEA), 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D. C.

Catalog of Publications 1969-1970. Includes references in sex education.

Sex Education Resource Units: Grades K-4, 5-7, 1969. 71 student references, 126 teacher references, 63 other general references. Well annotated section on supplementary teaching aids, films, filmstrips and slides, transparencies, charts, catalogs, teaching lists, primarily commercially produced.

American Medical Association, for Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. 60610

Miracle of Life and Sex Education Series. Seven booklets specifically relevant to sex education. Four are for parents, the other three for children. About 20 more about related areas of health care. Also a health education materials catalog. Two booklets on physiology included.

American School Health Association, Committee on Health Guidance in Sex Education, 515 East Main St., Kent, Ohio

Growth Patterns and Sex Education. 1967. An extensive bibliography emphasizing texts and audiovisuals with other materials.

Cleveland Health Museum, Euclid at 89th St., Cleveland, Ohio

Teacher's Guide for Instructed Classes, 1968-1969. Given to teachers planning to accompany classes to the Museum. Comprehensive program of long standing. Includes series of films on "Sex in American Culture." No bibliography, but list of above films and several others.

Family Life Publications, Moorhead, Minnesota

Family Life and Sex Education: A Graded Program, 1967. J. Mark Perrin, Ed.D., and Thomas E. Smith, Ed.D. Contains over 100 references, noted as to "student" or "adult" sources.

Family Service Association of America, 44 East 23rd Street, New York, New York

Agency Sources for Material on Sex Education: B-22F. 1969. A list of agencies or associations which prepare accepted information on sex education. Also a list of publications.

Marriage, Parenthood and Family Relationships—Reading references on. A list of 68 books and over 100 pamphlets on family life.

Minnesota Council on Family Relations, 1219 University Avenue, Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Family Life–Literature and Films. 1970. This is a 189-page bibliography of books, pamphlets, films, tapes, carefully categorized into sections such as The American Family, Perspectives, Human Sexuality and Sex Education, etc. Each section has its own appropriately annotated bibliography.

National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York.

Sex Education in Major Protestant Denominations. John H. Phillips, Ph. D. This does not have a separate bibliography, but cites volumes used by each denomination; relies heavily on publications of Concordia Press.

National Council on Family Relations, 1219 University Avenue, S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Journal of Marriage and the Family, Volume 32, Number 1, February 1970. Of the 22 articles at least 16 are directly connected with some form of sex education. References to many other articles. Book reviews.

The Family Coordinator: Journal of Education, Counseling, and Services, Volume 19, Number 1, January 1970. 17 articles devoted to family living; some have extensive reference lists, mostly to other articles. Final article of particular interest–"Community Experiences with the 1969 Attack on Sex Education."

National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Family Life and Sex Education in the Elementary School. 1968. Helen Manley. Bibliography by grade levels; 66 items, some prepared for students, some for teacher training.

National School Public Relations Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Sex Education in Schools. 1969. *EDUCATION U.S.A.* Special Report. A general discussion of what has been and might be done in public schools; surveys current status of states and communities. Bibliography of 67 items; about half are curriculum guides of various public schools. Also books, pamphlets, journals and magazine articles, agency aids, and audiovisuals.

New England School Development Council, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts.

Sex Education Programs for Public Schools. 1968. A booklet of four articles, two appendices which are bibliographies of books and audiovisual teaching aids.

Planned Parenthood Publications, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, New York.

Planned Parenthood Publications. 1970. This is a catalog of literature offered by Planned Parenthood–World Population. A variety of reprints and current publications pertinent to their own purposes are available from PPP.

Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), 1855 Broadway, New York, New York.

Sexuality and Man. 1970. Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York. A complete chapter devoted to resources used and a bibliography.

State and local curriculum guide bibliographies

Alaska

Guidelines to Human Sexuality Education. 1967. Withdrawn from circulation; new guidelines being prepared for 1970 curriculum. Clifford R. Hartman, Commissioner of Education, Juneau, Alaska. A very good guide with bibliographies at each grade level unit. Approximately 100 films, books, pamphlets listed, many with excellent annotations. Commercial, government and agency sources included, plus an appendix of organizations with additional materials available.

California

Contra Costa County, 75 Santa Barbara Road, Pleasant Hill, California. *Family Life Education.* 1969. Three sections: K-6, 7-8, 9-12. Extensive bibliographies at end of each section.

San Diego City Schools, Health Services Department, San Diego, California. *Overview of Social Health Program in the San Diego Schools.* 1969. The overview states quite clearly that this is designed and intended to be "A voluntary program designed to supplement the teaching of the home and church." Brief discussion of program offered at 6th, 9th, 11th, and 12th grades. Program appears spotty; teachers appear very well prepared. Each grade level contains bibiliography; also accompanied by pamphlet containing 38 references.

San Mateo County Division of Education, Curriculum Department, San Mateo, California. *Family Life Education–Teacher Resource Guide.* 1969. A two-volume (K-8, 9-12), very extensive report with a vast list of resource materials, with appropriate pages of books, films, etc., correlated with exact grade level content. Appendix includes a reproduction of a sound track on "Human Reproduction."

Colorado

An Outline Guide for Family Life Education (For Parents, Schools, and Other Community Groups). 1967. John C. Thompson, Ph.D., Colorado Department of Education, Colfax and Sherman, Denver, Colorado. A two-page outline of attitudes, information, content goals, at each level. About 40 references in bibliography. Also cites associations which might be helpful.

K-12 Health Instruction Guide for Colorado Schools. 1969. Leo P. Black, Assistant Commissioner, Colorado Department of Education. Routine outline form. Chapter XV contains bibliography including textbooks, resource books and pamphlets, films; commercial, government and agency sources are identified.

Illinois

School District 65, Evanston, Illinois. *Family Living Curriculum Guide.* Extensive bibliography.

Kansas

Unified School District No. 501, Topeka, Kansas. *Health Concepts and Their Development: A Teacher's Guide for Health and Safety Instruction in the Junior High School.* Dixie L. Barb and Richard S. Mossman. Unit IX: Human Growth and Development is of special interest. The general bibliography does not appear to have many items concerning sex education.

Kentucky

Fayette County Public Schools, 400 Lafayette Parkway, Lexington, Kentucky. *Sex Education Curriculum Guide.* 1969. Bibliographies scattered throughout two volumes (grades 1-6, grades 7-8); approximately 60 books, articles, films, tapes.

Maryland

Anne Arundel County Public Schools, Annapolis, Maryland. *Pilot Unit on Human Reproduction: Evolution Report of Grade Six.* 1969. Eva M. Pumphrey, Director of Curriculum. A clear-cut text dealing only with human reproduction. Brief bibliography lists one basic text, with two supplementary texts, two transparencies, five films.

Massachusetts

Lexington, Massachusetts. A Summary Report–1969 Summer Workshop. *Human Development and Human Relations: A program including Family Living, Sex Education and Interpersonal Relations.* Committee of parents and teachers developed a general outline of a model for a curriculum; studied different approaches, developed a questionnaire for parents. Contains bibliography of 16 books and a materials bibliography, including books, films, records of 42 items annotated.

Newton, Massachusetts. *Family Life and Sex Education per Grade Level.* This is a broad concept guideline with an attached bibliography of 150 titles, indexed by authors.

Michigan

Report on the Advisory Committee on Sex Education. 1969. State Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan. A fairly comprehensive set of guidelines for Sex Education and Family Planning Information Programs in schools, citing numerous governmental, religious, and professional agencies. The 10-page bibliography includes books, films, records, charts, slides, and transparencies.

Minnesota

Family Living and Modern Sex Education, St. Paul Public Schools, Elementary Resource Units, Curriculum Bulletin No. 349, Secondary, Resource Units, Curriculum Bulletin No. 350, Fall 1969 (and 1968 No. 332). Independent School District 625, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102. Detailed curriculum by grade

from K-12. Concepts in detail with questions and discussion and specific activities outlined; bibliography, equipment, books, films, etc., all annotated. Actual classroom units developed from the 1968 curriculum guide are recorded. Children's questions are recorded along with suggested teacher "pivotal questions."

Bloomington Public Schools, 1969-1970, *Family Life Education*, a summary of the curriculum (K-12). Collection of committee reports, with bibliographies in each. "Summary and Report of Family Life Meetings," 27 schools surveyed materials, as to number of schools using specific and general categories of transparencies, filmstrips, books, tapes, charts. Number of schools and grades using titled materials are reported. Concerns of parents as stated at meetings are recorded.

Missouri

Ferguson-Florissant School District, 655 January Avenue, Ferguson, Missouri. *Education for Family Living: A Guide for Elementary Teachers.* 1969. Bibliography cites six charts, films, books, transparencies.

New Jersey

Public Schools, Department of Health and Physical Education, Montclair, New Jersey. *Education in Human Growth and Development.* 1968. A working copy only. This appears to be a thorough parent-teacher-student program. Extensive resource material lists for each grade level, with suggested texts and films for parents.

North Carolina

Family Life and Sex Education. 1970. Health and Physical Education Section, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina. A straight bibliography, evaluated as appropriate for use at specific grade levels. No annotations. 18 books, 19 films, 14 filmstrips with recordings, four records, one set of charts. Broad approach.

Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. *About You.* 8th Grade health class curriculum guide; teacher's guide; extensive bibliography, All Science Research Associates; films and other audiovisuals list. *The Miracle of Me.* 5th Grade program; teacher's manual; bibliography of 27 books and pamphlets, three films.

Ohio

The School and Sex Education. 1969. P. C. Betchel, Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Columbus, Ohio. Discussion of various points, citing programs in other public schools. Two bibliographies; bibliography of seven guides, six sources of audiovisual materials, 11 resource agencies.

Bexley City Schools, Bexley, Ohio. *The Study of Family Living and Sex Education: A Curriculum Guide for the Addendum–Health Curriculum.* 1969. There is a fairly extensive bibliography at end of this publication. Deals with all phases of health, and items pertaining to sex education are scattered throughout; probably two or three references per grade.

Columbus, Ohio Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio. *Guidelines for Sex Education.* 1967. A mimeographed six-page brochure; essentially a bibliography for each grade level. 15 books, 12 films, four tapes, about one dozen articles and pamphlets listed.

Pennsylvania

Conceptual Guidelines for School Health Programs in Pennsylvania—A program continuum for total school health. 1970. Section 3, Human Sexuality. Outline format, brief bibliography.

Lower Merion School District, Ardmore, Pennsylvania. *Health Education Curriculum Guide.* 1969. Chapter on Human Sexuality is particularly good. Developed by Department of Health Education of Lankenau Hospital for Main Line Project Learning of Lower Merion School District (Haverford, Lower Merion, Radnor). Four pages of bibliography.

Commercial sources

Association Press, 291 Broadway, New York, New York 10007.

Sex and Family Life Education. Three books by Dr. Evelyn Millis Duvall:

1. *About Sex and Growing Up.* 4-6 grade text about sexuality. $1.50 paperback.
2. *Love and the Facts of Life.* For teenagers. $0.95 paperback.
3. *Today's Teenagers.* Guide for educators and parents. $4.95.

Sex in the Adolescent Years: New directions in guiding and teaching youth. By Isadore Rubin and Lester Kirkendall. (Includes "What parents should do about pornography".)

ACI Productions, 16 West 46th Street, New York, New York 10036.

For Better, For Worse. A film concerned with teenage marriage and its accompanying problems. Upper grades, 25 minutes, B/W, price $160.

Addison-Wesley, 2725 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, California 94025.

Biology—Introduction to Life, 1969. High school biology text, with teacher's guide and laboratory manual.

American Library and Educational Service Company (ALESCO), 404 Sietta Drive, Paramus, New Jersey 07652.

The Teenager and His World, 1969. A collection of materials concerning teenagers' needs and interests. 90 books, annotated. Covers the spectrum of sex education. Sound film strips, cost $35, $40. Books from $2.00-6.00.

Bantam Books, Inc., 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10019.

Love and Sex in Plain Language. By Dr. Eric Johnson. Paperback. Wide distribution. An excellent brief text or reference book.

Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 113 Crossways Park Drive, Woodbury, New York 11797.

Teenage Sex Counselor. Paperback written for perplexed teenager seeking advice. $1.50.

CCM School Materials Inc., 342 Western Avenue, Boston, Mass. 02135.

Sex Education and Family Living Series, 1970. Transparencies, Models, etc. A graphic and factual set of materials—comprehensive. Basic set, $265. Models available from $12.50 to $124. All available individually or in sets with correlated transparencies.

Channing L. Bete Co., Inc., 45 Federal Street, Greenfield, Mass. 01301.

Him N' Her (ABC's of Sex). One of series of booklets on drugs, V.D., health, etc. Basic anatomy, biology, psychology of sexuality. Transparencies available.

Creative Educational Society, Inc., Mankato, Minnesota 56001.

Creative Life Science Series, March 1970. By Julian May. A set of eight titles, the first three of which are especially appropriate. Grades K-4, $3.95 per book.

Creative Visuals, Box 1911, Big Spring, Texas 79720.

Human Living and Sex Education, 1970. Transparencies covering four levels from primary through senior high school; six areas of concern including Family Relations and Dating Relations. 30-70 transparencies in each series covering social attitudes and emotional and physical growth. Cost $6.00 individual transparency or $117 to $275 for each set with teacher's manual.

Don Bosco Films, New Rochelle, New York 10802.

Concordia Sex Education Series. A coordinated set of six books, four filmstrips, and record sets for grades 5-8, 9-11, 12-14, 15 and over, and for parents and pastors. Prepared for Christian educators. Books $1.95; filmstrip and record set $10.00.

Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York 11530 (School Library Division).

Family Living and Sex Education. Categorized list, elementary, junior and senior high school, and adult. 21 books, annotated, noting recommendations from book lists, journals, etc.

Educational Progress Corp., 8538 East St., Tulsa, Okla. 74145.

Human Growth and Development, 1970. Recordings, filmstrips, and printed materials for K-6 (30 filmstrips and tapes) and 7-9 (10 filmstrips and tapes) with teacher's guide covering basics of family living—biology, physical growth, dating, etc. Cost: K-6 $360; 7-9 $132. Some levels available separately.

Friendship Press, New York

Questions for Christians: What About Sex? Booklet by Frank and Leslie Wier, with reading list, secular instruction. Cost $0.65.

George F. Cram Co., Inc., School and Library Division, 301 S. LaSalle Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46206.

Materials for Sex Education and Human Development, 1970. Plastic, dissectible models of male and female torsos, with sex organs. 16 models of development of embryo, etc. Prices: organic-muscular torso with interchange-

able sex organs $399; embryo $90.

Guidance Associates, Pleasantville, New York 10570.

Who Am I? 1970. Four sets of sound filmstrips at about $40 per set. "Masculinity and Feminity," "Dare to be Different," "Your Personality," "Sexual Values in Society."

Henk Newenhouse, 1825 Willow Road, Northfield, Illinois 60093.

Family Living, Human Growth and Human Development Materials. 16 mm. films, filmstrips, tapes, records. Contributions by: E. C. Brown, National Film Board of Canada; Margolis-Fleming, Portafilms; Hillar-Harris, Audio Productions; Wexler, National Council on Family Relations; Churchill, McGraw-Hill; Brigham Young University; Medical Arts Productions; Granada-British. Costs $80-$300, rentals $10-$30. Some B/W; some color.

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 383 Madison Ave., New York, New York 10017.

Modern Sex Education. A text at the secondary school level, science.

Imperial International Learning, Box 548, Rt. 54, South Kanakee, Ill. 60901.

Human Growth and Understanding. Audio-tape series.

Instructional Aids, Inc., P. O. Box 191, Mankato, Minn. 56001

Reproduction and Human Development, 1970. Six sets of study prints with text on reverse side of illustrations and diagrams, for use in the teaching of reproduction and human development. Grades 4 and up. Each set $14.95, series of six sets $25.

Jayark Corp., Educational Programs Division, 10 E. 49th St., New York, New York 10017.

Lessons in Living and Education for Sexuality, 1969. Three phases: "I Am Me" (K-5), "You Are You" (6-8), "Mind of Your Own" (9-12). Cartridge films, transparencies, charts. 120-page teacher's manual, five illustrated units. Coordinated multimedia comprehensive K-12 program.

Kensorthy Educational Service, Inc., P. O. Box 3031, 138 Allen St., Buffalo, New York 14205.

How To Tell Teenagers About Growing Up. Two records.

Kimberly-Clark Corp., Box 551-CK, Neenah, Wisconsin 54956

Life Cycle Center. Diagrams, films, and series of booklets on menstruation and personal relationships. Fourth grade through college. All printed material free. Film, $3.00.

Laidlaw Brothers, Educational Publishers, Thatcher and Madison, River Forest, Illinois

The Laidlaw Health Series. Limited coverage of sex education materials. One booklet "Human Growth and Reproduction," price $0.84.

Life (Magazine) Education Program, Box 834, Radio City Post Office, New York, New York 10019

The Human Body, 1970. Three lecture booklets and correlated filmstrips "Life Before Birth," biology of birth. Filmstrips $6.00, reprints $0.75; bulk rates available.

J. B. Lippincott Co., Educational Publishing Div., East Washington Square, Philadelphia, Pa. 19105.

Toward Adulthood and *Love and Sex in Plain Language.* For use in sex education classes as text or reference.

NASCO, Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin 53538

The Human Reproduction System. A set of 10 overhead transparencies with accompanying lecture guide. Also as 2 x 2 color slides. Aims at a straightforward, biological approach to the teaching of human reproduction for high schools and colleges.

National Instructional Television, Inc., Box A, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

A Time of Your Life, 1970. Series of 20-minute video-tape lessons in family life education for grades 5 and 6. Also 10-lesson course. Lessons on sex education also available on film. Previews available, and teacher's manual. Also grades 1 and 2 program, "All About You"; high school series, "Health: Your Decision."

Population Dynamics, 13201 9th Ave., N.W., Seattle, Washington 98177.

Beyond Conception. Sound film for junior and senior high school and junior college grades. 35 minutes, color, population ecology, contraception. Cost $275; $15 rental fee.

Pyramid Films, Box 1048, Santa Monica, California 90406.

Breath of Life, Pulse of Life, Cautious Twins, Sound Off. Safety and health series; range of 10-27 minute films. Cost $100-$250; rental $10.

Q & ED Productions (A Division of Cathedral Films, Inc.), 2921 West Almeda Ave., Burbank, California 91505.

Filmstrips for Education, 1969-1970. Four series of film strips, records, and study guides. First two include basic book for series. Grades through senior high and college, parents and teachers. "About Sex and Growing Up" (by Dr. Duvall) $36.50; "Love and the Facts of Life," (by Dr. Duvall) $46.00; "A Base for Morality", $45.90. Others now in production.

Scholastic Book Services, Division of Scholastic Magazines, Englewood, New Jersey 07632.

What You Should Know About Sex and Sexuality. 64-page booklet with teacher's guide. Discussion of sexuality, all aspects. Separate booklet on V.D.

Scott-Foresman, 99 Bauer Drive, Oakland, New Jersey 07436.

The New Basic Health and Safety Program. Includes "The Human Story: Facts of Birth, Growth, and Reproduction." For grades 5-8. Cited in public school curriculum guides. 48-page set and cover book with teacher's handbook. School price for both $1.08.

Stephen Bosustrow Productions, Malibu, California

A Basis for Sex Morality. Study guide and six filmstrip series. Comprehensive discussions with moral emphasis.

Sterling Educational Films, 241 East 34th St., New York, N. Y. 10016.

Family Life Education and Human Growth, 1969. 33 16 mm. films covering grades K-12. Sex, family life, physical, emotional, moral concepts. Primarily sex education, but some films on drugs, child development. Total cost $4,870; total sex and family life series costs $3,910. Three levels: K-6, 12 titles; 7-9, 12 titles; 10-12, 15 titles.

Teachers' College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y. 100277.

Family Insights Through the Use of Short Story, A Guide for Teachers and Workshop Leaders. Use of short stories in "Marriage and the Family" adult classes. Paperback, $1.95. Booklet, *Teaching Family Life Education,* 1970. *The Toms River Program; an example of community involvement,* paperback $1.00.

Universal Education and Visual Arts, A Division of Universal City Studios, Inc., 221 Park Ave. South, New York, New York 10003.

Where Does Love Begin? 1970. An 8-minute movie of a natural child-birth. For sex education courses, senior high school level, college; and adult. B/W, sale price $60 (16 mm.); $48 (Super 8).

Warren Schloat Productions, Inc., (Prentice-Hall Company), Pleasantville, New York 10570.

Human Birth, Growth, and Development; Facts and Feelings. Six sound filmstrips, teacher's guide with narration and bibliography for preparation and follow-up. Senior high and college.

APPENDIX B

Pitfalls in sex education

Excerpts from the Congressional Record, 90th Congress Second Session, June 26, 1968, Vol. 114 No. 110.

"Among the organizations shaping the structure of American sex education, by far the most influential is SIECUS (pronounced "seek us"). The acronym stands for Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. Set up four years ago in New York City."

"As of February 1968 the letterhead of SIECUS lists the officers as: Lester L. Doniger, President; Immediate Past President, David R. Mace, Ph.D.; Vice Presidents, Jesse Bernard, Ph.D., Harold I. Lief, M.D., J. Noel Macy; Secretary, George Hagmaier, C.S.P., Ed.D.; Treasurer, Isadore Rubin, Ph.D.; Executive Director, Mary S. Calderone, M.D., M.P.H."

"Identified Communist and Treasurer of SIECUS, Isadore Rubin, stated at a symposium on Sex and The Teenager: 'For the community to ask the sex educator to take on the responsibility of cutting down on illegitimacy or on venereal disease is to ask him to undertake a task that is foredoomed to failure.'"

"Dr. Lester Kirkendall characterized opponents of sex education as 'a fringe group of dissidents who don't think rationally.' He maintains that those who oppose the program to 'change America's sexual attitudes have hangups about sex.' To skirt these 'sick' people, Kirkendall recommends: 'Just sneak it (the sex program) in as an experimental course...Go to your P.T.A. and get support. That's where the power lies...Don't say that you are going to start a sex education course. Always move forward. Say that you are going to enrich, expand, and make it better. The opposition can't stop something you have already started.'"

"As she threads a film entitled *The Game* into a projector, a young counselor named Mrs. Persida Drakulich matter-of-factly announces to the 40 girls in one ninth-grade class at Pershing Junior High, 'You're going to see how a boy feels after intercourse with a virgin.'"

"One slide, which shows two dogs copulating, carries this dialogue: 'When a father dog wants to send his sperm into a mother dog, he climbs on her back...' The film then shows human male and female anatomy, indicates how a baby is produced, and ends with an optional slide showing a man and a woman in bed with the narrative: 'You have already learned how a father's sperm meets and fertilizes a mother's egg to create a new baby. To do this, they lie down facing each other.' One such film set, used in a Westchester County elementary school shows dogs copulating, followed by a human couple under bed sheets, as a recorded voice explains: 'Mummy and Daddy are doing the same things the dogs do.'"

"Here, for example, is a letter of November 27, 1968, from a Mrs. Erwin Handel to the *Phoenix American*: 'We just received our Nov. 6... issue of *The American*. I noted the article on the front page about sex education—which might better and more accurately be termed 'obscenity education' in the Phoenix schools. 'We just moved from Phoenix—and for that reason. We have a 12 year old son who was taught this smut last spring, and about 9 weeks thereafter we had a near disaster in our home. I walked in and caught him sexually molesting our 4 year old daughter. He had been taught all about intercourse at school and wanted to 'try it out' on his sister. (I caught him before he actually committed the act.)

Do YOU want YOUR child exposed to this? SEX TO REPLACE PRAYER. For additional copies, write W.E. Miller, P.O. Box 12102, Nashville, Tenn.

---

1. Ealing Corporation, 225 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass. 02140.
2. *Love and the Facts of Life*. Q & ED Productions (a division of Cathedral Films, Inc.), 2921 W. Alameda Avenue, Burbank, Calif. 91505.
3. *Family Living, Human Growth and Human Development Materials*. Henk Newenhouse, 1825 Willow Road, Northfield, Ill. 60093.
4. *The Life Cycle Center*. Kimberly-Clark Corporation, Neenah, Wisc. 54956.
5. *Family Life Education and Human Growth*. Sterling Educational Films, Inc., 241 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016, May, 1970.

The Positive and Constructive Approach to Pornography

In General Sex Education, in the Home, and in Sexological Counseling

JOHN MONEY
Johns Hopkins University

Children learn moral standards

Every Sunday hundreds of thousands of children go to Sunday School, as they have done for hundreds of years. There they learn the story of the crucifixion, rather detailed in its instruction, and possibly illustrated with vivid three-dimensional models.

Lecture after lecture, I have used this evidence to illustrate the fact that our children learn not simply the facts they are exposed to, but also the moral context in which these facts are presented. They do not come home from Sunday School to play crucifixion games, nailing up their playmates. Nor even do they use a doll as a dummy, crucifying it, to reenact what they have learned.

The point is, of course, that children over the generations have been taught not only the facts of how to crucify, but also the history, theological principles, and moral significance of crucifixion to the Christian religion. They learn how to place the procedural details of crucifixion into context in their lives. They learn how and when to use, and not to use the knowledge they have acquired. They learn that there is a negative as well as a positive application of factual knowledge.

The moral standard that we teach today's children regarding pornography is that it is dirty and forbidden. By default, we teach them that, if they learn about it, they must do so surreptitiously in secret, and then protect us adults from knowing that they know. The standard we impart is that visual or narrative portrayal of all eroticism is bad and forbidden—even the portrayal of what they will one day be required to accept as normal.

The forbidden and the weapon of defiance

There is a popular shibboleth that runs completely counter to the principle that children can and do differentiate negative from positive standards. It is the shibboleth that the immature mind automatically copies whatever it is exposed to, particularly whatever is bad—which it must, therefore, be forbidden to have access to. This is cart-before-the-horse logic. The truth is that, whenever children need a way of being bad, they need simply to obtain access to the forbidden and utilize it. That is a sure-fire way of striking back at adults who have deprived them, frustrated them, or made them angry.

To be able to strike back in this way requires, of course, some awareness of forbidden materials, or some acquaintance with forbidden knowledge. It would not be possible, for instance, for a New York schoolboy to strike back at his teacher by using sexual curse words in an Aboriginal Australian language, the language and its curse words being totally unknown to him and his teacher. By contrast, if the same boy lived with his missionary parents in an Aboriginal settlement and went to school there, he could readily learn some of the language from his school mates and employ its sexual curses in anger, as an effective weapon against his teacher. For the curses to be effective, however, the teacher would have to be sufficiently familiar with them as to have them blacklisted, or forbidden.

To forbid something effectively, it is not enough simply to make it off limits. It must be altogether inaccessible, which means that it must be totally destroyed, never again to become available. This is the kind of total destruction that has in the past befallen some ethnic languages, religions and customs that were banned and suppressed by ruling overlords. One of the most spectacular historical examples of censorship by total obliteration was the burning of Mayan books or codices, considered to be dangerous and pagan writings of the devil, under the order of the second Bishop of Yucatan in the 16th century. So complete was his destruction of pre-Columbian scholarship that today we have total ignorance, not only of the contents of the books, but even of the very script in which they were written, and of how to read surviving inscriptions in stone.

Bishop Diego de Landa achieved his purpose of suppressing for all time the learning of the Mayan priesthood, so that it could not be transmitted to subsequent generations. It would be extremely difficult today to achieve such total censorship, except perhaps if an author's single-copy manuscript were burned and the author himself killed or prevented from ever writing it again. Today it is too easy for an individual or a corporate group to produce duplicates of censorable material prior to its exposure to the censor, so that one or more copies may escape or survive even the most vigorous censorship, eventually to be disseminated and studied. In modern society, no one censor or censorship bureau can monitor everybody, everywhere, all the time, to check on their censorable or anticensor activities in the making—including the replication of censored or censorable materials.

Moral immunity of the censors

There is another factor also that defeats universal censorship by total eradication, namely, the curiosity of homo sapiens. Many people who would

willingly support the censorship of books, movies, magazines, shows or demonstrations with respect to certain audiences or readerships, are too curious about their contents to vote for their total and complete eradication or nonproduction. They would prefer rather to make them of limited access.

Censors themselves always work on the assumption that they, personally, are safely immune to the moral perils of the materials they must examine in order to pronounce them morally dangerous for someone else. In self-defense, unless they are megalomaniac, they must admit that there are at least a few collaborators and assistants among their colleagues and friends who are as morally safe as they are. The censors do not have any absolute criteria by which to identify those who constitute this safe audience. By the same token, they lack absolute criteria as to who constitute the unsafe audience. Since, however, they must protect someone from moral danger, they usually elect to protect someone who has no power to answer back—someone who is younger or politically impotent, for example—and who must accept the status of being unable to make his own decision.

So deeply is this attitude toward censorship imbedded in our cultural pattern, and so rapidly transmitted between the generations that, even at eight years of age, a boy recently taken into confidence in matters of frank sex education is likely to vote that his six-year-old brother is too young to share any part of his new-found knowledge. Already at eight he is a censor, yet completely resentful of his older brother, aged 10, who votes to censor too much frankness in the sex education of eights.

Leakages from censorship

The 10 year olds do not, of course, succeed in keeping their sexual knowledge completely forbidden to the eights, nor the eights to the sixes, any more than adult censors succeed in totally suppressing the material they would censor. There is always something that leaks out. This something, being forbidden, has all the special power of the forbidden to be an effective weapon of defiance when used against the censoring ones.

The success of such defiance is very much contingent on the reactivity of the person being defied. If the boy of six confronts his brother of eight with possessing some of the sex knowlege the older brother would have forbidden to him, the two are more likely to enter into a fraternity of shared secrets than a censorship battle. By contrast, the same boy, revealing his sex knowledge at school, may be chastised by the teacher, and told to keep his "dirty talk" to himself thenceforth, that is, to subject it to censorship. The teacher thereby puts herself back on the familiar treadmill of having supplied the boy with a weapon to use against her on some future occasion, should he need to use it.

Transmission of sexual information: Two systems

Incomplete success in keeping censored materials effectively suppressed is conspicuous for the degree of its incompleteness in matters of sex. The result is, in our society at large, that there are, in this last third of the twentieth century, two systems for the transmission of sexual information; the open system and the underground system. The open system is more constricted for minors than for

adults, but even for adults there is much sexual information that is classified as pornography and, therefore, is available only through underground channels.

It goes without saying that a complete and total ban on sexual information is incompatible with sexual reproduction of the species. It would require either total asexualism, or at the very least, total celibacy—which means that the society would have banned itself out of existence. Such extremism may occur, and has occured, in association with religious fanaticism; but secular societies opt, less extremely, only for rules and regulations governing the spread of sexual information. They have no other choice, since Nature herself transmits a certain amount of unsolicited sexual information into man's mind and imagination, thoughts and dreams, of a type guaranteed to ensure the perpetuation of the species--not only during man's adolescence and adulthood, but, by way of a preparatory rehearsal, during his childhood as well.

Obviously, then, even for children, there can be no complete banning of sexual information. Open instruction is becoming available in more homes than formerly (though many parents are too "uptight" to be as frankly sincere as the children need them to be), in more churches, and in more schools (despite the 1970 backlash of the anti-sex-education leagues). Even without open instruction, however, plenty of information flows on the circuits of the schoolboy and schoolgirl underground. These circuits carry the traditional juvenile supply of facts, contaminated with conjecture, concerning copulation and birth. Increasingly, however, conjecture is being replaced by scientific knowledge made available to children from time to time through the national magazines and television. The media, especially in drama and documentaries, also release information, in programs and publications seen by children, on themes of infidelity, adultery, unwed motherhood, birth control and abortion.

Availability to minors of illicit erotica

Regardless of whether children get sex information straightforwardly and openly from parents and teachers, or "behind the barn" on the juvenile underground, they are increasingly likely, in the present day and age, to have access also to additional material that the parents and teachers of many of them would consider illicit. Such material is pictorial and narrative and deals realistically with sexual intercourse, preliminaries that lead up to it, and varieties of erotic technique. No one knows how many preteen and teenaged children actually encounter this type of erotica, nor how much of it, either new or second hand. A single copy of a publication can pass through many hands before it disintegrates and, in large cities especially, copies are extremely easy to come by.

Of course there are those who would like to think that circulation among minors could be stopped, or limited, by more stringent rules and regulations. But the flow of such materials has been too steady and too strong for further efforts at censorship to be effective. A completely new tactic is needed, one that faces the situation as it is, fairly and squarely: the sex education of minors already includes, behind the scenes, materials that by current legal or conventional standards qualify as indecent, obscene or pornographic. Rather than wear horse blinkers, let us instead be honest and bring these materials into the open for serious discussion, as a basis for moral guidance as to their proper place in preteen and teenaged life.

Pornography in the home

The biggest single obstacle to the inclusion of erotic materials of an ostensibly pornographic or obscene quality in a home curriculum of sex education is that parents themselves, having received, at best, only a behind-the-scenes education in such matters, feel completely at a loss to know how to talk about them openly and wisely with their own children. The average parents, for example, simply do not know how to behave in response to still pictures or movies of human copulation when they are shown in the presence of their own children—and this is true, regardless of the age of the children, even up to adulthood. How much more discomfiting it is for these same parents if they are confronted with the need to explain pictures or stories of fellatio, cunnilingus, homosexuality, zoophilia or sadism. Yet no one of these topics is beyond the scope of locker room talk during grade-school age, with or without pictorial illustrations, Moreover, in crowded exposure to life in big cities, it is quite likely that by puberty children will have been exposed to one or more of these activities, either by direct observation or by hearsay from someone who has had first hand experience. Even the more sparse life of rural towns is no guarantee that children will be sequestered from such sophistication. It is not fair to the children that the subject matter of their sophistication be tabooed by their parents and therefore be unmentionable even with respect to objective advice and wise counseling.

The intelligent and sincere parent who seeks education in how to deal with the erotic matter of pornography and obscenity in the course of his children's sex education turns to—whom? This parent has been raised to turn to his friendly family doctor as a repository of wisdom in matters of sexual function, and to his pastor, in matters of sexual morals. But the disheartening truth of the matter is that neither of these people is, by reason of specific training in sexology as a whole, competent to give any better advice than the neighbor next door—at least this has been true in times past, with some recent evidence of a change.

Obviously, there is a need to educate doctors and pastors, as well as parents—to say nothing of teachers, lawyers, judges, psychiatrists, psychologists—in fact, everybody.

It was because of this educational need that in 1970 I took advantage of an invitation to prepare a new six-session course, Sexual Behavior, for the psychiatry curriculum of freshman medical students at Johns Hopkins, to confront them with the challenge and the issues of "Pornography in the Home."

Direct confrontation technique

The course was based methodologically on the direct confrontation technique, for the students were confronted with erotic materials—readings, slides and movies (see appendix)—that traditionally they would not expect to encounter in a classroom, with both sexes and two generations represented in the audience.

Direct confrontation forces an audience not to be apathetic, but to become emotionally engaged. They have no choice except to respond to and think about the lecture and demonstration materials. The initial emotional response to pornographic erotica may be either disgust or erotic arousal or a combination of both. The exception is in the case of people already familiar with and often

exposed to erotic materials; they are likely to remain emotionally disengaged, probably as a result of the same principle expressed in the adage, "familiarity breeds contempt."

Half-life of pornography

Familiarity may be built up in small increments over extended time, or in a large increment in a brief time by reason of intensive exposure. In either case, the half-life of pornography—to borrow a term from nuclear physics—is approximately two to three hours in one's total life time. That is to say, the stimulus power of pornographic materials to automatically evoke an aversive or erotic-arousal response in the viewer or reader, regardless of time, place or circumstance, decays by 50% after the first two to three hours of exposure. Thereafter, pornographic materials progressively lose their power to trigger an automatic response, until eventually the person is as indifferent to sexy pictures and writings as most of us are, most of the time, indifferent to portrayals of killings and human misery in war, and to other examples of the pornography of violence.

To have reached this stage of indifference or satiation does not mean that one has become sexually apathetic, not even to erotic pornography. What it does mean is that these materials cannot dictate a response, as they did when they were novel. It means that when and if one does respond, it is because the time, place and circumstance so permit. In particular, it means that the cycle of the body's own internal rhythms has once again readied one to be responsive to sexual stimulation. Figuratively speaking, the response goes out to find a stimulus; the stimulus does not find and capture a response.

Erotic response to pornography: Sex and age difference

The use of erotic representations, pictorial or narrative, as adjuncts to sexual arousal and the achievement of climax is variable according to sex, age and the presence or absence of psychosexual pathology. The sex difference is a subtle one, and not clearly dichotomous, since both sexes are capable of responding to pornographic erotica. When a male is exposed to erotic representations, the genital response, namely erection, is one of the initial signs of his responsiveness. Thereafter the biological time-clock of ejaculation is sufficiently short in its setting that ejaculation may occur spontaneously (particularly in the young adolescent), or may be facilitated by masturbation. The acceptance of a partner may be indiscriminate, should none be available except on a promiscuous basis.

The female, by contrast, is slower to respond genitally to the cognitive stimulation of erotica. She is more dependent on sentiment, preliminaries, and the possibility of imaginative build-up of a romantic story line. When she is aroused, the biological timing of orgasm is not so insistent as in the male, so that spontaneous or masturbatory climax is unlikely. Acceptance of a partner is likely to be highly selective and restricted to the man who is the object of her romantic devotions.

In early adolescence, girls are more likely to use erotic materials as a stimulus to romance rather than to genital sex, whereas boys are biologically geared to react in the opposite direction. For example, the young adolescent male is likely

to use pornographic pictures as an adjunct to masturbation, building fantasies around them, when he does not yet have a real-life romance. The young adolescent girl, by contrast, reads a paper-back seduction novel, and then waits for the boyfriend who will make love to her. For either the boy or the girl, the stimulus materials can be, by legal technicality, pornographic, or not. The boy who does not have available to him pictures of, say, nude females with their legs spread, can use lingerie models from the Sears Roebuck catalogue as his masturbation pictures—with an attendant risk, incidentally, of getting a "hang up" on underclothes as an erotic fetish.

After adolescence, and after having an experience of falling in love and a regularized love life, a boy has reduced capacity to be "turned on" by erotic representations as opposed to a living sexual partner—unless perhaps he is sex segregated, as are men in jail. As an adult, a man's erotic responsiveness to pornographic materials, say a film of sexual intercourse, is (unless he is a novice to such materials) most likely to be as a prelude to anticipated sexual relations with his wife or girlfriend. His response then is very similar to that of his partner, since her full response to a picture of other people having intercourse is contingent on the availability of a person she has some feeling for. Some older couples utilize this parallelism of response to pornography to pep up a sex life that might be flagging, and in need of the spice of shared novelty and variety.

Pornography and psychosexual pathology (paraphilia)

The pornographic market offers a fairly extensive list of publications dealing with psychosexual pathologies. Part of the profit here lies in the fact that these publications constitute Everyman's textbook of sexual behavior disorders, and in some degree they satisfy his curiosity—the same curiosity that sends him to the freak show at the circus and the county fair. The rest of the profit, however, lies in the purchases of people themselves affected by the paraphilia in question. Some of these customers are simply curious; some are using stories and pictures as substitutes for what they cannot find, or cannot risk finding in real life; some are using them as adjunctive to their own sex lives; and some are using them exclusively, in the sense that they have a "hang up" or paraphilia for pictures and/or stories. Such a "hang up" may well be a by-product of a pervasive taboo on sex during the developmental years that produces a peep-hole mentality. The same taboo prerequisite to the development of such a paraphilia pornographia is also prerequisite to the flourishing of the market that caters to it.

The paraphilias commonly represented on the U.S. pornography market today are: fetishism for women's underclothes, homosexuality (male nudes, without sexual action), sadomasochism (especially for masochistic men who need to be beaten by sadistic women in order to reach a climax), and impersonating transvestism (men impersonating women). Of these, by far the greatest is the garment fetish. It eclipses the representation of the normal nude female in erotic poses, and suggests that millions of American men have been so abnormally sensitized against nudity that garter belts, hosiery, shoes or brassieres are as essential to their arousal as the woman herself. The purely naked partner might impair their performance and make them impotent. Impotence itself, incidentally, was enshrined as a national ideal up to March 1970, until which time it had been

legally permissable to show a nude man and woman together in an erotic pose only if the man's penis remained soft. Photographs of normal heterosexual copulation are no longer illegal, but are still none too common. Normal heterosexual oral sex is not yet freely portrayed, nor is oral or anal homosexual activity, except in publications originating in Denmark.

Paraphilias and sex education

Portrayal of the paraphilias in pornography constitutes a major source of anticipatory panic in those who might otherwise be at ease in integrating the pornography of normal sexual relations into their children's sex education. The origin of this panic lies in the parents' own ignorance of even a simplified version of the etiology, symptomatology and prognosis of the paraphilias. They are actually being terrorized by their own lack of knowledge.

One effective way to de-terrorize oneself is to study the paraphilias in terms of their phyletic origins, as well as their etiology in the ontology of affected individuals' lives (Money, 1970). Then it becomes obvious that exposure to pictorial or narrative representations of these sexual "errors of the mind" cannot, per se, by some mysterious and contagious power, twist the mind of the beholder into being paraphiliac itself. In fact the very reverse holds true: by acquainting a growing child with what does happen to human sexual nature in some cases, pornographic representations of the paraphilias can be capitalized on as the best way to steer him in the direction of heterosexual normalcy. The representations of normal sexual activity are, conversely, of educational value in giving the child an accurate image of the goal which he (or she) will ultimately reach, guided by the moral checks and balances of a sane sex education. All children do some rehearsing, in childhood play, of the adult sexual role, just as kittens rehearse stalking their prey. It is desirable, therefore, that the rehearsal be authentic.

Even in the case of a child who has had the misadventure and misfortune to develop the beginnings of a paraphilia early in life—which is when most paraphilias do have their commencement—exposure to diagnostically similar pornographic materials can be turned to therapeutic advantage. The occasion may provide the child with a first opportunity to divulge his inner secrets, and so to be given professional help to straighten out his remaining psychosexual differentiation and development, as much as possible. The earlier one begins with such problems, the better the prognosis.

Clinical use of pornography: Birth defects

Apart from sex education in general, there is a special use of pornography, especially photographic pornography, in the sex education of people, including adults, with birth deformities and other disabilities of the sex organs themselves. For example, it is not too uncommon for a boy to be born with an unusually small penis, in extreme cases so small that it is the equivalent in size of a clitoris. Such a boy needs comparative information as to the magnitude of his disability. Only then will he have some preliminary idea as to the extent of the handicap he might expect in sexual intercourse, and only then will he be able to plan rationally, helped perhaps with a prosthetic penis, and armed with the courage to

try. It goes without saying that he owes it to his fiancee' not to obligate her in a marriage until he has proved to himself that he can satisfy her sexually. As today's sexological world is constituted, there is no source of information on comparative penis size to which this patient can turn as an adolescent boy or young man, except the pornographic market. Almost unbelieveably, there also is no source of an artificial penis, except the hit-and-miss, mail-order business on the semi-pornographic market.

Psychologically, a parallel situation exists for the boy born with an unfinished (hypospadiac) penis, surgically repaired; or the boy born with congenital absence of the testes and supplied with surgically implanted artificial ones. Both these boys need to know that they can safely expose their nudity in the locker room without fear of teasing and ridicule. Pictures can give them the reassurance they need—a reassurance that multiplies and eventually gives them confidence to enter a sexual relationship, disability and all.

The same need to be reassured of the normalcy of one's appearance occurs also in females born with a deformity of the sex organs, which may include absence of the vagina, excessive enlargement of the clitoris to resemble an unfinished penis, and partial closure of the labia to resemble an unfinished scrotum. If a girl with such defects is lucky enough to have been surgically corrected at birth, then she need never be afflicted with anxiety over her body image. Otherwise, remembering what she used to look like, she will, after surgical correction has been completed, have lingering (albeit irrational) doubts about whether the man she first goes to bed with will somehow be able to recognize her as abnormal. Since she has not been able to compare her anatomy minutely with that of normal women, she has no other way of making the comparison than with pictures, and no other source of such pictures than pornographic picture books. One such patient I recall was obsessed with the idea that she had been born like a male, and to this she attributed the color and wrinkling of the perineal skin around her vulva, equating it with scrotal skin. She recoiled in horror from the idea of ever allowing any man the opportunity of discovering her abnormality. No amount of talking could reduce her erroneous obsession, until she saw rear-view pictures of the female genitalia in color in a pornography magazine. It was the only possible place in which to find color photos of the normal female perineal area, fully exposed.

Clinical use of pornography: Errors of function

In some cases of so-called frigidity in women, the problem proves to be more precisely a disabling phobia: the woman has an obsessive-compulsive inability to have anything enter the vagina. Erotically she freezes in her tracks as soon as it is time for the penis to be inserted in the vagina, and she is totally incapable of going through with it. She will often seek medical attention under the guise of infertility, when she and her husband desire a pregnancy. As a first step in helping to break her phobia, it can be of benefit to this woman to look at pornographic close-ups of other women's vaginas. In this way, probably for the first time in her life, she can get an accurate image of the part of her anatomy she dreads and avoids. It can be of further help to her to see pictures of a vagina in use, in intercourse, or a movie of actual intercourse.

Movies showing sexual intercourse have a more widespread use than in cases of phobia for vaginal penetration. As an instructional device, a pair of movies, one showing clumsy and the other skilled erotic technique, can be a beneficial adjunct in the treatment of copulatory maladaptations between partners, including perfunctory and apathetic sex, faked orgasm, premature ejaculation, and impotence. At the present time, the only source of such movies is the pornographic market. As a consequence, they do not teach the precise lesson needed, matched precisely to each couple's diagnosis, as would be the case if sex films could be produced by professionals for the commercial market.

The next step in the history of sexological medicine will quite probably be the use of videotape to record the errors of relationship, including the errors of sexual performance, in a couple whose marriage is failing on a sexual basis. With an actual record available, the couple will be able to compare their own inept approach to one another as compared with standards in demonstration films.

Vesalius in the 16th century sinned, according to the moral law of his time, when he defied the church and defiled the human cadaver by dissecting it, sexual organs included, in the name of science and for the advancement of surgery of the living. Since then, medical science has taken an ever more penetrating diagnostic look at the hidden inner recesses of the living body, with techniques ranging from fluoroscopic radiography to microelectrodes implanted in the brain. Is it not therefore strange that, man's own benefit notwithstanding, the direct observation of his own sexual act, for diagnostic, corrective, or preventive therapeutic purposes, is still subject to moral taboo?

Use of pornography in medical student education

The medical school curriculum traditionally has included instruction in fertility, conception and childbirth, and in surgery of the sexual organs, but not in the sexual behavior of human beings. Even in psychiatry, where the physician is trained to listen to anything the patient has to disclose, there has been no direct training in human sexual behavior per se. In consequence, the majority of medical students graduated in the past were intellectually and emotionally unequipped to listen to their patients' talk about problems of sexual function and erotic adjustment. Such problems are more widespread than the layman imagines and often lurk behind other more "respectable" presenting symptoms in 25% or more of all complaints presented to the general practicioner. The physician needs to be trained to be emotionally composed and at ease, if he is to be of maximum help to the patient with a sexual problem.

The use of pornographic slides and movies proved to be completely successful in enabling medical students to "shake up the molecules of their thought" and to regroup and professionalize them—that is, to examine their preconceived attitudes toward sexual behavior and its aberrations and to reformulate them professionally. They were then, by universal consent, better prepared to be expert in their approach to their first patients with sexual behavior disorders and to help them.

The use of pornographic movies for teaching purposes is being pioneered in a few medical schools across the country. The movies used in my course at Johns Hopkins have been requested for use in the teaching program at Harvard and at the University of New South Wales, Australia.

Effect on minors of guided exposure to pornography

In view of present day attitudes toward the portrayal of the sex organs and the sexual act, it comes as no surprise that there have been no systematic, on-the-spot investigations as to the effect of pornography on minors. The information that is available for our guidance comes either in retrospect from people now older or from teenagers on an anecdotal basis. In summation, the information from these sources indicates that young people are as capable of putting pornography into a sane perspective in their lives as are their elders.

It is not sufficient to circulate a questionnaire among teenagers either before or in association with exposure to pornography. Their answers under such a circumstance will simply reflect the attitudes that they personally have accepted or evolved from the tradition of their rearing. What is necessary is a study of what happens to them personally after exposure to pornography—or, better still, a before-and-after study.

I have now delivered my illustrated lecture, Pornography in the Home, to seven audiences totaling approximately 3,000 people. Slightly fewer than half were drawn from a medical school environment (representing two medical schools); a few were graduate students and half undergraduates, representing three universities. Both sexes were present, and a small proportion were middle-aged. There have not yet been resources available to make a survey of audience reaction. In the incidental feedback subsequent to the lectures, however, there has been no indication that members of the audience personally felt themselves adversely affected by either the thesis presented or the visual materials, nor that they believed they had been prematurely exposed to data they were unequipped to deal with at their age. There was, however, an occasional misgiving among the middle-aged concerning the exposure of college teenagers. One such critic, an assistant in mental health counseling, resolved her doubts and revised her opinion a week later. She then discovered that her own exposure to visual pornography gave her a new-found freedom in counseling a youth with Klinefelter's (XXY) syndrome on personal problems contingent on his having a too-small penis.

There have been no adverse comments or misgivings on the fact that men and women students came together to the lectures nor that males brought their girlfriends or wives. In fact, the opposite has been true. It was valuable to the men to learn the women's point of view first hand and to the women not to be excluded, yet once again, from their men's secret societies of the smoke concert and the stag movie or skin flick.

Though some people, men and women, admitted to being erotically aroused, there were no reports of people who felt or acted as though their libidos had been unchained, turning them into sexual maniacs. Whether or not the incidence of sexual intercourse may have been elevated during the 12 to 24 hours following the presentation is not known. There was certainly no public-nuisance value, if it was. Some conservatives, even among the young, considered that still younger people might have gone sexually berserk but exempted themselves as perfectly safe and self-controlled. This degree of apprehension on behalf of others typically preceded a sufficient exposure to pornography to permit experience of the satiation or "half-life" effect. Thus, apprehension on behalf of others was actually experienced in anticipation of not knowing what to expect in oneself.

There were four youths of 15 and 16 from the ghetto surrounding Johns Hopkins who agreed to record an interview on the effects of visual pornography on themselves. They all had experienced a broad sex education on the streets, including some of the more exotic forms of sexual behavior, and all had some degree of experience in heterosexual intercourse. They agreed on the sexual stimulus value of pornographic pictures and allowed that seeing them might shorten the interval prior to their next arranging to meet their girlfriends and have intercourse. Their exposure to the pictures did not release uncontrollable impulses, nor otherwise change the usual pattern of their sexual behavior. Two of the boys who had seen pornographic pictures previously experienced the satiation effect more rapidly than the others.

Effect on a family of guided exposure to pornography

In one case, it was possible to make an actual test of the effect of pornography in the home by allowing pornographic slides to be seen, with appropriate discussion, by all six members of a family group. The youngest, a girl of nine, put them in the category of rude or vulgar, but considered it her rightful privilege as a member of the family not to have been excluded from seeing them. Her next oldest sister, an adolescent of 13, responded by subsequently being more confiding in sexual discussions with her parents, whereas previously they had been seriously concerned at losing contact and not being able to reach her as an adolescent having troubles of teenaged adjustment. For her, her parents' broadmindedness in matters of pornography made them less square, less inaccessible, and more trustworthy. Her older sister, 16, had an opportunity a few weeks later to attend with her mother one of the lectures, already mentioned, on pornography in the home, in which she saw a movie of sexual intercourse as well as the slides already familiar to her. Afterwards, when she discussed the experience with her mother, her considered opinion was that, the sexual relationship being as she had seen it portrayed, she was convinced that she would want to be in love with the boy with whom she first had sexual intercourse.

The reaction of the oldest child in this family, a man of 21, was to be glad that his girlfriend had been present also to see the slides, as she had suffered under repressive Victorianism in her sexual education, as he had not. The young woman, despite being taken aback at first, was pleased with the broadening of her education.

Visiting with the family at the time was a nephew of 11. He believed that he was old enough and responsible enough for this new step in his always broad sex education; but he took the step, when he returned home, of getting his parents' confirmation that they also approved of it. His uncle and aunt, who had taken what was for them essentially an experimental step in the dark, were pleased to have contributed something to the advancement of sexological science, and to have added yet another increment of confidentiality and trust to their relationships with their children. Their gain had been to learn a point of view on pornography with which to approach their children. They had rescued their children from the need to adopt a behind-the-scenes, smutty attitude toward pornography and helped them to view it scientifically and morally instead. In so doing, they had spared their children from being forced into the traditional point

of view that to see pictorial representations of the normal sexual act is dirty—surely a ridiculous corner, if ever there was one, for the adult generation to have painted itself into.

Definition

There is no satisfactory definition of pornography today, for the very term carries an implication of something undesirable or morally unclean in portraying matters sexual. In addition, the criterion of undesirability changes, as has been so clearly evident in the legal challenges and decisions of the 1960's in the United States.

What is needed is a radical revision of the definition of pornography to mean the visual or narrative portrayal of any aspect of eroticism and sexuality. Pornography would then be synonymous with erotica, as would also the obscene. The classification of the different types of pornographia, normal and paraphiliac, would then be a nosological problem in science, similar to the one resolved by Linneas for plants and animals. On the basis of a proper classification system, one could then work out a rational sex education system, geared to age and prior knowledge. In this way one could circumvent today's insoluble conundrum of where lies the dividing line between the pornographic and the not pornographic. There is no such dividing line. There is only erotica—or call it pornographia, if you will—for different times, places and moral purposes.

A national institute for sexological studies

To guide the public with respect to pornography's times, places and moral purpose, there might well be established a national institute for sexological studies. This institute could be charged with the responsibility of educating parents in how to deal with pornography in the education of their children, as well as undertaking or sponsoring basic research. The institute would function as an agent of social change toward a more sane and healthy attitude toward sex and sexual behavior than our society at present enjoys.

Summary

Children learn, as well as factual knowledge, moral standards for its application, as is indicated in religious teaching of crucifixion. The standard conveyed to today's children regarding the visual or narrative portrayal of erotic activity, including the normal sexual act, is that it is forbidden, so that knowledge must be acquired surreptitiously and kept hidden from adults. Forbidden knowledge becomes a weapon of defiance which children can use against adults when angered by them. It does not make them bad; they use it when they are provoked to be bad.

To be totally censored, materials must be totally destroyed, which is seldom possible. Therefore, an attempt is made to put them off limits. Censors always presume that they personally are immune to the danger of what they are censoring, but that someone else is not. Leakages from censorship produce a situation today in which there are two systems for the transmission of sexual

information, the open and the behind-the-scenes. The latter includes pictorial and narrative erotic material, commonly judged illicit, which is nowadays rather widely available to preteens and teenagers. It is better for this material to be a topic of open and sane discussion in the home than of error and distortion in the locker room; but most parents are quite at a loss to know what to say about it, and how to use it instructively.

The direct confrontation technique is an effective method of helping parents and others reshuffle "the molecules of their thought" and revise their approach to pornography so that it is more sane and scientific. They then discover that the "half-life" of pornography is no longer than two to three hours per lifetime. When the satiation point is reached, pornography has progressively diminishing power to initiate an emotional response, either erotic or aversive. Its erotic arousal value then depends on the internal sexual state of the organism. Females are responsive to erotic portrayal as well as males, with a difference that is best identified, briefly, as more romantic and sentimental. In males, the height of responsiveness to pornography comes early in adolescence, in females, later.

There are certain individuals, primarily males, who have an obsessive, erotic fixation or "hang up" on pictorial and/or narrative sex which in itself qualifies as a paraphilia. When the casually curious are excluded, these are the regular customers on the pornographic market. The same social forces of taboo prerequisite to the existence of a pornographic market are also prerequisite to the development of a paraphilia pornographia. Portrayal of the paraphilias in pornography can be put to good use in sex education as an indication of what can be avoided when one has a healthy exposure to, and healthy respect for, heterosexual eroticism.

Pornography can be put to good use in the sex education and counseling of individuals with birth defects and related disabilities of the genital organs, especially in cases of doubt or anxiety concerning adequacy of appearance and of ability to perform. Acquaintance with demonstrations of love-making and coital technique can improve the sexual happiness of many couples, not only those whose relationship is impaired, sexually and otherwise, and who need special counseling.

Guided exposure to pornography has not yet been shown to have an adverse effect on minors, young adults or parents. On the contrary, there is a growing body of evidence as to its benefit to individuals, to couples and to families.

The definition of pornography needs revision so that it does not automatically carry a negative connotation, but is synonymous with erotica. Then one could empirically classify pornography according to the purposes it might serve, or not serve, and avoid today's ever-bedevilling issue of where lies the dividing line between what is pornographic and what is not. A national institute for sexological studies could be charged with the responsibility of guiding and educating the public toward this new orientation.

APPENDIX

Materials of the lecture, "Pornography in the Home"

Thesis. The thesis of the spoken part of this lecture is essentially the same as has been written in the foregoing. The same propositions are presented.

Illustrations. There are two 8 mm. movie films, lasting about five minutes each, of sexual intercourse. One lacks technical erotic skill, the other does not. The contrast is self-evident, as is the lesson therefrom.

There are also 87 slides, grouped as follows:

16 slides	Samples of erotica in the fine arts, historical and modern.
20 slides	Female nudes and heterosexual pairs, historically arranged, legal in the U.S. up to 1970.
8 slides	Heterosexual couples and trios, legal in Denmark after 1969.
8 slides	Male nudes, historically arranged with and without genital covering, legal in the U.S. up to 1970.
4 slides	Homosexual couples and trios, legal in Denmark after 1969.
6 slides	Sadism, pedophilia, transvestism, fetishism and autofellatio.
10 slides	Images that include penile erection, from the publication *Sexual Freedom,* as a legal case, U.S., 1970.
3 slides	Birth of a baby.
12 slides	Normal human coital positions, in color photography, with live models.

REFERENCES

Money, J. Paraphilias: phyletic origins. In *Introduction to Psychiatry and the Behavioral Sciences, Readings #5, Sexual Behavior.* Baltimore, Dept. of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, 1970.

Sexual Freedom, The Color Pictorial Dedicated to Liberation from Sexual Repression. Hollywood, California, Zephyr Publications, 1969.

Effects of Erotic Stimuli Used in National Sex Forum Training Courses in Human Sexuality

GLIDE FOUNDATION
San Francisco, Calif.

INTRODUCTION

In January, 1970, the National Sex and Drug Forum began an evaluation of the effects of the erotic stimuli used in the Forum's training courses on human sexuality.

The report of this study will contain three sections:

1. A descriptive account of the development of the Forum's training courses on human sexuality during the past two years, including how various types of erotic stimuli were tested, selected and used.

2. An evaluation of the training experiences, including the exposure to erotic materials, by participants.

3. The results of an empirical (questionnaire) study of characteristics of five groups of people (directors and ministers of Christian education, students in a social ethics class of a seminary, participants in a regularly scheduled Forum course for professional workers, students and faculty at Drake University, and students and advisors at the University of California) and the effects of erotic materials on these respondents.

NATIONAL SEX AND DRUG FORUM, A DESCRIPTION

The National Sex and Drug Forum, a service of The Glide Foundation of the Glide Methodist Church, opened officially in October, 1968, after nine months of preparation. The Forum was developed to meet a long-standing need for objective, factual, comprehensive information, education, training and research on the subjects of human sexuality and of mind-altering drug use and abuse. The

Forum's courses are designed primarily for professional persons with specific interests in the two areas.

During its first year and one-half of operation more than 4,500 persons attended Forum courses at its location at the Glide Urban Center, 330 Ellis Street, San Francisco, and in other cities such as Seattle, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Miami, Honolulu, Eugene, Des Moines and San Diego. Many universities, urban training centers and other organizations are increasingly availing themselves of the services of the Forum.

The National Sex and Drug Forum treats the areas of sex and drugs separately, at different times, and with different techniques. A common concern is that people dealing with these areas need accurate, undistorted information in context to overcome ignorance, fear and extremism as well as to live fuller and more joyful lives.

Human sexuality

The Forum makes the following assumptions in its work in human sexuality:

1. The most significant factor in sex education is that sex can be talked about casually and nonjudgmentally.
2. Individuals should be allowed meaningful exposure to a realistic objectification of the range of behavior into which their own experiences and those of other humans fall.
3. The person who teaches, counsels, or gives advice (regardless of professional qualifications) should have a low burden of sexual guilt feelings so as to be of service to others rather than serving his own needs.

The areas that are covered by the Forum's courses include: sexual identification, sexual attitudes, sexual mythology, the heightening of sexual sensitivity, and an intensive survey of the range of human sexuality.

Methodology

The National Sex and Drug Forum employs a unique environmental approach to its task, using a variety of multimedia methods involving multiple projection, light, sound, and tactile environments which facilitate both information-giving and feeling-response. Its courses at the Glide Urban Center are held in a specially designed Awareness Room affording a wide degree of environmental control.

In addition to developing and using new techniques, the Forum is also involved in the creation, use and dissemination of materials which include audio and film material. The Forum also trains persons who have an existing professional background for new vocations in the area of human sexuality.

Development

The development of the Forum's training courses on human sexuality drew originally upon four types of experience:

1. The educational expertise of the Glide Urban Center, a pioneer in new concepts of education.
2. Consultation with the staff of the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University.
3. The experience gained in training sessions on homosexuality conducted by The Council on Religion and the Homosexual.
4. Advice from a selected interdisciplinary group of 20 professionals who gathered together during Christmas week of 1967. (Additional groups were also tested prior to the official opening of the Forum in October 1968.)

From these four areas of input the staff of the National Sex Forum decided on seven categories of materials and procedures as a basis for the course.

After choosing the categories, a process of acquistion and testing began. Our first approach was to acquire everything we could that had to do with human sexuality. This included books, photographs, drawings, slides, tapes, films and sexual objects. At first our major emphasis was toward traditional sex education which basically dealt with reproductive biology and the management of social relationships. As supplementary aids we used sex action films and other material depicting sexual activity. It was immediately evident that the persons attending our first experimental training sessions were far more interested in graphic sexual materials than in the traditional sex education materials. This led us to the conclusion that we had to deal with what people did sexually, not what they should or should not do.

As we looked for more materials that might be helpful we became more aware of the poor quality of much of the material that was available. As more people became active in the Forum's training programs the demand for accurate interpretive training aids about what people felt sexually increased. This led us to seek out materials dealing with fantasy and, when we could not find adequate material, to attempt to create our own. In addition, we discovered that it is not the quantity of materials available that is important but rather the choice and the quality.

We have sifted through thousands of photographs and looked at more than 5,000 historical and current sex action and fantasy films in narrowing our material down to the amount shown below. Following is a list of the categories of materials and procedures used:

1. Books of photographs and drawings. Twenty books are used for reference by persons in the courses. These books contain more than 400 photographs and drawings.
2. Tapes of music, poetry, lectures, sounds of people engaging in sexual relations.
3. Approximately 500 slides of erotic art objects.
4. Ten historic and ten current sex action films.
5. Eight fantasy films.
6. In talking about sex the Forum uses the standard procedure of small group discussions with persons reacting to the shared experience of looking at erotic materials.
7. The setting of the room enables a controlled environment through lighting, sound, carpeting and pillows for sitting, plus the use of all the walls as

projection surfaces. The control booth permits use of 26 pieces of equipment at the same time. This controlled environment is very helpful in speeding up the learning process.

EVALUATION OF TRAINING EXPERIENCES

Participant evaluation

This section contains an evaluation of the training experiences, including exposure to erotic materials, by participants. It also includes a very simple "agree" or "disagree" evaluation of the three assumptions of the National Sex Forum. One assumption is of particular importance to this study because it deals with the question of whether or not people should be allowed exposure to a full range of graphic sexual representation.

Each category of materials and each methodology used was evaulated by 329 persons in terms of its contribution to the total experience.

The National Sex and Drug Forum attempts to design training events to fit the participants. Because of this design consideration not all of the respondents were exposed to all seven categories. All respondents were exposed to Category B, which was "Tapes of Music, etc." (poetry, lectures, and sounds of people engaging in sexual activity); Category C, which consisted of "Slides of Erotic Art Objects"; Category D, "Historic and Current Sex Action Films"; and Category E, "Fantasy Films." Two hundred and six respondents were exposed to Category A, "Books of Photographs and Drawings"; 56 persons were asked to evaluate Category F, which was "Multimedia Approach"; 244 respondents reacted to Category G, "The Setting of the Room"; and finally, 273 were asked to evaluate Category H, "Talking About Sex."

It is difficult to make evaluations of individual categories of a training program specifically designed to be experienced as a whole. In terms of ranking, the multimedia approach was first, with 92.8% saying that it "helped" or "greatly helped." Historic and current sex action films, the setting of the room, and talking about sex were evaluated as having "helped" or "greatly helped" by over 80% of the respondents. The lowest evaluations were of books of photographs and drawings and slides of erotic art objects, with 63% saying they either "helped" or "greatly helped." The ranking was almost exactly the same among four groups—religious educators, seminary students, Drake University faculty and students, and University of California students.

Of particular significance are the responses of another group, consisting of 90 persons who had attended the National Sex and Drug Forum at an earlier date and had had time to reflect upon their experience. Of this group, 95.6% felt that the historic and current sex action films "helped" or "greatly helped." Of this same group, over 90% said that fantasy films, talking about sex, and the setting of the room either "helped" or "greatly helped." The lowest evaluation was given to books of photographs and drawings, with 72.3% saying they "helped" or "greatly helped." The reactions of men and women to the various categories were amazingly similar. The highest single ranking by women was given to talking about sex, with 74.1% saying it "greatly helped." The highest single ranking by men was given to historic and current sex action films, with 65.1% saying they

Table 1

EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS OF FORUM COURSE

	Greatly helped	Helped	Neutral	Detracted	Greatly detracted	Don't know	No answer
A. Books of photographs and drawings							
Asked of 77 females	16 20.8%	25 32.4%	26 33.8%	3 3.9%		2 2.6%	5 6.5%
Asked of 129 males	28 21.7%	62 48.1%	23 17.8%	3 2.3%		2 1.6%	11 8.5%
206 Total	44 21.4%	87 42.2%	49 23.8%	6 2.9%		4 1.9%	16 7.8%
B. Tapes of music, etc.							
Asked of 87 females	28 32.2%	36 41.4%	13 14.9%	4 4.6%	1 1.1%		5 5.8%
Asked of 150 males	42 28.0%	71 47.4%	26 17.3%	3 2.0%			8 5.3%
Asked of 92 persons who failed to identify their sex	35 38.0%	42 45.7%	6 6.5%	2 2.2%		7 7.6%	
329 Total	105 31.9%	149 45.3%	45 13.7%	9 2.7%	1 0.3%	7 2.1%	13 4.0%
C. Slides of erotic art objects							
Asked of 87 females	12 13.8%	40 46.0%	26 29.9%	2 2.3%	1 1.1%		6 6.9%
Asked of 150 males	23 15.3%	78 52.0%	30 20.0%	7 4.7%	1 0.7%		11 7.3%
Asked of 92 persons who failed to identify their sex	7 7.6%	47 51.1%	36 39.1%	1 1.1%		1 1.1%	
329 Total	42 12.8%	165 50.2%	92 28.0%	10 3.0%	2 0.6%	1 0.3%	17 5.1%
D. Historic and sex action films							
Asked of 87 females	34 39.1%	36 41.4%	8 9.2%	1 1.1%			8 9.2%
Asked of 150 males	78 52.0%	56 37.4%	6 4.0%	2 1.3%			8 5.3%
Asked of 92 persons who failed to identify their sex	26 28.3%	53 57.6%	10 10.8%	2 2.2%		1 1.1%	
329 Total	138 41.9%	145 44.1%	24 7.3%	5 1.5%		1 0.3%	16 4.9%

Table 2

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED BY MAIL BY PERSONS WHO HAD ATTENDED THE NATIONAL SEX FORUM AT AN EARLIER DATE

	Greatly helped	Helped	Neutral	Detracted	Greatly detracted	Don't know	No answer
A. Books of photographs and drawings							
Asked of 27 females	2 7.4%	12 44.5%	11 40.7%	2 7.4%			
Asked of 63 males	13 20.6%	38 60.3%	10 15.9%	2 3.2%			
90 Total	15 16.7%	50 55.6%	21 23.3%	4 4.4%			
B. Tapes of music, etc.							
Asked of 27 females	7 25.9%	15 55.6%	2 7.4%	2 7.4%	1 3.7%		
Asked of 63 males	16 25.4%	30 47.6%	15 23.8%	2 3.2%			
90 Total	23 25.6%	45 50.0%	17 18.9%	4 4.4%	1 1.1%		
C. Slides of erotic art objects							
Asked of 27 females	6 22.2%	14 51.9%	7 25.9%				
Asked of 63 males	10 15.9%	42 66.7%	7 11.1%	3 4.7%	1 1.6%		
90 Total	16 17.8%	56 62.2%	14 15.6%	3 3.3%	1 1.1%		
D. Historic and current sex action films							
Asked of 27 females	16 59.3%	9 33.3%	1 3.7%			1 3.7%	
Asked of 63 males	41 65.1%	20 31.7%	1 1.6%	1 1.6%			
90 Total	57 63.4%	29 32.2%	2 2.2%	1 1.1%		1 1.1%	
E. Fantasy films							
Asked of 27 females	16 59.3%	7 25.9%	2 7.4%			2 7.4%	
Asked of 63 males	36 57.2%	24 38.1%	3 4.7%				
90 Total	52 57.8%	31 34.4%	5 5.6%			2 2.2%	
F. Talking about sex							
Asked of 27 females	20 74.1%	5 18.5%	1 3.7%	1 3.7%			
Asked of 63 males	27 42.8%	33 52.4%	2 3.2%	1 1.6%			
90 Total	47 52.3%	38 42.2%	3 3.3%	2 2.2%			
G. Setting of the room							
Asked of 27 females	14 51.9%	13 48.1%					
Asked of 63 males	23 36.5%	31 49.2%	8 12.7%	1 1.6%			
90 Total	37 41.1%	44 48.9%	8 8.9%	1 1.1%			

Table 2 Continued

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1. The most significant factor in sex education is that sex can be talked about casually and nonjudgmentally.			
Asked of 27 females	27 100%		
Asked of 63 males	62 98.4%	1 1.6%	
90 Total	89 98.9%	1 1.1%	
2. Individuals should be allowed meaningful exposure to a realistic objectification of the range of behavior into which their own experiences and those of other humans fall.			
Asked of 27 females	26 96.3%	1 3.7%	
Asked of 63 males	62 98.4%	1 1.6%	
90 Total	88 97.3%	2 2.2%	
3. The person who teaches, counsels, or gives advice (regardless of professional qualifications) should have a low burden of sexual guilt feelings so as to be of service to others rather than serving his own needs.			
Asked of 27 females	27 100%		
Asked of 63 males	62 98.4%	1 1.6%	
90 Total	89 98.9%	1 1.1%	

"greatly helped." The highest single ranking by men and women together was also historic and current sex action films, with 63.4% saying they "greatly helped."

The assumptions of the Forum

An evaluation of the assumptions of the Forum was included in the questionnaire. Among the 219 respondents, over 90% agreed with all three of our assumptions. The highest ranking was given to the question relating to whether or not people should be allowed exposure to graphic sexual materials. Two hundred and six people (94%) agreed that they should; three people (1.4%) disagreed; three (1.4%) didn't know, and seven (3.2%) did not answer the question.

Summary

The participants in the National Sex and Drug Forum's training courses gave the various categories an extremely high ranking. The exposure methodology and the choice of materials were seen as the most helpful of the categories. The single most helpful teaching aid was the category of historic and current sex action films. The second most helpful was talking about sex, casually and nonjudgmentally, and the third was the fantasy films, dealing with people's feelings.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND EFFECTS OF EROTIC MATERIALS

Characteristics of respondents

This section reports the results of an empirical study of the characteristics of, and the effects of erotic materials on, five groups of people who participated in the National Sex Forum training courses on human sexuality. These five groups were: ministers and directors of Christian education, a group of theological students, a student and faculty group at Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa, students and advisors at the University of California, Berkeley, and 90 persons who had taken a regularly scheduled course on human sexuality.

Of the 199 respondents, 59% were men and 41% women. Nearly half the people were 25 years of age or younger. Slightly more than half were married or had been married. Of those currently married, the majority reported their marriage as being "very happy" or "happier than average." There was almost no difference between men and women in the evaluation of their marriage.

The respondents were well educated. Almost all reported at least some college and over 62% had completed graduate or professional school. The women who participated in this study were, as a whole, not as well educated as the men.

By occupation, over 90% of the participants in this study were professionals or students. The largest single profession was clergy and seminarians who made up 27% of the total group.

The religious preference of the respondents was 46% Protestant, 8% Catholic, 28% listing no religious preference. When evaluating religious feelings, 86% felt that religious beliefs and practices should change to fit the times.

The people in the sample group are active in many organizations, generally

sociable, interested in politics. They generally think the goals they pursue are meaningful, and they like to experiment with new things. This group did not feel that there are many things about themselves that they would like to change.

Sexual knowledge of respondents

The ages at which the respondents first learned about some selected aspects of human sexuality and sexual functioning vary considerably between men and women. Most of the men had learned about masturbation by the age of 14, but the women did not learn until age 16 or older. Women were also slower to learn about intercourse, with 11% of the women not knowing what intercourse was until they were 20 years of age of older.

Both men and women knew about pregnancy at an earlier age than they knew about intercourse. They knew the result, but not what the act of intercourse consisted of. Women were less likely than men to have learned the relationship of intercourse to pregnancy by age 16.

Formal sex education

Almost 70% of the respondents reported not having had a sex education course in school. Of those saying that they had a course, the majority reported they did not learn anything they did not already know. This data points out very strongly that most of the respondents in this study had not learned many of the basic facts of human sexuality and sexual functioning until they were well into their teens, and that the women did not learn until considerably later than the men. Regardless of what and when they learned about sexuality, they now report that they consider sex to be important to them and that their sexual adjustment is above average.

Sexual activity of respondents

The rates of masturbation for this sample are similar to the rates reported in the Kinsey studies. Almost all the men have masturbated to orgasm while only two-thirds of the women have done so. Most of the men first masturbated between the ages of 12 to 14. The majority of the women first masturbated after age 20.

Of the respondents, 11% of the males and 20% of the females reported they had never had sexual intercourse. For those having had sexual intercourse, 30% reported having only one sexual partner while almost as many reported having 10 or more partners. The interesting finding here is that women were as likely as men to report having had 10 or more partners. The percentage of women who have had 10 or more sexual partners—in this study 30%—is much higher than the 19% reported in the Kinsey studies.

When evaluating intercourse over the past year, 77% of the women and 94% of the men enjoyed intercourse all or most of the time. Both men and women reported that they enjoy intercourse more now than they did in the past.

Almost 50% of the men and 20% of the women reported having a homosexual contact at some point in their life.

Table 3

LEVELS OF EXPOSURE TO SEXUALLY EXPLICIT MATERIALS

		Inter-course	Oral-genital	Lesbian	Homo-sexual	Group sex	Being forced
Percent having read material describing	Male	95%	85%	80%	81%	76%	82%
	Female	99%	75%	62%	70%	61%	69%
Percent having seen movies	Male	88%	78%	80%	75%	74%	62%
	Female	86%	60%	70%	65%	49%	53%
Percent having seen pictures	Male	95%	92%	80%	86%	77%	60%
	Female	87%	66%	59%	58%	53%	44%

Reactions to sexually explicit materials

The respondents were asked to describe their usual reactions to explicit sexual materials. This data is restricted to those respondents who reported that they had been exposed to the particular materials in question.

Intercourse was the most commonly seen form of behavior, and books and pictures of oral-genital contact were the second most common form.

Reading about intercourse was the most likely to provoke a reaction of arousal. This was true for both men and women. Both men and women, however, were as likely to report "interest" as a reaction to reading about intercourse as they were likely to report "arousal." Other reactions were: "curiosity," "happiness," and "informed." The least common reactions were "disinterested," "disgusted," and "shocked."

The reactions to other forms of written sexually explicit materials were mostly: "interested," "curious," and "informed." "Shocked" and "disgusted" were among the least common.

Reactions to movies of sexually explicit activity were much like the reactions to written material.

The three types of activity most likely to result in arousal were: intercourse, oral-genital sex, and group sex. A majority of both men and women were aroused by seeing or reading about the first two types of activity. Movies of group sex aroused a majority of the men, but only one-third of the women.

The lowest proportion of both men and women to report being "aroused," and the highest proportion of both to report being "uncomfortable," was in reaction to the depictions of someone being forced.

Reactions to still photographs of sexual activity are much the same as the reactions to movies and reading. The one exception is that the levels of arousal are lower. In summary, reactions to depictions of sexual materials center around curiosity, interest, and information. Arousal is also a common reaction, but only in a few cases is it the most common reaction. Negative reactions are also very rare except in a case of depictions of people being forced to do things against their will. It would seem, from the data, that sexually explicit descriptions and

Table 4

REACTIONS TO EROTIC STIMULI: READING

Usual reaction to reading about:	No. of persons responding		Aroused	Disgusted	Interested	Shocked	Curious	Disinterested	Informed	Happy	Uncomfortable
			Percent								
Intercourse	105	Male	82	4	70	2	52	2	45	33	7
	69	Female	70	1	74	6	49	3	30	26	13
Oral-genital	95	Male	75	8	67	2	56	2	43	32	8
	46	Female	54	9	61	4	46	6	26	17	20
Lesbian	99	Male	44	7	62	2	62	6	48	13	10
	54	Female	13	9	57	9	59	9	37	11	26
Homosexual	90	Male	28	13	56	3	59	13	49	14	31
	50	Female	16	6	58	8	58	12	38	2	26
Group sex	90	Male	64	4	70	2	64	3	41	21	10
	38	Female	34	13	68	8	53	5	34	16	18
Being forced	78	Male	14	31	35	17	24	12	27	3	50
	39	Female	13	54	23	10	23	3	13	0	60

Table 5

REACTIONS TO EROTIC STIMULI: MOVIES

Usual reaction to movies of:	No. of persons responding		Aroused	Disgusted	Interested	Shocked	Curious	Disinterested	Informed	Happy	Uncomfortable
			Percent								
Intercourse	105	Male	82	4	70	2	52	2	45	33	7
	69	Female	70	1	74	6	49	3	30	26	13
Oral-genital	95	Male	75	8	67	2	56	2	43	32	8
	46	Female	54	9	61	4	46	6	26	17	20
Lesbian	99	Male	44	7	62	2	62	6	48	13	10
	54	Female	13	9	57	9	59	9	37	11	26
Homosexual	90	Male	28	13	56	3	59	13	49	14	31
	50	Female	16	6	58	8	58	12	38	2	26
Group sex	90	Male	64	4	70	2	64	3	41	21	10
	38	Female	34	13	68	8	53	5	34	16	18
Being forced	78	Male	14	31	35	17	24	12	27	3	50
	39	Female	13	54	23	10	23	3	13	0	62

Table 6

REACTION TO EROTIC STIMULI: PICTURES

Usual reaction to pictures of:	No. of persons responding		Percent								
			Aroused	Disgusted	Interested	Shocked	Curious	Disinterested	Informed	Happy	Uncomfortable
Intercourse	114	Male	68	7	72	3	48	4	38	26	4
	71	Female	42	16	66	3	41	8	25	18	11
Oral-genital	110	Male	60	8	64	3	51	4	37	22	10
	53	Female	28	15	58	4	45	8	26	13	13
Lesbian	93	Male	41	6	60	2	58	8	40	8	10
	45	Female	28	15	58	4	45	8	26	13	13
Homosexual	100	Male	23	9	51	6	55	12	43	7	11
	44	Female	11	4	57	4	52	18	30	7	11
Group sex	88	Male	61	3	62	1	54	7	39	17	7
	39	Female	26	15	56	5	59	13	31	18	15
Being forced	73	Male	19	22	40	14	34	16	29	4	44
	31	Female	10	58	29	13	26	10	19	0	58

presentations appeal to motives and needs other than arousal and are unlikely to function as motivating forces in other behavioral contexts.

Selected aspects of past and anticipated sexual activity

The respondents were asked to indicate which of a variety of sexual activities they had thought of trying and, regardless of whether they had thought of trying a particular activity, how attractive they found the idea. They were also asked whether or not they had tried any of the activities, and if they thought they would try the ones that had not been tried.

Almost all the respondents had thought of intercourse and oral-genital contact, and both men and women found the idea of intercourse "very attractive." The men were more likely than the women to report the idea of oral-genital contact "very attractive." Two-thirds of the respondents had thought of sexual activity with members of their same sex. Also, two-thirds reported they found the idea "somewhat unattractive" or "very unattractive."

Group sex had been thought about by 92% of the men and 65% of the women; 79% of the men and 44% of the women found the idea "attractive."

Men were more likely than women to think of forcing someone, and women were more likely than men to have thought about being forced. Large proportions of both sexes found the thought of either activity to be "very unattractive."

Very few respondents indicated that they had engaged in many different kinds of sexual activities.

Table 7

People frequently think about different sexual activities even if they never do them. For each kind of sexual activity listed, please indicate whether or not you had ever thought of trying that activity.

Activity	Have thought of it	Have never thought of it	Total no. responding
	%	%	
Intercourse			
Male	98	2	117
Female	98	2	81
Oral-genital			
Male	95	5	115
Female	90	10	80
Lesbian			
Male			
Female	73	27	79
Male homosexual			
Male	77	23	112
Female			
Group sex			
Male	92	8	112
Female	65	35	75
Forcing someone			
Male	52	48	112
Female	22	78	71
Being forced			
Male	50	50	107
Female	75	25	77

With the exception of intercourse and oral-genital contact, most of the respondents who had not already tried a given activity did not plan to try it in the future.

Summary

The respondents in this survey seem well-adjusted, happy, and normal. There has been some experimentation with sexual activity, but the bounds of this experimentation are relatively restricted. The response to explicit descriptions of sexual activity seems, for the most part, centered in curiosity, interest, and information. A large proportion of males were aroused, but this was not the most common reaction, and the fact of being aroused seems to have resulted in no plans to engage in new types of sexual activities. One of the most interesting findings was the low level of negative reactions to explicit descriptions and presentations of sexual activity. The sole exception was depictions of people being forced to do what they did not want to do.

Table 8

Whether or not you had ever thought of it, do you find the idea:

	Very attractive	Somewhat attractive	Somewhat unattractive	Very unattractive	No. persons responding
	%	%	%	%	
Intercourse					
Male	94	4	2	0	116
Female	88	11	1	0	81
Oral-genital					
Male	68	20	6	6	117
Female	42	34	16	8	80
Lesbian					
Male					
Female	4	26	33	37	78
Male homosexual					
Male	13	20	36	31	115
Female					
Group sex					
Male	39	40	14	7	114
Female	12	32	24	31	80
Forcing someone					
Male	4	14	13	68	113
Female	0	6	18	76	76
Being forced					
Male	3	10	20	68	114
Female	6	9	16	69	80

Table 9

Percentage of those who have tried the following activities:

Activity	Male	Female	Total
Intercourse	89%	92%	86
Total no. responding	(117)	(79)	(196)
Oral-genital	80%	82%	81
Total no. responding	(117)	(79)	(196)
Lesbian	0%	19%	11
Total no. responding		(75)	(160)
Homosexual	39%	0%	25
Total no. responding	(113)		(176)
Group sex	20%	11%	16
Total no. responding	(110)	(74)	(181)
Forcing someone	14%	3%	9
Total no. responding	(87)	(74)	(181)
Being forced	8%	29%	17
Total no. responding	(108)	(75)	(183)

Table 10

Percentage of those who have never tried activities, but think they will:

Activity	Male	Female
Intercourse	83%	95%
Total no. responding	(36)	(20)
Oral-genital	72%	75%
Total no. responding	(40)	(20)
Lesbian	0%	13%
Total no. responding		(54)
Homosexual	7%	0%
Total no. responding	(71)	
Group sex	47%	31%
Total no. responding	(79)	(65)
Forcing someone	6%	4%
Total no. responding	(93)	(68)
Being forced	7%	9%
Total no. responding	(98)	(58)

The data would indicate that exposure to sexually explicit materials does not have the motivating force to create the desire to engage in new kinds of sexual activity.

CONCLUSION

The National Sex Forum has used various types of erotic stimuli in its training courses on human sexuality during the past two years. We continue to use that material because we find it valuable in helping persons understand their own sexuality and that of others. In an evaluation of their experience, close to 90% of the 329 persons found that historic and current sex action films, which are graphic depictions of sexual activity, helped or greatly helped in the Forum's training courses. The setting of the room, fantasy films, talking about sex, and the tapes of music and erotic sounds were evaluated as having helped or greatly helped by over 80% of the respondents. Even the two lowest categories, the books of photographs and drawings and the slides of erotic art objects, were felt to be helpful by over 60% of the respondents. We found this true of both men and women.

In an empirical study we found that a large majority of persons who come to the Forum are well-adjusted, happy persons, most of whom are in the helping professions. Their primary reaction to erotic material was interest and curiosity, along with a degree of arousal.

Pornography and Youth: A Survey of Sex Educators and Counselors

W. Cody Wilson
Sylvia Jacobs

The American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors mailed a four-page questionnaire to its membership of approximately 800 in March 1970. The questionnaire had been prepared by the staff of the U.S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Fourteen questions asked about the individual's perception of adolescents' sex education, adolescents' experiences with explicit sexual materials, and the consequences of such experience. Seven questions asked about the individual's background and experience in the area of sex education and counseling.

Unfortunately, the postal strike of 1970 began almost immediately after the questionnaires had been mailed. We do not know the complete effect of the strike on the survey. Several members of AASEC indicated at the annual meeting in April that they never received the questionnaire. Many received the questionnaire and returned it, but we have no way of knowing how many were lost in the confusion during and following the strike. Certainly, many of the responses were delayed and some continued to straggle in for many weeks afterward.

A total of 342 usable questionnaires had been returned by the third week of April when processing was begun. This represents approximately a 43% response rate.

We decided to analyze and report the results of the survey even though the response rate was low. The decision was based on three factors. First, we assumed that the postal strike had affected the response rate and that this effect would approach randomness as far as bias in responses was concerned; that is, we assumed that the responses were less biased and more representative than is usual with a 43% response rate. Second, there are no published formal studies on the effect of sex education; this makes the expert opinion of practitioners in the area quite important. And third, there is no published information on the characteristics and backgrounds of sex educators and counselors.

In reporting the survey we will first present information about the characteristics of the respondents and later present information about their perceptions of adolescent experience.

Background and training of sex educators and counselors

Forty percent of the respondents were female and 60% were male.

Twelve percent of the respondents were under 30 years of age, 60% were between 30 and 50, and 28% were over 50. Significantly more of the women were under 30 and over 50, while more men were in the intermediate age range, 30 to 50.

Fourteen percent of the respondents had less than three years of experience in the field of sex education and counseling, 50% had three to 10 years experience, and 35% had more than 10 years experience. Males had significantly more experience than the females, but this may be due in part to the age differential.

Fifty-three percent of these sex educators and counselors work in a school setting (grades 1 through 12), 33% work in a higher education setting (college or graduate school), and 55% work outside of an educational setting (religious, medical, social service, private practice, etc.). Note that the total exceeds 100%; approximately 40% work in more than one setting. Women are more likely to work in a school setting and men in a noneducational setting, and the tendency is statistically significant.

These sex educators and counselors received their first professional training in a variety of disciplines. Most, 39%, were originally trained in some phase of education; 13% came from the field of religion, 13% from medicine, 18% from the social or psychological sciences, and 18% from a variety of other backgrounds. Those who come from a background in religion are nearly all males, while a number of women come from a home economics background. Less than 5% of the respondents received their first professional degree in the area of sex education.

These sex educators and counselors do not have a great deal of formal training in sex education. One-third have had no formal course work in sex education; one-half reported having had one to five courses–less than one full semester of training; only 14% reported having had more than five courses–more than one semester of formal training. This is not surprising, however, for there are few courses in sex education offered in colleges and universities today, and there were fewer still in the past.

On the other hand, the respondents reported that they do take advantage of more informal training opportunities such as workshops and institutes sponsored by the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors. Forty-two percent reported having devoted more than five weeks to these informal educational experiences, 37% reported having devoted one to five weeks to them, and only 18% reported having spent less than one week in such training programs.

Opinions of sex education

A substantial majority (70%) of the sex educators and counselors felt that the average boy or girl gets most of his information about sex from friends about the same age. Another 9% felt that most of the information comes from brothers and sisters. Thus, nearly 80% maintained that the principal source of sex information is other non-adults. Eleven percent thought parents are the principal source, and 4% thought school courses are the principal source. Church, family doctor, and

books were considered to be negligible sources. Pornography was thought to be the principal source by less than 1% of the sex educators and counselors.

The perception of the principal source of sex information for the average boy or girl did not differ by either sex or age of the professional.

These respondents overwhelmingly judged the sex information received from these principal sources as inadequate. Only 11% felt it to be fairly satisfactory; 12%, not satisfactory; 44%, fairly unsatisfactory; and 27%, very unsatisfactory. These judgments do not differ by sex of the sex educator or counselor, but they do differ by the age of the professional. Younger professionals judged the sex information to be *less* adequate than did older ones.

The respondents were asked about the relationship between sex education (described as "a teacher in a school teaching students about the biology of sex, male and female sexual behavior, and sexual morals in the U.S.") and pornography. Less than 1% of these professionals felt that sex education has the same effect on children that pornography has or that sex education would lead to an interest in pornography. Over a third (36%) felt that sex education satisfies a child's natural interest in sex and may reduce his interest in pornography. Another 43% felt that sex education provides a background that may prevent potentially harmful effects of later exposure to pornography. Thus, 80% of these professionals felt that sex education would be an antidote to pornography. Another 15% felt that sex education is not relevant to the issue of pornography. The perception of the relationship between sex education and pornography did not differ by sex or age of the professional.

Adolescents' experience with explicit sexual materials

Several questions referred to "explicit sexual materials" which were described in the questionnaire as "pictorial or verbal material which is a depiction or detailed description of human sexual intercourse, masturbation, direct physical stimulation of clothed or unclothed genitals, or sodomy, or pictorial material which prominantly depicts uncovered adult human genitals."

The vast majority of sex educators and counselors (81%) reported that in their experience most adolescent boys and girls are interested in explicit sexual materials; only 17% felt that most adolescents are not interested in such materials. Adolescent interest in these materials was characterized as natural curiosity by over three-quarters (77%) of the professionals; only 5% characterized this interest as precocious or prurient curiosity; no one characterized it as a morbid preoccupation or perverse sexual practice; 18% did not respond to the question.

Perceptions of adolescent interest in explicit sexual material and characterizations of this interest did not vary according to the sex and age of the professionals, but professionals working in a church setting were *less* likely to characterize the interest in explicit sexual materials as natural curiosity (X^2 [with 1 degree of freedom] = 4.5).

The questionnaire asked at what age, in the experience of the respondent, have 50% of the boys and 50% of the girls in our society been exposed to explicit sexual material.

One-third of the sex educators and counselors reported that 50% of boys have been exposed to these materials by the age of 12; 80% reported that half the boys

in our society have seen such materials by the age of 15; and 95% reported that by the age of 18 half the boys have been exposed.

Girls' experience, on the other hand, was perceived to occur at a later age than boys'. Roughly one-quarter (23%) felt that 50% of girls have been exposed to explicit sexual materials by the age of 12; 60% reported that half the girls have had such experience by age 15; and 85% felt that by age 18 half the girls have been exposed.

These estimates of when 50% of boys and 50% of girls have been exposed to explicit sexual materials did not differ by sex or age of the professional.

The sex educators and counselors were also asked to indicate the most probable source of the explicit sexual materials to which adolescents in our society are exposed. Sixty-three percent of the respondents indicated that a friend of about the same age was the most probable source; 11% felt that the most probable source was home; 15% felt that the adolescent would most likely get it at a newsstand or bookstore; 2% thought he would get it through the mails; 2% thought he would buy it from an adult; and 2% thought he would most likely see it by being shown by an older person who was trying to exploit him sexually. Thus, 75% felt exposure would most probably come from a noncommercial and nonexploitive source. These perceptions did not differ according to sex and age of the professional.

Several questions asked about the characteristics of adolescents who were likely to have the most exposure to explicit sexual materials.

Twenty-seven percent of the professionals felt that students with less than average grades would be more likely to have exposure to sexual materials, 6% felt that students with average or better grades would have more experience, while 60% felt there would be no difference between these groups.

Ten percent of the respondents felt that adolescents from poor families would more likely have exposure to sexual materials, 20% felt that adolescents from families with average or better income would have more exposure, while 64% felt that family income would not influence this experience.

Thirty percent of the sex educators and counselors felt that kids who were less popular and had few friends would have greater experience with these materials, 17% felt that the more popular kids would be more likely to be exposed, while 46% felt popularity would not affect this experience.

Forty-two percent thought that adolescents who were less active in school activities or were drop-outs would have most experience, only 5% thought the more active would have most exposure, and 45% thought that this dimension would not differentiate experience with sexual materials.

Twenty-four percent felt that adolescents with the least sexual experience would be more likely to be exposed to explicit sexual materials, 27% thought that adolescents with average or more experience with sex would be more likely to be exposed, and 41% felt that there would be no differences between these two groups.

In summary, based on their experiences, the sex educators and counselors report that most adolescents are interested in explicit sexual materials and that this is a natural curiosity, that more than half of adolescents have been exposed to explicit sexual materials by the time they complete junior high school, that the most common sources of exposure are peers and the family, and that experience

is not very well differentiated by success in school or family background.

Consequences of exposure

The sex educators and counselors reported, on the basis of their experience, several likely consequences of adolescents' exposure to explicit sexual materials: 4% felt the materials would bore the kids; 52% felt the materials would provide status for the possessor; 41% thought they provide a harmless outlet for bottled-up impulses; 38% felt they provide information about sex; 61% thought the materials would excite the adolescent sexually; 10% feared that they would lead to undesirable sex behaviors; 19% feared that they would lead to a premature preoccupation with sex; 5% felt they would cause the kids to lose respect for women; 5% felt they would lead to a breakdown of morals; and 20% felt that exposure to explicit sexual materials would have very little discernable influence on adolescents. Less than 15% of the named likely consequences would be classified as harmful.

These perceptions of the likely consequences of adolescent exposure to explicit sexual materials did not differ by sex or age of the experts. There was a statistically significant (X^2 [one degree of freedom] = 3.96) tendency for professionals working in a church situation to name more harmful consequences to exposure to these materials.

PB-35096
5-14

221411

221411

HQ
471
U5
v.5 U.S. Commission on Obscenity
and Pornography.
Technical report.

DATE DUE NO 30 '71 BORROWER'S NAME

DE 1 '71 MOORE RESERVE

U.S. Commission
Technical...v.5

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.