



Journal

of the American Family Association

Attention Pastors

Christians & Society TODAY, pages 3 and 4, can be reproduced locally on a photocopier for use as a supplement or insert with bulletins or newsletters.

ALCOHOL

Alcohol abuse takes toll on society 22

FAMILY

Sen. Coats says youth facing crisis of character 18

MEDIA

Media bias and abortion 15

Networks feel AFA impact 16

Media leading society downhill... 17

PORNOGRAPHY

Porn Picket Day Set 12

TELEVISION

Hollywood censors religion 5

TV pushes homosexuality, teen sex, anti-Christian bigotry 7

ALL-MEMBERSHIP PLAN

Use All-Membership Plan to subscribe for members or leaders of your church. \$4 per year per subscription (minimum--10). Send check, name of church and legible mailing list: AFA Journal, P.O. Drawer 2440, Tupelo, MS 38803. Single subscription--\$15/year.

Copies of this issue are available at \$12.50 for 50 copies. Enclose check with order.

NBC says it will hold Universal Studios responsible for advertising losses on program

Efforts by AFA to stop the networks from promoting the homosexual lifestyle in their programs is having an effect.

According to The Wall Street Journal (9/30/91), NBC told Universal Studios it would be responsible for any losses suffered by advertiser pull-out of an upcoming QUANTUM LEAP episode promoting

homosexuality. NBC's warning to the producers of QUANTUM LEAP came just two weeks after AFA began a campaign against the sponsors of pro-homosexual TV shows.

NBC asked QUANTUM LEAP producer Universal Television to make changes in the episode. If Universal did not make the changes, NBC said the

studio would be financially liable to cover some of what one executive estimated could be a loss of \$1 million in advertising revenues.

The unusual move, believed to be the first of its kind ever taken by a network toward a producer, immediately provoked cries of censorship from public

Continued on page 24

Congress closer to stopping NEA funding of filth

Individuals who have been acting to stop the National Endowment for the Arts from using tax dollars to fund pornographic and anti-Christian "art" won a victory in October.

Both the House and the Senate approved a bill by Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina which would have helped end the NEA's abuse of tax dollars. Sen. Jesse Helms' bill would forbid

NEA funds from being used "to promote, disseminate or produce materials that depict or describe, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs."

The Senate approved the bill 68-28. Rep. Bill Dannemeyer introduced a motion which instructed the House members of a conference committee to use the Senate language in their

meeting with members of the Senate when working together on the bill. That motion was approved by the House 287-133.

However, as the AFA Journal went to press, members of the House, led by the extremely liberal Congressman Yates of Illinois, were attempting to gut Dannemeyer's motion and restore the current language

Continued on page 24

AFA asks one million Christian households to join Kmart boycott

In October, American Family Association mailed "Boycott Packets" to 1,000,000 Christian households asking that they join the boycott of Kmart. Kmart is one of the leading retailers of pornography in America.

AFA timed the mailing to coincide with the Christmas season, traditionally the largest selling time of the year for Kmart. "When doing their Christmas shopping, Christians need to remember that Kmart has arrogantly refused to get out of the pornography business," said Donald E. Wildmon, AFA president.

Recent events show that pornography is having a devastating effect on our society. "There is no doubt that pornography plays a major role in sexual harassment and sex crimes," Wildmon said.

Individuals are urged to call

their local Kmart store and their subsidiaries and tell the manager you will be boycotting Kmart and asking others to do the same. Always be polite when calling. You may be told that Kmart does not sell pornography in their stores. That is correct. The pornography is sold in Waldenbooks, owned by Kmart. Kmart has the authority to order Waldenbooks to get out of the por-

nography business at any time.

Also write Chrm. Joseph Antonini, Kmart Corporation, 3100 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, MI 48084, phone 1-800-635-6278. Kmart owns Waldenbooks, American Fare Stores, Payless Drug Stores, Office Square, Bargain Harold's, Builders Square home supply stores, Sports Authority and PACE Membership Warehouse

American Family Association
Post Office Drawer 2440
Tupelo, Mississippi 38803

STORES.

Non. Profit Org.
U.S. Postage Paid
Permit No. 36
Gordonsville, VA 22942

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

When the leader doesn't lead, what do you do?

Dr. Donald E. Wildmon
President

I received a letter from a friend of mine recently. I thought it important enough to share with you since I didn't have any ready answers to his questions.

"Dear Don, I write for some help. The pastor of the church I attend is a good man. He tries to be a good pastor. I feel he genuinely loves the people in our church. He works well with the members.

"But he never, ever mentions any of the moral issues you discuss in his sermons or in his discussions. He never gives us any direction, or applies the scriptures to the moral issues affecting our daily lives.

"Take abortion. I have never heard him mention abortion in any of his sermons. There are one and one half million abortions in our country each year. Yet from his pulpit there is silence. Why? Christians need to know what the Bible has to say about abortion. They need to know where their pastor stands on the issue, and why he takes the stand he does. Would you suggest any reason why he doesn't address this issue in any of his sermons?

"Then there is pornography. I remember that once or twice in the past three or four years my pastor has mentioned pornography in his sermons. I gathered from what he had to say that he considered it wrong. But he just mentioned it lightly and then moved on. There has never been a Biblical view of pornography presented. Never any information given as to what we sitting in the pew can do to fight pornography. Never a call to action.

"I know a few people who attend church fairly regular who are really into pornography. I know of some immoral behavior and some sexual abuse by some church members who wanted their wives to act out some of the stuff in the pornography. Why doesn't he give us some direction, why isn't he willing to preach on this subject?

"He has never mentioned the sorry state of television, and all the filth on TV. The adultery, violence, the profanity, the negative stereotyping of Christians has never been mentioned.

"He has said a little about drugs, but nothing about alcohol and the devastation it is having on our society—especially our youth.

"He doesn't mention sex education in schools or any issues like that. He never asks that we get involved in issues. His sermons are mostly soothing and comfortable. I do not leave feeling that I have been moved to do anything about the moral decay in our society. Doesn't being a Christian mean one should get involved?

"In fact, I'm left with the feeling that if I go to church and participate in the church functions and help support the church financially, I have done my Christian duty.

"I do know he receives your *AFA Journal*, so it is not that he is completely ignorant of these matters. Please tell me what I can do to get him to give our members some guidance on these matters. I have casually mentioned one or two of them to him, but nothing came of it. Are there a large number of ministers like this? I discussed this with a friend of mine who goes to another church and he said that his minister preaches on these issues quite often.

"Since you are a minister, maybe you can give me some help. Please tell me what I can do to get him to help our congregation deal with these matters.

"I look forward to your response."

Well, I have some opinions. But I have two questions of my own. First, I wonder how many others feel the same way. And, next, why do those ministers who do address these issues do so?

Are there many churches like this, or is this just an isolated case? How many of you face the same situation? How did you deal with it? Can you offer some help to my friend. Perhaps there is a minister or two who could give my friend some direction.

If so, please write me. I will share your suggestions with my friend. I look forward to hearing from you.

Don

Holiday thoughts

By **Tim Wildmon**
AFA Associate Director

The Thanksgiving/Christmas/New Year's Day holiday season is a great time to be alive, isn't it? There are so many friends and family to see and visit with. Good times shared by all. Parties, bowl games, food, bowl games, food and bowl games generally make up my holiday season.

However, as much as I love all of the above, it is the spiritual dimension that makes this season so special.

Thanksgiving brings to mind images of pilgrims and Indians gathering for a meal in New England and thanking God for His blessings upon them. Thanksgiving also brings images of a small country home in the hills of northeast Mississippi where my grandparents live and where our family gathers each year to share a meal and thank God for His blessings upon us.

Christmas brings to mind images of the Christ child lying in a manger with Mary and Joseph looking on some 2000 years ago. Christmas is hope and happiness knowing that through Christ we all can have life eternal and life abundant: Christmas is the peace of heart and peace of mind Jesus brings to those who receive Him. Christmas also brings to mind images of our family gathered around the decorated tree on Christmas Eve and my dad reading about the birth of Christ from the scriptures.

New Year's brings to mind communion services on New Year's Eve and committing to follow Jesus better the year ahead than the year before. On the lighter side New Year's Day brings to mind images of great parades on television, and enjoying the excitement and pageantry of college football bowl games with friends.

The holiday season is annually a wonderful experience for me and my family. I thank God for it. I hope yours is just as wonderful. From our home to yours, Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!



AFA Journal
Volume 15
Number 11

A publication of the American Family Association. Published monthly and November/December. Address: P.O. Drawer 2440, Tupelo, MS 38803. Phone 601/844-5036. Subscription rate: \$15 per year.

Executive Editor: Donald E. Wildmon
Editor: Randall Murphree
Editorial Assistant: Jessica Huckaby

AFA is a Christian organization promoting the Biblical ethic of decency in American society with primary emphasis on TV and other media.

Christians & Society **TODAY**

November/December 1991

A supplement for local bulletins and newsletters

'L.A. Law' star: 'Spitting on Christ was a great deal of fun'

Last season L.A. LAW introduced its audience to the bisexual character C.J. Lamb with a scene featuring a lesbian kiss between two attorneys. Based on a recent interview with Amanda Donohoe, who plays C.J., the controversial kiss may be just the beginning.

"(C.J. is as) close as you can get to my personality in a fictional role," the actress said. "What I've decided to bring to C.J. are my sensibilities, my morals, my political views."

What are Donohoe's morals? The actress had no problem with her role in **Lair of the White Worm**, in which her character spits on a crucifix. "I'm an atheist, so it was actually a joy. Spitting on Christ was a great deal of fun—especially for me, being a woman...I can't embrace

a male god who has persecuted female sexuality throughout the ages. And that persecution still goes on today all over the world."

"The Roman Catholic Church has persecuted female sexuality for centuries. Immaculate conception? What is so wrong with conception that they have to immaculate it? Why do they have to clean it up? Because it's dirty? That really bugs me," said Donohoe, complaining in the July 1 *People* that there isn't enough sex in movies and television.

Donohoe claims her character's bisexuality "should be of paramount importance in terms of her growth...I'd like to see her battle a few fundamentalist Christians."

TV etc., 9/91

Former clinic nurse changes mind on abortion issue

Abortion clinics have a cavalier attitude about informing women of the risks and options of terminating pregnancies, a former clinic nurse testified in U.S. District Court in Jackson, Mississippi.

"Many times a patient would come in and say that she was not certain whether she wanted to have an abortion and she would express that to me," said Angela Ford, a registered nurse and former employee of the South Jackson Women's Clinic. "I would say that they didn't have a good choice, but the easiest choice would be to have an abortion."

Ford said she was permitted to discuss abortion risks and alternatives only at a patient's request. Sometimes, Ford said, information about the age of the fetus would be withheld from a patient if the age became a factor.

"If a patient said not to give her an abortion at 12 weeks, and if the (fetus) was over 12 weeks, then we would not tell her the gestational age and perform the procedure anyway," Ford said.

Jackson, MS Clarion-Ledger, 8/30/91

Politics plays ugly hand in health research

The last place in our society where we need to play politics is with the lives of individuals. Yet our federal government is doing exactly that. At the expense of other members of our society President Bush and members of Congress have bowed down to extreme political pressure from the radical element of the homosexual community. Homosexual activists have demanded, and received, favored treatment.

As the figures below show, the amount of research and prevention funds given to AIDS in comparison to other diseases is way out of proportion.

Heart disease, which claims 20 times more lives than AIDS, gets only 36% of the amount of money as AIDS. Cancer, which claims 13 times more lives than AIDS, gets only 93% as much money.

Diabetes, which claims approximately the same number of lives as AIDS, receives only 15% as much money. And Alzheimer's, which claims 2.5 times the number of lives as AIDS, receives only 12% as much money.

If the homosexual community is interested in reducing AIDS, a change in behavior will do more than all the billions of dollars government can spend. Government will then have more to spend on diseases which are not behavior related.

If you feel that politics should not be a part of funding for medical research and prevention, contact the President and your Congressman and Senators: President George Bush, The White House, Washington, DC 20505; U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510; House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.

DISEASE	RESEARCH AND PREVENTION	ANNUAL DEATHS
AIDS	\$1,950,000,000	37,000-45,000
Cancer	\$1,810,000,000	518,000
Heart Disease	\$708,000,000	760,000
Diabetes	\$295,000,000	36,000
Alzheimer's	\$243,000,000	100,000

*Congressional Research Service,
The Library of Congress*

Playboy visit protested by women

Women's groups at Miami, Ohio, University are upset at the institution's lecture committee for paying the chairman of Playboy Enterprises Inc. \$8,000 to speak on campus.

Christie Hefner, the daughter of Playboy founder Hugh Hefner, is credited with turning around the business when it was losing money. She spoke at Miami's Shriver Center about marketing in the 1990s.

"I personally think it was wrong to invite her," said Ann Fuehrer, director of women's studies at the university. "And it was wrong to pay her \$8,000. We didn't need to have that validation of her work."

Some student groups, including the Association of Women Students, protested the speech. They say Playboy magazine degrades women and promotes pornography, including child pornography.

Cambridge, OH Daily Jeffersonian, 9/26/91

CLear-TV boycott of Johnson Wax, Pfizer continues

S.C. Johnson (Johnson Wax) and Pfizer continue to sponsor sex, violence, profanity and anti-Christian bigotry on television. In March, Christian Leaders for Responsible Television (CLear-TV) called for a boycott of the products of the two companies because of their refusal to reduce the amount of filth they help sponsor. Since that time, neither Pfizer nor S.C. Johnson have given any indication they intend to change their advertising practice. The two companies are leading sponsors of sex, violence and profanity on television. CLear-TV has made repeated requests to the companies asking them to reduce their sponsorship, but the companies have ignored the requests.

CLear-TV is a coalition of approximately 1600 Christian leaders, including the heads of more than 70 denominations.

Individuals are urged to join the boycott, to encourage others to join the boycott, and to write or call the companies and let them know you are participating in the boycott. The addresses:

Chrm. William C. Steere, Jr., Pfizer, Inc., 235 E. 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017, Phone 212-573-2323, Fax 212-573-5476. Pfizer personal care products: Barbasol shaving cream, Coty perfumes, Emeraude perfume, Shape'n Shadow eye kit, Stetson cologne, Visaclean lense cleaner. Pfizer health products: Ben-Gay rub, Bonine motion sickness medicine, Desitin skin products, Plax mouthwash, Unisom, Visine eye drops.

Chrm. Samuel C. Johnson, S.C. Johnson & Sons, Inc., 1525 Howe Street, Racine, WI 53403, Phone 414-631-2000, Fax 414-631-2133. S.C. Johnson personal care products: Agree shampoo, Curel skin lotion, Edge shaving cream, Enhance perfume, Halsal shampoo, Soft Sense lotion. S.C. Johnson household products: Bravo wax, Brite floor wax, Carnu polish, Clean & Clear wax, Duster Plus cleaner, Favor polish, Future floor coating, Glade room odorizer, Glo Coat floor coating, Glory rug cleaner, J-Wax, Johnson Wax, Klear floor coating, Off insect repellent, Pledge wax, Pride wax, Raid insecticide, Shout stain remover.

Mayor declares Friday the 13th 'Freddy Krueger Day'

Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley honored the sixth and final installment of the "Nightmare on Elm Street" films by declaring Friday, September 13, "Freddy Krueger Day." The proclamation coincided with the opening of **Freddy's Dead: the Final Nightmare**.

But some people found the gesture embarrassing. Critics decried paying such respect to the fictional killer, a metal-clawed madman who leaves a bloody trail of young bodies.

The mayor should be promoting "someone good that children can look up to," said Cindy Wong, PTA district president for the Los Angeles basin.

Orange County, CA Register, 9/14/91

Homosexual protest disrupts church services

More than 75 militant homosexuals, angered by Christian views on homosexuality, AIDS and homosexual rights issues, descended on a major Orange County church during services in a raucous protest that ended in three arrests.

Three activists disrupted a service at Calvary Chapel in south Santa Ana by yelling "Stop crucifying queers!" They

were pushed out of the sanctuary by ushers and arrested by police on suspicion of trespassing.

The incident lasted more than three hours and was witnessed by thousands of worshippers. Outside the church, police formed a line to separate protesters from churchgoers.

Inside, church ushers scuffled with the activists. "They fought us and we had to take them out forcibly," said one usher. Another usher said a protester bit his hand.

The protest was organized by the radical group Queer Nation, sometimes described as the "shock troops" of the homosexual rights movement. Most waged their protest in a theatrical picket line that featured men wearing dresses, fishnet stockings, and nuns' habits.

"God chose me to be queer," proclaimed one man's sign. Other slogans described sex acts. Two men kissed as churchgoers looked on. The activists say their tactics are intended to offend people.

L.A. Times, 9/9/91

Correction

In the October *Christians & Society Today*, the caption of an article stated: "PCUSA seeks repeal of Kentucky state sodomy law." It is James Andrews individually, the stated clerk of the Presbyterian Church USA, not the PCUSA itself, who has filed an amicus brief supporting the overturning of Kentucky's sodomy law. We apologize for the error.

Lotus company gives homosexual workers spousal special benefits

Lotus Development Corp., has begun allowing employees who have same-sex partners to sign contracts to qualify them for the same benefits offered to employees' spouses.

Some cities and non-profit organizations already provide benefits to employees' unmarried partners, whether homosexual or heterosexual, under domestic-partner agreements. But Lotus' research found no other major publicly traded company has a plan such as the one Lotus adopted after two years of talks with homosexuals, said Russ Campanello, vice president of human resources for the computer software maker.

Lotus said it would provide medical and dental benefits and bereavement leave to the partners and dependents of homosexual employees, but not unmarried heterosexual partners.

Lotus makes computer software. The address: Chrm. Jim Manzi, Lotus Development Corporation, 55 Cambridge Parkway, Cambridge, MA 02142, phone 617/577-8500.

Associated Press, 9/7/91

No-porn policy pays off, video store owner says

Andy Morack is on a roll. In January he opened his first video store, called Family Video, in Milton, Pennsylvania. He opened another in Lewisburg August 30 and is planning yet another for Northumberland, to open September 20.

Morack, formerly a power plant supervisor, stresses friendly service and a no-pornography policy at his stores.

"I like people," he said. "I believe in my heart you can have a video store without selling pornography. That is our difference. We don't handle pornography."

Morack said he had been warned that adult-movie sales account for as much as 40% of a video store's business and that a no-porn policy would spell failure. "This is our third store in nine months," he said. "Evidently somebody was wrong somewhere."

Sunbury, PA Daily Item, 9/15/91

Christians and Society TODAY is published by American Family Association, P.O. Drawer 2440, Tupelo, MS 38803, to be reproduced for use as a supplemental insert for church newsletters and bulletins and for use by other concerned organizations. Sources cited indicate source of basic information only.

Hollywood abandons religion, censors religious characters from TV, movies

By James Breig
Syndicated Columnist
Reprinted from Our Sunday Visitor

I've got a baffler that even Robert Stack can't solve. Every week on NBC's UNSOLVED MYSTERIES, Stack probes unusual circumstances, odd phenomena and bizarre twists. The series also seeks—often with great success—lost loves, fugitive felons and kidnapped children.

But I think I know a missing person not even UNSOLVED MYSTERIES can find: the seriously religious person who is influential in Hollywood. I recently went in search of him or her and came up empty after talking with several producers and writers. I had them all scratching their heads when I asked, "Can you name someone who is a power in movies or television and who also practices his or her faith?"

I put the question to John Prizer, a writer and producer of such TV specials as GUYANA TRAGEDY: THE STORY OF JIM JONES. An active Episcopalian, he replied: "I can't think offhand of anybody in the last 20 years who is active in church affairs."

Prizer pondered some more and called up with names from the past: Loretta Young, the Catholic actress, and George Seaton, the Episcopal; director. But he gave up on a contemporary name and added:

"It's worth a really good article because the lack of religious commitment on the part of people in Hollywood is quite astonishing. I can't think of a director or actor or writer under 45 who goes to church or synagogue."

What bothers Prizer and others, including media critic Michael Medved, is not that Hollywood's movers and shakers are not pray-ers and believers. The problem is that their lack of religious faith is translated into their work.

The result is that movies and TV shows either portray religion as missing in human life or ridicule it as a remnant of the past, something only for old folks or even a harmful element in modern society.

What brought about my search for the missing Hollywood believer was a speech by Medved, who is seen on PBS's SNEAK PREVIEWS. In 1989, he spoke at a college about Hollywood's approach to religion. Based on his experience as a critic, he detected both a "hostility to our Judeo-Christian heritage" in many films and "a deep-seated anti-religious bias" among filmmakers.

I can't think of anybody [in Hollywood] in the last 20 years who is active in church affairs.

—Writer-Producer John Prizer

In later remarks to *Our Sunday Visitor*, Medved said that the bias is "so obvious you'd have to be blind not to see" it. Despite what he finds to be "a big audience out there interested in films that are positive about religion," such movies do not get made. One explanation, he believes, is that the people who make the movies are themselves non-religious or even anti-religious.

With Medved's charges in my ears, I began my search for the religious people he must have missed. I called Ron Austin, a writer and producer of such shows as MISSION; IMPOSSIBLE, CHARLIE'S ANGELS and MATLOCK. A Catholic, Austin termed Medved's analysis "pretty accurate. The people I know,

although many are genuinely decent, are very alienated from religion—even hostile to it."

It can't be that bad, I said to myself, as I dialed John Furia, Jr. A Catholic who is past president of the Writers Guild, Furia has written and produced everything from KUNG FU to such TV movies as Hemingway's THE SUN ALSO RISES. Surely, he would know Hollywood powerhouses who are religious. Wrong!

Religion, he said, "is definitely not taken seriously in Hollywood. The actors don't know religious people or aren't religious themselves, so their portrayals lack any sense of reality. Religion is generally an absent subject.

"I can't think offhand of a picture or TV show that has dealt seriously with religion or people with religious beliefs. Spirituality is often misunderstood, and a vocation—clerical or lay—is incomprehensible to the people" behind the scenes in Hollywood, he added.

Religion is definitely not taken seriously in Hollywood. The actors don't know religious people.

—Producer John Furia, Jr.

There are a couple of reasons why my search for influential believers in Hollywood is so difficult, say the people who work in the media. "Ethics and morality have very little to do with the film business or what gets on TV," said Bill O'Donnell bluntly. A former art director and designer for CBS, he now works outside Hollywood.

"I don't know people who say, 'I won't do that.' They compromise. Hollywood absorbs everybody. If you take a stand, you're seen as not cooperating, and your stand doesn't even get through."

It also does not get through because Hollywood has undergone a generational change that is reflected in other influential segments of society, say the writers and producers I spoke with.

"There's a kind of generation gap," Prizer explained. "Before **Easy Rider**, you had a sprinkling of practicing Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Jews, whatever. Hollywood was never a place where the devout went to work, but there used to be an adequate sprinkling."

Among Catholics alone, that "sprinkling" included such famous directors as John Ford, Frank Capra and Alfred Hitchcock, and such standout performers as Bing Crosby, Loretta Young and Pat O'Brien.

"If you go back to the origins of Hollywood," explained Austin, "there was always a cynical materialism. But you had (director) Leo McCarey, **Going My Way**, Cecil B. DeMille's Bible spectacles, Hitchcock and Ford—arguably the best filmmaker in America.

"Then the '60s came. Religion was lumped in as an oppressive institution that had to be overthrown. Anything traditional was trashed. **Easy Rider** is as good a symbol as any."

That 1969 movie, which one guide to films describes as being about "hippies, rednecks, prostitutes and drugs," not only indicated that movie content was changing; it also uncovered the youth market. And that market is not necessarily interested in religion.

"TV aims at young urban viewers," Austin noted, "and so older people outside the cities who have some religious values are not the audience TV wants."

When mainstream religion left Hollywood, two things filled the vacuum: an anti-religious sentiment and trendy religions. New Age beliefs, gurus and Eastern mysticism became popular. "I know more practicing Hindus and Buddhists than Catholics," Prizer admitted. "Buddhism is fashionable in some circles." He added, however, that filmmakers are not the only ones who rejected traditional religion.

"What you find in Hollywood is no different from what you find among tenured professors or media people. It has to do with a whole class of people. Hollywood, if taken by itself, is an aberration from the culture as a whole, but it's not much different if compared to Stanford or CNN. A whole class has secularized itself," Prizer said.

The [anti-religious] bias is so obvious you'd have to be blind not to see it.

— 'Sneak Previews' Host Michael Medved

Austin agrees: "Hollywood's view of America is relentlessly secular. That's true of all literature and arts of our time. Look at novelists, poets and playwrights. How many outstanding religious writers are there in the U.S. who are not ghetto-ized into being religious writers? The religious faith of American writers and artists is invisible."

But the problem goes deeper than just media controlled by secularists or Buddhists-for-the-day; the problem is that many of the media's powerful elite are anti-religious, especially if that religion is Catholicism.

"There isn't a good prominent Catholic writer in Hollywood," Austin declared. "If there were, he or she wouldn't advertise it, because it wouldn't be a plus. Anti-Catholicism is alive and well in Hollywood if for no other reason than the Church's stands on sexual issues. That's not politically correct."

But screenwriter Furia adds a qualifier. The absence of religion on movie and TV screens isn't just a matter of "creative people not having strong religious connections" and "no theological dimension." He also points to a practical matter: "It's difficult to find the vocabulary to express religion in drama and comedy. It's difficult to deal with it in a dramatic language that isn't superficial."

So the heads of the studios are not people of faith, and the major producers are anti-religious, and the important writers are secular humanists. But what about the writers and producers I talked to? They are active Christians who have thought about their beliefs and values. Have they been able to influence movies and TV?

Have they tried to get religious themes into their shows?

"I wrote a pilot about a priest, which demanded an understanding of what he did and why he did it," Furia said. "It wasn't made, but it didn't have to do with the subject matter. There is fear at the studios that such subjects won't reach a broad audience. Religion is a ticklish subject in our society. Religion remains in the closet."

I asked Austin what would have happened if he had ever suggested that a character on Charlie's Angels become religious. What if he had recommended that Farrah Fawcett's character undergo a conversion?

"Any religious expression," he replied, "is considered sectarian. So the producers would have asked me, 'What religion will she be?'"

Any expression of spirituality that does get on has no affiliation and no moral component. By and large, religious characters on TV are incidental and played for comedy, or they are quaint and benign.

"It would be unacceptable to introduce a religious aspect. In entertainment shows, the characters don't talk about God. Religion is absent; you never see people pray, even if they confront life-and-death situations."

In my search for Hollywood's missing religious people, Austin advised, I should keep in mind what Hollywood does: "It is dealing with a mass product for a mass audience. It produces entertainment. They're selling escape from reality and truth. Religion is about truth, and anything tough about life, like the choice between good and evil, is avoided."

"If you want to be cynical, look at it this way: If religion sold, they'd sell it. The real law in Hollywood is money, and if they could sell a religious movie or TV series, they'd sell it—but as escape. The priest would be a detective or there'd be a sexy nun."

Ethics and morality have very little to do with the film business or what gets on TV.

— Former CBS Art Director Bill O'Donnell

Maybe it is just as well that I could not find the missing religious persons in Hollywood. On the other hand, I could not help wondering what would happen if director Martin Scorsese made a movie about the real Jesus instead of The Last Temptation of Christ?

What would happen if Arnold Schwarzenegger put his multi-million-dollar clout behind a film about Thomas Merton?

What would happen if a major studio announced that it was going to start producing TV shows promoting chastity?

I guess for now all of those "what-ifs" remain unsolved mysteries.

Poll shows TV's major role in lives of children

Nearly half of America's school-age children have a TV in their bedroom and more worry about getting AIDS than worry about getting into college, according to a national survey on youth, education and television.

Send AFA Responses

Please send AFA copies of replies you receive from advertisers and other companies. Also, send news clippings on family issues. Your assistance is deeply appreciated.

Sponsored by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the poll's preliminary findings document the profound influence that television has on the culture of children.

After spending a day in schools where three in four teachers use TV in their classrooms, the survey showed, nearly four of five children watch television at home before eating dinner.

For keeping up with current events, 79% of the respondents—children ages 6 to 17—said they get most of their news from television. That compares to 30% who read newspapers.

Cox News Service, 9/27/91

Bush says TV hurting kids

President Bush has blamed TV's excesses for contributing to the breakdown of the family. Bush said government can do little about it "when sensationalism dominates" on TV, adding that his grandchildren "watch stuff that has no redeeming social value."

"I am convinced that the excesses are having a bad effect on our children and family stability and learning," Bush said. He cited no examples, but said free speech rights curtail government involvement.

His message to parents: "Don't make the mistake of thinking your kids only learn from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m."

USA Today, 9/4/91

Homosexuality, teen sex, anti-Christian themes crowd fall schedule

Promotion of homosexuality as a positive and desirable lifestyle, illicit teen sex and anti-Christian themes fill family-time hours on the networks this fall. Prime-time parents are helping their teenage children become sexually active as never before on the small screen. Homosexuality has never been promoted so blatantly and so clearly. As might be expected, the family is under assault on other fronts as well—pro-abortion themes, frequent adultery, illicit sex, and attacks on traditional values.

Church & Dwight, Subaru ads support anti-Christian plot

The premiere episodes of NBC's FLESH 'N BLOOD aired September 19 and 20. A main focus is the mockery of Christianity. Both plots were filled with sexual innuendo and portrayed members of a Christian family as dishonest, ignorant, impolite, scheming country bumpkins. Arlo Weed, the "Christian" father curses often. Writers for both episodes were Michael Digaetano and Lawrence Gay. Tim Berry produced the first, Daniel Palladino the second.

In the opening scene of the first episode, Arlene, assistant to Rachel (a district attorney and the series main character) is on the phone placing a newspaper ad calling herself "horny" and giving her phone number. That morning as Rachel, who was adopted, is discussing looking for her biological family, Arlo Weed bursts through her office door, spouting nonsense lines about the Lord and "Jesus in the book of Job" in his thick country dialect. He then tells her he is her long lost brother. The Christian fool remarks, "Da---n, I wish Mom could see us now."

An associate of Rachel's tells her that Arlo is selling Bibles personally autographed by Moses.

Later in the episode Arlo's daughter, Beauty, tells Rachel she can adopt her and have a child without "committing the sinful act of fornication." (Canned laughter follows.)

In the second episode the Christians continue to be the subject of ridicule and more sexual innuendo is added. The Weeds have now moved in with Rachel.

One evening as Rachel awaits her date's arrival, Beauty asks if she is going to sin on her date tonight. Rachel says yes, she is. (A laugh track follows.) After she leaves, the Weeds see a man on TV who looks like her date. He is a murderer. Beauty says, "This

is no coincidence, the hand of the Almighty was on the channel changer." At that moment Arlo's son, King, throws the channel changer down on the floor. (Canned laughter follows.)

The Weed family goes to the restaurant where Rachel and her date are having dinner. Rachel's date turns out to be an innocent actor and the Weeds ruin her evening. When Rachel returns from her date distraught that it didn't go well, she expresses displeasure with her newly-discovered Christian family. Young Beauty piously quotes Psalm 19:14 to her—"Let the words of my mouth and...."

"Da---t!" Arlo exclaims. "I can't go to bed with you upset." He offers to cheer her up by taking her to a favorite strip club. He then tells a bar joke.

Advertisers on the first episode included: CEO Masaharu Masumitsu, Subaru of America, Inc., Post Office Box 6000, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034, Phone 609-488-8500. Subaru automobiles.

On the second episode, advertisers included: Pres. Dwight C. Minton, Church & Dwight Company, CN 5297, Princeton, NJ 08543, Phone 609-683-5900. Arm & Hammer baking powder, Arm & Hammer deodorizer spray, Dental Care tooth powder.

Honda, Ralston Purina support pro-homosexual episode on NBC sitcom

The September 18 episode of SEINFELD on NBC dealt with homosexuality. The writer for the episode was Larry David, and the producer was Larry Charles.

Series hero is stand-up comic Jerry Seinfeld. Major focus of this episode is Seinfeld's friend George, who fears he may be homosexual after enjoying a massage by a masseuse.

Explicit dialogue follows in later scenes. George describes, for Seinfeld, how the masseuse "got two inches from 'it'" and "'it' moved." Seinfeld suggests, maybe it was "just changing positions" and says his does that all the time. George, however, is obsessed with his fear, recalling that "men have been popping into my sexual fantasies."

In the closing scene, Seinfeld does his stand-up comedy routine and says he believes heterosexual men worry about being homosexual because "deep down we have weak cells resistance...men think they could be talked into anything..."

He asks the men in his audience if they were to accidentally walk into a homosexual store would they wind up holding a guy's

hand if they were asked to?

The pro-homosexual episode was supported by ads from: Pres. Koichi Amemiya, American Honda Company, 100 West Alondra, Gardena, CA 90248, Phone 213-783-2000. Acura automobile, Honda motor vehicles.

Ralston Purina Company, Chrm. William P. Stiritz, Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, MO 63164, Phone TOLL FREE: 1-800-345-5678. Chex cereal and products, Chuck Wagon pet food, Energizer batteries, Eveready batteries, Hostess snack foods.

General Motors ads sponsor homosexual theme in new NBC series

The first episodes of PACIFIC STATION aired on NBC September 15, 22 and 29. They were filled with sexual and homosexual innuendo usually followed with canned laughter. Debut episode writers were Barry Fanaro, Mort Nathan, Kathy Speer and Terry Grossman; Rita Dillon was producer. Martin Weiss and Robert Bruce wrote, and George Sunga produced the second episode.

Series heroes are Bob and Caprielli, police detective partners. Seeing bits of situations out of context, their supervisor is led to believe they are homosexual lovers. For example, he once walks in on them hugging; another time he finds Caprielli giving flowers to Bob (from Bob's wife). These frequent misinterpretations keep the homosexual theme before viewers.

There are also implications of illicit sex when Bob moves in with Caprielli because he is having marital trouble. (He eventually moves home and works it out.) Shortly after Bob arrives at Caprielli's, a woman appears in the bedroom dressed in a short bathrobe. Caprielli tells her he'll have to drive her back to the airport since Bob needs a place to stay.

"...don't you remember Bob?" Caprielli asks the woman. "The man I told you about during foreplay?"

The third episode, written by Speer and Grossman, and produced by Sunga, continued the all-sex theme, boasting "jokes" on foreplay, prostitution, women's breasts, bimbos, dog urination, porn magazines and toilet jokes.

Sponsoring all three family-time episodes was: Chrm. Robert C. Stempel, General Motors Corporation, 3044 W. Grand Blvd., Detroit, MI 48202, Phone 313-556-5000. Buick, Cadillac, Chevrolet, Oldsmobile, and Pontiac automobiles.

Unilever, V.F. Corp. ads legitimize lesbian 'wedding'

NBC's September 20 season premiere of DEAR JOHN dealt with lesbianism. Thomas Lofaro produced the Marco Pennette script.

During the episode series regular Kirk is filled with shame when his support group learns his wife Carol left him for a woman. Kirk, however, fears she left because of his sexual inadequacy. Dialogue about his adulterous affairs is always followed by canned laughter.

Kirk later confronts Carol, to ask if his sexual performance was lacking.

"I didn't decide to turn gay," Carol assures him sensitively. "It's not like changing your hair color. I didn't know I was gay when we got married. I was taught that you go to school, you meet a man and you settle down, no questions asked. Then one day I met Donna and I started getting these feelings that I'd never gotten for any guy. I was falling in love."

She expresses her gratitude for his unfaithfulness in marriage, because it helped her to discover her true self. Kirk tells the lesbian couple he hopes they are happy together, concluding with this sermonette: "I've always believed that people have a right to live their lives any way they want to. After all, this is the nineties, right?"

With tears in her eyes, Carol responds, "I'm really touched," then invites him to the lesbian wedding.

Advertisers included: Pres. Richard A. Goldstein, Unilever United States, Inc., 390 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10022, Phone TOLL FREE: 1-800-223-0392. Country Crock butter, Cutex nail polisher & remover, Lipton tea & soups, Q-tips, Ragu' Italian foods, Vaseline products

Chrm. Lawrence R. Pugh, V.F. Corporation, P.O. Box 1022, Reading, PA 19603, Phone 215-378-1151. Jantzen clothing, Lee jeans, Wrangler boots, Wrangler clothes.

General Motors, Mazda, CBS offer illicit sex, promote homosexuality

A male stripper, genitalia and urination jokes, and promotion of homosexuality fill the September 16 and 23 episodes of DESIGNING WOMEN on CBS. Both were produced by Tommy Thompson and Douglas Jackson.

On September 16, the hour-long season premiere focused on the birthday celebration planned for Julia Sugarbaker, one of the sitcom's stars. Her friends hire a male stripper who appears and performs

his strip-and-grind act for the wrong Ms. Sugarbaker. The story, of course, allows room for countless jokes about nude men throughout the episode. Other jokes are about male genitals, homosexuality, singles bars, and urination.

The latter episode features Mark, the man Julia is dating. When a friend plants in her mind the idea that Mark is homosexual, Julia confronts him: "Mark, I thought you were gay."

"Gay!/? Me??" laughs Mark in disbelief. "Are you serious?"

"Well," Julia declares, reassuring him, "there's nothing wrong with being gay!"

"Well, no, of course not," Mark agrees. "I'm just not, that's all." The sermon is clearly preached in the dialogue.

Advertisers appearing on both episodes included: Chrm. Robert C. Stempel, General Motors Corporation, 3044 W. Grand Blvd., Detroit, MI 48202, Phone 313-556-5000. AC-Delco auto parts, Buick automobiles, Cadillac automobiles, Chevrolet automobiles, Mr. Goodwrench service.

Pres. Yoshinori Taura, Mazda Motors of America, Inc., 7755 Irvine Center Drive, Irvine, CA 92718, Phone 714-727-1990. Mazda automobiles.

Helene Curtis ads promote promiscuity, homosexuality on CBS

The September 9 repeat episode of NORTHERNEXPOSURE on CBS features various forms of illicit sex. Shelley, 19, and her sixtyish live-in lover make out behind the counter of the restaurant they run. Rick and Maggie, another live-in pair of lovers, are also a focal point. After a lover's spat, Rick goes camping and is killed by a falling satellite. Maggie then has to add his memorabilia to a shrine she maintains in her home honoring five lovers, all of whom died while having an illicit affair with her.

A homosexual couple rounds out the episode's couples. They have moved to the little Alaska town to purchase an old home for renovation as a bed and breakfast inn. One scene features them in tender embraces, dancing at the local restaurant.

Cheryl Bloch and Matthew Nodella produced the Diane Frolov-Andrew Schneider script.

Advertisers included: Chrm. John R. Stafford, American Home Products, 685 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, Phone 212-878-5000. Advil pain reliever, Anacin pain medication, Chef Boy-ar-dee food products, Old English oil, Robitussin cough medicine.

Chrm. Gerald Gidwitz, Helene Curtis Industries, Inc., 325 N. Wells Street, Chicago, IL 60610, Phone 312-661-0222. Atune hair conditioner and hairspray, Degree deodorant, Enden shampoo, Finesse

hair conditioner, Salon Selectives, Suave shampoo.

P&G ads support teen sex theme on sitcom

The September 16 episode of NBC'S BLOSSOM dealt with teen sex. Roxie W. Evans produced the script by Racelle R. Schaefer.

Fifteen-year-old Blossom contemplates getting sexually involved with her boyfriend, Jimmy. She tells her best friend that she is thinking about "going to second base." The young girls then discuss "taking off their bras and touching under sweaters." Blossom's teenage brother, Anthony, worried about a possible earthquake, asks younger brother Joey if he has his earthquake survival kit gear ready. Joey laughs, "I've got all I need—a hairdryer, a week's worth of clean underwear and condoms...." (Laughter follows.)

Blossom goes to her father (the divorced mother apparently lives far away) to discuss becoming sexually involved with Jimmy. The oblivious father, however, doesn't really listen, and simply tells her to "go for it in a big way," that "life is short." Later, Dad changes his advice, telling the 15-year-old girl only to "use good judgment" since she's so young.

In the October 2 episode, Joey, also a teenager, discusses with Blossom and Tony his plan to get a fake I.D. in order to have sex with an older woman. In other sex jokes, Joey denies ownership of the porn magazines under his bed and tries to pick up an undercover cop posing as a hooker.

Promoting the irresponsible and promiscuous teen sex on these episodes were ads from: Chrm. Edwin L. Artzt, Procter & Gamble, P.O. Box 599, Cincinnati, OH 45201, Phone TOLL FREE: 1-800-543-7276. Comet cleanser, Cover Girl cosmetics and products, Crest toothpaste, Jif peanut butter and Vicks medications.

Toyota, Kodak ads push illicit teen sex on ABC's 'Doogie Howser'

Eighteen-year-old Doogie thinks he's not a man because "a man has lots of sex," in the September 25 season premiere of ABC'S DOOGIE HOWSER, M.D. The teenage surgeon tells his psychiatrist, "Being a virgin is driving me nuts!" He discusses with his sex-obsessed friend Vinnie the fact that they both are lagging way behind their friends; both boys are desperate to have sex.

As Doogie's girlfriend Wanda leaves for art school the next day, he has planned a romantic evening to end with sex. But Doogie gets sidetracked by a patient at the

hospital, and stands Wanda up. He goes to her house the next morning while she is packing, and the two have sex.

Doogie later tells his shrink that while he was having sex with Wanda he had these "crazy questions" running through his mind—"Is this right? Should I be doing this?" These questions—depicted as irrational and illogical—were the episode's only hint at interjecting any traditional moral values.

Having illicit sex is unquestionably a good thing for Doogie and Wanda, as reflected in his entry into his computer at the show's end. He wrote, "There's a difference between having sex and making love. Wanda and I made love. And even though she's 2,000 miles away, I've never felt closer to her."

The Vic Rauseo-Linda Morris script was produced by Joe Ann Fogle, Mitchell Lee Katlin and Nat Bernstein.

Chrm. Kay Whitmore, Eastman Kodak Company, 343 State Street, Rochester, NY 14650, TOLL FREE: 1-800-237-5398. Bayer aspirin, Kodak photo products and services, Lysol disinfectant, Resolve spray carpet cleaner.

Toyota Motor Sales, Pres. Y. Togo, Post Office Box 2991, Torrance, CA 90509, TOLL FREE: 1-800-331-4331. Lexus automobiles, Toyota motor vehicles.

Cosmair is regular sponsor of adultery, teen sex, homosexuality

ABC's ROSEANNE opened the fall season promoting teen sex and homosexuality. On September 17, Becky, 17-year-old daughter of Dan and Roseanne, tells her mother she wants birth control. (She doesn't tell Mom she's already having sex with her boyfriend.)

"She's 17, Dan," Roseanne tells the upset father, "I don't think there's much we can do." The parents then allude to their own teen sexual exploits. Roseanne eventually takes Becky to the doctor to get birth control pills.

Later, Roseanne says, "Becky, you're young; this is really a big step. You have time to reconsider."

"We already—," Becky mumbles in confession. "Don't worry, Mom! We used something—a condom for diseases and stuff!"

"Good thinking," retorts Roseanne.

"Don't tell Dad," Becky pleads.

Roseanne agrees; the scene ends with mother and daughter in warm embrace.

On October 1, Leon, Roseanne's homosexual boss, is the focus of the story when he is invited to fill in for an absentee at Dan's weekly poker game. Dan and his poker friends exhibit very little response to the revelation.

"It's okay," Dan reassures Leon. "It happens."

Another story line features Roseanne's sister Jackie, who's been having sex with one of the married poker regulars.

On October 15, the series continued the pro-homosexual slant, featuring a plotline in which Leon insists that his live-in lover leave home while Leon's mother visits. Of course, Leon is shamed (by Steven, the lover, and by Roseanne) into having him stay home. When Steven doesn't like Leon's mother, Leon retorts, "You wanted a mother-in-law, buddy boy, now you got one!"

Profanity fills the dialogue of all three of these anti-family episodes.

Brad Isaacs, Maxine Lapiduss and Al Lowenstein produced all three. Amy Sherman and Jennifer Heath wrote the first, Chuck Lorre the second, and Martin Mull and Lapiduss the last.

Advertisers appearing on all three episodes was Chrm. Jacques H. Correze, Cosmair, Inc., 30 Terminal Avenue, Clark, NJ 07066, TOLL FREE: 1-800-462-2211. Advantage hair color, L'Oreal hair care products, Preference hair dye, Studio Line hair products.

CBS movie with positive portrayal of Christians sponsored by P&G

CBS's September 13 movie ALWAYS REMEMBER I LOVE YOU was a touching drama that portrayed a Christian family in a positive light. The writer was Vivienne Radkoff, and producers were Marcy Gross and Ann Weston. The plot centers around the kidnapping and illegal adoption of two-year-old Robert Mendon, now 16. His adoptive parents, the Mendons, a wealthy couple, thought the adoption was legal. Paul, the crooked attorney who arranged the adoption is arrested and the Mendons eventually learn the truth. The Mendons are reticent to tell Robert, but he overhears a conversation and they tell him the whole story.

In anger, Robert runs away seeking his real parents; he finds them—the Monroes—in a small Ohio town. They are a compassionate Christian family who pray and attend church together. The parents are kind, warm, and loving people. Thinking Robert is a runaway, they take him in and let him stay in their home, asking him to call his parents and let them know he is okay.

Robert eventually meets with his adoptive parents but is torn about what to do, so he talks to Mrs. Monroe (who still doesn't know he's her son). She is very understanding and encourages Robert to forgive his adoptive parents and return to them. He leaves his real mother a touching letter letting her know he is her son and

returns to his Michigan home. When he arrives home he tells his adoptive mother what Mrs. Monroe taught him about forgiving others.

Top advertiser was Chrm. Edwin L. Artzt, Procter & Gamble, P.O. Box 599, Cincinnati, OH 45201, Phone, TOLL FREE: 1-800-543-7276. Camay soap, Cascade detergent, Cover Girl, Crisco oil & shortening, Dawn dish detergent, Vicks medications.

Mazda, P&G ads in CBS pro-abortion episode

Murphy Brown, CBS's ultimate 90's woman, hit the new season with a bang September 16. The MURPHY BROWN sitcom's title character is an obnoxious, liberal, feminist network TV news star. In the season premiere, Brown, single and 42, discovers she is pregnant. The Diane English teleplay was produced by Deborah Smith. The script is totally pro-abortion.

The baby's father is Murphy's ex-husband, Jake; he's been in town for three weeks—after years of absence—and the two decided to have sex.

As Murphy considers her dilemma and her choice, she tells one friend, "I don't have room in my life [for a baby]...."

Another time she wonders, "Do I have to live with my mistake? Does the child have to live with it? I know I have the right to make this decision!"

Miles, her executive producer, reacts with hysteria, telling her she cannot be a single mother and remain a news star.

Murphy's co-workers greet the news with shock and disbelief. Corky (the series "dumb blonde") tells Murphy not to worry, she'll be there to help her even if it means "I have to drive you to some dark alley so some shady doctor who might not even wash his hands can take care of things."

Murphy tells the stupid Corky there are no more "back alleys" for women—"...women in this country still have a choice. At least I think they still do. I haven't checked the paper today!" (Laughter and applause.)

Once Murphy tells Jake she's going to have the baby, he explains that he can't "be there" for her, reassures her how much he cares, and says goodbye.

Murphy finally concludes, "I'm exercising my choice to have this baby!" Jim proposes that it may well be the "worst decision" in television. Miles again goes into hysterics, shouting, "People who have children should be married!" A laugh track punctuates the line to assure viewers that Miles's irrational statement about marriage is not to be taken seriously.

Top advertisers were: Chrm. Edwin L. Artzt, Procter & Gamble, P.O. Box 599, Cincinnati, OH 45201, TOLL FREE: 1-800-543-7276. Camay soap, Cover Girl

cosmetics, Hawaiian Punch fruit drink, Head & Shoulders shampoo, Pampers diapers, Pert shampoo.

Chrm. Jacques H. Correze, Cosmair, Inc., 30 Terminal Avenue, Clark, NJ 07066, TOLL FREE: 1-800-462-2211. L'Oreal hair care products, Paloma Picasso fragrance, Preference hair dye, Studio Line hair products.

GM, McDonald's ads on CBS movie with adultery, violence

CBS's September 31 movie STRANGER AT MY DOOR contained murder, violence, graphic blood and gore and adulterous sexual relationships. The writer was Peter S. Fischer and the producer was Kevin Cremin.

The setting is a small Southern town with a corrupt sheriff and deputies who cover up murders for friends. Sharon Dancey, the wife of Jimmy Lee Dancey, an abusive alcoholic, sees him beat his mistress, Marsha Wells, to death with a poker. Dancey then comes after his wife and she narrowly escapes death as he cuts her up with a knife in a graphic scene.

The sheriff, in cahoots with Dancey, has his deputies go to Miss Wells' house where they find her bloody and badly disfigured corpse. They burn the house and her body, along with the body of an attorney who was trying to help Mrs. Dancey. Mrs. Dancey runs to a nearby farm for help where a man is hiding out with his children from his mobster father-in-law and a corrupt police officer. He helps Mrs. Dancey hide from the crooked sheriff and her violent husband. The two have sex although Mrs. Dancey is married.

Also treated lightly is the subject of pornography. Robert, a 10-year-old, keeps porn magazines under his bed. When his sister Cindy tells their father, he shows little concern. In the scene that follows, the little boy leers lewdly at Mrs. Dancey as his father begins undressing her to get her out of her muddy clothes while she is unconscious.

Advertisers included: Chrm. Robert C. Stempel, General Motors Corporation, 3044 W. Grand Blvd., Detroit, MI 48202, Phone 313-556-5000. Buick automobiles, Cadillac automobiles, Chevrolet automobiles, Mr. Goodwrench service.

Chrm. Fred Turner, McDonald's Corporation, One McDonald's Plaza, Oak Brook, IL 60521, Phone 312-575-3000. McDonald's fast food.

Kodak ads bring illicit sex, religious murderer

NBC's debut episodes of REASONABLE DOUBTS contained

implications of adultery, illicit sex and violence. The September 26 episode writer was Robert Singer, and September 27 writer was Steven P. Smith. Randall Zisk produced both.

The show stars Dickey, a police investigator assigned to work with Tessie, a deaf, but effective District Attorney. The first episode has a sex scene with Dickey and his girlfriend nude, draped with sheets.

The second episode also featured a murder and illicit sex. The plot focuses on a young black man, Lionell, who very gruesomely cuts up, and later murders, a black alcoholic woman for playing her music too loud. As he first attacks her he says, "I'm going to cut the devil out of you before he gets into me." Lionell is released by the court with the stipulation that he be on medication. But he skips his medication and returns to murder the woman.

His mother insists, "He's not bad, he's sick...Lionell went haywire in college when...his head was all full of religious stuff that wouldn't leave him."

On the front of a book Dickey found in Lionell's home was the word "Immanuel." Dickey said no wonder Lionell is crazy if he's been reading this.

As Tessie and Dickey meet to investigate the crime, she asks if he had a fun night in the city. He jokes, "No, I was at home reading the Bible." In reality, he was having sex with his girlfriend.

Advertisers included: Chrm. Kay Whitmore, Eastman Kodak Company, 343 State Street, Rochester, NY 14650, TOLL FREE: 1-800-237-5398. Chubs babywipes, Eastman Kodak, Givenchy perfume, Love My Carpet, Lysol products.

Kellogg sponsors NBC episodes with adultery, sacrilege

NBC's GOLDEN GIRLS September 14 and 21 episodes contained sacrilege and frequent sexual innuendo. Writers were Matthew Diamond and Mitchell Hurwitz. Producers were Marc Sotkin and Nina Feinberg.

On September 14, Sophia learns of the death of an acquaintance. Clearly not saddened by the news, she snarls, "Good riddance...God bless her soul." (Sophia then makes the Catholic sign of the cross and canned laughter follows.)

There are also jokes about shriners and many crude sexual references.

On September 21, Rose is convinced that Blanche slept with her late husband many years ago because of a photograph of the two together. It turns out that Blanche is innocent—in this case. However, Blanche gets out her journals which list the men she has had sex with. Gold and silver stars denote those who were good lovers. Her

initials—"BED"—decorate the front of the journals. When asked about one of the men, she says, "I probably can't remember because he was probably just lousy in bed." (Canned laughter follows.)

There were demeaning references to religion. Sophia tells Dorothy, "Every time you bring home a pamphlet, I get that disease...and not only diseases either...for a while I thought I was a Jew for Jesus." (Laughter follows.)

In one scene as Sophia enters the house, she sees Dorothy standing before her with her arms open. Sophia remarks sarcastically (referring to Dorothy), "I'm having a religious vision, Oh, God, it's beautiful."

Blanche, the promiscuous roommate, answers, "Sophia, please! Our Saviour wouldn't be caught dead in that outfit." (Canned laughter follows.)

Having ads on both shows was: Chrm. William E. LaMothe, Kellogg Company, One Kellogg Square PO Box 3599, Battle Creek, MI 49016, Phone 616-961-2000. Kellogg's Cereals, Crispix party mix, Eggo Waffles, Mrs. Smith's Pies, Pop Tarts.

Sears ads bring tawdry sex, ridicule of blind

Tawdry, illicit sex, profanity and a demeaning treatment of the blind are the mainstays in ABC's new fall series GOOD AND EVIL. In the debut episode, Denise (the evil sister) snorts, "The hell with my mother!" It is clear that mother and daughter hate each other with equal passion.

Mother later calls Denise a "bi--h," and Denise refers to her late father as a "stupid fat pig."

Meanwhile Genevieve (the good sister) talks often with her deceased husband. Denise's lover Eric meets and falls for Genevieve (and the good Genevieve for him). Genevieve also has another admirer, George. A blind man, George is portrayed as a total idiot and a klutz. The script makes his blindness the butt of jokes and countless sight gags. Despite his being married, George actively pursues a romantic relationship with Genevieve.

The two episodes combine a lot of profanity (God's name in vain 10 times in the first episode) with urination jokes, and perverse sex jokes including homosexuality, a gigolo, euphemisms for male genitalia, and bondage.

The first trashy episode was written by Susan Harris, the second by Tom Straw. Producers included Gilbert Junger, Valerie Curtin, and Bill Bryan.

Believing this to be good family entertainment, and sponsoring both episodes was Chrm. Edward A. Brennan, Sears, Roebuck and Co., Sears Tower, Chicago, IL 60684, Phone 312-875-2500.

Allstate insurance, Coldwell Banker realty, Kenmore appliances, Western Auto stores.

Perverse sex show sponsored by Ford

Drunken, horny sailors and genitalia jokes open ABC's September 25 episode of ANYTHING BUT LOVE. In a subsequent scene, series star Hannah's friend Robin talks about sex with cowboys, and ovulation.

Hannah thinks she's pregnant, and a home pregnancy test confirms her fear. When she tells her boyfriend Marty, he promptly proposes. Feminist to the core, however, she is indignant when he proposes marriage. ("You're seriously proposing to me just because I'm pregnant!?!")

Later jokes use euphemisms for intercourse as Hannah tells co-workers she's pregnant. As it turns out, she's not.

The October 2 episode opens with Marty openly ogling a woman in a restaurant; Hannah does the same to a man. They then proceed to discuss sexual fantasies and make homosexual jokes.

Another "story" line focuses on Kathryn, the boss at the magazine publishing office where they work. Kathryn is ecstatic about a full page newspaper ad revealing her plagiarism as a college journalist, and that she has led a promiscuous lifestyle. One of her sexual partners was Marty, but that doesn't bother feminist Hannah at all.

Peter Noah wrote the first episode, Bill Barol the latter. Pamela Grant produced both.

Advertising on both of these family-time episodes was Chrm. Harold Poling, Ford Motor Company, Post Office Box 1899, Dearborn, MI 48121, Phone 313-322-3000. Ford motor vehicles, Lincoln Continental automobiles, Mercury automobiles, Motorcraft automotive parts.

Mitsubishi helps Fox air anti-family sitcom

The FOX network's MARRIED... WITH CHILDREN again took cheap shots at marriage, fidelity and family during its September 15 episode. The writer was Kevin Curran, and the producer was Barbara B. Cramer. This episode focuses on how much Kelly and Bud, the Bundy teens, hate the yet-unborn Bundy baby, and how disappointed Al Bundy is that his wife Peg is pregnant.

Kelly tells Bud, "I hate Mom! I mean, you can't blame Dad—he's just a stupid animal but mom knew what she was doing."

Al goes to a bar to escape Peg and to ogle skimpily-clad dancers while he

contemplates leaving his wife.

Al remarks, "What a great place, a bar hooked up to the public address system at the bus terminal so you don't miss your connection for leaving your wife."

"Don't forget the cheap bimbos," responds the bartender. "They give the place some class."

More conversation belittles child-bearing as two men pout over their wives' pregnancies. Al is completely engrossed in lust over the lewd dancer on the bar in front of him.

Among the advertisers was Chrm. Taiji Fukuda, Mitsubishi Motor Sales of America, Inc., 6400 W. Katella, Cypress, CA 90630, Phone 714-372-6000. Mitsubishi automobiles.

General Mills helps ABC debut new sitcom with sex, profanity

ABC's new sitcom SIBS, which debuted September 17 could be an amusing look into the interactions in the lives of three adult sisters. The first three scripts, however, depend on insults, sexual content and profanity. Writers include Heidi Perlman, Dick Blasucci, Marc Flanagan, Jay Kogen and Wallace Wolodarsky. Producers were Richard Sakai, Ted Bessell and Larina Jean Adamson.

Nora, the oldest, is married to Howard; they are a middle-aged couple. In the debut they are shown in bed, apparently nude, discussing their sex life. Also in this episode, Lily, the insecure youngest sister, leaves her live-in boyfriend, Monty, when he wants out of the relationship because she "holds him back from sleeping with other women." Lily moves in with Nora and Howard.

Middle sister Audie, a realtor, is a recovering alcoholic. She is, admirably, trying to overcome her selfish nature and lack of self-control. One evening in Nora's den, Audie tells Lily to get off her case about her past. Audie says she sent Lily an Alcoholics Anonymous form letter admitting Lily is a victim of Audie's selfishness. (Canned laughter follows.)

In the September 24 episode Lily writes Monty, who has his art on tour in Europe. Her letter implies sadomasochistic sex (with handcuffs). She shows the letter to Nora who persuades her not to send it.

An October 2 scene has Howard on the telephone with his college son Stevie. They discuss Stevie's sexual conquests, of which Dad is clearly proud. The episode is packed with profanity, most of it the use of God's name in vain.

Advertising on two of the above episodes was: Chrm. H. Brewster Atwater Jr., General Mills, Inc., P. O. Box 1113, Minneapolis, MN 55440, Phone 612-540-2311. Betty Crocker mixes, Gold Medal Flour, Cheerios cereal, Granola bars, Kix cereal, Nerf toys.

Pro-life movement needs uncompromising church By Mary Haggerty

I am reverently involved in right-to-life. It was not difficult to undertake because pro-life flows from Jesus' teachings in every book of the New Testament. Seeking justice for the unborn is proclaiming the gospel Christ preached. By approaching this calling with a desire to serve God first, I have acquired many committed and lifelong friends, maintained my faith when confusion surrounded me, and experienced an empathetic love not found through any other community. This is the happy news.

The sad news is that the more I have the opportunity to speak at church groups, religious gatherings, or even one-on-one, the more I am witness to Christians having been swayed toward pro-abortion thinking and action. Their argument often stems from moral confusion and misplaced compassion.

Abortion is a legitimate moral issue in and of itself, not some remote political appendage of women's civil rights. It can only be defined as the deliberate, direct killing of an innocent unborn human being. No other injustice compares in reality and every other injustice pales in proportion.

Pro-life is not just another social justice issue. We should not complicate the God-given right to life continuation with social and legislative obstacles. The illogical tenets of the Supreme Court too often overshadow the loving wisdom of God. We are created in His image and likeness. Therefore, every unborn child is like Jesus, as are the child's parents. We cannot trade in the life of the unborn to better the lifestyle of the parents, no matter how appealing.

Maybe I shouldn't expect everyone to understand the motivation and determination of right-to-lifers. Those who do not acknowledge human life as a gift on loan from God cannot fully grasp its heavenly value. I do, however, expect that prayerful Christians ought to know better.

Pro-lifers fight for the very lives of the unborn who will experience the most violent forms of abuse and death during abortion. If the unborn must pass certain social criteria to continue their lives, it would be quite naive to think that the same criteria won't eventually be applied to all other humans, as it is now also applied to rationalize infanticide and euthanasia. If defenders of the poor, homeless, and abused do not first acknowledge protection for the preborn, it will only be a matter of time before society will justify that the poor, homeless, and abused will also become too much of a burden and destined for termination, as well. If

We cannot trade in the life of the unborn to better the lifestyle of the parents, no matter how appealing.

violence is not the solution to the problems encompassing poverty, why are some swayed toward accepting violence as a solution to unplanned pregnancy? What is worse, why are so many Christians unresponsive to the ongoing executions?

Christians who say to pro-lifers, "God bless you for your hard work" but won't vote for pro-life candidates or help defeat laws that deny our God-given right to life are counterfeits at best. After hearing the rationale of some voters in this past election, I discovered that they had sold out the gospel command to defend life in exchange for other favors and promises from pro-abortion candidates. God commanded his **Church**, not the government, to

aid the poor and oppressed. We are not to pander to government legislators at the expense of cashing in our Christian principles. Christ never allowed his Church to compromise **life for lifestyle**. He never asked his Church to compromise at all.

Sadly, there are those within the Church who have abused the analogy of the **seamless garment** by fervently campaigning for social justice while ignoring the teachings of the Church on abortion. These members merely elude truth by hiding under the guise of the seamless garment. We cannot believe in a subjective justice that dilutes the consequences of the abortion holocaust on humankind. Embracing the seamless garment means taking an involved attitude toward the total living gospel. Justice must be the very fabric of the seamless garment if it is to have any meaning at all.

I am the Church and I'm here for the duration but I have often felt isolation and alienation by my own church hierarchy when I needed them most. I believe I echo the feelings of many committed right-to-lifers. We are sometimes set apart, as if we were some sort of odd piece of furniture in the matched sofa set. Are we not all the body of Christ? Pro-lifers need the ointment of empathy

The sad news is that the more I have the opportunity to speak at church groups, religious gatherings, or even one-on-one, the more I am witness to Christians having been swayed toward pro-abortion thinking and action.

from our shepherds. We tire, we cry, and we sometimes feel crushed and forgotten. Ministers who pat us "brave" pro-lifers on the back, but do not stand with us in the forefront of battle, fail to fathom our most piercing wounds.

Many ministers fear speaking on abortion from the pulpit because there may be someone in the congregation who has experienced an abortion. Most assuredly there will be, considering the inordinate number of abortions performed each year. It is just as certain, however, that **not** to disclose the evil entrapments of abortion is to assure that there will always be women in the congregation who have had abortions and men who have fostered the killing of their own children. For this reason it is paramount that priests also offer reconciliation and the forgiveness of Our Lord to those members who have, in any way, participated in abortion. To do any less would be to neglect the total spectrum of conscience formation, repentance, forgiveness and healing, as Jesus taught.

Abortion offends our Savior, who was sent to offer new life to all. We can never obtain God's peace without insuring God's justice. Apathetic Christians need to become actively involved in restoring the unborn's God-given right to life. Complacency is not the heavenly peace that Christ desires for his Church on earth. It never has been. Complacency only maintains a false peace that is built on the silenced, invisible gravesites of the unborn children killed by abortion.

Hollywood's poison factory: Making it the dream factory again

By Michael Medved
Reprinted by permission from IMPRIMIS
The monthly journal of Hillsdale College
Subscription free upon request

America's long-running romance with Hollywood is over. For millions of people, the entertainment industry no longer represents a source of enchantment, of magical fantasy, of uplift, or even of harmless diversion. Popular culture is viewed now as an implacable enemy, a threat to their basic values and a menace to the raising of their children. The Hollywood dream factory has become the poison factory.

This disenchantment is reflected in poll after poll. An Associated Press Media General poll released in 1990 showed that 80 percent of Americans objected to the amount of foul language in motion pictures; 82 percent objected to the amount of violence, 72 percent objected to the amount of explicit sexuality, and by a ratio of 3 to 1 they felt that movies today are worse than ever.

In reality, you don't need polls or surveys to understand what is going on. When was the last time you heard someone say, "You know, by golly, movies today are better than ever!" Only Jack Valenti, the head of the Motion Picture Association of America, can make such statements with a straight face. There is a general recognition even among those Americans who still like to go to movies that their quality has declined. And this has begun to register in disastrous box office receipts.

Hollywood's dirty little secret

There is a dirty little secret in Hollywood. For movie attendance, 1991 was the worst year in 15 years. The summer season was the worst in 23 years. Forty percent of Americans report that they don't see a single film in the course of a year—a higher percentage than ever before. What Hollywood publicizes, of course, is total box office gross receipts, which look respectable, but which are misleading. Why? Because the ticket prices have been raised so much! If you actually count the number of warm bodies sitting in theater seats, movie attendance has disastrously declined.

Major studios like MGM and Orion are teetering on the verge of collapse. Carolco, which produced **Terminator II**, the year's biggest hit, has since scaled back all operations and fired one-third of its employees. This is clearly an industry in trouble.

Rather than searching for solutions, Hollywood looks for scapegoats. The most common line is: "It's the recession," but this ignores, among other things, the fact that in the past the movie business has always proven to be recession proof. Economic downturns generally saw the movie business profit as people sought escape.

In recent articles, a few critical colleagues believe they have discovered the culprit—blaming all of Hollywood's woes on one "over-the-hill" ex-Warner Brothers actor who hasn't worked in movies for some 30 years. His name is Ronald Reagan. Somehow, this former President was supposed to have singlehandedly destroyed the quality of American film.

What Hollywood insiders refuse to recognize is that the crisis of popular culture is at its very core a crisis of values. The problem isn't that the camera is out of focus, or that the editing is sloppy, or that the acting is bad. The problem is with the kind of stories Hollywood is telling and the kind of messages that it is sending in film after film. The industry is bursting with professionalism and prowess. But it suffers from a sickness of the soul.

Hollywood no longer reflects—or even respects—the values

that most Americans cherish.

Take a look, for example, at the most recent Oscars. Five very fine actors were nominated for best actor of the year. Three of them portrayed murderous psychos: Robert DeNiro in **Cape Fear**, Warren Beatty in **Bugsy**, and Anthony Hopkins in **The Silence of the Lambs** (this last a delightful family film about two serial killers—one eats and the other skins his victims). A fourth actor, Robin Williams, was nominated for playing a delusional homeless psycho in **The Fisher King**. The most wholesome character was Nick Nolte's, a good old fashioned manic-depressive-suicidal neurotic in **The Prince of Tides**.

These are all good actors, delivering splendid performances, compelling and technically accomplished. But isn't it sad when

What Hollywood insiders refuse to recognize is that the crisis of popular culture is at its very core a crisis of values.

all this artistry is lavished on films that are so empty, so barren, so unfulfilling? Isn't it sad when at the Academy Awards—the annual event that celebrates the highest achievement of which the film industry is capable—the best we can come up with is movies that are so floridly, strangely whacked out?

I repeat: The fundamental problem with Hollywood has nothing at all to do with the brilliance of the performers, or the camera work, or the editing. In many ways, these things are better than ever before. Modern films are technically brilliant, but they are morally and spiritually empty.

The messages

What are the messages in today's films? For a number of years I have been writing about Hollywood's anti-religious bias, but I must point out that this hostility has never been quite as intense as in the last few years. The 1991 season boasted one religion-bashing movie after another in which Hollywood was able to demonstrate that it was an equal-opportunity offender.

For Protestants there was **At Play in the Fields of the Lord**, a lavish \$35 million rainforest spectacle about natives and their wholesome primitive ways and the sick, disgusting missionaries who try to ruin their lives. And then for Catholics there was **The Pope Must Die**, which was re-released as **The Pope Must Diet**. It didn't work either way. It features scenes of the Holy Father flirting with harlot nuns and hiding in a closet pigging out on communion wafers. For Jews there was **Naked Tango**, written and directed by the brother of the screenwriter for **The Last Temptation of Christ**. This particular epic featured religious Jews operating a brutal bordello right next door to a synagogue and forcing women into white slavery.

And then most amazingly there was **Cape Fear**, which was nominated for a number of the most prestigious Academy Awards. It wasn't an original concept. **Cape Fear** was a remake of a 1962 movie in which Robert Mitchum plays a released convict intent on revenge who tracks down his old defense attorney. Gregory Peck portrays the defense attorney, a strong, stalwart and upright man who defends his family against this crazed killer. In the

remake, by **Last Temptation** director Martin Scorsese, there is a new twist: the released convict is not just an ordinary maniac, but a “Killer Christian from Hell.” To prevent anyone from missing the point, his muscular back has a gigantic cross tattooed on it, and he has Biblical verses tattooed on both arms.

When he is about to rape the attorney’s wife, played by Jessica Lange, he says, “Are you ready to be born again? After just one hour with me, you’ll be talking in tongues.” He carries a Bible with him in scenes in which he is persecuting his family, and he tells people that he is a member of a Pentecostal church.

The most surprising aspect of this utterly insulting characterization is that it drew so little protest. Imagine that DeNiro’s character had been portrayed as a gay rights activist. Homosexual groups would have howled in protest, condemning

In the past TV season there were seven different pregnancies. What did six of the seven pregnancies have in common? They were out of wedlock.

this caricature as an example of bigotry. But we are so accustomed to Hollywood’s insulting stereotypes of religious believers that no one even seems to notice the hatred behind them.

The entertainment industry further demonstrates its hostility to organized religion by eliminating faith and ritual as a factor in the lives of nearly all the characters it creates. Forty to fifty percent of all Americans go to church or synagogue every week. When was the last time you saw anybody in a motion picture going to church, unless that person was some kind of crook, or a mental case, or a flagrant hypocrite?

Hollywood even removes religious elements from situations in which they clearly belong. The summer of 1991 offered a spate of medical melodramas like **Regarding Henry**, **Dying Young**, and **The Doctor**. Did you notice that all these characters go into the operating room without once invoking the name of God, or whispering one little prayer, or asking for clergy? I wrote a nonfiction book about hospital life once, and I guarantee that just as there are no atheists in foxholes, there are no atheists in operating rooms only in Hollywood.

Religion isn’t Hollywood’s only target; the traditional family has also received surprisingly harsh treatment from today’s movie moguls. Look again at **Cape Fear**. The remake didn’t only change the killer, it also changed the hero, and this brings me to the second message that Hollywood regularly broadcasts. As I mentioned, the original character Gregory Peck plays is a decent and honorable man. In the remake, Nick Nolte’s character is, not to put too fine a point on it, a sleazeball. He is repeatedly unfaithful to his wife; when his wife dares to question that practice, he hits her. He tries to beat up his daughter on one occasion because she is smoking marijuana. He is not a likable person. That a happily married, family-defending hero—the kind of person that people can identify with—is transformed into a sadistic, cheating, bitter man, says volumes about the direction of American movies.

Did you ever notice how few movies there are about happily married people? There are very few movies about married people at all, but those that are made tend to portray marriage as a disaster, as a dangerous situation, as a battleground—with a long series of murderous marriage movies.

There was **Sleeping with the Enemy**, in which Patrick Bergin beats up Julia Roberts so mercilessly that she has to run away. When he comes after her, she eventually kills him. There was also **Mortal Thoughts** in which Bruce Willis beats up his wife and he

is killed by his wife’s best friend. In **Thelma and Louise**, there is another horrible, brutal and insensitive husband to run away from. In **A Kiss Before Dying**, Matt Dillon persuades twin sisters to marry him. He kills the first one and then tries to kill the second, but she gets to him first.

In **She-Devil**, Rosanne Barr torments her cheating husband Ed Begley, Jr., and in **Total Recall** Sharon Stone pretends to be married to Arnold Schwarzenegger and tries to kill him. When he gets the upper hand, she objects, “But you can’t hurt me! I’m your wife.” Arnold shoots her through the forehead and says, “Consider that a divorce.” And then there was a more recent film, **Deceived**, starring Goldie Hawn. The advertisement for the movie says, “She thought her life was perfect,” and, of course, her model husband turns out to be a murderous monster. **Deceived** is an appropriate title, because we all have been deceived by Hollywood’s portrayal of marriage. It even applies to television. The New York Times reports that in the past TV season there were seven different pregnancies. What did six of the seven pregnancies have in common? They were out of wedlock. The message is that marriage is outmoded, it is dangerous, oppressive, unhealthy.

But is it true? Recently, I made an interesting discovery. The conventional wisdom is that the divorce rate in America stands at 50 percent. This figure is used repeatedly in the media. But the 1990 U.S. Census Bureau has a category listing the number of people who have ever been married and who have ever been divorced. Less than twenty percent have been divorced! The evidence is overwhelming that the idea of a 50 percent divorce rate is more than a slight over-statement; it is a destructive and misleading myth.

Yet for years Hollywood has been selling divorce. Remember **The Last Married Couple in America**, starring the late Natalie Wood? That may be a Hollywood prophecy, but it is not the reality of the American heartland. In this matter, as in so many others, by overstating the negative, the film industry leads viewers to feel terrified and/or insecure, and their behavior is adversely affected. I know many people who say, “I’m reluctant to get married because I know there’s a 50 percent chance I’m going to get divorced.” Wouldn’t it make a difference if they knew there was an 80 percent chance of staying together?

Another negative message is America-bashing. This is a very patriotic country, one of the most patriotic countries in the world. Let me get personal for a minute: My mother was born in Germany. She was lucky enough to get out with her family in 1935. There were other family members who were not fortunate enough to get out, and most who stayed behind died in Hitler’s holocaust. In any event, my mother had a first cousin, Hans, who also got out of Germany, and within a year of arriving in the United States, speaking only broken, heavily-accented English,

We are so accustomed to Hollywood’s insulting stereotypes of religious believers that no one even seems to notice the hatred behind them.

he enlisted in the Army Air Corps. He became a tail gunner and flew 25 bombing missions. On the last, when he was 21 years old, he was shot down and killed over Romania. His parents, for whom he was the only child, had a little shrine in their home ever afterwards, with an American flag and a picture of Hans in his airman’s uniform. They often used to say, “We’re proud that he died for this wonderful country.”

I relate this story not because it is exceptional but because it is typical. Don’t we all have personal stories that show our love,

our pride, our gratitude for being born in this amazingly fortunate situation in which we find ourselves? The luckiest people on earth—that's how most Americans feel. But what do they see on their movie and television screens? What is the dream of America that is portrayed? It is a dream of a nightmarish land, where nothing is going right, where evil powers dominate. Consider for example that full-color, breathless guided tour of the fetid fever swamps of Oliver Stone's paranoid imagination—the movie **JFK**, a tale in which Stone suggests a conspiracy so grand, so enormous, so corrupt that it involves absolutely every conceivable American institution and organization except the CampFire Girls.

Oliver Stone's nightmare has increasingly become Hollywood's dream of America. Once upon a time, one of the

The traditional family has also received surprisingly harsh treatment from today's movie moguls.

ways that my immigrant mother, and my immigrant grandparents on my father's side, learned about America was through movies. Movies glorified the American past, and some of them were very good, like **Drums Along the Mohawk** or **Young Mr. Lincoln**. Today, if Hollywood made a movie about young Mr. Lincoln he would be an abused child and grow up to be corrupt and power-lusting.

The American past, according to Hollywood, is mainly about the rise of evil businessmen and the "exploitative" capitalist system, or, alternately, about the supposedly glorious 1960s. There are a plethora of phony Sixties nostalgia movies clearly made by people who are determined to glorify all those who protested against the Vietnam War and to insult all those who actually fought it. Is there a more insulted and abused group of people than Vietnam vets? You always see them with twitches, right? They're always weird guys. If a screenwriter needs to come up with an explanation for why a character is a crazed killer, there is always: "Oh, he was in 'Nam." But three million Americans fought in Vietnam and they are not all crazed killers.

The other era that the movies tend to focus on obsessively is the 1930s, with those wonderful dramatic elements of negativity, the Depression and gangsters. The glories of our history? Forget it.

In 1985, there was an attempt to make a movie about the American Revolution that cost \$35 million and showcased Al Pacino, his Brooklyn accent firmly intact, as a soldier in the Continental Army. But this movie made the Americans the bad guys! Did it take a genius to tell Warner Brothers that if you make a movie about the Revolution that runs two and a half hours and makes the Americans the bad guys, no one will want to see it?

Recently, we went through an amazing national experience when America rallied with a unanimity that has not been seen in my lifetime behind Operation Desert Storm. Many commentators predicted that there would be a glut of movies about it. Wouldn't Hollywood be eager to exploit the Gulf War? Not one is currently in production or even in development.

By contrast, there are currently **five** major studio projects in development about the Black Panther Party—that tiny, briefly fashionable gang of thugs who murdered many of their own members. An industry that thinks that the American people are more interested in the Black Panthers than in the genuine heroes of our armed forces is an industry that is profoundly out of touch.

The motivation

What is the motivation behind the messages Hollywood is sending?

Some people say, "Well, you know, the movie business is perfect capitalism; it's merely giving the people what they want."

But a simple analysis of the controversial content of recent films and their corresponding box office performance shows that this is not the case. Over 60 percent of all the feature films are now rated "R"—despite the fact that they consistently earn less money than those rated "G" or "PG." In 1991, PG-rated films drew a median box office gross **three times larger** than R-rated films—but Hollywood persists in keeping the majority of its releases as gore-and-sex drenched R-rated shockers. Is this an example of responding to the public?

Hollywood expresses its underlying values most clearly with those projects which it considers serious "art" films—films that make some philosophical or political statement. Consider the 1990 bomb, **Guilty by Suspicion**, a dark, tragic tale of an idealistic, blacklisted left-wing director in the 1950s. How could Warner Brothers possibly assume it would make money on this very expensive Robert DeNiro project especially when more than a half-dozen previous films about the horrors of the McCarthy era had all failed miserably at the box office?

Or take a look at the three gigantically expensive film biographies that came out in 1992. You know what they're about? They're about three terrific American heroes. One of them is Jimmy Hoffa, played by Jack Nicholson. The second is about Malcolm X, directed by Spike Lee. The third is about Charlie Chaplin, specifically about his struggles with McCarthyism during the 1950s and about how he eventually had to flee to a self-imposed exile because of his left-wing politics.

If we can assume that the primary purpose of these movies, each of which will cost tens of millions of dollars, is not to make money, then what is it? Why does Hollywood persist in making films that so constantly revel in the dark side, in gloom and despair, destruction and horror? I'll try to offer a brief explanation, but it's a complicated psychological problem. Someone versed in clinical psychology might be better able to diagnose the situation.

People in the movie business are motivated by a tremendous desire to be taken seriously. They don't want to be thought of as just entertainers. They want to be respected as "artists." And the view today is that in order to be a serious artist—to make a statement—you have to be removed from the mainstream in your own country.

This view ignores all of Western history. Was William Shakespeare alienated from the Tudor monarchy? He wrote play after play glorifying Elizabeth's antecedents and became a court favorite. He was part of the establishment and proud of it. When

Over 60 percent of all the feature films are now rated "R"—despite the fact that they consistently earn less money than those rated "G" or "PG."

Johann Sebastian Bach wrote the imperishable glories for which he is known, he wrote for Prince Leopold, for the elector of Brandenburg, and for the Church of St. Thomas in Leipzig. He composed more than 600 sacred cantatas and chorales, devotedly serving the religious hierarchy of his time.

In the past, most great artists served and respected the society they lived in. To be sure, they were not content with all its aspects, but they weren't off on the sidelines wearing black turtle-necks saying that life is meaningless and bleak or immersing crucifixes in their own urine. Today the "serious artist alienated from society" syndrome has ruined the visual arts, poetry, and classical music. It has even begun to destroy popular culture, which

heretofore has been more in tune with ordinary people.

Today to win the highest critical praise, or to receive leading Oscar consideration, you have to make a movie that says life is short and bitter, and it stinks. Mel Brooks recently made the least successful movie of his career. Do you know what it was called? **Life Stinks**. Pretend for a moment that you are the head of MGM, and Mel comes to you and says, "Hey, I have an idea for a fun comedy called **Life Stinks**. Think that's gonna sell?" No, but it will help Mel get taken seriously as an "artist."

These are not bad people. They are very well intentioned. There isn't a single AIDS benefit that they will miss. If there is any kind of dinner to save the rainforests, they are there. They want to be loved. But they earnestly believe that the only way they will receive respect from those who "count"—the critics, the industry heavyweights, the media, the intellectual elites—is to make brutal, bitter, America-bashing, family-bashing, religion-bashing movies.

What do we do?

What do we do about it? At a recent conference on popular culture and values, I was on a panel that included Jack Valenti, William Bennett and Robert Bork. The question of regulating the content of movies came up. Interestingly enough, Judge Bork was generally in favor of government intervention, i.e., censorship. He pointed out that all law is based upon moral judgments. Law exists to influence the moral behavior of its citizens.

This is certainly a convincing argument, but I don't think censorship is a good idea for one very simple reason: the government makes a mess of everything it does, and it would make a huge mess of determining what goes into movies! It always surprises me that conservatives, who understand that the government is remarkably inept, even at running the postal system, believe that state power can somehow suddenly be counted upon to raise the moral tone of our popular culture. It can't—forget it, it is only wishful thinking.

This does not mean that we can't talk about values in movies. I have drawn a good deal of criticism over the years because as a professional critic I try to consider the values and the message in movies—not just their technical excellence—and I speak out about this in the national press and on television. It is vital that those considerations should play a more prominent role in our

Many commentators predicted that there would be a glut of movies about Desert Storm. Wouldn't Hollywood be eager to exploit the Gulf War? Not one is currently in production or even in development.

public discussions of contemporary cinema. That is alternative number one to censorship. No movie is morally neutral, no movie fails to send a message, no movie doesn't change you to some extent when you see it. Movies have a cumulative, potent and lasting impact.

Another alternative to censorship is **corporate responsibility**. The great business conglomerates that are making entertainment have to exercise a more mature sense of social and corporate accountability. We are living in an age when increasingly we are asking corporations to be responsible for their pollution of the air and the water; why shouldn't they be responsible for the pollution of the cultural environment around us? In the same way that other

activists use boycotts and stockholders meetings and every sort of public pressure, popular culture activists must develop a new sense of determination and resourcefulness. The impact of popular culture on our children and our future is too important an issue to leave in the hands of a few isolated movie moguls in Hollywood—or to self-important politicians in Washington.

There are many indications that the entertainment industry may be eager to reconnect with the grass roots—and to entertain an expanded notion of its own obligations to the public. The

Imprimis newsletter available

*Michael Medved is co-host of the weekly PBS TV SNEAK PREVIEWS. He is author or co-author of numerous books including **Hollywood vs. America**. President of the Pacific Jewish Center, he is an active volunteer for a wide variety of Jewish causes.*

*This article was first delivered as a lecture in a seminar sponsored by Hillsdale College, and later printed in the College's **Imprimis** newsletter. For a free subscription to **Imprimis**, write Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan 49242.*

industry has, in some areas, behaved responsibly. In the past five years it changed its message about drugs. No longer is it making movies in which marijuana, cocaine and other drugs are glamorized. Hollywood made a decision. Was it self-censorship? You bet. Was it responsible? Yes.

We can challenge the industry to adapt a more wholesome outlook, to send more constructive messages. We can clamor for movies that don't portray marriage as a living hell, that recognize the spiritual side of man's nature, that glorify the blessings in life we enjoy as Americans and the people who make sacrifices to ensure that others will be able to enjoy them.

The box office crisis put Hollywood in a receptive mood. Already two film corporations have committed to a schedule of family movies for a very simple reason: they are wildly successful. Only two percent of movies released in 1991 were G-rated—just 14 titles—but at least 8 of these 14 proved to be unequivocally profitable. (By comparison, of more than 600 other titles, **at most 20 percent** earned back their investment.) Look at **Beauty and the Beast**, my choice for Best Movie of 1991. It was a stunning financial success. We need many more pictures like this, and not just animated features geared for younger audiences. Shouldn't it be possible to create movies with adult themes but without foul language, graphic sex or cinematic brutality? During Hollywood's golden age, industry leaders understood that there was nothing inherently **mature** about these unsettling elements.

Rekindling our love affair with Hollywood

People tell me sometimes, "Boy, the way you talk, it sounds as though you really hate movies." The fact is that I don't. I'm a film critic because I **love** movies. And I want to tell you something: All of the people who are trying to make a difference in this business love movies and they love the industry, despite all its faults. They love what it has done in the past, and they love its potential for the future. They believe that Hollywood can be the dream factory again.

When I go to a screening, sit in a theater seat, and the lights go down, there's a little something inside me that hopes against all rational expectation that what I'm going to see on the screen is going to delight me, enchant me, and entice me, like the best movies do. I began by declaring that America's long-running romance with Hollywood is over. It is a romance, however, that can be rekindled, if this appalling, amazing industry can once again create movies that are worthy of love and that merit the ardent affection of its audience.

Volunteer labeling not working

By Thomas L. Jipping, J.D., Director
Center for Law and Democracy
Free Congress Foundation

The renewed debate over popular music and its effects on young people has raged with particular intensity for several years. In 1985, the Parents' Music Resource Center (PMRC) began raising public awareness and pressured a few record companies into promising to place a label on recordings promoting explicit sex, violence, or substance abuse. No company was required to label anything and, if it did, could choose for itself what, when, and how to label. No sanctions existed for failure to do so. And the bottom line is that children and not parents will see the label; it will simply alert children to the recordings that adults do not want them to purchase. The result is as predictable as the kitchen cookie jar.

Not surprisingly, the music industry failed to abide by even an agreement with terms totally in its favor. *Rolling Stone* magazine reported in May, 1986, that companies that agreed to label their releases, including CBS, RCA, A&M, and Warner, had avoided labeling anything at all and had "devised various strategies to...get around the agreement." *U.S. News* reported that others, including MCA, had "defected" from the agreement. PMRC monitored compliance with the voluntary agreement from 1986 through 1990 and found that less than half of the recordings needing labels had them and that many of these were "hard to find, easily removed, incorrectly worded, displaced, or too small to read." The industry has never offered any evidence to counter this indictment.

Under the threat of legislation to cure the problem, the industry in 1990 repeated its promise to voluntarily label its releases. Jason Berman, president of the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA), took a new approach. He insisted the absence of a "uniform label" had been the problem. RIAA paid a graphic artist to design a new one and offered it to the industry.

In reality, however, the situation had not changed. No company is required to use the "uniform" label, or any label at all for that matter. Whether and how to label everything, anything, or nothing is still at the complete discretion of individual companies. No requirement exists for participation; no sanction exists for failure to comply. RIAA has to date refused to release a list of its member companies agreeing to use the new label. But by shifting the focus from the ineffectiveness of any system of voluntary labeling to a supposed lack of uniformity, the industry hopes once again to avoid scrutiny and escape responsibility.

Unfortunately, even PMRC seems to have been taken in. The group actively opposes any approach other than voluntary labeling and helped the industry in its public relations campaign promoting the "uniform" label. Since 1990, PMRC no longer monitors what the industry produces and appears more to defend the industry against the threat of legislation than to defend children against the ravages of heavy metal music.

This sorry record of failure should not surprise anyone. The industry that makes billions of dollars selling to children the works of such "artists" as Atheist, Atrocity, Blood Feast, Coven, Death Angel, Entombed, Legion of Death, Massacre, Obituary, Pestilence, Pusshead, Slayer, Suicidal Tendencies, and Venom is hardly going to voluntarily cramp its own style. No requirements plus no penalties equals no change.

Why should parents, educators, clergy, public officials, and other citizens be concerned? Because music and its messages dramatically affect everyone. Maxwell House knows it, aerobics instructors know it, music therapists know it. This is especially true for teenagers who listen to rock music an average of five hours every day. Child and adolescent psychiatrist Dr. Robert

Demski identifies music as one of the two most powerful influences on young people. Dr. Hannelore Wass at the University of Florida has found that 90% of heavy metal rock music fans know the words to their favorite songs and 60% agree with those words.

The consequences for America's youth and, therefore for America itself, are very real. Dr. Sheila Davis at New York University has written that popular music "provide the primary 'equipment for living' for America's youth." As heavy metal band Motley Crue says on its *Shout at the Devil* album, "those who have the youth have the future." The problem is that those who have the youth are providing them with equipment for living that includes murder and suicide, sexual promiscuity and deviance, rebellion, drug abuse, hatred, and bigotry.

Both the American Medical Association and American Academy of Pediatrics have publicly expressed their concern about the negative influence of rock music. Dr. T.L. Tashjian, chairman of the department of psychiatry at Philadelphia's Mount Sinai Hospital, has found significant effects of rock music on the formation of values among children. According to *Time*, a majority of Americans believe that rock lyrics glorifying sex and

Since 1990, PMRC no longer monitors what the industry produces and appears more to defend the industry against the threat of legislation than to defend children against the ravages of heavy metal music.

violence are mainly to blame for teenage violence. Dr. Joyce Brothers agrees, and says there is "little question that rock lyrics that stress physical abuse of women desensitize men to the crime of rape and assault." The National Education Association believes that many of the thousands of teen suicides each year are linked to fatalistic music and lyrics.

The voluntary approach is a failure. Since the problem is the effect on children of consuming this stuff, legislators have increasingly turned toward an approach based on restricting access by children to this material. As the Congressional Research Service concluded in 1987, this approach, in general, poses no constitutional problem; "censorship" is merely a buzzword intended as a scare tactic. Recently, the Washington state legislature succeeded in a modest attempt to address the problem that may find application in other states.

For more than 20 years, Washington state has prohibited selling or distributing erotic material to minors. The relevant statute, however, only applied to print and video. Led by Representatives Richard King and Mike Padden, the legislature overwhelmingly passed a bill amending this statute to include sound recordings as well. Governor Booth Gardner signed H.B.2554 into law on March 20, 1992.

Many states have statutes regulating the sale of pornographic, obscene, erotic, or similar material to children. Concerned citizens should determine whether their statute has a loophole for sound recordings and, if so, should consider taking action to close it. This is a very modest approach, because the material covered by these statutes is typically defined very narrowly. But at least it is a start, and a good way to send a clear signal to the music industry that concerned citizens will no longer tolerate empty promises, smokescreens, and nice sounding rhetoric.

Clinton will kill education reform

By Don Feder
Creators Syndicate, Inc.

The Clinton administration has just three letters in its education vocabulary: N—E—A.

An ominous foreshadowing of our new president's subservience to the teachers union came during last week's confirmation hearing for his education secretary-designate.

Richard Riley voiced his unqualified opposition to even a pilot voucher program. He is convinced that allowing poor parents to send their children to a private school, via state scholarship assistance, would "pull the rug out from under the public school system."

The timing was interesting, coming as it did within a week of the Clintons' announcement that they had selected a private academy—the exclusive Sidwell School—for their daughter. Would you believe it? With 27 public junior high schools in the District of Columbia, Bill and Hillary couldn't find one that was adequate for little Chelsea?

The President's spokesman was quick to assure us that this did not mean Mr. Clinton was abandoning public education. (With the National Education Association, whose members comprised 20 percent of the delegates to the last Democratic convention, holding a first and second mortgage on his presidency, no fear of that.) The President believes devoutly in public schooling—for your kids.

Some of the most outspoken proponents of public education vote with their children for the private alternative. Vice President Albert Gore sends his to a prep school, as does Hillary's old honcho at the Children's Defense Fund, Marion Wright Edelman.

Populist Jesse Jackson chose elitist St. Albans for his scion. Sen. Edward Kennedy, who was fulsome in his praise of Riley at

As of January 1, Russians can send their kids to the school of their choice, parochial not excepted, at state expense.

the hearings ("brilliant," "obviously well-qualified") stashed each of his issue at posh prep schools like Phillips Academy.

Of 535 members of the last Congress only one, Rep. Tom Downey (D-N.Y.), enrolled his children in the D.C. school system. Figuring that if he was that dumb he didn't deserve to represent them, voters declined to re-elect the congressman.

At the federal level, serious school choice (not the pick-a-public-poison variety) is dead, even as the public expresses increasing confidence in the reform. An Associated Press poll, released on September 6, 1992, showed 63% of Americans favoring the Bush proposal for \$1,000 scholarships for the children of poor and middle-income parents, to be used "at any public, private or religious school."

Among minorities—the principal victims of education malpractice—support for vouchers is even more pronounced, 84% for blacks, 86% for Hispanics.

Media apologists for Clinton's decision argue that, as a concerned parent, the president wouldn't want to send his daughter to an "underfunded" public school.

But the district's public institutions spend more per pupil

(\$7,550) than 95% of the city's private schools. Only New Jersey and New York have higher per pupil expenditures. Despite these lavish outlays, D.C. ranks 50th in SAT scores, once again demonstrating the relationship—absolutely none—between spending and performance.

Everywhere, it's the same pathetic picture—high drop-out rates, failure to impart basic knowledge, low test scores, too high

Some of the most outspoken proponents of public education vote with their children for the private alternative.

a percentage of graduates who are functional illiterates. Minorities and the poor get the worst of it—urban schools that resemble institutions for the criminally insane. Nationally, 40 teachers are assaulted every hour on school property.

Even in the former communist bloc and nations once synonymous with socialism, private education advances with official sanction. As of January 1, Russians can send their kids to the school of their choice, parochial not excepted, at state expense.

Poland provides scholarships up to 50% of the average cost of public education; it's 85% in Sweden, the cradle of democratic socialism. Only in the land of the fleeced and home of the bamboozled is there no alternative when it comes to public funding.

During one of the debates for the Democratic presidential nomination, ABC's Cokie Roberts asked each of the candidates: If your daughter was in a public school where "she was shaken down for lunch money, she was afraid to go to school and was hardly learning anything, you could put her in a private school." Why shouldn't an inner-city family have the same option?

Clinton avoided a direct response. But in his choice for education secretary and his choice for Chelsea we have an answer more eloquent than words. Public education is fine for the masses. If their children get a substandard education, are forced

Of 535 members of the last Congress only one, Rep. Tom Downey (D-N.Y.), enrolled his children in the D.C. school system.

into schools that resemble opium dens where the principal wears a bulletproof vest, if they graduate barely able to read a bus schedule—well, that's just the price we have to pay for keeping the "rug...under the public school system," not to mention paying our campaign debts.

It's a threadbare but increasingly costly carpet that covers an abyss of ignorance, coercion and waste.

Homosexuals over-ride radio's free speech, RCA silences artist with Christian values

By Samuel Francis
Human Events
December 12, 1992

In the quaint delusion that he still lives in a free country, Charlie Ochs, vice president and general manager of WMZQ, Washington, D.C.'s main country-Western music station, refused to carry an ad sponsored by the Gay and Lesbian Activists Alliance.

In the exercise of what he still imagined were his rights of property and free expression, Ochs even went so far as to tell the

You can bet your home and job the people whose rights will never be protected under hate crime and human rights laws are those who defend traditional institutions and beliefs.

group he wouldn't run its ad. That's when Ochs began to be disabused of his delusions.

The "activists" whose ad whines and whimpers about "hatred and intolerance," scampered upstairs to the mayor's office to whine and whimper some more and visit a bit of their love and tolerance on Ochs.

Soon one of the mayor's munchkins was on the horn to him, explaining just what he still could and couldn't do in the Land of the Free. One thing the munchkin told Ochs he still couldn't do is decide what to run on his own station.

Ochs' refusal to broadcast the ad violated the District's "Human Rights Statute," and the munchkin later expatiated to the Washington Times on the munchkin theory of "human rights" that undergirds the law.

"I don't think that anyone wants to make someone run something against their will," chirped the munchkin in a rare concession to quaint delusions, "but then again, if not doing it can be shown to be discriminatory...."

Ochs concluded that discretion was the better part of free expression. Faced with legal action by the city and its odd pals, he decided to run the ad. Well, let him live with it. People who don't defend their own rights don't deserve any, but those who take their rights more seriously had better tune in while they still have some left.

"Imagine losing your home and job," moans the ad, "being harassed and beaten. Imagine having your love called a crime.... Imagine being lesbian or gay."

Maybe, like most people, you'd rather not imagine that, even if, under the law, you still have to listen to it. But whatever you do, never imagine that the "hate crime" and "human rights" posse will let real rights stand in the way of its power trip. The whole purpose of the laws they strut behind is to make sure you know *ve haf vays* to make you imagine.

"Hate crime" and "human rights" laws have nothing to do with hate and human rights; they have everything to do with how the partisans of putrid political agendas can use the force of the state

to break people and institutions that get in their way.

Sometimes the agenda is that of "gays and lesbians;" sometimes it's that of afro-racists or feminists or one or the other obnoxious cults and causes that lurk on college campuses, public broadcasting and inside mayors' offices.

But you can bet your home and job the people whose rights will never be protected under hate crime and human rights laws are those who defend traditional institutions and beliefs.

One performer who does defend them is a country-Western artist named Steve Vaus. Last June he signed a contract with RCA to turn out a song, "We Must Take America Back," an explicit defense of patriotic, prayer-in-school, tough-on-crime, Made-in-America traditions. According to Vaus, his song debuted on the charts at 68 and "was the most requested song at many radio stations." That was his first mistake; soon he was off the air entirely.

"RCA killed it," he says in a press statement the press has ignored. RCA, he says, "abandoned plans for a followup single, dumped his album, canceled his contract and won't allow him to use his material though they will not make it available."

Vaus says his song was sailing up through the charts at smaller stations, but many big-city stations refused to play it at all and complained to RCA that his message was "too conservative." Specifically, he says, they didn't much care for the lines, "We need prayer in the schools" and "When bullets and birth control outnumber books, something's wrong."

"How radical do you have to be before your free expression is defended?" demands Vaus. There he goes again with those quaint delusions about "free expression."

"Is it a coincidence that I'm a white conservative Christian pro-lifer and few in the media care that I've been gagged?"

"Hate crime" and "human rights" laws have everything to do with how the partisans of putrid political agendas can use the force of the state to break people and institutions that get in their way.

Hate crime laws and human rights statutes don't seem to cover the bloodthirsty blather of Sister Souljah and Ice-T. There's plenty of media attention for them, but nobody can find time for Vaus' tunes to a different drummer.

It's no coincidence that champions of traditional beliefs like Vaus are silenced while self-pitying political poseurs use the legal power of the state to bludgeon their way into your eardrums. Maybe Ochs is content to do whatever the munchkins tell him, but if one day you turn on your radio and learn you no longer have any rights while what you believe is blacked out, don't imagine that's a coincidence either.

How about some 'tolerance' for Colorado?

By William Murchison
Syndicated Columnist

It's these voters in Colorado, you see. Weirdos. Bigots. Somehow along the line, they acquired a taste for self-government, which taste they now have entrenched by outlawing special "anti-discrimination" protections for homosexuals and lesbians.

Why, they didn't even ask Barbra Streisand's permission, or Liza Minnelli's, or the New York City Council's; they just voted

Streisand and the New York Times disclaim others' right to stake out a moral view even a historic and well-nigh universal one—that is different from their own.

their convictions last Election Day. For this un-American deed, they are reaping the consequences—a burgeoning boycott said to have cost the state \$20 million already in lost business.

Ms. Streisand has been leading the charge; Ms. Minnelli withdrew from ironically—a benefit concert for a Colorado group seeking to reimpose the ban; and various city councils, New York's included, have banned official travel to Colorado by local employees.

Political correctness, we have to recognize, knows no geographical boundaries, accepts no reversals. Gay rights ordinances, Martin Luther King holidays, equal this and equal that—go along or get burned.

Arizona, boycotted nationally for declining to make the King birthday a state holiday, found the principle of local autonomy too expensive to defend. Arizona voters got in line with the rest of the country about the same time Coloradans were going their own way on gay rights.

The anti-Colorado hysteria has its comical side. Aspen, which voted overwhelmingly to retain the ban, continues to draw Hollywoodians who aren't about to let their Aspen houses sit idle during the post-Christmas ski-and-party season. Jack Nicholson refers to the boycott as "rubbish." The International Gay Travel Association has magnanimously carved out an exemption for participants in Aspen Gay Ski Week, January 23-30, few of whom relish losing their deposits.

The magisterial New York Times makes the case for the boycott about as cogently as it can be made, and that's not very. Colorado, the Times frowns, has committed bigotry. "A successful

boycott can help energize the most progressive Coloradans to overturn their new law." We can count, I fancy, on the New York Times' continuing to market its product in Colorado, all in the name of the First Amendment; but, then, principle has its limits.

The main thing is the message—the same caliber message a Mafia don would deliver, which is, shut up and do what I say. Talk about bigots, Streisand and the Times represent bigotry on the hoof. They disclaim others' right to stake out a moral view even a historic and well-nigh universal one—that is different from their own.

Might an impertinent question be put? Whatever happened to the "pluralism" we are always being admonished to embrace? If pluralism means tolerance of minority viewpoints, what about tolerance for the majority's views? We find the Colorado boycotters trying to legislate one moral orthodoxy out of existence so as to replace it with another. By declaring homosexuality a "civil right," we blast away the old perception that somehow man-man and woman-woman sex isn't quite natural (not to mention advisable, in the era of AIDS).

This is what the local gay rights ordinances in Colorado did, prior to their overturn on the November 3 ballot. They switched moral codes on us—always a highhanded thing to do. Outside

If pluralism means tolerance of minority viewpoints, what about tolerance for the majority's views?

Denver, Aspen and Boulder, however, voters saw what was going on. The vote to repeal the ordinances and to prevent the enactment of any more like them, could be called the outcry of a different downtrodden class—ordinary folk, deeply disturbed by the waning of official support for our 2,000-year-old moral and religious outlook.

The Colorado gay rights vote isn't by the imagination's wildest stretch an invitation to beat up homosexuals, it's a reaffirmation of moral principle. Not to mention democratic principle—the right of a sovereign people to decide for themselves what laws they shall live under. Nobody who objects to the outcome of the November 3 vote has to ski in Colorado or, for that matter, to live there. A little tolerance is what Colorado needs at this stage; a little—if you please—pluralism.

Homosexual ban in military makes sense

By Mike McManus

President Clinton is running into a concrete wall in trying to lift the military's ban against active homosexuals in the armed forces.

Good. It is one political promise that should never have been made.

There is much misinformation about homosexuality. Begin with the assertion in *Newsweek* last year that "like the population at large, the armed services are 10% gay." That figure is based on flawed Kinsey research. A quarter of the men he interviewed were prisoners who often practice homosexuality due to a lack of

women.

A 1991 study of the National Opinion Research Center found only "two percent of sexually active adults reported being exclusively homosexual or bisexual during the year preceding the survey."

Another common assertion is that gays "are born that way." A study by Simon LeVay, a professed homosexual, seemed to show a genetic difference.

By examining the brains of 35 male cadavers, he found that a cluster of nerves in the hypothalamus was twice as large in

heterosexual males as in homosexual males. Robert Knight of the Family Research Council counters, "Since behavior can alter brain patterns, the size of the nodes may be the result, not the cause of homosexual activity."

More important, there is substantial evidence many homosexuals can change their sexual orientation. Masters and Johnson

A 1978 study found 43% of white male homosexuals estimated they had sex with 500 or more different sexual partners, and 28% had more than 1,000!

report a 79.1% immediate success rate for their patients who attempt to discontinue homosexual activity, and 71.6% success rate after five years. (Like alcoholics, some do slip back into their old lifestyle.) There are 130 ex-gay groups helping men and women change their sexual orientation.

In fairness, however, most gays can not remember having anything but a same sex attraction. And thousands of gays have tried to change but can't.

The "nurture vs. nature" debate can not be proven either way. A more important question is whether homosexuality is desirable and healthy—something society wants to encourage as equally valid as heterosexuality.

The answer is clearly no—and not just because two-thirds of those dying from AIDS are gay. A recent study of 5,246 obituaries in 16 homosexual newspapers found that the average age of those dying from AIDS was 39. But the average age of those dying from all other causes is only 41! Why? Gays are three times as likely to have alcohol or drug abuse problems. And homosexual youth are 23 times more likely to get syphilis, and other sexually transmitted diseases than heterosexual youth.

Why? They have vastly more sexual partners. A 1978 study found 43% of white male homosexuals estimated they had sex with 500 or more different sexual partners, and 28% had more than 1,000! An American Psychological Association study in 1984 reported that average homosexual promiscuity did drop

after the onset of AIDS. Instead of 70 partners a year, they had 50 partners. And most of those partners are strangers.

"Homosexuals are notoriously promiscuous," Commander Craig Quigley of the Navy told The New York Times. To heterosexual sailors, this is not only repugnant, but having to shower with gays is an invasion of privacy. It is as if female soldiers were forced to shower with young males.

"I cannot think of a better way to destroy fighting spirit and gut U.S. combat effectiveness," said David Hackworth, who has eight Purple Hearts and is the most decorated living American veteran.

In The Washington Post he cites examples of inappropriate behavior such as a gay commanding officer who gave combat awards to his lovers who had never been on the line. "I saw countless officers and NCOs who couldn't stop themselves from hitting on soldiers. The absoluteness of their authority, the lack of privacy, enforced intimacy and a 24-hour duty made sexual urges difficult to control. The objects of their affection were impressionable lads who, searching for a caring role model, sometimes ended up in a gay relationship that they might not have sought...."

"Sure banning gays from defending their country is discriminatory. But discriminations are necessary when a larger public purpose is being served." In combat, men must be able to "trust one another totally."

E. L. Pattullo, a retired director of Harvard's Center for Behavioral Sciences, writes in *Commentary* that "substantial

There is substantial evidence many homosexuals can change their sexual orientation.

numbers of children have the capacity to grow in either direction." He calls them "waverers."

To the extent we want to strengthen "the institution of the family and to the extent parents have an interest in reducing the risk their children will become homosexual—there is warrant for resisting the movement to abolish all societal distinctions between homosexual and heterosexual."

'Picket Fences' to feature transsexual

To prepare for the role of a transsexual in an upcoming episode of the TV series PICKET FENCES, Natalija Nogulich talked with a few transsexuals, watched informational movies—and used a lot of imagination.

First for Women, 2/1/93

Ex-scoutmaster charged with assault

A former Boy Scout leader pleaded innocent to 10 charges of sexual assault and sexual abuse involving four Scouts.

Derek W. Nicoll, 52, of Huntington, South Carolina, was arrested on four counts of second-degree sexual assault and six counts of first-degree sexual abuse, authorities said.

Prosecutor Chris Chiles said the charges involve incidents over several years and involve scouts from Nicoll's former troop. The earliest charge cites an alleged inci-

dent in 1983.

Levi Strauss withdrew funding from the Boy Scouts because they would not accept homosexuals as scoutmasters.

Charleston Gazette, 1/9/93

The Lord...

Continued from page 2

This is part of the order of Being and relates directly to the biblical principle of Creation.

The Democratic Party, in its platform, its promises, and its performance, is repudiating these things and, by implication, the order of Being and even the Creator himself. Is that what the people wanted, and want? Perhaps we shall never know, or at least not until the full impact of such proposals makes itself felt, because the fact and the implications of this repudiation were never made plain to the public. The Democrats spoke in slogans and must bear the responsibility, when their plans become reality, for the consequences to which they have won the public. The Republicans, for the most part, have not shared in the plans,

but must bear a share of the burden of responsibility, for their abdication of discourse and persuasion in a situation which is of crucial importance for the future of society. If the wisdom of centuries—which coincides on important points with the teachings of the Bible—should prove correct, and the trendy new science of the politically correct prove wrong, no small measure of guilt for the ensuing harm will rest not only on those who have repudiated moral values, but also on those who abdicated moral leadership.

CLear-TV...

Continued from page 1

simply will not wash. "We have monitored their television advertising for more than two years and their record hardly suggests they have been guided by 'high ethical standards.' To the contrary, we have a situation here where a company says one thing to the public, while practicing

Alcohol abuse takes heavy toll on society

By Angela Wildmon

According to the National Council on Alcoholism, an alcohol-related family problem strikes one out of every four American homes. Alcoholism and related problems cost the nation an estimated \$85.8 billion in 1988, which amounts to \$27.5 billion more than illicit use of all other drugs. Successfully treating alcohol problems costs ten times less than the current cost of alcohol problems to society. An estimated 20% to 45% of the 3 million Americans who experience some type of homelessness each year have alcohol problems.

About a quarter of all hospitalized patients have alcohol-related problems. Alcohol is the number one drug of choice most abused among all age groups in America and it is the number one drug problem among youth. It remains more widespread in its use among youth than tobacco or any illicit drug. It is the number one health problem in the black community, causing liver cirrhosis

Four-fifths of those who eventually become alcoholics began drinking regularly before the age of 18.

and esophageal cancer and other disproportionately high alcohol-related problems. Yet alcohol companies continue massive marketing campaigns aimed at the black community.

Statistics show that one out of every 10 people who drink alcohol will develop alcoholism. One half of all vehicle traffic deaths are alcohol-related. Alcohol-related vehicle accidents are the number one cause of death among young people aged 15 to 24 years of age. Suicide is second.

Alcohol use is involved in 60% of all violent crimes (including homicides), 30% of all suicides and 80% of fire and drowning accidents. About 4.6 million 14- to 17-year-olds in 1985 experienced negative consequences (i.e., arrest, involvement in an accident, impaired health or job performance) from using alcohol.

The use of alcohol as a "gateway" drug usually precedes other drug use. A survey of 27,000 seventh to twelfth graders in New York State found little or no use of other drugs among teens who had not used alcohol first. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, just as more smokers begin smoking early in life, rather than during adulthood, many alcoholics begin their habit during the teenage years. According to former HHS Secretary Bowen three out of every 10 adolescents (5,000,000) have drinking problems. Studies at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Medicine by Professor of Psychiatry Dr. Javad Kashani revealed that four-fifths of those who eventually become alcoholics began drinking regularly before the age of 18. Yet alcohol companies continue to target the young through advertising.

Alcohol advertising on television and in print glamorizes the use of alcohol, particularly to the young. Teenagers and youth see images on television that tell them that using alcohol will make them sexy, powerful and successful. They see beer advertisements on the sides of speeding race cars and in their minds they connect that drinking and driving can go together. Alcohol advertising gives youth a one-sided view without giving the negative

consequences of such use.

Former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, in his *Workshop of Drunk Driving* booklet, noticed this inaccuracy and made several recommendations on alcohol advertising and promotion. He recommended that the advertising and promotion of alcohol on college campuses and at other events such as sports events, and musical concerts, where a high proportion of those targeted are under the national legal drinking age of 21 be eliminated—either through legal or economic sanctions. Koop also recommended that the use of celebrities who have a strong appeal to youth be eliminated and that the portrayal of activities that can be dangerous when combined with alcohol be eliminated.

Koop recommended many strategies to get responsibility in alcohol advertising. Unfortunately, so far, these have remained only recommendations and have not been put into effect.

Sports heroes and celebrities are used as spokespersons in alcohol commercials. Musical concerts attracting large crowds of teenagers and pre-teens are often sponsored by alcohol companies. An example would be the sponsorship of top forty pop star Gloria Estefan's current tour by Seagram's or the use of pop star Huey Lewis and the News or country superstar George Strait by Budweiser for television commercials. Young people know who these celebrities are. They are their role models. Young people notice when they represent alcohol companies and conclude that successful people drink alcohol.

The book *Marketing Booze to Blacks* by the Center for Science in the Public Interest sheds light on the massive marketing strategies used by alcohol companies aimed at increasing alcohol use among blacks: "Part of the alcohol marketers' strategy includes 'reputation development' in the black community. Alcohol companies sponsor such events as 'Black History Month' or award dinners for well-known leaders. Their contributions to black civic and community organizations and scholarship funds are generous compared to those of most other companies and their assistance to black economic development is a model for other industries. This largesse had placed many black civic and political leaders in a bind. In return for accepting the contributions, they are forced to abstain from taking effective action to reduce

One half of all vehicle traffic deaths are alcohol-related.

alcohol problems in the black community and to acquiesce in alcoholic beverage company marketing efforts designed to increase black drinking."

An excerpt from *The Booze Merchants* by the Center for Science in the Public Interest describes themes in alcohol advertising on television and in print: "Frequently alcohol ads focus on lifestyle. These ads offer a set of desirable 'outcome states' as the result of drinking. The ads are a promise of 'making it' in society, if you only imbibe the advertised product. Drinking is associated with wealth, prestige and success, social approval, the leisurely life, hedonism and sex...the correct wine represents class...beer brings the fellowship of attractive young men or women. In all cases, alcohol is the key to success. The ads are emotional rather than factual, neither presenting product

information nor suggesting control. The alcoholic beverage is the means to the 'good life'.

"Another theme frequently depicted in television and print alcohol ads are risky or dangerous activities, with some companies relying on this theme extensively. The ads show people shooting rapids, riding bucking broncos, hang-gliding and operating dangerous machinery...Risk-taking, or the desire to do so, has

Alcohol use is involved in 60% of all violent crimes (including homicides), 30% of all suicides and 80% of fire and drowning accidents.

been cited as a prominent behavior of many alcoholics and heavy drinkers...problem drinkers act recklessly. The best example is driving while drunk. The risk-taking ads not only appeal to such personalities, they may in fact encourage such behavior."

An example of risk-taking was depicted in two recent Coors Light Commercials. The first depicted beautiful bikini-clad girls and handsome young men in swim trunks going speed sailing on a catamaran. Both the girls and the boys have perfectly fit and toned bodies. They all appear to be under the age of 25. If these people spent a lot of time drinking alcohol, would their bodies look like that? In this television commercial, no one in the group is wearing a life jacket. They are depicted having a great time laughing and drinking beer while a catchy, sensual song, "Old Man River"... plays in the background. In another recent Coors Light Commercial, we see a group of young men and women laughing, having a great time shooting the rapids.

In a recent Budweiser commercial the main subject dealt with was "Why has the great outdoors become an indoor sport?" This commercial portrayed young men and women sweating over exercise machines sporting beautifully toned bodies. Again, if these young men and women spent a lot of time drinking beer would they look like that? At the end of the commercial the narrator apathetically says, "Why ask why? Just try Bud Light."

In another Budweiser beer commercial the narrator asks "Why can't life be like beer commercials?" The commercial depicts the shooting of a beer commercial in a fairy-tale land. In it, a not very handsome looking boy is portrayed with two beautiful models on each side of him. The boy giggles, smirks, looks into the camera and asks, "Why can't fashion models be attracted to ordinary guys?" A short scenario follows with the narrator asking "Why can't life be like beer commercials." At the end of the commercial a narrator again asks in his apathetic tone "Why ask why? Just try Bud Light."

It is difficult to get legislation passed restricting alcohol advertising because the alcohol industry has so much lobbying power.

In Old Milwaukee's most recent commercial campaign, following the narrator's question "...how could it get any better than this?", a group of bleach blonde Barbie Doll type women clad in skimpy bikinis, called the "Swedish Bikini Team" show

up to dance for the all male beer-drinking party.

Most beer commercials and others are aimed at the young—telling them that to be sexy and "hip" they need to drink beer. More truthful images of smashed-up cars, boats and trains and the maimed and mutilated bodies of the victims of alcohol-related accidents aren't shown. The ads fail to show those mourning the death of a loved one killed by a drunk driver. Also not depicted is the violence that often goes hand in hand with alcohol abuse and the emotional abuse.

It is difficult to get legislation passed restricting alcohol advertising because the alcohol industry has so much lobbying power via the vast amount of money it generates. The alcohol industry has paid consultants who testify before Congress and they offer campaign funding to legislators and politicians. This kind of lobbying power is difficult to beat. But those who care must continue the campaign and persuade others to join in to get changes made.

If restrictions cannot be made to end or limit alcohol advertising, it is imperative that we have equivalent exposure to effective pro-health and safety messages. Congressional hearings are pending which will start the ball rolling for the passage of legislation which will require prominent health and safety warning information in all alcoholic beverage advertising and promotional materials. Unfortunately, the Bush Administration has shown little interest in this campaign. Senators Strom Thurmond (R-SC) and Albert Gore (D-TN), and Representative Joseph Kennedy

Statistics show that one out of every 10 people who drink alcohol will develop alcoholism.

(D-MA) have introduced bills to require health and safety warning messages in alcoholic beverage advertisements broadcast on radio and TV or printed in books, brochures, magazines, newspapers and promotional displays.

The bills are called the Alcoholic Beverage Advertisement Act of 1991 (S. 664) and the Sensible Advertising and Family Education Act (H.R. 1443).

Each will require a series of five rotating messages about alcohol. Print advertisements will be required to also include a toll-free number for people to call if they need help or more information about alcohol.

Senator Ernest Hollings (D-SC) is chairman of the Consumer sub-committee where S. 664 is now pending. Phone calls and letters need to go to Senator Hollings, asking him to get the bill onto the floor for public hearings and a vote before the session ends. The number is 202-224-6121.

Representative Al Swift chairs the Transportation and Hazardous materials sub-committee where H. R. 1443 is now. Phone calls and letters need to go to him asking that the bill be brought out of committee and onto the floor for public hearings and a vote before the end of this session. The number is 202-225-2605.

To express your opinion, write your Senators at U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510 and your Congressman at House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.

The booklet "What You Can Do to Support Health and Safety Warning Messages in Alcohol Ads" is very helpful in educating individuals about these bills. The cost is \$4.95. Write: Center for Science in the Public Interest, 1875 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20009-5728.

To educate yourself on the insidious problem of alcohol abuse, or for practical help on dealing with alcoholism on a more personal level, physician Anderson Spickard's book *Dying for a Drink* is recommended. It can be purchased at most Christian book stores.

Congress...

Continued from page 1

which forbids only the funding of "art" which is legally obscene.

"Congress is beginning to get the message. I strongly encourage concerned citizens to continue to contact their Congressman and Senators regarding the NEA. Let them know you are angry," said Donald E. Wildmon.

Unfortunately, the *Journal* deadline made it impossible for us to report the final outcome. The January issue will have a full report.

Addresses for concerned taxpayers: Congressman: U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515. Senators: U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. The phone number for your Congressman and Senators is 202-224-3121.

Concerned individuals can also write President George Bush, The White House, Washington, DC 20500. Mr. Bush appointed John Frohnmayr NEA chairman and defends Frohnmayr's actions in awarding grants for offensive art.

Listed below are the members of the House who voted against Dannemeyer's motion, thus voting to continue funding of pornographic and anti-Christian art by the NEA.

AZ - Ed Pastor
CA - Anthony C. Beilenson
CA - Howard Berman
CA - Barbara Boxer
CA - George E. Brown, Jr.
CA - Tom Campbell
CA - Ronald Dellums
CA - Julian Dixon
CA - Mervyn Dymally
CA - Don Edwards
CA - Victor Fazio
CA - Richard Lehman
CA - Mel Levine
CA - Robert T. Matsui
CA - George Miller
CA - Norman Mineta
CA - Leon P. Panetta
CA - Nancy Pelosi
CA - Edward Roybal
CA - Fortney (Pete) Stark
CA - Esteban Torres
CO - Patricia Schroeder
CO - David E. Skaggs
CT - Rosa DeLauro
CT - Sam Gejdenson
FL - Jim Bacchus
FL - Dante Fascell

FL - Harry A. Johnston
FL - William Lehman
FL - Lawrence J. Smith
GA - Charles F. Hatcher
GA - Ben Jones
GA - John Lewis
HI - Neil Abercrombie
HI - Patsy T. Mink
IA - Fred Grandy
IA - Jim Leach
IA - Dave Nagle
IA - Neal Smith
ID - Larry LaRocco
IL - Cardiss Collins
IL - John W. Cox, Jr.
IL - Richard J. Durbin
IL - Lane Evans
IL - Charles A. Hayes
IL - Gus Savage
IL - Sidney Yates
KY - Romano L. Mazzoli
LA - William J. Jefferson
MA - Chester Atkins
MA - Barney Frank
MA - Edward J. Markey
MA - John Olver
MA - Gerry E. Studds
MD - Benjamin L. Cardin
MD - Steny Hoyer
MD - Kweisi Mfume
MD - Constance Morella
ME - Thomas H. Andrews
MI - Barbara-Rose Collins
MI - John Conyers, Jr.
MI - John Dingell
MI - William D. Ford
MI - Dennis M. Hertel
MI - Dale E. Kildee
MI - Sander Levin
MI - Howard Wolpe
MN - James L. Oberstar
MN - Martin Sabo
MN - Gerry Sikorski
MN - Bruce Vento
MO - William Clay
MO - Joan Kelly Horn
MO - Alan Wheat
MT - Pat Williams
NJ - Robert E. Andrews
NJ - William J. Hughes
NJ - Donald M. Payne
NM - Bill Richardson
NM - Joe Skeen
NY - Gary Ackerman
NY - Sherwood Boehlert
NY - Thomas J. Downey
NY - Eliot L. Engel
NY - Hamilton Fish, Jr.
NY - Floyd H. Flake
NY - Benjamin Gilman II
NY - Bill Green
NY - Frank Horton
NY - Amo Houghton
NY - John LaFalce
NY - Nita M. Lowey
NY - Matthew McHugh
NY - Robert J. Mrazek
NY - Henry J. Nowak
NY - Major Owens
NY - Charles B. Rangel
NY - James H. Scheuer
NY - Charles Schumer
NY - Jose' E. Serrano
NY - Louise Slaughter
NY - Stephen Solarz

NY - Ted Weiss
OH - Dennis Eckart
OH - Edward F. Feighan
OH - Mary Rose Oakar
OH - Donald J. Pease
OH - Thomas Sawyer
OH - Louis Stokes
OK - Michael Synar
OR - Les AuCoin
OR - Peter A. De Fazio
OR - Mike Kopetski
OR - Ron Wyden
PA - William F. Clinger, Jr.
PA - William J. Coyne
PA - Thomas Foglietta
PA - Peter Kostmayer
PA - John P. Murtha
RI - Ronald K. Machtley
RI - Jack F. Reed
SC - Butler Derrick
TN - Harold E. Ford
TX - Henry B. Gonzalez
TX - Craig A. Washington
UT - Wayne Owens
VA - James P. Moran, Jr.
VT - Bernard Sanders
WA - Jim McDermott
WA - Al Swift
WA - Jolene Unsoeld
WI - Les Aspin
WI - David R. Obey

Senators who voted against the Helms amendment, thus voting to continue the funding of pornographic and anti-Christian "art" included:

AZ - Dennis DeConcini
CA - Alan Cranston
CO - Timothy E. Wirth
CT - Joseph I. Lieberman
DE - Joseph R. Biden, Jr.
HI - Daniel K. Akaka
KS - Nancy L. Kassebaum
MA - Edward M. Kennedy
MA - John F. Kerry
MD - Paul S. Sarbanes
ME - George J. Mitchell
MI - Carl Levin
MI - Donald W. Riegle
MN - David F. Durenberger
MN - Paul Wellstone
MO - John C. Danforth
NJ - Bill Bradley
NJ - Frank Lautenberg
NY - Daniel P. Moynihan
OH - Howard Metzenbaum
PA - Harris Wofford
RI - John H. Chafee
RI - Claiborne Pell
TN - Albert Gore Jr.
VT - James M. Jeffords
VT - Patrick J. Leahy
WA - Brock Adams
WV - John D. Rockefeller, IV

NBC...

Continued from page 1
interest groups and TV producers, who contended that the networks are increasingly bending to advertiser pressure.

The action also drew immediate fire from the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against

Defamation and reignited the debate about advertisers who support programs promoting homosexuality. GLAAD has criticized AFA in the past when AFA called for a boycott, calling such action censorship.

"NBC's move comes at a time when all three networks are publicly claiming that advertiser boycotts do not work. Only last month, the Network TV Assn. sent out thousands of letters to advertising agencies and their clients urging them to support controversial programs and not buckle to boycotting campaigns," the Los Angeles Times said.

A major front page article in *Electronic Media* (10/7/91) entitled "'Quantum' fight sparks debate" said that advertisers are listening to those who write and call. "Producers want free creativity, but somebody has to pay for this stuff," said Jim Cunningham, vice president and associate national broadcast director, Foote, Cone & Belding. "The heads of these (sponsoring) companies are sick and tired of getting letters from these Reverend Wildmons and such."

"NBC's action proves that our boycotts are having a positive effect," said AFA president Donald E. Wildmon.

Leading sponsors of pro-homosexual programs include:

Pres. Y. Togo, Toyota Motor Sales, Post Office Box 2991, Torrance, CA 90509.

Pres. Richard A. Goldstein, Lever Brothers, 390 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10022, (All and Wisk detergent, Close-Up and Pepsodent toothpaste, Lipton teas and soups)

Pres. Robert P. Luciano, Schering-Plough Corporation, One Giralda Farms, Madison, NJ 07940 (St. Joseph aspirin, Dr. Scholl's foot products, and Correctol laxative)

Chrm. Richard L. Gelb, Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, 345 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10154 (Ban, Bufferin, Nuprin, Excedrin, and Nice 'n Easy shampoo)

Chrm. Robert E. Allen, AT&T, 550 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022.