

A Wake-Up Call Reflections on Media, Freedom, and Morality

Dr. Ahmed Afzaal

The pace of Westernization in the Pakistani cultural scene has increased tremendously during the last couple of years. The easy availability of explicit foreign videos, novels, and glossy magazines, the increasingly bold and daring policies being adopted by our own electronic and print media, as well as the leniency with which all this is being tolerated and even encouraged by those in authority — all these are signs of a serious decadence. Add to this the liberalization of social norms that used to regulate the behavior of young men and women, and you have a perfect recipe for societal degeneration.

Attempts to criticize and condemn this trend are often brushed aside as irrational and dogmatic opinions of a few narrow-minded fanatics, or as signs of an obscurantist mentality. Such derogatory labels, however, do not constitute any logical argument, nor do they prove anything. Instead, what we really need, in order to reach a rational solution to the issue of whether or not we should adopt the Western and liberal values, is an objective analysis of the whole problem.

Let's start our discussion at the very beginning.

Facts of Life

Like all animals, the *Homo sapiens* consist of two different genders: male and female. The biological urge to mate ensures the sharing of different types of genetic material, so that greater variation in form and function can be achieved with each passing generation. A sort of

Natural Selection is applicable here, because the animals who mate are able to leave offspring to continue the race, whereas those who are not interested in mating quickly become extinct. The strong sexual urge, therefore, guarantees the continuation of species.

Throughout the animal kingdom the male is always the sexual aggressor while the female remains passive. This difference is based on a fundamental biological fact. The male reproductive cells, the sperms, are small and motile, while the female reproductive cells, the ova, are large and relatively immobile. A female produces far fewer eggs than a male generates sperm. In other words, there are always more sperms than eggs. This means that, from a purely biological standpoint, males of all species can spread their sperm far and wide, impregnating as many females as possible, but the females may get only one mating opportunity per season. Therefore, the female must hold back and choose the best possible mate, while the male can afford to be rather indiscreet.

Although this is clearly applicable to the human beings inasmuch as they possess physical bodies and instincts similar to those of the lower animals, there are a number of significant differences. It is a self-evident fact that the intensity and vigor of sexual urge in human beings is far greater than any other animal. Moreover, there is no built-in mechanism in the human beings, again unlike other animals, that would diminish or abate their sexual desire once its primary purpose - reproduction - has been achieved.

The human race could easily have been prevented from becoming extinct with only a fraction of the normal human sexual urge. This implies that, as far as the human beings are concerned, the sexual urge must have an important function in addition to that of biological reproduction. What is that extra function?

The answer is quite obvious: Nature wants us to live together, as families and clans and tribes and societies. That is exactly why men and women not only crave physical union, they also

yearn for permanent relationships and love and commitment and spiritual devotion. That is why the human infant is the most helpless and fragile creature in the entire animal kingdom, and also the most dependent on his parents' care and protection. Again, that is why human parents are more loving and caring than any other species. Clearly, Nature doesn't want men and women to come together just for the sake of their physical need, but she wants them to develop real and lasting love and companionship that would, on the one hand, ensure the survival and well-being of the helpless newborn and, on the other hand, become the basis of a stable family life which would, in turn, give rise to close-knit communities.

However, the strong sexual instinct in man is a double-edged sword. On account of its remarkable intensity, human sexuality has a potential for getting out of control and becoming an end in itself. Thus, an essential prerequisite for establishing and maintaining a stable and healthy civilization is to restrain the sex impulse by special customs and social institutions, to allow its expression only within well-defined boundaries, and to strictly prohibit and check any transgression of those limits. Otherwise a chaotic expression of sex impulse will result, leading to the decay of the institution of family, degeneration of morals, and a culture of men exploiting women.

There is an undeniable link between the sexual norms of a nation and its overall well-being. A famous study of eighty primitive and civilized societies, carried out by former Cambridge Professor J. D. Unwin, has proved the existence of a direct correlation between increasing sexual freedom and social decline.¹ According to the results of this study, the more sexually permissive a society becomes, the less creative energy it exhibits and the slower its movement towards rationality, philosophical speculation, and advanced civilization. Similarly, the eminent British historian Arnold Toynbee has argued that a culture which postpones rather than stimulates sexual experience in young adults is a culture more prone to progress.²

Unfortunately, in our morbid zeal of blindly imitating the West, we even ignore how a growing number of European and American writers have been enlightening their own people about the disastrous consequences of sexual permissiveness. While many of the secular and liberal "intellectuals" among us are still waiting eagerly for the arrival of the "Sexual Revolution" of the 1960's from the United States, the Americans themselves are beginning to recognize the importance of traditional family values and premarital abstinence. A new breed of writers and activists in USA and Europe are forcefully presenting the case for decency in the media and a return to traditional family system as the ideal way of life.³ Their logical and sober advice is often based on the recognition of inborn differences between the two genders.

Gender Differences

Although radical feminists have long insisted that men and women are alike except for their reproductive functions, and that all apparent differences are produced by a "repressive" environment, we now possess evidence that proves the exact opposite. Authentic scientific research has clearly demonstrated that such differences between men and women are genetic in origin and have firm biological foundations.

The more protective and less belligerent attitude of women towards others, their greater competence regarding relationships and people, their tendency to sacrifice personal interests in order to meet the needs of friends and relatives, their propensity to avoid conflicts and confrontations, their anxiety to please others, as well as their strong maternal and nurturing instinct - all these traits make women ideal home-makers. On the other hand, men are physically stronger, tend to excel in the logical manipulation of concepts, and are, in general, more self-assured, self-sufficient, and independent as compared to women - all of which make them well-adapted for their role as providers, protectors, and supervisors of the family unit.

More relevant to our subject, however, is the difference between men and women that is manifested in their emotions and attitudes regarding sex. The basic biochemical mediator of sex activation, aggression, and dominance — in both men and women — is the hormone "testosterone." The primary sources of this hormone are testes in men and the adrenal glands in women. The distinctions occur because, unlike the female, the male brain is exposed to testosterone right from its development in the mother's womb, and also because, after puberty, there is twenty times more testosterone in a man's body as compared to that in a woman's. This makes men, in relation to women, much more aggressive, dominant, and sexually active. Also, the higher testosterone level leads to the well-documented male tendency towards promiscuity.

Men, in general, tend to be more interested in the physical aspect of sex as compared to its personal dimension. On the other hand, women value companionship, love, commitment, attachment, and affection much more than physical gratification. Research has shown that men are likely to become irritable when deprived of sex, whereas women rarely experience the same feeling of deprivation in a celibate state. Men have a greater capacity for spatial-visual skills and are more responsive to visual stimuli; that's why they are so preoccupied with the shapes and forms of the opposite sex, and that's why over 90% of the consumers of pornography are men. On the other hand, women are usually attracted towards the members of the opposite sex due to the latter's communication competence, social position, confidence, or sense of humor, and only rarely because of their physical appearance.⁴

Women frequently complain that men see them as "objects." Men complain that women are only interested in talking. Both are correct because, for men, sex is largely a matter of objective things and actions, whereas for women it has more to do with communication and intimacy. No amount of protesting and grumbling can change the essential nature of either men or women. Instead, women must keep in mind that men are very easily aroused, and that they frequently misconstrue the

slightest hint of friendship as a sexual invitation. The old warning that men are only after one thing is absolutely true.

The Miracle of Marriage

Men are basically promiscuous. It is only the institution of marriage that can convert their aimless lust into constructive love, and divert their short-term preoccupation with physical pleasure into long-term commitments for the care and protection of their families. In the absence of any social and legal restriction on sexual activity outside of marriage, men tend to revert back towards their instinctual pattern of promiscuous and irresponsible sexual behavior. We can see how this permissiveness results in a huge number of unmarried mothers who are left to provide for themselves as well as for their children. Contrary to what Western women have been led to believe, "One Night Stands" have nothing to do with equality or freedom; this is only a modern version of the old deception - men taking advantage of women.

Sexual permissiveness demolishes the institution of family. Despite all attempts to portray "Single Motherhood" as something desirable and trendy, the fact remains that the intact two parent family offers much greater security and much better outcomes by providing ideal environment for the proper growth and development of children. Unregulated sexual freedom, on the other hand, allows men to be indiscriminate in their "adventures", and since - in the absence of strong social conventions - nothing and no one can force them to act in a responsible manner, their promiscuous behavior results in a large number of illegitimate children who never receive the care, protection, and love of their fathers. We certainly don't want to introduce this kind of social anarchy into our own society. Or do we?

Mistaken Views of Human Nature

Some of us are indeed under the impression that the sexual freedom now prevalent in the West resulted from the much needed revolt against "unnatural" restrictions and prudish or puritanical rigidities of the Victorian age, that

a liberal life-style represents enlightenment and rationality, and that we should also follow suit. However, it may be pointed out that the culture of sexual permissiveness - which can be traced to its origin about a century ago in the Anglo-American milieu - is in sharp contravention to the true human nature, and that it actually represents the unfortunate but inevitable outcome of two very misleading theories.

The ideas of Charles Darwin (1809-1882) and Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) have played a decisive role in changing the general conceptions and behavior of Western men and women. The view of man as nothing more than a sophisticated animal has had devastating effects on the entire societal and familial structure. Out went morals and ethics and the need for self-restraint. All attention was now focused on the satisfaction of physical needs and gratification of carnal desires. If I am an animal and so are you, then why bother with religion and tradition and convention? Everything and anything should be permissible, provided, of course, that no "law" is broken. But the "law", when it is formulated by majority vote, itself becomes a most pliable and flexible institution.

Then came Freud, whose views regarding the nature of human self are highly ingenious, but also, to a large extent, inaccurate. According to him, the principal and primary urge of the human "id" is sexual in character, and all social customs and conventions that restrict the free expression of sex instinct are damaging to the mental health of the individual and lead to different types of neuroses. Although his views remained controversial among the scientific community, Freud quickly became a popular figure and his name became synonymous with sexual freedom, especially in the United States. His ideas then infiltrated into art, literature, drama, and feature films, thereby influencing whole generations. The effects of his theory on the Western thought and culture are too numerous and far-reaching to estimate. However, it can be safely argued that the cult of promiscuous sex owes its popularity largely to the teachings of Sigmund Freud.⁶

How can we challenge the growing trends of permissiveness when it is backed by "Science"? The malignant effects of the materialistic version of evolution and the sexual view of the human psyche can be neutralized only by appreciating that human beings, unlike all other creatures, have a dual nature. A human being is composed of a physical body as well as a spiritual soul. This implies that while man certainly possesses the purely animal instincts for survival, reproduction, and dominance, at the same time he also has a strong predisposition towards moral virtue and an urge to love, adore, and worship a Supreme Being. Ignoring the spiritual side of humanity results in the misconception that we are nothing more than well-developed apes, and this, in turn, leads to a society where the physical and carnal aspects assume ultimate importance. Instead, the establishment of a healthy and balanced culture requires that the soul be allowed to rule the body, and not vice versa.⁷

The Myth of Unlimited Freedom

Once we realize the extent of the damage that is caused by sexual permissiveness, it is easy to see how various kinds of erotic images in the mass media contribute towards moral and social degeneration, without serving any constructive purpose. The prevalence of such images, whether suggestive and subtle or explicit and obvious, only accentuates the already potent effects of sex hormones, especially among the adolescents and young adults. The resulting preoccupation with sex consumes a lot of their time and energy, leaving very little for healthy and positive pursuits.

Moreover, in view of the central and pivotal importance of marriage and its constructive role vis-à-vis human civilization, we can appreciate the significance of closing all avenues that could lead, directly or indirectly, towards a relaxation of the restrictions on non-marital sexual activity. Such a relaxation is, of course, highly detrimental to the institutions of marriage and family, and, therefore, to the fabric of civilization itself.

Keeping in mind the naturally strong human predisposition towards sex, we can also see that all ways and means employed to intensify and heighten this instinct will only result in unnecessary frustrations and mental conflicts, which will lead, sooner or later, to the free and unrestricted expression of sexual urge, along with all its disastrous consequences. Furthermore, the kind of physical attractiveness and erotic appeal that is routinely depicted in the mass media is so rare that most women cannot live up to such a high standard of perfection; the resulting dissatisfaction in their husbands is insidiously damaging to the institution of family. It may be pointed out that it is precisely this myth of the ideal female body that has resulted in the menace of what has been described as the "commodification" of women. The moral decadence of the Western society clearly demonstrates that extremely adverse consequences can result if a society remains tolerant or indifferent to the kind of images that are presented in the mass media.

The easy availability of explicit material in the form of books, magazines, films, posters, and even computer diskettes and CDs, actually represents commercial exploitation of a human weakness on a grand scale. No civilized and sane society should ever allow its own destruction at the hands of a few entrepreneurs. Unfortunately, this is exactly what we are doing under the guise of "progress", "upward mobility" and "freedom".

There is a serious misunderstanding prevalent among our so-called liberal elite. It consists of their tendency to confuse the highly desirable values of equality and freedom with the equally undesirable propagation of obscenity and vulgarity. The freedom to express is, no doubt a basic democratic and moral ideal, but it can never be absolute and unqualified. A society that values its stability and moral standards can never allow a few of its citizens to express things that would undermine the societal foundation and threaten to disintegrate its moral fabric. The democratic ideal of freedom from censorship has more to do with the right to

express dissent against the government and to criticize its policies, and has nothing to do with spreading licentious and immoral material. It is indeed amazing that the state-owned electronic media in Pakistan, while shamelessly denying the people their fundamental right to disagree with the government, continues to insist on transmitting obscene and objectionable material under the hypocritical banner of "freedom."⁸

Indeed, the manufacture and sale of salacious stuff can be justified neither on the grounds of free speech nor by appeals to human psychology. All kinds of libidinous material are damaging to public morality and social well-being, but, of course, the more explicit and obscene they are, the more extensive will be their harm. Also, the younger and more impressionable the viewers, the more permanent and far-reaching will be the damage.

Sometimes people try to defend their "right" to have access to such material on the grounds that sex is a natural activity, and, therefore, it is unnatural to put any restrictions in this regard. What they don't realize is the fact that sex is essentially a private matter; its open performance or depiction is not only repulsive to the undefiled and pristine human nature, it also robs a beautiful act of its personal, social, moral, spiritual, and esthetic dimensions, leaving nothing but animal lust.

In the entire animal kingdom, we find only a single "animal" that has a sense of privacy, and the capacity for shame when this privacy is violated; that animal is, of course, the *Homo sapiens*. Even in the most primitive tribes, men and women cover their private parts and do not copulate in public. The sexual act is an animal activity that also involves uniquely human emotions and ideals. But when sex is made into a public spectacle, the audience cannot see the human element; they can only view the animal coupling, and this is what debases a unique human experience into a mere animal connection. Pornography, by making a gross public display of the private physical intimacies of human life,

degrades both men and women to a subhuman level. That is why we describe such books and movies as "dirty"; not that the sexual act itself is perceived as unclean, but because its public performance and depiction in explicit detail is what debases and brutalizes and insults our sensibilities.

The dignity of a human being is derived not from the basic instincts or the physiological processes of his body that he shares with other creatures; rather it is based on his higher faculties — rational, moral, and spiritual — which are the real foundations of his distinctive individuality. In our everyday lives, we partially hide our instinctual and animal aspects under cover of social conventions, which help keep their demands under control. Pornography, by depicting in explicit detail the instinctual and animal aspects of human existence, removes this very protection of social conventions, thereby degrading human beings and robbing them of their dignity.

Innocent Fun?

Pornography has a well-documented role in sexual violence. Rape and child molestation is on the rise in Pakistan, but we are still choosing to ignore the most important causal factor in such criminal and disgusting manifestations of deviant sexuality. Research has shown that repeated exposure to pornography often results in compulsive and aberrant behavior and in many cases leads to sex crimes. American psychotherapist Dr. Victor B. Cline has done extensive studies regarding the effects of pornography. He has described a four-factor syndrome in almost all of his patients. The first stage is that of *Addiction*. After becoming involved in pornographic material, people tend to become dependent; they keep coming back for more and more. The material provides a very powerful sexual stimulant or aphrodisiac effect as well as exciting imagery, which is frequently recalled and elaborated into fantasies. The second phase is that of *Escalation*. With the passage of time, the addict requires more explicit and more perverted material to get the same amount of stimulation. He begins to prefer pornography and

autoeroticism over normal sexual relations, often resulting in divorce and loss of family. The third phase is that of *Desensitization*. The addict reaches a point where material hitherto considered shocking is now seen as acceptable and commonplace. He begins to legitimize the sexual activity that he witnesses, and, irrespective of how deviant, he feels that "everybody does it." The fourth stage is called *Acting Out*. This is characterized by an increasing tendency to act out sexually the behaviors repeatedly witnessed, including compulsive promiscuity, exhibitionism, child molestation, rape, and sadomasochism. Evidence suggests that sexual deviations are always learned forms of behavior and not inherited traits. The models for this type of learning most commonly come from pornographic magazines and videos.¹⁰

Violent and abnormal manifestations of sexuality is often the result of prolonged exposure to prurient material. In our own country, a great and commendable effort is being made by various Non-Governmental Organizations in educating the masses regarding the seriousness of violence against women, especially its most despicable variety - rape. However, the theme which is conspicuous by its absence in the whole corpus of speeches, seminars, articles, and advertisements is the role played by the breakdown of morals, free social interaction between young men and women, and easy availability of sexually explicit material. While we should certainly condemn rape, there is an equally important need to recognize and eradicate the factors which promote and contribute towards this crime.

Unfortunately, whenever the role of provocatively dressed women and their equally provocative demeanor is pointed out as unnecessarily exciting the potential rapist, the immediate rejoinder - often delivered sarcastically - consists of the counter-argument that this is "blaming the victim." It is undeniable that no man has the right to rape a woman under any circumstances, but does it mean that young women should deliberately place themselves in dangerous situations?

Why is rape so serious a problem even in societies where non-marital sex is freely available? This has a lot to do with the nescience and naïveté of women regarding the dynamics of male sexuality. Women too often forget the basic fact that sexual behavior in men is deeply intertwined with aggression. The leaders of the Feminist and Women's Liberation movements in the West have misled their sisters into believing that men and women are exactly alike; that women can do anything, go anywhere, say anything, and wear anything, without having to face any undesirable consequence. They have also attacked and weakened the traditional morality where women enjoyed the protection of their fathers and brothers. The consequences of such misguided and essentially futile attempts to change the basic human nature have been nothing short of disastrous.¹¹ The same thing is now happening in our own society.

Moreover, feminists keep on telling us that rape is not a crime of passion, but that it is a "hate-crime", by which men intimidate and threaten women and force them into subjugation. Based upon a misleading and superficial judgment that *all* men are oppressors and *all* women are victims (which itself betrays a hatred for men), the theory of rape as a manifestation of misogyny is full of fallacious assumptions. A more plausible explanation of the rising incidence of rape is as follows.

In an environment where non-marital sex is condoned, the sexual "victories" assume an out of proportion importance for men and their threshold for tolerating rejection is greatly diminished. At the same time, the widespread availability of, and exposure to, pornographic material puts an abnormal strain on male sexuality, and it makes men constantly preoccupied with sexual performance and prowess.¹² Moreover, women are depicted in such books and movies as always sexually ready, willing, and eager; they are often shown as enjoying rape, physical torture, and humiliation.¹³ As a result, the viewers or readers begin to perceive various acts of sexual violence and coercion as normal, everyday practices. All

these factors, when combined with the natural aggressiveness of men and also the naïveté of women concerning the male obsession with sex, lead to the unfortunate incidents of rape. In order to reduce the prevalence of this crime, therefore, something more serious than mere male-bashing is needed.

In addition to rape, non-marital sex, child molestation, and even homosexual practices are becoming more and more common in our own society. Whenever citizens demand that media policies be reformed in order to check the growing moral decadence, they receive the condescending advice not to see or buy "what you don't like." One is simply dumbfounded at such shallow and childish "solutions" of crucial moral and social issues. Whether or not someone likes obscene and erotic material is simply irrelevant. The point is that morally and socially damaging material is being published, transmitted, imported, and openly sold in the market, and all this has to be stopped. Not every one is mature enough to realize the damage caused by such material, and even those who do understand are rarely able to protect either themselves or their families. No one can live in a vacuum, isolated from the rest of the society. Whether he likes it or not, every individual is affected by what happens in his environment. Where the whole atmosphere is polluted, only an imbecile can say: "if you don't like smoke, just stop breathing."

If we want to avoid the predicament that is troubling the Western world, then, obviously, we must curb our own drift towards permissiveness before it is too late. The wise person is the one who learns from other people's mistakes. The spread of all forms of obscene or pornographic material, whether indigenous or foreign, must be controlled. The use of erotic images in both the electronic and print media must be effectively prohibited. Those who are in charge of making our cultural policies must divert their attention from music, dancing, and modeling to more constructive endeavors. The time to take corrective measures is rapidly running out. If we were to lose this time in our complacency and nonchalance, then the future generations would

need much stronger and more strict measures to control what would then be a more serious decadence. As they say in Persian, fools do the same thing as the wise, but only after suffering a whole lot of trouble.

Finally, there is another and more sinister dimension to the whole issue. Note how utterly idiotic is the claim that such liberal policies are being adopted because people "want" this sort of entertainment. People want a just and equitable distribution of wealth; they want a break from the devastating inflation; they want peace and security. Obviously, they are not receiving any of these. All they are being fed is a heavy dose of obscenity and vulgarity in the guise of culture and entertainment and progress and liberty. It seems there is a deliberate attempt to keep us occupied with these toys and, thereby, to divert our attentions away from the real issues. Indeed, the whole entertainment industry is acting as "Opium of the Masses."

Let's wake up for a change.

END NOTES

¹Unwin, Professor J. D., *Sex and Culture*, quoted in Christenson, Dr. Reo M., *Censorship of Pornography?* (The Progressive, September 1970)

²Toynbee, Arnold., *Why I dislike Western Civilization* (New York Times Magazine, May 10, 1964)

³Some of the most prominent persons in this field include: Phyllis Schlafly, the author of *The Power of the Positive Woman* (1977) and the editor/publisher of the newsletter *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*; George Gilder, who has recently revised and updated his book *Sexual Suicide* (1973) as *Men and Marriage* (1986); Donald E. Wildmon, who is the president of *The American Family Association*; Pat Socia, who is a sex-education consultant and teaches "Abstinence-Only" curriculum in High Schools; Janet Kid, who is the author of *The Benefits of Chastity Before Marriage*; and Mary Whitehouse, who is the founder of *Clean-Up T.V. Campaign*, and has been described as the "articulate voice of the silent majority raised in protest against pornography."

⁴For details of recent scientific evidence regarding gender differences, see:Evatt, Cris., *He and She*,

(California: Conari Press, 1992), Moir, Anne & Jessel, David., *Brain Sex* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1991), and Begley, Sharon., *Gray Matters*, (Newsweek, March 27, 1995). The issue of gender differences is also covered in Davidson, Nicholas., *The Failure of Feminism* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1988), Levin Michael., *Feminism and Freedom* (New York: Transaction Books, 1987), and Stein, Sara Bonnett., *Girls and Boys: The Limits of Nonsexist Childrearing* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1983)

⁵Cf. Whitehead, Barbara Dafoe., *Dan Quayle Was Right*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1993.

⁶Cf. Torrey, Fuller E., *Freudian Fraud: The Malignant Effects of Freud's Theory on American Thought and Culture* (Harper Perennial, New York, 1992)

⁷For a refutation of Freud's theory from an Islamic perspective, Cf., Rafiuddin, Dr. Muhammd., *Ideology of the Future* (Lahore: Sheikh Muhammad Ashraf, 1946)

⁸The Supreme Court of the United States of America has repeatedly given the verdict that the Freedom of Speech clause (in the First Amendment of the US Constitution) does not apply to obscene and pornographic material. For example, the Supreme Court in *Roth v. United States* (1957) ruled that the First Amendment's concept of Free Speech is not absolute and that obscene material has no expressive value. The court explained:

[the] protection given to speech and press was fashioned to assure unfettered interchange of ideas for the bringing about of political and social change desired by the people.

In *Miller v. California*, the Court ruled:

in our view, to equate the free and robust exchange of ideas and political debate with commercial exploitation of obscene material demeans the grand conception of the First Amendment and its high purposes in the historic struggle for freedom.

In *Paris Theater v. Slaton* (1973) the Supreme Court ruled:

The sum of experience, including that of the past two decades, affords ample basis for legislatures to conclude that a sensitive, key relationship of human existence, central to family life, community welfare, and the development of human personality, can be debased and distorted by crass commercial

exploitation of sex. Nothing in the Constitution prohibits a state from reaching such a conclusion and acting on it legislatively... We categorically disapprove the theory that obscene films acquire constitutional immunity from state regulation simply because they are exhibited for consenting adults only. The rights and interests other than those of the advocates are involved. These include the interests of the public in the quality of life, the total community environment, the tone of commerce, and possible, public safety itself.

For details, cf. Kirk, Dr. Jerry. R., *The Mind Polluters* (Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1985), and Parker, Thomas., *The Impact of Pornography on Marriage*, in Christian Life Commission (CLC) Annual Seminar Proceedings (1989)

⁹Cf. Kristol, Irving., *The Case For Liberal Censorship*, and Clor, Harry., *Obsenity and Freedom of Expression*, in Cline, Victor (Ed.) *Where Do You Draw the Line? Explorations in Media Violence, Pornography, and Censorship* (Brigham Young University Press, 1974)

¹⁰Cline, Victor B., *Pornography's Effects on Adults and Children* (New York: Morality in Media, 1993), Zillman and Bryant, *Pornography and Sexual Aggression* (New York: Academic, 1984), and Zillmann et al (Eds.) *Media: Children and the Family* (New Jersey: L. Erlbaum & Associates, 1993)

¹¹Cf. Paglia, Camille., *Sex, Art, and American Culture* (Vintage Books, 1992)

¹²Cf. Brod Harry., *Pornography and the Alienation of Male Sexuality*, *Social Theory and Practice* (Fall 1988)

¹³Gordon, George N., *Erotic Communications* (Hastings House, New York, 1980), and statements by Johnson, Hillary., in *Pornography: A Humanist Issue*, *The Humanist*, July/August 1985. It may be pointed out that many radical feminists — like Susan Brownmiller and Andrea Dworkin — are also active against violent pornography, but the target of their opposition is restricted to the portrayal of women as inferior and subordinate to men, which they believe to be derogatory and a causal factor in violence against women; they are not against eroticism in the media as such.