

PORNOGRAPHY AND HUMAN SEXUALITY

Edited by
J. N. SANTAMARIA

ISBN - 85826 - 102-2

A.C.T.S. No 1662 (1974)

A quotation from the Nobel Speech on Literature by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, entitled "*One Word of Truth*". The title comes from a Russian proverb, "one word of truth outweighs the whole world".

"The spirit of Munich is a dominant one in the 20th century. . . . The spirit of Munich is an illness of the willpower of the well-to-do, it is the usual state of those who have surrendered to the lustful comfort at any price, have surrendered to materialism as the main aim of our life on earth."

* * *

INTRODUCTION

These papers were presented at a public meeting held in Melbourne in October, 1973. The chairman was Dr. J. J. Billings. Because of the important nature of these topics and the expertise of the speakers, it has been decided to reproduce these papers in a published form.

J. N. Santamaria

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Today there is a loosening of moral restraints over large sectors of public life with consequent dangers for all of society. Part of the challenge comes from a distorted view of sex which pornography fosters.

There is in the community a large section which holds to the traditional view, shared by different cultures all over the world for centuries, that the basic unit of a stable society is the family, and that peaceful, integrated families ensure the development of a society in which all individuals enjoy the greatest freedom possible. Respect for the family involves respect for sexual activity, and a particular view of what limitations society should impose upon sexual behaviour or on the display of material likely to incite sexual passion. Many people from time to time have strong impulses to behave in a fashion which the traditional opinion would not approve, and this is the very reason why individual self-control must be developed, reinforced by laws which protect society.

In other words, those who believe that sexual loving is an intimate and sacred expression of the unity between husband and wife on which the security of family life is built should enjoy the freedom of living in a society where this opinion is not blatantly sabotaged and ridiculed. The promotion of pornography is not really a defence of freedom at all; it is a gigantic financial enterprise supported by arguments which are noisy rather than logical. Sex has become the battleground for those who take a religious or moral view of human life and human activity, and those who do not.

-Dr. J. J. Billings

* * * * *

Paper I
**The Nature and Effects
of Pornography**

DR. J. H. COURT,
Senior Lecturer in Psychology,
Flinders University of S.A.

DR. JOHN COURT is a Clinical Psychologist who is the Senior Lecturer in Psychology at Flinders University, South Australia. He is an Honours Graduate of Reading University in the United Kingdom and from 1956 until 1961 was a teacher of retarded and delinquent individuals. He was appointed to the University of Adelaide in 1964 and was a visiting professor in the University of Pittsburgh in the United States of America in 1970.

I. The Nature of Pornography

To describe the nature of pornography circumvents the need for a definition per se. Nonetheless, a definition may serve as a starting point to distinguish pornography from other material often brought into consideration with it. The *Kronhausens* (1967) said that "pornography is characterized by an absence of the reality constraints that mark erotically realistic works of fiction . . . One might say that the primary aim is to create a state of increasing sexual arousal in the reader by portraying sexual relations in which all standards are violated and in which the only psychological feelings involved are lust and a mindless sexual joy."

It should be apparent that this definition excludes many things on our bookstalls which often cause offence. Much literature which can better be described as erotica is aimed at producing titillation and sexual arousal in the normal male. Its presence in the community may be sufficient to cause offence, especially to women, but it is important to recognize that pornography, especially hard-core pornography, is in a different category when its nature is considered.

Erotica typically arouses the male sexually to have erotic thoughts and intentions, and, to a lesser extent, women have also been shown to respond to such material (*Schmidt and Sigusch, 1970*). Pornography with subjects defined as normal can be distinguished in terms of the reactions people report. *Amoroso et al* (1972) report that undergraduate males gave meaning to pornography different from that given to erotica. Typically, it was found that material rated as sexually stimulating might also be either 'pleasant' or 'unpleasant'. Material identified as arousing but unpleasant may be labelled as pornographic, while erotica may be that which is reported to be arousing and pleasant.

While making this broad distinction, it will become apparent that one is speaking of a continuum of which I have described the opposite poles, but there is a middle grey' area where disagreement over definition will rage. Dispute over what should be done about pornography often arises because one group is defending availability of sexually-explicit material (e.g. nudity), while the other side is referring to hard-core representations of bestiality, etc.

This distinction found with normal male student populations cannot be maintained when material is presented to more deviant populations. It is clear from the vast pornography industry that there are many males who seek after pornography in an addictive fashion, apparently not experiencing either the revulsion of many normal subjects or the satiation ('boredom') reported when normals experience forced-feeding (*Reifler et al 1971*). Some evidence for this comes from *Nawy's* (1970) study of patrons of pornographic films who demonstrate a high rate of attendance as well as a high level of promiscuous behaviour.

To understand why there could be different reactions it is necessary to consider further what is the underlying meaning of pornography. This has been the subject of considerable psychiatric study in recent years by Khan and Winnicott, whose views have been brought to wider attention by *Holbrook (1972 a)*, (and *1972 b*). Central to his theme is the idea that the essential message of pornography is hate, which of course puts it far removed from the position where sex is seen to be the vehicle for the expression of love. This element of hate would explain why well-adjusted people instinctively react against pornography even when they may not understand why, whereas those with pent-up hostilities or frustrations may find something to which they can respond. Some of the elements are contained in the following:

"... the champions of pornography make out that what they are trying to remedy are the inhibitions of our instincts through prudish traditions - they are trying to 'release' us. They are trying, they claim, to enable us to be more vital and feeling - to be 'ourselves' more, in the sexual realm. And yet, as *Khan (1972)* says, what pornography achieves is the opposite. In it, the images and words 'usurp' the natural functions of instinct. Instead of natural, loving feelings, moving towards 'meeting' another human being, we have an intense mental concoction of often brutal imagery - as in the cinema, where rape, and other gross acts of sadism are now frequent. The effect of these mental brutalities is to 'disregard the person and being of the characters'. We may observe this, even in 'girlie' magazines, in which the titillating way the girl is discussed and her photographic exploitation as an object destroy her personal unique qualities. This is the objection to the use of nudity in advertisements, too. It makes women into a commodity thing. In all pornography, she is humiliated and subjected to contempt as a mere sex object. In her image, humanity itself is degraded, by being deprived of value and subjected to hate, as the Jew or Negro is degraded in racist propaganda. Guilt and fear are not dispelled by pornography; on the contrary, it encourages us to enjoy hate in our attitudes to sex, and to have contempt for other people, especially women." *Holbrook (1972 b)*.

The defence of pornography often follows the line that a few dirty pictures won't hurt anyone, and that sort of stuff has always been around for those who want it. Such a reaction is either naive or dishonest. The nature of pornography is such that its users are not content to stay with the 'few dirty pictures' but must always move on to new material as the effect of familiarity blunts reaction. The similarity to a physical addiction is not co-incidental. There has been in recent years a pushing back of boundaries to permit more and more perverted material to circulate. It is still true in this country that even most supporters of pornography reject the free dissemination of pornography representing bestiality, incest and assault of minors. Yet these bounds will be extended soon enough if we adopt a conciliatory attitude at a lesser level.

The defence of pornography as being already available to those who seek it rarely takes account of two further considerations:

(i)
the hitherto restricted availability has been a mark of disapproval of the society at large. Those who sought it out did so recognizing they were at odds with the cultural norm. To permit free availability at this point is in effect to give endorsement to pornography by breaking the taboo associated with it. This is well-recognized by those who advocate the removal of restrictions: the implications of breaking taboos deserve serious thought as it is very difficult to reverse decisions about social customs in this area.

(ii)
for a small number of people to have illicit access to pornography is one thing. To permit free circulation of it is quite another. Even though point-of-sale restrictions may be placed on material so that minors do not buy it, it is clear that this protection disappears as soon as the material has been purchased (*Court, 1972*). Thus the much-vaunted protection of children becomes no more than a hollow promise as soon as adults -take their absolute freedom to see and read what they will.

As sexually-explicit material is widely defended today, it should be noted that a gradual "softening-up" approach was adopted in Denmark, so that people in that country failed to respond appropriately as

increasingly explicit and pathological material was introduced (*Clunies-Ross*, 1970). This deliberate policy prepared the way for the public acceptance of sex shows including not only intercourse live on stage, but group sex and bestiality (*Holbrook*, 1972 c). In this context, pornography was used deliberately to influence behaviour.

Pornography can also have its influence on behaviour in less carefully planned ways. The acceptance of perverse behaviour by many well-meaning people is matched by the acting-out of perversity by disturbed individuals who become 'a social hazard. We have in recent months had reports of the 37 boys murdered by a homosexual sadist and the more recent Boston white woman forced to douse herself with petrol and destroy herself in a style presented on film in that city shortly before. A little further back we recall the Manson killings, in which pornography played a part; and we should note with alarm that a film has been made of that event. There is a real risk that screening such a film could have similar harmful consequences to those which have followed the screening of *'Clockwork Orange'* and *'Dirty Harry'* (*Court*, 1973 c).

Such instances underline the importance of recognizing the intrinsic hate and hostility expressed through pornography. (1970) maintains that pornography does not simply represent perversions, but is itself perverted, leading as it does away from the meaningful relationship aspects of sex. Moreover, he would answer those who maintain that pornography deserves freedom from the law as being in the area of victimless crimes, that this underlying hostility means there is always a victim involved. Actors and models are humiliated, viewers are insulted, buyers are exploited.

There are two further senses in which one may associate pornography and perversion. Firstly, the use of pornography may be seen as a form of sexual deviation in itself, of a voyeuristic type (*Stoller*, 1970). It serves as a poor substitute for a healthy sexual encounter based on commitment, so that far from glorifying sex, it tends to destroy its meaning. Secondly, 'pornography is not an affirmation but a denial of life, and commercial pornography is a denial of life for the sake of money.' (**The Times**, 1970). The similarly anti-sexual nature of much erotica has often been noted in the past (e.g. *Cox*, 1965, *May*, 1969), but in pornography it goes further. Whereas in erotica the emphasis is removed from person to technique, from relationship to experience, in pornography a further detachment from reality occurs. Under the guise of unrestrained intimacy of a liberating kind, there is in fact a denial of any true intimacy and a great emphasis on control - this latter becoming most evident with the sadistic pornography of flagellation. A whole range of analyses of the nature of pornography has been drawn together in the edited volume *'The Case Against Pornography'* (*Holbrook*, 1972 d), as well as in the individual members' contributions to *'The Longford Report'* (*Longford*, 1972).

II. The Effects of Pornography

It is highly artificial to separate this effects section from a discussion of the nature of pornography and, in consequence, some indications have already appeared above of its effects insofar as they relate to its nature. Nonetheless, several further issues need to be raised which bear specifically on the question of effects.

At the simplest level we may look for effects which are good or bad, or, failing to find either, argue that there are no effects. This simplicity begs many questions, not least the meaning of good and bad. It is necessary to go further and specify effects on whom, when and under what conditions. A thorough evaluation would specify effects on individuals as well as on society at large. With individuals we should look for:

- (i) direct (causal) and indirect effects;
- (ii) short and long-term effects;
- (iii) hyper-arousal or blunting.

In society at large we would seek for evidence of:

- (i) changes in directly-related social pathology statistics (e.g. sex offences);
- (ii) changes in indirectly-related social pathology statistics (other crimes against persons or property);
- (iii) changes in the incidence of sex-transmitted diseases (V.D.) (S.T.D.);
- (iv) changes in social attitudes to pornography (including revulsion or unaroused acceptance).

Evidence relating to some or these indicators has been examined elsewhere (*Court, 1971, 1972*). There is accumulating evidence for significant harmful effects against a background of numerous equivocal studies. The suggestion that there might also be some good effects is so commonly made that this will be given special consideration below.

It is important to realize that widespread confusion over the effects of pornography exists for several reasons. Until only a few years ago the harmfulness was self-evident on moral grounds but scientifically unproven. More recently, with pressure to reject moral norms, the onus of proof has moved to experimental studies, the *American Report of 1970* being among the more important ones. The quality of that evidence was, however, severely flawed by the expectations of some of those contributing to the research. That the Commission Chairman was a prominent Civil Liberties man and was yet prepared to accept suppression of evidence which conflicted with the general findings reflects badly on the defence of freedom of speech and information. Many have been persuaded to reject some of the most compelling evidence in the technical reports to the Commission on the grounds that it was contained in the dissenting minority report of *Hill and Link (1970)*. It must therefore be recognized that the evidence which these two writers brought to the attention of the general public with the aid of a Supreme Court action was equally based on the technical reports within the main body of data. That the main report deserved criticism has been noted by *Eysenck (1972)* who says the "strictures on the authors of the majority report are unfortunately only too well taken."

The evidence on effects is also difficult to evaluate because of the technical problems in studying them.

The area has only recently become a subject for study. Methods are not yet refined and many of the critical experiments one might wish to do in theory are impossible in practice. Much of what has been done is largely irrelevant because of the restricted samples studied. It is no more suitable to draw conclusions about the effects of pornography on a sexually-disturbed man from presenting some to students under controlled laboratory conditions than it is to assess the effect of a glass of spirits on an alcoholic by giving a test-dose to a university student. Many other methodological and statistical problems still cloud the picture (*Court, 1973 a*).

The evidence from studies of individuals and groups which supports the view that pornography has harmful effects may be summarized as follows:

- (i) comparison of sex-deviate groups and others using self-reports indicated a high desire among deviates to imitate what they see in erotic material when compared with normals (*Goldstein et al, 1970*) ;
- (ii) while many studies with normal subjects fail to demonstrate harm, there is evidence that a minority even within normal groups do experience an adverse reaction (*Schmidt and Sigusch, 1970*) ;
- (iii) that not only attitudes but also actual behaviour may be affected is shown by *Walker (1970)* whose

study of the aggressive sexual offender concluded that "the experimental group reported more frequently than the control group that pornography had led them to commit a sexual crime . . . had something to do with their being in hospital or prison . . . that their sexual behaviour had been affected by viewing erotic materials;

(iv)

the view that sex-crimes go down following the legalization of pornography must be rejected as scientific nonsense. The widely-quoted Danish figures of *Kutschinsky* (1970) and *Ben-Veniste* (1970) have been shown to be utterly misleading (e.g. *Gummer*, 1971, *Court*, 1972) and can only be used in evidence by those who refuse to examine the more recent data. I have reported elsewhere the striking rise in rape statistics that have occurred since 1969 in Denmark (see Fig. 1), Britain, America, and now also in Australia (*Court*, 1973 a).

[Dr Court provided a reference to " Fig. 1", which I have not reproduced. It is titled: "Fig. 1. **RAPE AND ATTEMPTED RAPE. Ben-Veniste's Danish data extended to include 1971 figures**". It shows the number of rapes for each year as follows: 1958 - 52, 1959 - 54, 1960 - 38, 1961 - 48, 1962 - 47, 1963 - 48, 1964 - 37, 1965 - 40, 1966 - 50 (or 68), 1967 - 41, 1968 - 46, 1969 - 27, which the graph shows as the year "Porno Legalized". The graph shows a fairly consistent downward leaning plateau with a significant decline in 1969. BUT, Dr Court shows that the figures for 1971 are 96 rapes! (1970 figures are slightly doubtful and are listed as 55 '?'). Thus the figure shows a significant sky-rocket!]

The rise from 1970 to 1971 for Australia from 416 cases to 578 (39%) represents a significant upward departure from an already rising trend. The drop from 1971-72 to 544 cases (6%) is insufficient to conclude that any statistically significant improvement is occurring (Fig. 2).

[Again, I have not reproduced Dr Court's Fig. 2. it is titled: "Fig. 2. **CRIMES REPORTED OR BECOMING KNOWN TO POLICE: RAPE. - Source: YEAR BOOK - AUSTRALIA.**" It lists the year, the total female population (To nearest 1,000), and the number of 'Rape and Attempted Rape". Thus: 1964 - 5,597,000 - 270, 1965 - 5,711,000 - 265, 1966 - 5,815,000 - 255, 1967 - 5,924,000 - 320, 1968 - 6,044,000 - 370, 1969 - 6,157,000 - 380, 1970 - 6,283,000 - 416, 1971 - 6,407,000 - 578, and for 1972 Dr Court listed 544 rapes.]

There is every reason to remain deeply concerned at the trend of the last ten years - particularly when we recall that such reports represent only a small part of the total problem. That these trends are occurring in different countries but concurrently with the dissemination of pornography reduces the alternative explanations for the observed harm and strengthens the case against pornography.

Insofar as the civil liberties argument for free distribution of pornography rested on the Danish figures, the evidence has now gone so far the other way that its supporters should be among the leading exponents of a reversed policy. Indeed, in Britain this does now appear to be the case among responsible rationalists. At the recent announcement by the Home Secretary of measures to control pornography, a woman writer in the "*Freethinker*" (17 May, 1973) said that these measures would be welcomed "by liberals and liberationists, and all those who have some concern for the quality of life in our country today."

Finally, it is necessary to examine the other main argument of those who favour the free availability of pornography which says that not only is it not harmful but it may even be beneficial to some. This remarkable view derives its support from the catharsis theory of emotion and supposes that one who has strong pent-up sexual tensions which might erupt in anti-social behaviour can view sexual material and achieve a vicarious experience so that they become less likely to act out against others.

This argument achieved popularity by arguing indirectly from a study not on pornography but on aggression conducted by *Feshbach* (1955). The so-called "Feshbach hypothesis" proposed that the ventilation of aggression through fantasy would reduce the probability of enacting it against others.

It may be objected, of course, that it is a big leap from aggression to sex, even though many will grant that the mechanisms governing expression and control are effectively comparable. The more major objection, however, lies in the repeated failure of later workers to confirm the theory. On the contrary, the accumulated evidence now convincingly shows that the result of screening aggression in films or over TV is to produce an increase of such behaviour in the viewer both in the short and long term (*Liebert, Neale and Davidson, 1972*). That the same trend could be predicted with pornography is readily apparent when one recognizes the hostile and destructive undertones which characterize pornography.

The other more recent line of argument was that following availability of pornography in Denmark, there was a striking drop in offences like voyeurism and exhibitionism (*Kutschinsky, 1970*). Taken in isolation, such evidence appears to indicate that the man who was previously a social nuisance has diverted his sexual energies to the more solitary pursuit of pornography.

It is now possible to dispel that myth by showing that in reality the modelling effect seen with violence is also apparent with pornography. The problems have become worse, not better. A police report from Denmark notes that sex offences are now more often serious than minor (see *Court, 1973 b*); they have found that over the years since 1969 there has been an escalation of problems (e.g., rape and attempted rape figures rose from 27 in 1969 to 96 in 1971 (Fig. 1). Furthermore, just as there is increasing dismay that our society is coming to accept violence as normal, so too one effect of widespread pornography is that its values and meanings permeate the society. If the message of pornography is one of hate and hostility, then its acceptance must have destructive consequences. *Holbrook (1972 c)* says this is so - "the toleration of perversion can have its own meaning, and can communicate abroad the implication that psycho-pathological 'solutions' are socially acceptable." *Neville (Longford 1972)* similarly notes that the effect of making pornography available is to destroy the family and encourage promiscuity.

Perhaps the most helpful summary currently available would be the following:

"It cannot any longer be argued with any degree of conviction that pornography, or the portrayal of violence, have no effect on the behaviour of the people who see these things on the screen, or read about them in books and magazines. . . Both behaviour and emotional reactions are affected, and the effects are not transitory. The evidence is admittedly indirect, but that is not really a valid point of criticism; much scientific evidence in the "hard" sciences is of this kind, and is readily accepted on much the same level as direct evidence. . . . What the argument is about is simply the nature of the society in which we wish to live, and in which we wish our children to live - neither more nor less." (*Eysenck, 1972*).

REFERENCES

- Amoroso, D. M., Brown, M., Pruesse, M., Ware, E. E., and Pilkey, D. W. (1972). The effects of physiological measurement and presence of others in ratings of erotic stimuli. *Canadian J. Behaviour, Science*, 4, 3, 191-203.
- Ben-Veniste, R. (1970). Pornography and Sex Crime. *Tech. Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*, Vol. 7, 245 261. Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
- Clunies-Ross, B. (1970). *The Bulletin*, 27 June.
- Court, J. H. (1971) in Shilton, L. (Ed.). *No, No, Calcutta*. Brolga Books, Adelaide.
- Court, J. H. (1972). *Changing Community Standards*. Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide.
- Court, J. H. (1973 a). Pornography - Personal and Societal Effects. Geigy Symposium Paper, University of N.S.W.
- Court, J. H. (1973 b). The place of censored material in the treatment of behaviour disturbances. *Australian Psychology* 8, 2, 150-161.
- Court, J. H. (1973 c). *Stand Up and Be Counted*. Adelaide, Lutheran Publishing House.
- Cox, H. (1965). *The Secular City*. London, SCM Press.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1972). *Psychology is about People*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Feshbach, S. (1955). The drive reducing function of fantasy behaviour. *J. Abnormal Soc. Psychology* 50,

1, 3-12.

- Goldstein, H. J., Kant, H. S., Judd, L. L., Rice, C. J., and Green, R. (1970). Exposure to pornography and sexual behaviour in deviant and normal groups. *Tech. Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*, Vol. 7, 1-90. Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
- Gummer, J. S. (1971). *The Permissive Society*. Cassell, London.
- Hill, M. A., and Link, W. C. (1970) in *Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*. Bantam Books.
- Holbrook, D. (1972a). *The Masks of Hate*. London, Pergamon.
- Holbrook, D. (1972 b). *Pornography and Hate*. London, The Responsible Society.
- Holbrook, D. (1972 c). *Sex and Dehumanization*. London, Pitman.
- Holbrook, D. (1972 d). *The Case against Pornography*. London, Tom Stacey.
- Khan, M. (1972). In Holbrook, D. *Pornography and Hate*.
- Kronhausen, E., and Kronhausen, P. (1967). The psychology of pornography. In Ellis, A., and Abarbanel, A. (Eds.). *The Encyclopaedia of Sexual Behaviour*. New York. Hawthorn Books.
- Kutschinsky, B. (1970). Towards an explanation of the decrease in registered sex crimes in Copenhagen. *New Social Science Monographs*, 99-159.
- Liebert, R. M., Neale, J. M., and Davidson, E. S. (1972). *The Early Window*, New York, Pergamon.
- Longford, Lord (1972). *Pornography: The Longford Report*. London, Coronet Books.
- May, R. (1969). *Love and Will*. New York, W. W. Norton and Co.
- Nawy, H. (1970). The San Francisco erotic marketplace. *Tech. Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*, Vol. 4, 155-224. Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
- Neville, R., quoted in Longford, Lord (1972). *Pornography: The Longford Report*. London, Coronet Books.
- Reifler, C. B., Howard, J., Lipton, M. A., Liptzin, M. B., and Widman, D. E. (1971). Pornography; an experimental study of effects. *American J. Psychiatry*, 128, 5, 575-582.
- Schmidt, G., and Sigusch, V. (1970). Sex differences in response to psycho-sexual stimulation by films and slides. *J. Sex. Research*, 6, 4, 268-283.
- Stoller, R. (1970). Pornography and Perversion. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, 22, 490. (Reprinted in Holbrook, D. (Ed.), (1972). *The Case against Pornography*. Tom Stacey, London).
- The Times*. Editorial. Sept. 3, 1970. (Quoting the UNESCO Conference on Culture, 1970).
- Walker, C. E. (1970). Erotic stimuli and the aggressive sexual offender. *Tech. Reports of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*, Vol. 7, 91-148, Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

* * *

Paper II

The Faces of Pornography

By Very Rev. F. M. Chamberlin,
Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne

DEAN CHAMBERLIN is the Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne. He is Episcopal Vicar for Communications and the Mass Media, and lectures widely on these subjects. He was ordained a priest by Archbishop Mannix in 1946 and his special study has been the cinema, about which he has written extensively.

Introduction:

Definitions and descriptions of "pornography" and of the related term "obscenity" abound.

There are people who describe pornography as "anything which a culture defines to be pornographic", that is, anything which violates that society's accepted norms of sexual expression.

Others try to discover objective, universal ingredients in material which make it pornographic, like fantasy

situations with heavy emphasis on sexual details and an absence of anti-erotic elements, etc.

What is obscene under the law may be one thing - "material which has a tendency to deprave and corrupt" to paraphrase the *British Obscene Publications Act of 1959*.

What is obscene by definition can be another - "repulsive, filthy, loathsome, indecent, lewd" according to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*.

And what is considered obscene by the individual can be something again - "anything I would be embarrassed to show my wife and children." (Reference 1. Nightingale Earl: On Smut and Pornography, *National Decency Reporter*, Vol. VIII, No. 3-4. March - April, 1971. Los Angeles, Calif.)

Gebhard and others have defined pornography as "material deliberately designed to produce strong sexual arousal, rather than titillation, and which usually achieves its primary goal." (2. Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., and Christenson, C. V.: *Sex Offenders - an Analysis of Types*. Harper and Row, New York. 1965. p. 669.)

D. H. Lawrence wrote that "pornography is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it." (3. Lawrence, D. H. (1929): *Pornography and Obscenity* in Beal, A. *Selected Literary Criticism*. Heinemann, London. 1967.)

A working definition was given by Mr. Don Chipp when, as Minister for Customs and Excise in the previous Liberal-Country Party Government which lost office in 1972, he declared "pornography consists of verbal or pictorial publications devoted overwhelmingly to the explicit depiction of sexual activities in gross detail, with neither acceptable supporting purpose or theme, nor redeeming features of literary or artistic merit". (4. Shilton, Lance R. (ed.): *No, No, Calcutta*, Brolga Books, Adelaide. 1971. Quoted by Court, J. H.: *A Psychologist's Assessment*. p. 36.)

By nature pornography concerns itself with human sexuality. By association we speak of the pornography of violence and the pornography of tastelessness as part of the moral pollution which afflicts Western society in our day.

In this paper I can do no more than outline briefly some of the facets of this world-wide problem with special application to the situation in Australia, and I do this under the general title of "The Faces of Pornography".

A. Public Face

Many people in this country are unaware of the nature and extent of the sex-oriented material - both printed and pictorial - on public sale.

They will have seen "girlie" and "nudie" magazines and sex manuals on display at street corners, in newsagencies and at some local milk bars and delicatessens.

On examination, some of this material is quite explicitly pornographic. And there are outlets where hard-core pornography is available. The term "hard-core pornography" is used generally to describe photographic depictions of actual sexual intercourse or of sexual perversions. Obviously illegal material sold from under-the-counter is referred to as hard-core pornography by some.

The situation continues to deteriorate and the new 'R' (or restricted) certificate legislation in Victoria covering publications, limiting their sale to over 18-year-olds, has many loop-holes and weaknesses.

The State Advisory Board on Publications has power only to make recommendations to the Chief Secretary on material submitted to it by him.

There are only two choices open to the Board - to declare a publication suitable for general sale or to give

it an 'R' certificate restricting its display and sale. Under this scheme hard-core pornography would receive an 'R' certificate; the Board has no other choice.

All publications are not brought under notice and some publishers, distributors and retailers will choose to by-pass the Board and take their chances with prosecution for selling obscene goods, under section 166 of the Act.

The 'R' legislation safeguards the retailer so long as he observes the restrictions under which 'R' publications can be offered for sale, namely no member of his staff under 18 years of age may have access to these publications; they must not be available for perusal by customers under 18; and they may not be displayed in shop windows or in doorways, nor may there be any notices or advertisements drawing attention to them in the shop.

B. SEMI-PUBLIC FACE

Even now, hard-core material - in books, magazines, films, slides, etc. - can be obtained through the mails by answering advertisements in papers and magazines on open sale in this city.

And live shows and blue movies are bringing a handsome return to their promoters in and around Melbourne. Massage parlours cause growing concern.

Three months ago, the Commonwealth Film Censor, Mr. R. J. Prowse, flew a kite for the Attorney-General when he proposed the introduction of a new system of film rating, under which films now banned for public exhibition in Australia would be admitted for private screenings. The Film Censorship Board would cease to exercise its censorship powers and become a classification body.

This would open the way to a proliferation of all forms of screen pornography and of the worst kind. There would be no ban, no censorship of films involving sex or violence, and experience in Britain shows clearly that private screenings are in fact public screenings open to adults on payment of a club membership fee along with an admission charge.

C. REAL FACE

Of pornography, D. H. Lawrence declared: "Even I would censor genuine pornography, rigorously... . You can recognize it by the insult it offers, invariably, to sex and to the human spirit. Pornography is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it . . . The insult to a vital human relationship! Ugly and cheap they make the human nudity, ugly and degraded they make the sexual act, trivial and cheap and nasty." (5. *Lawrence, D. H.: op. cit.*)

Here is the real face of pornography:

- it debases the dignity of man
- it degrades the human person, especially the woman
- it insults sex and the human spirit
- it corrupts real love
- it misrepresents human sexuality
- it makes men and women seem to be no more than sex-ridden machines
- it has no place for tenderness and compassion
- it offers only the brutality and immaturity of the animal relationship
- it divorces sex from a genuine human relationship
- it rejects the institution of marriage
- it attacks the basis of our society, the family
- it distorts our values
- it promotes the wrong goals
- it coarsens our manners and behaviour
- it destroys individuals and ultimately society itself.

D. HIDDEN FACE

Peregrine Worsthorne, deputy editor of the London "*Sunday Telegraph*", rightly observes:

"The subject of pornography is manifestly inappropriate for treatment by a Royal Commission or even by some sort of official academic body. It raises moral, social and political questions that cannot be answered by the taking of evidence, or by scientific analysis." (6. Worsthorne, Peregrine: *Porn and the Liberals - Thoughts after Longford. Encounter*, May, 1973. London. p. 88.)

Dr. John Court has analysed in some detail the oft-repeated claim that statistics from Denmark show a decline in sex crimes following the removal of restrictions on pornography.

These figures do not stand up to critical examination. (7. *Shilton*, L. (ed.): op. cit. pp. 39-41.
Court, J. H.: *Changing Community Standards*. Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide. 1972. pp. 16-18.
Court, J. H.: *Pornography - Personal and Societal Effects*. 1973 (unpublished [but data given in Paper I of this pamphlet. See also his analysis in the first article of this pamphlet.])

On the contrary, Vice Kommissar Nielsen of the Danish State Police said in London (1972):

"Violent sex crimes have increased in Denmark since the abolition of sex laws. They rose from 2461 in 1970 to 2702 in 1971 - the last year for which figures are available. In 1965 there were 12 cases of rape and 28 cases of attempted rape. By 1971 these figures had risen to 32 and 64 respectively." (8. Court, J. H.: *Pornography - Personal and Societal Effects*. 1973. (unpublished [but see Paper I of this pamphlet]).

Scotland Yard figures show a 50% increase in reported rape in the first half of 1972 compared with the same period in 1971.

But crime statistics are the wrong test. They ignore completely the hidden and statistically unrecorded effects of pornography. To quote Professor James Chu of Yale University:

"The issue is not to what degree pornography is linked to sex crimes; the issue is that pornography promotes a selfish and indulgent mentality which attacks the very stability and strength of society, inhibiting development of maturity and strength of character in the young - and adults - with devastating short and long range social consequences. (9. Chu, James: quoted in *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. IX, No. 7-9, July - Sept., 1972. Los Angeles, Calif.)

And Dr. Max Levin, psychologist and neurologist in practice in New York City, writes:

"A test of pornography that focuses on the rate of crime is the WRONG test.

"There is overt or outwardly manifested behaviour and implicit or internal behaviour. A man's overt behaviour may be impeccable in that he never commits a crime, he never assaults anyone, yet his internal behaviour may be destructive in that he assaults himself with his distorted notions of sex, and his disturbed sex fantasies, and, in the process he victimizes those whose lives are intertwined with his, most of all his wife and children.

"It is probably no exaggeration to say that sexual and marital maladjustment causes a sum total of human suffering greater than cancer and heart disease. The number of people who commit rape is small, whereas the number of those who suffer from sex problems is enormous. This, then, is the real test of pornography: does it disturb and pervert the feelings and attitudes that people have in the realm of sex? Does it foster an unhealthy conception of the role that sex plays in life?" (10. Levin, Max: *Current Medical Digest*, Nov., 1966.)

E. COMMERCIAL FACE

Without questioning the sincerity of those who defend pornography on the grounds of artistic freedom and the right of the individual to choose for himself what he reads, sees or hears, pornography is big business, aptly described as "dirt for money's sake".

The pornographers are not in the least interested in the philosophical arguments. They are in business for the money.

The value of the pornography industry in the U.S.A. was set at \$600 million in a recent issue of *'Newsweek'*. (11. Porn: The Vice Goes on Ice. *Newsweek*, July 23, 1972. p. 46.)

Others declare that, with its many ramifications there, it is now a multi-billion dollar business, which because of its high profitability, has attracted the attention of organized crime. (12. Lindner, Craig: Organized Crime - Has it infiltrated the pornography industry? *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. X. No. 1-2, Jan. - March, 1973. Los Angeles.)

Of the pornography trade in Britain the Longford Report says: ". . . informed guesses, on the conservative side, suggest that so-called hard-core pornography represents at least a £10 million a year turn-over, and soft pornography many times that amount - 'several hundred million pounds' according to Raymond Palmer in the *'Observer'*. In addition, there is an enormous import trade of direct mail order buying from continental sources." (13. *Pornography - The Longford Report*. Coronet Books, London, 1972. p. 34.)

Jean-Paul Lauret (in *"The Danish Sex Fairs"*) states that pornography in Denmark is a \$60 million a year industry, making it third only to agriculture and furniture-making among the industries of that country.

It is impossible to establish figures for Australia, but pornography is certainly a multi-million dollar industry.

The 72 tons of material seized in Melbourne twelve months ago had an estimated commercial value of close to *a half million dollars*.

F. REVOLUTIONARY FACE

Some individuals and groups see pornography as a revolutionary weapon to be used for the overthrow of society.

"The Little Red Schoolbook" in its original Danish version was subsidized by Maoist funds. It was written by Communist authors expounding a Marxist philosophy and clearly identifying its affiliations through its title. Although cleverly dressed up to look like a commentary on education and related issues, one of its authors, on becoming a Christian, made clear it had nothing to do with education, but was a calculated exercise in anarchy. (14. Court, J. H.: *Stand Up and Be Counted*. Lutheran Publishing House. S.A. May, 1973. pp. 13, 14.)

Dr. Siegfried Ernst of the Ulm Council, Germany, has stated:

"The proponents of the sexual revolution see very clearly that the way to social and political anarchy is through moral and sexual anarchy. It is high time that we all see that behind the propaganda of sexual revolution is an ideological plan to destroy our youth and the moral and spiritual foundation of our cultural and national life. The repeal of laws against the perversions of pornography, abortion and the like, pave the way to destruction of society as we know it." (15. *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. IX. No. 5-6. May - June, 1972.)

And a Communist reaction to sex shows is contained in the following statement from *"Cinema Documents"*, a publication produced under the supervision of the Italian Communist Party:

"As a tactical policy, our aim is to defend an enterprise that is pornographic and entirely free from the restrictions of ordinary moral rules. They (directors and actors) are in effect like ants working voluntarily and without pay for us as they eat away the very roots of bourgeois society. Why should we stop them from their work? Why should we place obstacles in their path?" (16. Whitehouse, Mary: *Who Does She Think She Is?* New English Library, London. 1971. Quoted on pp. 127, 128.)

G. INTOLERANT FACE

The promotion of an anti-censorship, pro-pornography line, has resulted in an illiberal, intolerant, repressive and even bigoted censorship of Judaeo-Christian values and standards, what David Holbrook calls "counter-censorship".

Speaking of the British situation he says:

"The (sexual) pseudo-revolution, pornography and all, has driven the meaning out of sex, and one of the worst aspects of the whole fake revolt has been the heavy censorship in the press of genuine dissent and disagreement, while the pseudo-revolutionaries and the new millionaires of exploited sexuality have dominated the scene." (17. Holbrook, David: 'Counter-Censorship', *The Tablet*. 8 Sept., 1973. London, p. 846.)

Further, he says: "A new and powerful censorship is closing round us - smiling and dressed as 'liberation' though it may be" and he quotes in support American psychotherapist, Natalie Shainess, who in a report to the U.S. postal authorities (1970) declared:

"Those who recommend abandonment of censorship over-look the fact that there will still be censorship, but this time provided by the sellers of sexual wares, and unopposed by other forces . . . The kind of censorship they will provide will eliminate anything sensitive, good, loving, interpersonal, or even healthily lusty from the scene." (18. *Holbrook*, David: op. cit.)

Peregrine Worsthorpe devotes a long article in a recent issue of "*Encounter*" (see Reference 6: May 1973) to an examination of the public, and in particular, the media reaction to the Longford Committee and its subsequent report. He concludes:

"The watchdogs of freedom do not bark when liberal certitudes are ruthlessly protected from the ravages of truth-telling because they are trained, like Pavlov's dogs, to react only to certain stimuli - i.e., the customary threats to intellectual freedom, which are assumed to come only from Right-wing reactionaries.

"The result is a society in which a whole range of views that are currently unpopular and heretical do not get a fair and proper hearing, since as soon as they begin to appear on the horizon a barrage of moral abuse and intellectual mockery falls upon them which makes rational debate virtually impossible . . .

"This happened, in my submission, to the Longford Report. Right from the moment that the study group was set up it received the kind of treatment from the media which was certain to minimize its influence while boosting its sales. It was anathematized by the liberal Establishment as being a product of the forces of darkness which the faithful should eschew if they valued their immortal souls. It was put, so to speak, on an invisible Index, denied the official imprimatur of progressive approval. Not that this treatment affected public curiosity. But putting books on the Index never does. What it does do, however, is to stifle rational debate.

"The case against the spread of pornography is one that deserves the most serious attention. Only wilful and blind dogmatism would insist that some form of censorship cannot be respectably considered in this context without those who do so being burnt at the stake of public ridicule. What

deeply worries me is that the reigning liberal establishment is so armoured with self-righteousness, so confident in its certitudes, so fanatical about its faith, so proud of its prejudices, that it simply cannot conceive that it might be wrong."

H. FUTURE FACE

What is the likely future face of pornography in this country? Australia was visited recently by Mrs. Mary Whitehouse, Hon. General Secretary of the National Viewers and Listeners' Association in Britain. She declared that, as yet, the level of moral pollution in Australia was not as high as in Britain, the U.S.A. or in parts of continental Europe.

But who is to say that we are not moving in the same general direction?

Since Mr. Chipp introduced his more liberal censorship policies in late 1971 - even with fairly stringent anti-obscenity laws in most States - pornography has become a multi-million dollar industry. The pornographers have moved in.

We have been treated to an increasing measure of pornography on our cinema screens - sometimes paraded as art or social comment, but mostly presented for what it is.

I have already outlined my fears for the 'R' legislation in Victoria covering publications.

The proposal to introduce a no-certificate category into our film censorship regulations is in line with the Federal Government's stated policy of allowing adults to see, read and hear what they choose and would mean that screen pornography of the worst kind would be readily available.

If present trends continue unchecked there is no reason to suppose that the situation in Australia within a few years will be any different from what it is in the United States, or Britain, or Denmark.

Two major decisions of recent times - in the United States and Britain - give hope that an attempt is being made to halt the galloping onrush of moral pollution in these countries.

On June 21 last [1973] the United States Supreme Court reversed its previous position regarding the legal permissiveness of obscenity by ruling:

- (a) that local, rather than national, standards may be used to determine whether material is obscene and thus outside constitutional protection; and
- (b) that juries and lower courts no longer must hold that material is "utterly without redeeming social importance" before it is declared obscene. Rather, they may determine whether a work "taken as a whole lacks serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value."

And on October 4 last, [1972] the British Home Secretary (Mr. Robert Carr) announced that the Government would press for legislation to crack down on Britain's thriving pornography industry. The proposed legislation would strengthen existing obscenity laws, would seek to stop books and magazines with pornographic covers being sold at street news-stands and would outlaw pornographic posters, displays outside cinemas, theatres and strip clubs, and mail circulars advertising obscene literature. This proposal lapsed with the subsequent change of government.

One wonders whether we have sufficient maturity, sufficient good sense, sufficient concern for our future to learn from the experience of others.

The future face of pornography here depends on you and me and thirteen million other Australians.

Regrettably there appears to be a large measure of ignorance of the problem, combined with a monumental apathy.

And it is as true today as it ever was that "all that is required for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

REFERENCES

1. Nightingale Earl: On Smut and Pornography, *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. VIII, No. 3-4. March - April, 1971. Los Angeles, Calif.
2. Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., and Christenson, C. V.: *Sex Offenders - an Analysis of Types*. Harper and Row, New York. 1965. p. 669.
3. Lawrence, D. H. (1929): *Pornography and Obscenity* in Beal, A. *Selected Literary Criticism*. Heinemann, London. 1967.
4. Shilton, Lance R. (ed.): *No, No, Calcutta*, Brolga Books, Adelaide. 1971. Quoted by Court, J. H.: A Psychologist's Assessment. p. 36.
5. Lawrence, D. H.: op. cit.
6. Worsthorne, Peregrine: Porn and the Liberals - Thoughts after Longford. *Encounter*, May, 1973. London. p. 88.
7. Shilton, L. (ed.): op. cit. pp. 39-41.
- Court, J. H.: *Changing Community Standards*. Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide. 1972. pp. 16-18.
- Court, J. H.: *Pornography - Personal and Societal Effects*. 1973 (unpublished [but data given in Paper I of this pamphlet]).
8. Court, J. H.: *Pornography - Personal and Societal Effects*. 1973. (unpublished [but see Paper I of this pamphlet]).
9. Chu, James: quoted in *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. IX, No. 7-9, July - Sept., 1972. Los Angeles, Calif.
10. Levin, Max: *Current Medical Digest*, Nov., 1966.
11. Porn: The Vice Goes on Ice. *Newsweek*, July 23, 1972. p. 46.
12. Lindner, Craig: Organized Crime - Has it infiltrated the pornography industry? *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. X. No. 1-2, Jan. - March, 1973. Los Angeles.
13. *Pornography - The Longford Report*. Coronet Books, London, 1972. p. 34.
14. Court, J. H.: *Stand Up and Be Counted*. Lutheran Publishing House. S.A. May, 1973. pp. 13, 14.
15. *National Decency Reporter*. Vol. IX. No. 5-6. May - June, 1972,
16. Whitehouse, Mary: *Who Does She Think She Is?* New English Library, London. 1971. Quoted on pp. 127, 128.
17. Holbrook, David: 'Counter-Censorship', *The Tablet*. 8 Sept., 1973. London, p. 846.
18. Holbrook, David: op. cit.

FURTHER READING

Pollution is a major world problem in modern society - moral pollution above all else.

In this paper it has not been possible to do more than make passing comment on some selected aspects of pornography.

It is a subject on which we need to be informed and about which we should be concerned.

I draw attention to sources referred to in the body of my paper.

Dr. John Court, Senior Lecturer in Psychology at Flinders University, South Australia, has made a supremely competent and worthwhile contribution to the censorship-pornography-community standards debate, borne of his professional skills and his Christian commitment.

His analysis of trends in modern society is clear, informed, closely reasoned and persuasive. Add to the above references -

Court, J. H.: *In defence of Censorship - A Christian View*. Adelaide, 1971.

As Chairman of the South Australian branch of the Australian Festival of Light, he is associated with the branch magazine, *Light* - a useful and attractively-produced record of news, events, talks, sermons, reviews, etc. (Box 1717, G.P.O., Adelaide, 5001). [Use your search engine to research 'Festival of Light'.]

He is also currently editor of *Community Standards News*, the national magazine of the Community Standards Organization. This 4-8 pages printed newsletter carries news and information about the fight for community standards here, with passing reference to what is happening elsewhere. (P.O. Box 308, Moorabbin, Vic., 3189). [Use your search engine to research 'Community Standards Organization' or Organisation.]

National Decency Reporter is the bi-monthly newsletter of Citizens for Decent Literature, Inc., and is dedicated to "decency in the mass media". It reports the anti-pornography fight in the U.S.A. and reprints articles and speeches from various sources.

Clor, Harry M.: *Obscenity and Public Morality - Censorship in a Liberal Society*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969 - An examination of the nature of obscenity against the background of Supreme Court decisions in the U.S.A. Clor demonstrates that a systematic and reasoned argument can be made for legal control of obscenity -one which does not rest ultimately upon religious or non-rational considerations.

Drakeford, John W., and Hamm, Jack; *Pornography - the Sexual Mirage*. Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, 1973 -The authors use actual examples from magazines, films, books, etc., to examine the pornography situation in the U.S.A. Popular presentation calling for action by responsible citizens.

Holbrook, David (ed.): *The Case Against Pornography* - Stacey, London, 1972 - A collection of 27 essays by psychotherapists, social and moral philosophers, psychiatrists, economists, novelists, journalists and educationalists.

Mishan, E. J.: Making the World Safe for Pornography. *Encounter*, March, 1972, pp. 9-30 - A rejection of some of the arguments advanced for the spread of pornography.

Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Bantam Books, New York, 1970 - The full report of the U.S. Presidential Commission, whose recommendations were rejected by the U.S. Senate by 60 votes to 5.

* * *

Paper III

Human Sexuality and Sex Education

By DR. FRANK AYD

DR. FRANK AYD is a distinguished Psychiatrist from the United States of America. He is a Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association and is famous especially for his contributions to biological psychiatry, which means the study of the causation and medical treatment of mental disorder. In 1970 he received the Taylor Manor Hospital Psychiatric Award which is provided "as a tribute to the genius of scientists dedicated to easing emotional and psychiatric suffering and to restoring mental health".

An unprecedented interest in and demand for sex education in schools has blossomed in this second half

of the twentieth century. Speakers at meetings of parents, educators, civic organizations, clergymen, physicians and other professional groups acknowledge that, ideally, sex education should be shared by the home, school and church. But, they charge, too often parents and church representatives cannot or will not assume this responsibility sensibly or effectively. Articles promulgating this attitude abound in newspapers and magazines. Many radio and television shows also are advocating sex education in school.

In the United States, the clamour for sex education has persuaded more and more well-intentioned individuals and organizations to pressure Departments of Education and School Boards to provide sex education from kindergarten through high school. In some states, legislation has been introduced to make sex education mandatory. In a few states such legislation has been enacted. Even the Federal Government has become involved. In 1967, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare supplied \$1.5 million to support the "new" sex education programmes in 13 school districts. How much Federal money has been granted since I do not know, but it is reasonable to assume that more, not less, has been allotted for sex education. In fact, the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning appointed by President Johnson in 1968 recommended that Federal assistance for local sex education programmes including instruction on population and family life, be expanded rapidly to several million dollars annually.

Since sex education in school is now topical in Australia, there are questions that Americans have posed which you also should ask about this highly controversial subject. These are: Who is behind the burgeoning demand for sex education in school? What are their motives and objectives? These pertinent questions demand forthright answers for everyone interested in the welfare of the nation and especially for parents who are vitally concerned about the character formation of their children and the value systems they adopt and live by.

There are at least five groups who want sex education in school. These are:

- (1)
children from age 10 or 11 who have valid questions for which they seek honest, helpful answers;
- (2)
parents who want the school to complement and reinforce the sex education they give by word and example at home;
- (3)
parents and others who are alarmed by the rising rate of illegitimate pregnancies and venereal diseases in young people;
- (4)
individuals and groups who wish to convince children through education of the need for and the methods of family planning in order to limit population growth and raise what they call "the quality of life"; and
- (5)
commercial organizations who see sex education programmes as a lucrative market for their products.

Each of these groups has different ideas of the need for, the purposes of, and what should be taught in sex education courses in school. This, not surprisingly, has led to controversy; the basis for which demands exposition. In an effort to do this, let me say that groups 1 and 2 have the right concerns for wholesome reasons that conflict with the reasons of groups 3, 4 and 5. This can be illustrated by a discussion of the reasons of groups 3, 4 and 5, because the motives for sex instruction influence what will be taught; especially what attitudes about human sexuality will be taught, and by whom and to whom they will be taught.

The Motives of Group 3

'Parents and others who are alarmed by the rising rate of illegitimate pregnancies and venereal diseases in young people.'

A coalition of permissive morality and commercial fostering of the prurient inclinations of youth has caused many of them to reject traditional codes of chastity and to refuse to bank for a time the lusty fires ignited in them. This has produced a widespread indulgence in sexual activities and a *teenage copulation explosion*. In the past decade there has been not only an increasing incidence of sexual intercourse among juveniles but a drop in the age of first experience, so that pre-teen intercourse is not rare. Furthermore, many girls and boys are having repeated carnal experiences, often with a succession of partners.

The harvest of this spreading youthful promiscuity is a sharp rise in illegitimate pregnancies, abortions and venereal diseases. To this chronicle must be added the incalculable psychological harm which is an inevitable consequence of adolescent promiscuity.

Aware of these facts, there are concerned parents, physicians and others who sincerely believe that sex instruction in school is essential if venereal diseases, illegitimate pregnancies, and abortions in our youth are to be reduced. They believe that sex education courses should discourage premarital sexual relations. Yet, many of them also argue that since some juveniles will have intercourse, they should be given birth control advice and contraceptives with instruction about their proper use. Contraceptives, they contend, should be furnished by the school, or teachers should direct pupils to appropriate medical sources for them. The objective is to prevent teenage pregnancies. But, even if they are educated to have a contraceptive awareness, teenagers cannot be expected to use contraceptives intelligently or consistently, because their emotional immaturity and impulsiveness preclude this. Hence, a percentage of juvenile illegitimate pregnancies are bound to occur. Consequently, some sex education supporters insist that young girls should be conditioned by their sex education in school to prefer abortion to an unwanted child, especially an illegitimate one.

If these statements seem incredible, I can cite many speeches and articles by American proponents of sex education in school to substantiate them. For example, Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, President of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., and Vice-President of the Association for the Study of Abortion, is a staunch advocate of sex education in school. In the March, 1969, issue of the journal **Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality**, Dr. Guttmacher has an article entitled "How Can We Best Combat Illegitimacy?" He suggests that this can be done by the introduction of sex education in school, and by making contraceptives more readily available to the unmarried.

What does Dr. Guttmacher believe sex education should include? This is his answer: "I see three main components of sex education: anatomy and physiology of reproduction, male-female relationships, and the process of coitus - its performance, regulation and consequences. Ideally, sex education should be so well integrated into other areas of instruction - history, economics, social studies, literature, science - that it need not be isolated into a separate pedagogic unit . . . I believe that in co-educational schools sex education should always be taught in co- educational groups . . . Anatomy and physiology of reproduction, I feel, should be introduced at the fourth or fifth grade level, when the children are 10 or 11 years old. I have taught it by dissecting a pregnant animal, placing spermatozoa under the microscope, washing eggs from the tubes for microscopic viewing, and showing a series of preserved human embryos . . . Male-female relationships - dating, petting, courtship, marriage, the family, illegitimacy, child-parent interactions - should be the main content of sex education during the seventh or eighth grade . . . In the second year of high school the facts of life should be taught frankly, yet sensitively. The teaching should include the emotional and procreative roles of coitus, marriage, its companionship and responsibilities, contraception, abortion, venereal disease, and the world population dilemma. [sic]"

Many cogent reasons can be given to expose the superficially plausible assumptions of the Group 3 advocates of sex education in school. Suffice it to say that, aside from convincing teenagers that abortion is the solution for unwanted pregnancies, there is no reason to presume that sex instruction in school or

the provision of contraceptives for teenagers will have any significant impact on the venereal disease rate or the incidence of illegitimate pregnancies in this age group. It may influence the abortion rate, that is increase it, as the data from those nations which have liberal abortion laws indicate.

Why?

For many years in countries such as Denmark and Sweden, teenagers have had sex education from kindergarten on, and easy access to birth control information and contraceptives. Official government reports from these countries disclose that, although children have sex education and contraceptives to use, their illegitimacy rate has increased significantly. At the same time, there has been a rise in venereal diseases to almost epidemic proportions in this age group. Official United States Government data show clearly that, even though American youngsters know about contraceptives and have little or no difficulty obtaining them, teenage venereal diseases and illegitimate pregnancies are increasing at a disturbing rate. These indisputable facts from Europe and the United States speak for themselves.

[We, of the internet age, know, only too well, how true this is!]

The Motives of Group 4

'Individuals and groups who wish to convince children through education of the need for and the methods of family planning in order to limit population growth and raise what they call "the quality of life". . .'

Many of the advocates of sex education are alarmed about the world's population growth. They tell us that if the population growth rate is not soon reduced to zero, the human race will destroy itself by an epidemic of unrestrained breeding. They point to the poverty, hunger, and human misery in this world. They warn that; if the quantity of people is not limited, the world's food supply will be insufficient to meet the demands for it. *Consequently, they predict that **sometime between 1975 and 1985**, because of vast famines, **hundreds of millions of people** are going to starve to death*, unless plague, thermo-nuclear war, or something else kills them first. These alleged imminent famines, they claim, can be avoided **only** by a drastic and immediate reduction of the birthrate.

[Note how inaccurate the doom-sayers were in 1973!]

Many experts on population agree that the oral contraceptive, the intra-uterine devices, and all other methods of family planning are not the solution to the population crisis. Population control, they rightly insist, is primarily a matter of human attitudes [and especially our attitudes to sharing the ABUNDANCE of the world's resources provided by a Provident God. 'Take care of the world's people and the population will take care of itself!']. People, they argue, must be convinced that they should not have more than two children. At present, many are not so convinced. [with good reason!] They are using contraceptives to space children until they have the number they desire, which for many Americans is three or four.

Those who ardently want a rapid reduction in population are clamouring for two things. First, no laws restricting abortion or a law guaranteeing the right of any woman to have an abortion whenever she wishes. Second, state or national legislation requiring sex education in schools which includes discussion of the need of regulating the birth rate and the techniques of birth control. Liberal abortion laws are needed, they say, because only abortion will quickly lower the birth rate as it did in Japan and some Iron Curtain countries, and we cannot wait for education to motivate young people to eventually limit family size through contraception. [Thus they advocate the death of innocent babies as the best (or final) solution to the 'population problem'!] Hence, as many of us know, but may not realize why, there are active campaigns going on to make people "abortion-minded" and ultimately to create a universal "contraceptive mentality" in our youth. These objectives, it is truly believed, can be achieved by sex education in school.

I feel obliged to warn you not to be deceived by the rationalizations being used by some sex education supporters to persuade educators and the public that there should be sex education from kindergarten to high school. They consider the current birth rate as an epidemic [sic!] which must be curtailed. This

position has been expressed by Dr. Mary S. Calderone, past-president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc., and presently Executive Director of SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States). Dr. Calderone said at the 1967 meeting of the American Public Health Association: "We have yet to beat our public health drums for birth control in the way we beat them for polio vaccine; we are still unable to put babies in the class of dangerous epidemics, even though this is the exact truth." If one accepts this premise, and Dr. Calderone does, it is only logical that she would champion sex education with instruction in birth control methods to curb an epidemic of babies. [sic!]
[Note; All this was said way back in 1973! And, it is enough to make one sick!]

What the proponents of sex education want is exemplified by this statement of Professor Paul Ehrlich in his book, **The Population Bomb**. "By 'sex education' I do not mean courses focusing on hygiene or presenting a simple-minded 'birds and bees' approach to human sexuality. The reproductive function of sex must be shown as just one of its functions, and one that must be carefully regulated in relation to the needs of the individual and society. Much emphasis must be placed on sex as an interpersonal relationship, as an important and extremely pleasurable aspect of being human, as mankind's major and most enduring recreation, as a fountainhead of his humour, as a phenomenon that affects every aspect of his being."

Professor Ehrlich wants instruction in birth control methods mandatory in all public schools. He argues: "If we take proper steps in education, legislation, and research, we should be able in a generation to have a population thoroughly enjoying its sexual activity, while raising smaller numbers of physically and mentally healthier children." To attain this goal, Professor Ehrlich and other proponents of sex education insist that children must be indoctrinated thoroughly not only in how to avoid the transmission of life but also to desire no more than two offspring.

Clearly the members of this group of advocates of sex education in school are primarily interested in utilizing these programmes to have youngsters adopt their value systems and their means to achieve zero population growth. They want to use sex education courses to effect attitudes and behaviour changes so that their social policies are implemented. This raises the vitally important question, "Should a pluralistic, democratic society permit the use of schools to expose children to and to persuade children to accept the value systems and social policies of any one segment of society?" To do so would be an infringement on the rights of those who hold contrary views and a denial of the rights of parents to determine the value systems their children are to be taught.

The Motives of Group 5

'Commercial organizations who see sex education programmes as a lucrative market for their products.'

Another group of strong proponents of sex education in school is composed of various commercial organizations. They see a multimillion dollar market and high profits from training programmes for teachers, from text-books for teachers, pupils and libraries, from pamphlets and reprints of articles on recommended reading lists, from charts, slides, models, records, questionnaires for teachers and students, and from films. Manufacturers of contraceptives and purveyors of pornographic material also favour sex education in school. They expect that such sex instruction will increase the sale of their products, and, of course, fatten their incomes. Their prime interest is making money, even if this should have catastrophic consequences for the individual and for society.

Comment

Sex education in school is a delicate and complex task. It requires highly qualified, well trained, mature teachers with special competence in this area. These are in short supply. Furthermore, serious consideration must be given to the content and method of sex education courses for each age group, whether there should be group instruction, and the size of the group; and last but not least we must ask if any value systems are to be taught and if so, which. There is no doubt that responsible parents want wholesome sex education for their children. There is no doubt that children want and can profit from sex

education, but it is imperative to ask what kind they want and require. Some teachers unintentionally have been guilty of stupid and harmful sex instructions. What they have done, for example, by using four-letter words and other crude expressions about human sexuality proves their unfitness. They do not realize that you do not have to act like a little boy to help him become a man. They utterly fail to comprehend that example is not only the best way to give good sex education, but that it is the only way.

I hope that what I have expressed will not be misinterpreted as a condemnation of all sex educators or as a lack of sympathy for and understanding of their earnest and genuine motives to contribute constructively and positively to the total maturation of their pupils. On the other hand, there is ample justification for concern about the type of sex instruction to which some children are being or may be exposed. The mere fact that a programme has been sanctioned by education officials, doctors, clergymen, and other civic and business leaders, does not make it good - or immune to critical scrutiny. These people endorse sex education because they honestly believe it is a good idea, but in some instances they apparently are not fully aware of exactly what they approve.

Finally, I must stress that I am not opposed to formal sex education in public and private schools. I insist, however, that the facile assumption that the subject matter being taught is what responsible parents want their children to learn is not necessarily consonant with the facts. Physicians and parents who are interested in the welfare of children should investigate what sex instruction is being or will be given in school. They should ask to see the literature being used and the films being shown, question the qualifications of sex educators, and demand to know what the true objectives of the courses are.

* * *
* * * * *