

CENSORSHIP

The newsletter dedicated to *complete* freedom of expression, association, and thought

Alert!

SOUNDING THE ALERT!

Censorship Alert! is a tax-creditable organization (accompanied by this newsletter of the same name) that has been formed specifically to arrest and reverse the alarming growth of censorship in the province of Ontario.

Just what is censorship? Simply, all *government restrictions and regulations* that obstruct, diminish access to, and-or make (or *threaten* to make) illegal the expression of one's opinion *with the use of his or her own property*.

The pervasive extent of censorship in Ontario is alarming, and includes restrictions on the language we may use, the units of measurement we employ, the numbers and types of television broadcast and cable channels we receive from our cable companies, the religions we may openly support or criticize, the movies available in our theatres, the political books we are permitted to import into Canada, the political opinions we may express, and much much more.

If you were under the impression that these freedoms were somehow guaranteed to us, then consider yourself to be put on the *Alert!* Our *fundamental freedoms* are being systematically violated each and every day by lobby groups, politicians, bureaucrats, and government agencies who are all of the common opinion that *they* should have the right to make *our* choices for us.

CENSORSHIP
Alert!
CALL TO ACTION!

Censorship Alert! has been formed to fight for *your right* to make *your own choices* when it comes to areas of expression.

Our newsletter intends to address every area of censorship with input provided by lawyers, politicians, victims of censorship, advocates of censorship, censoring government agencies, and various media sources whose articles and editorials will be of great assistance in helping keep us informed as to the developments (past, present, and future) that are rapidly leading us down the path to a society where our opinions will ultimately be pre-determined by others.

But **Censorship Alert!** will do much more than just inform.

Censorship Alert! is a call to action!

Initially, the campaign will be acting through this newsletter and through the purchase of large (usually full-page) ads in the daily papers of your community. These ads will increase the public's awareness of our official opposition to censorship and will serve to rally those of us with a common interest in fighting censorship under a single identifiable banner.

[continued on pg. 19]

HELP US PAY FOR THIS FULL-PAGE AD

CENSORSHIP WORKS.



ASK THE EXPERTS

THEY KNOW --- IT WORKED FOR THEM. THEIR IDEAS HELPED SHAPE THE WORLD WE LIVE IN.

But we don't have to live in their totalitarian societies to find people who insist on doing our thinking for us.

The "local" experts are in abundant supply:

Small text columns and portraits of various individuals, likely the "experts" mentioned in the ad.

The experts all agree that censorship works. They know that by dictating what language we may use, the units of measurement we may employ, the nature of our cultural and artistic heritage, the limits on our sexual, political, and religious freedom of expression, that their ideas, standards, and values will become *ours*, without the fear of criticism or opposition (even worse, by keeping us ignorant, uninformed, and suppressed through censorship, the experts know they can "convince" us that it's for our own good!

It's true. Censorship works --- for the experts, not for us. RECEIVE 8 ISSUES OF CENSORSHIP ALERT! FREE WITH YOUR DONATION!

CENSORSHIP
Alert!
SEND THIS COUPON TO:
P.O. BOX 874 STN. A, LONDON ONT. M6A 4E1
OR: 1000 SHEPPARD AVE. EAST, SUITE 100, SCARBOROUGH, ONT. M1B 3Y9
OR: 1000 SHEPPARD AVE. EAST, SUITE 100, SCARBOROUGH, ONT. M1B 3Y9

The above full-page ad is **Censorship Alert's** first of hopefully many newspaper ads attacking censors and censorship. **HELP US PAY FOR THESE ADS!**

CENSORSHIP...

2

-LET US COUNT THE WAYS

What is censorship?

Censorship occurs when a government or its agent (i.e., Ontario Censor Board, Canada Customs, C.R.T.C., etc.) has the *legal authority* to fine, imprison, or coerce its citizens for saying, printing, or illustrating their opinions or ideas in the peaceful manner of their own choice *with their own efforts and property*. When governments block access to the materials (i.e., paper, ink, printing presses, broadcast frequencies, etc.) necessary to make such expression of ideas possible, this is also censorship.

How bad is censorship in Canada?

Worse than you think.

Censorship involves much more than simply denying someone the right to read or view "obscene" publications. In fact, censorship in Canada has virtually become a way of life; its acceptance has resulted in an extensive and pervasive effect in *every form of communication open to individuals*.

But censorship exists only to protect government from the freedom of its citizens. *All* censorship exists to "protect" some vested interest group or the government itself. Censorship is imposed upon us by our federal government (through provisions in the Criminal Code), the provincial government (through the Ontario Censor Board, now ostensibly renamed the *Ontario Film Review Board*), and even by municipal governments (through zoning, licensing, and business regulations and taxes aimed specifically at individuals disseminating "unpopular" ideas or opinions).

Censorship is here and is getting much worse at a rate unprecedented in Canadian history.

How about some examples of censorship in Canada?

Alright. But remember, there would never be enough time or space to allow for anything resembling a *thorough* analysis or accounting of the innumerable applications of censorship in this country, so here's an initial sampling:

CRIME COMICS

Section 159(1)(b) of Canada's *Criminal Code* states that "Every one commits an offence who makes, prints, publishes, distributes, sells or has in his possession for the purpose of publication, distribution, or circulation, a crime comic."

Just *what* is a "crime comic"? Well, Section 159(7) explains that "crime comic" means a magazine, periodical or book that exclusively or substantially comprises matter depicting pictorially (a) the commission of crimes, real or fictitious, or (b) events connected with the commission of crimes, real or fictitious, whether occurring before or after the commission of the crime."

It looks like we'll have to hire *Columbo* to get *Dick Tracy* out of the mess he's in.

THE MAILS

Section 164 of the Criminal Code states that "every one commits an offence who makes use of the mails for the purpose of transmitting or delivering anything that is obscene, indecent, immoral or scurrilous..."

Even a private letter intended only for the recipient may fall under this section.

"Indecent" is determined on the "contemporary Canadian standard of decency," while "immoral" is determined upon the "community's sense of right and wrong at the time." In other words, it's not really the specific nature of the letter that is in question; it's simply a matter of being in the wrong community at the wrong time.

HATE LITERATURE

Section 281.2(1) states that "Every one who, by communicating (by telephone, broadcasting or other audible or visible means) statements in any public place, incites hatred against any identifiable group where such incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace, is guilty of (a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years; or (b) an offence punishable on summary conviction."

However, exceptions are allowed in cases where the accused believed his statements to be true (or were in fact true) and where an opinion is based upon a religious subject.

[continued on pg. 3]

**THE FREEDOM TO 'ABUSE' FREE SPEECH
IS THE ONLY PROOF THAT
FREE SPEECH EXISTS!**



On sale: These are some of the books, being sold under the counter in a store on Spadina Ave., that deny the Holocaust ever happened and say there is a Jewish plot to control the world.

OBSCENITY

Almost immediately upon becoming emperor, Augustus made obscenity a capital offence; within six months, criticism of the emperor was regarded as obscene.

You probably couldn't find a more *subjective* term in the entire English language than the word "obscenity" (which, like "beauty", is in the eye of the beholder), but Canada's Criminal Code nevertheless devotes a great deal of attention to it.

Section 159(1)(a) states that "Every one commits an offence who makes, prints, publishes, distributes, circulates, or has in his possession for the purpose of publication, distribution or circulation any obscene written matter, picture, model, phonograph record or other thing whatsoever."

But you can bet that our regarding such a subjectively oriented law as *obscene* won't carry any legal weight in having the law repealed.

Obscenity is really in the eye of the *judge* who happens to be presiding at the time.

DANCING

Ever since Elvis' pelvis was hidden from view on his first *Ed Sullivan Show* appearance, North Americans have had an acute awareness of the restrictions placed on a highly popular form of self-expression: dancing.

Today's most popular targets for government restrictions in this regard are best known as "exotic dancers" who, whether male or female, have found themselves in Ontario courts facing charges of "public nudity," "obscenity," and "indecenty," or who have faced outright government extortion, as was the case in Toronto in 1983 when bar owners wishing to display bottomless dancers were required to "contribute" as much as \$10,000 to charity before being allowed to continue in business.

Add to that various zoning restrictions, business licences, regulations, and determinations of "community standards" that are aimed *specifically at exotic dancing*, there's really not much to dance about.

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION and TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The *Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission [CRTC]* is one of the federal government's "tools" to regulate and monitor broadcasting and telecommunications in Canada.

In addition to requiring "Canadian content," "community" programming, French language options, etc., the Commission also licenses and regulates the availability of broadcast frequencies for Canadian broadcasters, the rates set by telecommunications monopolies (i.e., *Bell Canada, CNCP Telecommunications*, etc.), the methods of advertising and promotion permitted by cable and broadcast television, and the general availability of domestic and foreign radio and television signals.

BLASPHEMY

There's no law in Canada that says you have to *believe* in God, but be careful about what you might *say* about Him. Section 260(1) of the Criminal Code warns that "Every one who publishes a blasphemous libel is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years."

That you can believe.

METRIC MEASUREMENT REQUIREMENTS

As part of Canada's "voluntary" conversion to the metric system, the Metric Commission of Canada *imposed* metric on Canadians, threatening to fine and-or jail retailers and distributors who failed to use metric measurements --- or who used imperial measurements in conjunction with metric --- in the advertising and sale of their products. The current Conservative government repealed the latter provision, which makes the use of imperial measurements permissible.

However, failing to use metric is still a crime. And that's a crime.

ADVOCACY ADVERTISING (ALMOST) PROHIBITED

In 1984, the federal legislature, *with the support of all three political parties in the house*, approved the controversial *Bill C-169*, effectively making it an offence for non-partisan political groups and individuals to commercially promote their political opinions during a federal election campaign. Were it not for the court challenge won by the *National Citizens' Coalition*, we'd be a lot less free today.

HELP STOP METRICATION YOU DON'T EVEN NEED A STAMP

THIS IS IT. THE TIME HAS COME TO STOP METRICATION.

At this time as a laboratory of public opinion, opinion polls and surveys are being conducted to determine the public's views on metrication. The results will be published in the next issue of the *Canadian Journal of Public Opinion*.



MR. LALONDE PLEASE LISTEN!

THE NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM IS NOW ALL CANADIANS

CANADIAN JUNE 1987

CHANGING THE NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM TO A CANADIAN PROGRAM

MR. LALONDE

These men used our parliament to stifle our freedom of speech during elections

It took 40 minutes to do it.

These men used our parliament to stifle our freedom of speech during elections

It took 40 minutes to do it.

These men used our parliament to stifle our freedom of speech during elections

It took 40 minutes to do it.

Illustrated above are three 'advocacy' ads from differing groups that would have been illegal to publish during a federal election had Bill C-169 been left unchallenged in the courts.

OFFICIAL BILINGUALISM

The packaging of all products marketed in Canada must contain instructions and information in *both* French and English, even in areas where only one language is spoken. Cable companies in Ontario are all required to carry at least one French language television station, even though there may be no market demand for such a station.

Needless to say, the language requirements limit the number of products available to the consumer, and drive up prices of those products that *are* available.

[continued on pg. 4]

Canadian law requires that all printed items and publications imported into the country must pass through the eyes of *Canada Customs*.

Empowered to seize "immoral and indecent material," the discretion of determining *which* publications are 'immoral' or 'indecent' is left entirely to customs officers. Naturally, inconsistencies abound as to the nature and type of material allowed into the country; 'immoral' material confiscated at one border crossing may go virtually unnoticed at another.

However, a March 1985 federal court of Canada decision struck down the 117-year-old section of the *Customs Tariff Act*, saying that its definition of 'obscenity' was much too vague; the decision thus allowed importing even 'obscene' material *for personal use only*.

Parliament acted quickly to restore its powers of censorship. Within a month of the court decision, members of all parties approved a temporary bill restoring the authority of customs officers to confiscate restricted publications. The temporary amendment expires June 30, 1986, by which time the Conservatives expect to have introduced 'better' legislation making the authority of customs to seize publications permanent. [continued pg. 5... *Liquor Control*]

Politics At The Border...

POLITICAL BOOKS SEIZED BY CANADIAN CUSTOMS

Following is just a sampling of various political books (deemed "immoral - contrary to Criminal Code") that were seized by Canadian Customs during the period December 19, 1983 to January 18, 1985:

Unfortunately, in most instances, we're not in a position to be able to judge whether the government's disapproval

---let alone its outright banning and confiscation --- is justified in any of the cases cited below. And that's exactly what the problem with censorship is; *we're* not in the position to judge the material; our only option is to accept *someone else's* judgement that the publications in question are indeed "immoral."

Our judgements have already been made *for* us, but not *by* us.

All America Must Know The Terror That Is Upon Us
Anarchist Cookbook
Behind Communism
Britain's Blunder
Deadlier Than The H-Bomb
Germany and Peace - A Soldier's Message
The Hidden Hand
History's Most Terrifying Peace
Hoax of the Twentieth Century
The International Jew
Jewish-run Concentration Camps in Soviet Union
Journal of Historical Review
Library of Political Secrets
Proclamation of London of the European Liberation Front

The Myth of Marxism
The Nameless War
Nazi Gassings A Myth
None Dare Call It Conspiracy
The Red Fog Over America
The Rulers of Russia
Sacred War - Speech August 7, 1983
The Secret Powers Behind the Revolution
A Straight Look at the Third Reich
The Truth About The Protocols
The Ultimate World Order
Zionism Rules The World
Political Secrets -
12 Underground Facts of the Watergate Affair

CENSORSHIP- A BLACK AND WHITE ISSUE

THEY WANT TO CHANGE RALPH'S SPEECH

Thirteen-year-old Ralph Brown, a black Jamaican student in Toronto, was caught by surprise when one of three teachers judging his humorous speech about being 'black-turned-white' in Toronto, concluded that he was "angry about being black." Because the speech was good enough to make it to the school district finals, the contest judge and the school principal advised Ralph to "put (his speech) on hold."

Ralph's speech relates a "crazy dream" in which he wakes up white, "with straight blonde hair and baby blue eyes," and wonders if he stayed too long in the bath. The teacher in his dream scenario refuses to recognize the white-Ralph, saying that "the Ralph I know has a year-round tan."

Naturally, Ralph objected to having his dream "put on hold."

"If someone had told Martin Luther King to put his dream on hold, I wouldn't have my rights in society right now, including the right to free speech."

Conditioning us to accept censorship will apparently have to begin at an earlier age, it seems.



RALPH BROWN, 13, just wanted to compare being black to being white in his speech, but was told he was angry about being black.

Section 40(j) of Ontario's *Liquor Licence Act* states that "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations controlling the advertising of liquor or its availability for sale and requiring that the form of advertisement or public notice be subject to the approval of the Board."

Among the many restrictions in the regulations are the prohibition of the use of manufacturers' names on umbrellas or parasols on outdoor cafes and the prohibition of the use of celebrities in any alcohol advertising.

The depiction of anyone actually *drinking* an alcoholic beverage is also prohibited. We'll just have to guess as to what is done with the drinks after they're poured.

DONINI BARBECUISINE



NO HUMANS ALLOWED!

In the summer of 1983, Ontario's liquor licence board banned a wine ad featuring Margaret Trudeau and skating star Toller Cranston.

After giving advertisers conditional approval for the ad, and with full knowledge of the personalities appearing in it, the liquor licence board decided to ban the ad *after* it appeared in an issue of *Toronto Life* magazine, citing its policy of not allowing celebrities to be used "in the promotion of alcoholic beverages." (Ironically, only one in thirty people could identify Margaret Trudeau as one of the "personalities" in the ad, whose producers lost the \$25,000 it cost to produce.)

In any event, the banning of "celebrities" from alcohol advertising has created advocates of the next logical step in the censorship of lifestyle advertising: *no human beings allowed at all*. Health Minister Jake Epp, in his brief presented to the C.R.T.C. in November 1985, suggested that beer companies should no longer be able to use "a human model or models, or any other audio or visual element which might have a life-style connotation" in their advertising.

Like the artists who advocated a tax on private broadcasters to pay for public broadcasting, Epp also wanted to force the alcohol industry to devote 15% of its purchased broadcast time to messages promoting health. It's enough to drive us to drink.

TAXES

Most people would probably never think of *taxation* as a method of censorship, and in a literal sense, they would be quite correct in their assumption. However, it cannot be denied that artificially increasing the price of a product will arbitrarily limit access to it; in this way, taxation can be a highly effective form of control when applied to the production, distribution, and sale of published materials.

Although sales tax exemptions are available at the point of printing on magazines offered for sale, those distributed free or without regular frequency must pay the tax at the point of printing. A further 11% federal sales tax is applied to all printing costs until the fifth issue of publication when an exemption may be obtained if the publication appears with regular frequency.

Since the last provincial Conservative budget in 1984, Ontario purchasers of magazines are required to pay the 7% sales tax at the point of purchase.

Both taxes have the net effect of increasing hardship to new and existing publications (to say nothing of the consumer), and act as a restraint on freedom of expression.

...AND MORE!

There are many, many other ways in which governments can effectively control and limit our freedom of expression and they will be selectively dealt with in future issues of **Censorship Alert!**

Among them are certain provisions inherent in our libel and slander laws, the War Measures Act, The Emergency Powers Act, the Official Secrets Act, and in the regulations imposed by the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Art censorship, wiretapping, advertising prohibitions, licensing, and the use of zoning and infringements on property rights to prohibit certain forms of expression are further examples of government control on ideas.

Quasi-judicial bodies, like the federal government's 1981 *Royal Commission on Newspapers* serve as further examples of government attempts to control and regulate our right to freedom of expression.

It's up to everyone to be on the *Alert!* if they value and wish to retain the fundamental freedoms on which *all* freedoms are ultimately based.

Get involved. It's a matter of choice --- yours. ●

CENSORSHIP ALERT! Vol. 1 No. 1 February-April 1986 is published by the **Freedom Party of Ontario**, a fully-registered Ontario political party. Contributions to **Censorship Alert!** are tax-creditable and deemed to be an official contribution to a registered political party in the province of Ontario. All contributions to **Censorship Alert!** are exclusively devoted to fighting censorship in Ontario and in no way obligate the contributor to become a party member. Official tax receipts will be issued in time for annual tax returns; until then, your cheque is your receipt.

STILL THE CENSOR BOARD TO US

George Orwell clearly knew what he was talking about when he devised his *Newspeak* glossary as part of the state-controlled society he envisioned in his infamous novel, **Nineteen-Eighty-Four**. Just change the official meaning of a word (usually to its opposite) and you can destroy a people's ability to *conceptualize* the process that is eroding their fundamental freedoms and liberty.

So it is that the former *Ontario Board of Censors* has now been renamed the *Ontario Film Review Board*. In the transition from "censor" board to "review" board, the board *increased* its powers, enabling it to *censor* video tapes, video games, in addition to films. Like rent "review" (which is really rent *control*), film "review" also means film *control*. The word "review" has now come to mean "control," and Ontarians have accepted the transition as simply and as easily as Orwell predicted they would.

Censorship Alert! refuses to participate in this misleading and misrepresentative tactic. Consequently, **Censorship Alert!** will continue to call the board by its more descriptive and *proper* name.

It's the **Ontario Censor Board** --- and nothing less.

Sick and Tired of the Same Old Fare?

CLASSIFICATION TO LIMIT FILM AVAILABILITY

Now that *all* films shown in Ontario must be "classified" by the *Ontario Censor Board*, there will be fewer of them around.

Because many films produced between 1920 and 1965 have never been classified by the Censor Board, they cannot be legally shown until such classification has been obtained. This creates a particularly difficult situation for repertory cinemas who, because so many of their films appear for one showing only, have found it impractical to submit their films to the Censor Board two to three weeks in advance of a single night's showing and to pay the costs involved in obtaining a Board rating.

Thus repertory cinemas have increasingly found themselves rerunning more of the popular, *already-rated* movies, while fans of rarer, obscure films must do without.

MORE CENSORSHIP HAS ALL PARTY SUPPORT

When it comes to political alternatives favouring freedom of speech, Ontarians really haven't got a choice. All the major traditional political parties --- whether *Liberal*, *Progressive Conservative*, or *New Democrat* --- favour increased state intervention in the pre-determination of what we may see, hear, read, or express.

While the *Libertarian Party* officially opposes censorship in principle, the **Freedom Party of Ontario** is the only fully-registered Ontario party actively doing anything about it. **Censorship Alert!** is the proof of that activity.

But **Censorship Alert!** is not a partisan campaign.

Recognizing that, as a new party, electoral victories are still (relatively) a long way off, **Freedom Party** formed its **Censorship Alert!** campaign specifically to unite Ontarians of all political backgrounds and affiliations. Opponents to censorship come from all walks of life, and in many instances from the very groups and interests who have been publicly identified as *proponents* of censorship

It's thirteen o'clock...

'1984'

RESTRICTED BY 'BIG BROTHER'

in
1985

When the latest version of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four* was released in Ontario last year (January 1985), Ontario's Censor Board slapped a RESTRICTED label on it.

"In reality, it shows that Big Brother *is* watching what we watch," reacted Tom Lightburn, vice-president of *Norstar*, the movie's releasing company. "There is nothing worse in [1984] than in *Indiana Jones and The Temple of Doom* (which plays with a PG rating)," he added.

Perhaps 1984 was telling our youth something our government didn't want our "impressionable" young minds to see. But what could possibly be threatening about living in a society where *Big Brother* predetermines our thoughts and actions? We don't get it.

"FORGIVE THEM LORD..."

Arraigned in Butler, Pennsylvania, on the summary offense of blasphemy, which required no bond, John Sassone, 25, the owner of boutique, was charged when he displayed for sale a picture of Christ with the legend:

"Wanted for sedition, criminal anarchy, vagrancy, and conspiring to overthrow the established government. Dresses poorly. Said to be a carpenter by trade. Ill-nourished. Associates with common working people, the unemployed, and bums. An alien, believed to be a Jew."

The arrest, made after "numerous complaints from older people in the community," is set for magistrate's hearing on April 14, when some Butler clergymen are to testify against Sassone.

- *Los Angeles Times*, April 2, 1971

(i.e., church members, feminists, and members of the other political parties that officially support censorship). With their help **Censorship Alert!** can be instrumental in affecting the censorship policies of the various groups with which they may be involved.

Freedom is everybody's business. If you still value what little of it you have left, make it yours.

SO WHAT'S NOT OBSCENE?

Instead of asking our politicians and bureaucrats to decide what *obscenity* is, we should be asking them to define what they regard as being **not** obscene.

Then we could sit back and watch the sparks fly, as our elected officials get a taste of what they're imposing on their constituents --- having to justify their own particular (or peculiar) sexual tastes under the scrutiny of the public eye.

Just a thought.

**SMURFS, JEDI
MANIPULATE CHILDREN
THROUGH SEXUAL STEREOTYPING**

"Soviet reality" considered alternative...

While speaking to a group of teachers in London Ontario last February (1985), public affairs broadcaster Maude Barlow, a former women's issues adviser to ex-prime minister Pierre Trudeau, hurled accusations of sexual stereotyping at the cartoon show *The Smurfs* and at the Star Wars sequel *Return of the Jedi*.

Because the *Smurfs* depicted males as doctors, lawyers, and policemen (while placing females on a pedestal), and because actress Carrie Fisher appeared in a harem outfit while wearing a collar and chain during a segment of *Return of the Jedi*, children were being manipulated through their acceptance of such depictions without question, Barlow argued.

Barlow encouraged her audience to ensure that their students were not manipulated by violent rock videos or by their acceptance of pornography at face value, citing statistics that showed heavy television viewers were more likely to accept discrimination and to commit a crime.

**"IT MAY BE POSSIBLE THAT THE
SOVIETS HAVE A REALITY THAT
WE HAVE NOT EXAMINED."**

Whose values, besides her own, was Barlow promoting?

"It may be possible that the Soviets have a reality that we have not examined," Barlow said, while discussing the threat of nuclear war. It was "the responsibility of every Canadian to arm himself with this (nuclear) information," she argued.

However, she did not expand upon an examination of the "Soviet reality" that allows no room for freedom of expression, or for an examination of the state that is predicated on Communist philosophy and military expansion. Apparently, the existence of *independent thought* did not seem to be a reality in Barlow's perspective.

Who will protect us from the "manipulations" and ideas of our "protectors"?

Still Protecting the 'Children'...

**SWEDISH CENSOR BOARD
RESTRICTS**

E.T. - THE EXTRA TERRESTRIAL

When Spielberg's movie *E.T. - The Extra Terrestrial* was released in Sweden, its film censorship board banned youngsters 11 and under from seeing it.

Convinced that the country's children could be traumatized by a "threatening and frightening atmosphere" in which adults are portrayed as enemies of children, the decision may have aroused suspicions that the only people feeling threatened by trauma were on the censor board itself.

Five Year Mission Cut Short...

**FOUR STAR TREK EPISODES
DEEMED
UNSUITABLE FOR CHILDREN
BY
B.B.C.**

Britain's government-owned *BBC* network barred the early evening broadcasts of four *Star Trek* episodes, arguing that they were "unsuitable for children."

The episodes, entitled *Miri*, *The Empath*, *Whom The Gods Destroy*, and *Plato's Stepchildren*, dealt with themes ranging from premature death to the possession of psychic powers.

Despite the starship *Enterprise's* mission to "boldly go where no man has gone before," the moral guardians of the nation got there first.

1,000-Year-Old Stories Now Obscene in Egypt

**THOUSAND AND ONE NIGHTS
RULED OBSCENE**

Hailed by many Egyptian scholars and intellectuals as a world-renowned classic, *Thousand And One Nights* was ruled obscene in an Egyptian court early in 1984, due to its earthier scenes which were, in many cases, explicit descriptions of sexual acts.

Neither *Ali Baba and the 40 Thieves*, *Aladdin and his Magic Lamp*, or *Sinbad the Sailor* could do anything, despite their weapons and powers, about the powers of the state censor --- whose pen proved mightier than their swords.

**CENSORSHIP ALERT!
CONTRIBUTIONS TAX-CREDITABLE!**

Censorship Alert! has been formed under the auspices of the **Freedom Party of Ontario**, a fully-registered, tax-creditable political party in the province of Ontario. Financial contributions to the campaign are deemed to be official contributions to a registered political party in Ontario and are subject to the limits and restrictions imposed by the *Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses* (details elsewhere).

No contribution made payable to **Censorship Alert!** will be used, however, for any partisan purpose other than to fight censorship in Ontario. All contributions of \$15 or more will entitle the contributor to a six-issue subscription to *Censorship Alert!*, the newsletter accompanying the campaign of the same name.

NEW TYPE OF CENSORSHIP

A new Rumanian government decree prohibits the possession or use of typewriters by Rumanians who have a criminal record or pose 'a danger to public order or state security' according to a government publication issued yesterday.

The decree takes effect April 28. It requires private citizens to register with the police any typewriters they own or want to purchase.

The reasons for the decree were not given, but it was believed to be prompted by a spate of clandestine typewritten leaflets, critical of the Communist government, which have circulated in recent years.

New York Times, April 14, 1983



Why not let someone else think for you?

**TORONTO SUN PUBLISHER FINDS
ANTI-CENSORSHIP AD
"REPULSIVE, TASTELESS, AND INSENSITIVE"**

After publishing a full-page anti-censorship advertisement sponsored by *Penthouse* publisher Bob Guccione on November 15, 1984, *Toronto Sun* publisher Paul Godfrey went out of his way to make a public apology for the ad (and to withdraw its publication), ostensibly because of the large swastika that drew attention to it.

"I don't like the swastika. I don't like the message from Mr. Guccione. I personally find the ad repulsive, tasteless, and insensitive," remarked Godfrey. "I find the swastika --- as a Canadian, as a Jew and as a person who knows people who have suffered under the Nazi regime --- totally out of whack with today's concerned citizens."

Personally, we at **Censorship Alert!** could not find anything objectionable about the ad as it originally appeared, but Godfrey's reaction has admittedly left us somewhat bewildered. How could he object to *both* the swastika and "the message from Mr. Guccione" without contradicting himself?

The whole point of printing the swastika with an anti-censorship message was to create a connection between the conditions that created the Holocaust in Europe and similar conditions that are developing here in Canada today, with intolerance and censorship being among the primary ingredients of such conditions.

As a Canadian, and particularly as a Jew, Godfrey should have been among the first to congratulate promoters of the ad, not to criticize them and to cut off access to his paper to them. If he were as concerned with and sympathetic to the "people who have suffered under the Nazi regime" as he claimed, you'd think he'd be equally concerned with seeing to it that the same conditions don't develop here.

"Freedom is everybody's business," concluded the original ad in question. By his action, Godfrey has shown that he and the *Toronto Sun* will definitely *not* be making it their business to defend the fundamental freedom on which their business and livelihood depend. Once again, the struggle for freedom of expression has been left to be taken up by others.

And that's the sad truth. ●


RELIGIOUS CONVICTION CAN GET YOU A LEGAL CONVICTION

AT RIGHT: are examples of fundamentalist Christian "comic books" that had been sold in numerous Christian book shops. Complaints about these and other alleged "anti-Catholic" materials published by *Chick Publications* have led to their being censored under provisions in Canada's hate literature laws. Warrants were issued for one Canadian and five Americans who were distributing the literature during the Pope's visit to Canada in the fall of 1984.

The justification for the charges? Because the material was "anti-Catholic," it was deemed to be "hate literature." Yet, in all the fuss created about the dissemination of "hate literature," everyone seems to have forgotten that the *fundamental premise* of one's becoming a *Protestant* (i.e., literally, one who *protests* the Popery) is to repudiate the reputation of and faith in the Pope and the Vatican in Rome.

In a separate, unrelated incident of religious censorship, the *Way International* was prevented from establishing a bible college in London, Ontario (1982) when politicians took drastic steps to halt the college. While federal politicians argued that *the Way* could not establish a bible college on grounds that it was not a "bona-fide institution," local politicians argued that the college couldn't locate where it intended on grounds that the area was not zoned for *institutional* use!

When they want you, they can get you. ●



Pro-apartheid speaker ban sought at Toronto university

TORONTO (CP) — Four University of Toronto professors appear in court today seeking to ban any South African government representative from coming to the university and speaking in support of apartheid.

"Apartheid is a crime," the professors' lawyer, Charles Roach, told reporters Tuesday. "We cannot have people inciting criminal acts."

Roach will ask the supreme court of Ontario to issue a temporary injunction restraining the university from allowing its facilities to be used by South African government spokesmen promoting apartheid. He will seek a permanent injunction later.

The university will oppose the action.

Four University of Toronto professors appearing in the Ontario Supreme Court on January 15, 1986, sought to bar the South African ambassador to Canada from offering a verbal defence of his country's apartheid policies on campus. Arguing that his appearance on the campus would violate section 281.1 of the Criminal Code (which prohibits incitement of hatred against an "identifiable group"), the professors announced that "Apartheid is a crime," though no trial was ever held to arrive at their conclusion.

Fortunately, their case was thrown out of court, but it created an interesting side issue because the incident is not an isolated one.

Considering the action launched by the above-mentioned teachers and the action pursued by the *Federation of Women Teachers' Associations* (see article elsewhere), it would appear that teachers are becoming one of the greatest menaces to freedom of speech in our province today.

(continued on page 19)

**CENSORSHIP
VIOLATES ALL OUR
FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS**

OUR FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion;**
- (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;**
- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and**
- (d) freedom of association.**

- CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

**CENSORSHIP VIOLATES ALL OUR
FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS**

**When that happens, *anything* can happen next...
and usually does.**

GET INVOLVED IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CENSORSHIP

NO NUDES ARE GOOD NUDES

Last March, in New York City, *United Artists* motion picture company sent 2,268 postcards through the mails promoting its film of Goya's life, entitled *Nude Maja*. On one side of the postcard was pictured the 'Nude Maja,' while on the other was the film's plug which read: "the most breathtaking canvas that ever came to life."

But the film's promotion never came to life when the post office declared the cards 'unmailable' and 'obscene.'

The decision was upheld by Examiner William Duvall in a 19-page judgement issued on April 8, criticizing the poor reproduction of the painting by concluding that the postcard "cannot be considered a masterpiece... In sum, it is simply a color picture of a nude woman, and since, generally speaking, we live in a clothed society, a nude woman would strike the average person as indecent."

- *New York Times*, May 6, 1959



Activists favour 'Red Dawn' of their own...

DISARMAMENT GROUPS CITE HATE LITERATURE PROVISIONS IN ATTACK OF RED DAWN

Claiming that the movie *Red Dawn* portrays hatred toward the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, Cuba and Nicaragua, Frank Cox of the *Mid-Island Disarmament Association* (Nanaimo, British Columbia) said that the nations identified as enemies in the movie are those with whom Canada should be building stronger links.

When the movie was originally released in B.C., his group was distributing leaflets to moviegoers advising them that the film "is not a harmless fantasy."

"...A film such as *Red Dawn* that is aimed at whipping up patriotic fervor and blind hatred of other people is not only inappropriate but contravenes the Criminal Code... which makes it illegal to promote hatred against any identifiable group."

Cox was upset that Alberta's attorney general Neil Crawford refused to press charges of inciting hatred against the movie, and said that Crawford's decision was conditioned by Canada's proximity to the United States.

There's no law we're aware of, however, preventing Cox and his protest group from changing *their* proximity to the United States, but, of course, that hasn't happened yet.

As Expected...

WOMEN PRIMARY MARKET FOR 'BLUE' VIDEOS

With the advent of home video and with a good degree of freedom of expression, American women have become the primary market for blue movies, which are increasingly catering to female fantasies by putting more emphasis on plot and motivation for sex.

The November 1985 issue of *Glamour* magazine reports that "at least 60% of renters or buyers of adult videos are women shopping to suit themselves, not just their mates."

Proving, of course, that *choice* determines the nature of products available, not the reverse. The marketplace's response to demand for erotica has beat the feminists to the punch --- they thought *they* knew what "erotica" was!

Funny how freedom always produces the positive consequences sought by its detractors.

RACIST TRASH!

John Wallace, chairman of the Human Rights Commission in Fairfax, Virginia, thinks *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is "racist trash and anyone who teaches this book is a racist."

By the way, Wallace is an administrative assistant at the --- you guessed it --- *Mark Twain* Intermediate School in Fairfax.

- *Reason Magazine*, August 1982

CENSORSHIP! Alert!

visits

THE CENSOR BOARD

Editors Robert Metz and Marc Emery see the infamous 18-minute outtake of sex & violence. Our conversation with and observations of Mary Brown follow.

Send a stamped self-addressed envelope for this FREE booklet.

P.O. Box 2214
Station A
London, Ontario
N6A 4E3

HELP US SOUND THE ALERT! THROUGH NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

11

On the following page is a proposed draft of the type of full-page newspaper advertisements that, ultimately, *Censorship Alert!* would like to run in every major daily paper across Ontario.

The hard-hitting bold headline: **CENSORSHIP WORKS** guarantees everyone's attention --- both from those for and against censorship --- especially when associated with recognizable censor advocates in the varying localities where the ads will appear.

The primary purpose of these advertisements is to attract the attention of those in the reading public *who are already opposed to censorship*, and to encourage them to send in the coupons to help us continue our campaign to better inform them --- and other people in the public like them --- about censorship.

Millions of Ontario citizens who are completely opposed to censorship have no recognized representative to present their views to the media, politicians, and fellow citizens. These full-page ads will hopefully establish *Censorship Alert!* as *their* advocate for freedom of expression and put pressure on the media and politicians to address the alarming growth of, and justifications for, censorship in this province.

We realize that the advertisement's inclusion of locally recognizable political figures (including Ontario's current premier and the chairman of the Ontario Censor Board) may offend some people --- but even that reaction will provide a necessary basis for discussion.

Censorship Alert! welcomes every opportunity to confront the fact that even elected and appointed representatives in a democracy have no shroud of legitimacy when they begin to act like tyrants. Everyone can easily recognize Khomeini, Khaddafi, Hitler, or Stalin as brutes for allowing no dissent or opposition to their points of view. But when censor advocates like Mary Brown, David Peterson, etc., operate under the veil of "democracy" to conceal parallel motives, we tend to make the mistake of continuing to regard them as "the folks next door" --- until we discover that they're knocking on *our* doors to impose *their* perceptions and ideas on us.

Remember, we're not out to defend the *kinds* or *types* of material popularly being censored today; we're fighting for *your right* as adults to make the choice of what you

read or express yourself! To that end, our ads will encourage supporters to send in clippings about censorship, contribute money, volunteer support, and to spread the word about *Censorship Alert!* (The first newspaper slated for publication is the *London Free Press*, where the illustrated ad on the next page has already received tentative approval for publication.)

The cost of a full-page ad in the *London Free Press* (with a circulation of approximately 150,000 in South-western Ontario) is a little over \$4,000. \$4,000 is a great deal of money. While we expect some return on the cost from the coupon in the ad itself, the bulk of the money must be raised in advance. For that reason, we are pleased to be able to offer our *tax-creditable* status (see details on coupon) which, in effect, allows contributors to direct significant portions of their *already due and payable taxes* towards our effort to fight censorship. For example, an initial \$100 contribution to *Censorship Alert!* will qualify the contributor to a \$75 *direct provincial tax refund* on his or her tax return for the year in which the contribution was made! To find out what refunds you qualify for when making contributions of different amounts, simply refer to the remittance coupon appearing elsewhere in this newsletter.

If initial placement of ads draws an adequate response rate, then our *Censorship Alert!* campaign will be well on its way, with similar appearances in communities like Toronto, Ottawa, Windsor, Kitchener, and other major urban centres in Ontario!

Naturally, *Censorship Alert!* can't go anywhere without **your** contributions, support, and input.

Please write to us to let us know what you thought of our newsletter (pro or con), how you feel we can improve it, what information you would like to see included, etc.

Won't you join us?

GET INVOLVED IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CENSORSHIP!

CENSORSHIP AIDED AND ABETTED

One of the increasingly prevalent sources of the desire to suppress thought centers around the charges of 'degradation' or 'hate-mongering' used by various ethnic and lifestyle groups who feel threatened by various books, movies, magazines, and advertising:

In 1984, the Arab Community Centre of Toronto


appealed to Ontario's Attorney General to have Leon Uris' book, *The Haj*, proclaimed "anti-Arab" hate literature.

In October 1985, *University of Western Ontario* law professor, journalist, and past-NDP candidate **Rob Martin** appealed to the *C.R.T.C.* to have a local radio station's satirical municipal election campaign, "Manuel Cruz for Mayor," discontinued on grounds that Mexicans were made to appear like "idiots."

[continued on page 14]

THE PROPOSED DRAFT of a full-page newspaper advertisement below can be catered for use in any local community, with the "local experts" being the most recognizable censor advocates in a given locality, in addition to key personalities recognizable across the province of Ontario. [Typographical errors not yet corrected.] Full-page ads cost anywhere from \$2,000 to \$15,000 in Ontario's daily papers. We need your support!

CENSORSHIP WORKS.



ASK THE EXPERTS

THEY KNOW --- IT WORKED FOR THEM.

THEIR IDEAS HELPED SHAPE THE WORLD WE LIVE IN.

But we don't have to live in *their* totalitarian societies to find people who insist on doing our thinking for us.

The "local" experts are in abundant supply:



When asked what the (former) Ontario Censor Board was intended to protect us from, its Chairwoman, Mary Brown, replied: "(It is) not the intention of the Theatres Act, nor is it my intention, to

protect; (our) intention is to reflect community standards in what film content appears on the public screen."

In other words, *disagreement with the majority* has been deemed to be a crime, punishable by law.



Despite admitting that "We are encroaching on essential liberties (and) fundamental freedoms," Ontario Premier David Peterson still supports censorship --- but not by a censor board, he wants the legislature (in which he is a

member, to establish censorship standards. Censorship "would be better to do it in the open."

But it's still censorship.



As past MP for London, Jack Burghardt was one of the many who led "The Way" for us --- right out of town, in fact. He supported the prohibition of a religious group, the Way, from establishing a Bible College in

London. Mr. Burghardt was also protecting our minds when he raised (un)parliamentary concern with "backward masking" on record albums. No mask hides Mr. Burghardt's intentions!



Gord Walker, former MPP for London South, was minister in charge of the Ontario Censor Board in 1981 and briefly in 1985. Walker's reasoning for role is spelled out in his book, *A Conservative Canada*,

"Governments should continue to act wherever serious threats to decency and traditional values arise."



Through forced metrification, bi-lingualism, and his government's failed attempt to muzzle political expression during federal elections, past prime minister Pierre Trudeau let us know how little he actually valued

those fundamental freedoms contained in the document he was credited with bringing to Canada, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

GET INVOLVED IN THE CAMPAIGN TO BEAT CENSORSHIP!

The experts all agree that censorship works. They know that by dictating what *language* we may use, the units of *measurement* we may employ, the nature of our *cultural* and *artistic* heritage, the limits on our *sexual, political, and religious* freedom of expression, that *their* ideas, standards, and values will become *ours*, without the fear of criticism or opposition. Even worse, by keeping us ignorant, uninformed, and suppressed through censorship, the experts know they can "convince" us that it's for our own good!

It's true.

Censorship works --- for *the experts*, not for *us*.

RECEIVE 6 ISSUES OF CENSORSHIP ALERT! FREE WITH YOUR DONATION!

CENSORSHIP ALERT! is a campaign of information, advocacy, and action aimed specifically at fighting *censorship* in the province of Ontario.

Sponsored by the officially-registered **Freedom Party of Ontario**, the PURPOSE OF THE CAMPAIGN is as follows:

- (1) to alert Ontarians as to the pervasiveness and extent of censorship in their communities through advertising, advocacy action, and the spread of information;
- (2) to educate the public on the dangers inherent in censorship, and on the inevitably detrimental consequences of censorship;
- (3) to assist, participate with, and unite various and differing anti-censorship groups;
- (4) to bear pressure upon provincial, municipal, and federal governments in order to reduce their control of the right and means to expression;
- (5) to offer assistance, where possible, to victims of censorship.
- (6) to abolish the Ontario Censor Board (the *Ontario Film Review Board*).

We need your money and support to sponsor more newspaper ads, print and distribute newsletters, and to finance activity related to fighting censorship in Ontario. We need your news clippings and personal experiences with censorship in Ontario or elsewhere. **SEND IN THE COUPON TODAY!** All respondents will receive a **free issue of Censorship Alert!**, a newsletter packed with articles, information, opinion, and developments in the censorship battle. All contributions made payable to *Censorship Alert!* go directly to fighting censorship in Ontario and in no way obligate contributors to become members of the **Freedom Party of Ontario**.

CENSORSHIP ALERT! HOT-LINE IS 433-3305

CENSORSHIP Alert!

SEND THIS COUPON TO:

P.O. BOX 2214, STN. A, LONDON, ONT., N6A 4E3
VISIT OUR FULL-TIME OFFICE IN DOWNTOWN
LONDON: 364 RICHMOND ST., 3rd FLOOR

YES! I'D LIKE TO SEE MORE NEWSPAPER ADS AGAINST CENSORSHIP! I ENCLOSE A TAX-CREDITABLE CONTRIBUTION (see box) TO HELP PAY FOR FUTURE ADS. I REALIZE I WILL RECEIVE 6 ISSUES OF CENSORSHIP ALERT! TO KEEP ME INFORMED ABOUT CENSORSHIP IN ONTARIO, CANADA, AND AROUND THE WORLD.

I ENCLOSE \$15 \$25 \$50 \$100 (other)
I'D LIKE TO HELP, CALL ME I'D LIKE A
SAMPLE COPY OF *CENSORSHIP ALERT!*

NAME

ADDRESS APT. NUMBER

CITY POSTAL CODE

The chart below indicates the tax-credit, *ie. the amount the Ontario government will refund you*, and your actual net cost.

Contribution	Tax Credit	Actual Cost
\$15	\$11.25	\$3.75
\$25	\$18.75	\$6.75
\$50	\$37.50	\$12.50
\$100	\$75.00	\$25.00
\$250	\$150.00	\$100.00
\$500	\$275.00	\$225.00

all cheques made out to *Censorship Alert!* are tax-creditable; *Censorship Alert!* is sponsored and administered by the officially registered Ontario political party: **Freedom Party of Ontario**. All contributions will receive an official receipt for the following year's income tax remittance.

Freedom Party believes that the purpose of government is to protect your freedom of choice, not to restrict it. Contributors to *Censorship Alert!* are not in any way joining **Freedom Party** or are in any way obligated or associated with **Freedom Party** except in the *Censorship Alert!* campaign against censorship.

□ New York and California representatives of Chinese organizations appealed to producers of **Year of the Dragon** to have the film withdrawn from circulation on grounds that it negatively portrayed Chinese-Americans as drug smugglers and mobsters. Producers responded when promotional posters of the film were labelled with the warning that the movie may be "offensive" on that basis.

□ **Homosexuals** pressured New York Mayor Ed Koch to withhold permits allowing film director William Friedkin the use of New York City streets to film his movie **Cruising**. Despite the political support Koch received from the homosexual community, he did not bow to pressure, correctly pointing out that another mayor could just as easily be persuaded to ban permits to producers of *pro-homosexual* films.

□ Then-mayor of **San Francisco** Diane Feinstein unsuccessfully attempted to deny local theatre access to distributors of the film, **Cruising**, since homosexuals comprised a significant political influence in that community. Failing that, the mayor (again, unsuccessfully) presented *United Artists* with an invoice for \$130,450 to cover costs of policing demonstrators who protested the movie on San Francisco streets.

□ In the Bronx, New York, a coalition of Hispanics, blacks, and whites attempted to obtain a court order prohibiting the shooting of **Fort Apache, The Bronx** on grounds that the film defamed residents of the South Bronx.

□ **Jewish B'Nai B'Rith** director Alan Shefman of Toronto proclaimed that Canada was one of the "main centres in the world for hate propaganda," but offered little concrete evidence to support his claim. But his view, increasingly shared by politicians, has been responsible for the initiation of legal action against various "anti-Semitic," "anti-Zionist," or "Holocaust-revisionist" writers.

□ **Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice** was petitioned to be withdrawn from study by junior high-school grades on grounds that the play perpetuated "anti-Jewish stereotypes."

□ **Archie Comic Books** came under the attack of the *University of Western Ontario's* Anthropology Department's Dr. Carole Farber, who argued that the presence of "stereotyping" and "sexism" within the pages of **archie** comic books "raises the question of whether they meet the criteria of instruction and wholesomeness of the *Comics Code Authority*."

□ **Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn** was labelled "racist trash" by chairman of the Human Rights Commission in Fairfax Virginia.

□ The film **Red Dawn** was accused of "whipping up patriotic fervor and blind hatred of other people" by a British Columbia disarmament group, who attempted to have the film charged with "inciting hatred."

□ British Columbia's **Human Rights Commission** (now abolished) relentlessly harassed the owner of *Hunky Bill's*, a restaurant whose name was considered degrading to people of Ukrainian descent, since turn-of-the-century Ukrainain immigrants to Canada were called "hunkys." The fact that *Hunky Bill's*' owner was himself a Ukrainian did not deter the Commission's zealotry, which eventually succeeded in having the restaurant's name forcibly

changed.

□ **Columnist Barbara Amiel** faced the threatening ire of Manitoba's *Human Rights Commission* in 1977, when her *MacLeans* magazine article referring to Germany's participation in World War I contained the word, *huns*. In addition to using intimidation to foster a punitive environment for Ms. Amiel, the Commission issued press releases bringing the "racist article" and the "slurs at *MacLeans*" to the public's attention. They got it. Upon seeing an opportunity to create its own revisionist point of view, the *Canadian Alliance of German Canadians* appealed to the Commission to have the word *huns* declared racist and unacceptable, even in accurate references to the term as it was used during the years of World War I.

□ **City councils in Minneapolis and Indianapolis** attempted to pass legislation permitting people who found offensive passages or pictorials in books and magazines they purchased to sue retailers of said material on grounds that their "civil rights were violated."

□ 47-year-old Emily Carter is seeking compensatory and punitive damages from the Estate of Kate Douglas Wiggin, whose book, **Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm**, influenced Carter to the point of becoming "unfit for any career." Because Ms. Carter repeatedly reread the novel during her "impressionable" years of childhood, she has been forced to undergo many years of expensive therapy.

□ William Faulkner's novel, **Sanctuary**, because it was required reading during college, has been blamed for the "condition of sexual paralysis" of one of its readers, Vera Scarpa, whose lawyers are currently charging the book's publisher and the college with the responsibility for Scarpa's condition. Their evidence? --- Four broken and childless marriages, brought about by Scarpa's long history of frigidity.

□ **White Dog**, a movie described by *NBC* officials as "a well-made motion picture that makes a strong and anti-bigotry statement," was never broadcast by the network as a result of lobbying by the *National Association for the Advancement of Colored People* [NAACP] and by the *Black Anti-Defamation Coalition*. Because the film featured a German shepherd trained by a racist to attack black people, the groups viewed *White Dog* as an inflammatory tract for racist activities.

THE MESSAGE IS CLEAR!

If there's one overwhelming thing to be learned from the examples cited above, it is that **CENSORSHIP ALWAYS BREEDS MORE CENSORSHIP**.

In creating the *opportunity* for censorship, legislators have in fact *fabricated justifications* for censorship, justifications that would never have seen the light of day --- or *reason* --- without the grounds provided by our various legislators. Though in many cases, common sense did manage to prevail, the future trend does not look nearly as promising.

Censors are driven by insecurities and fears that, instead of being *abated* by censorship, are *abetted*.

And you can bet on it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Information Sources: *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; Prohibited Importations; Martin's Criminal Code; London Free Press; Toronto Sun; Toronto Star; Ontario Lawyer's Weekly; London MetroBulletin; Rolling Stone; Penthouse; New Look; Glamour; Take Back the Night; Ordeal.* Contributors: Marc Emery; Barry Malcolm; Robert Metz; Gordon Mood.

ROCK MUSIC & VIDEOS UNDER ATTACK

Now that the *Canadian Recording Industry Association* has adopted the new American practice of rating and labelling records that contain "possibly" offensive lyrics, Ontarians should be alerted to some of the history --- and mostly politics --- lurking behind this latest development, and how "rating systems" are ultimately used to justify outright censorship.

Concerned with lyrical references to "masturbation, bondage, rape, sodomy, incest, orgasm, anal vapors, codpieces and buzzsaws," an influential group of Washington wives formed the *Parents Music Resource Centre* (PMRC) to campaign against "smut" in rock. The fact that the type of material in question accounted for less than one per cent of all recordings released did not deter PMRC from its efforts to have *all* recordings reviewed and rated.

"CENSORSHIP HERE WOULD BE LIKE USING DECAPITATION TO DEAL WITH DANDRUFF"

- Frank Zappa, at Senate hearings

Co-founded by Tipper Gore (wife of Democrat Senator Albert Gore) and Susan Baker (wife of Treasury-Secretary James Baker), the PMRC appeared before the *Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation* on September 19, 1985 stressing that the group would not be satisfied until (1) "questionable" lyrics were printed and provided with their respective recordings, (2) until "objectionable" album covers were sold in plain brown wrappers (or sold in areas segregated from other albums), (3) until rock concerts were rated, and (4) until *MTV* segregated "questionable" video recordings into specific late night viewing slots.

Not only was the PMRC concerned with *explicit* lyrics, but the group also argued that "virgin minds" were being poisoned by "hidden messages and backward masking." (The group did not make explicit whether or not it wanted these "hidden" messages printed alongside the explicit lyrics, but it would certainly have been an interesting exercise to read its interpretations of these so-called "hidden" messages.)

In addition to appearing before the Senate Committee, PMRC was also lobbying record companies to "reassess" the contracts of those performers whom it found objectionable.

VIRGIN MINDS WERE BEING POISONED BY HIDDEN MESSAGES & BACKWARD MASKING...

Despite these actions, the women of the PMRC repeatedly argued that "We are not censors." Claiming that their intent was simply to establish a *voluntary* ratings system, the "voluntary" system they advocated was nevertheless backed up by a legal *threat*: "Clean up your act" or face legislation or regulation, warned several of the senators on the Senate Committee. (ED: If the ratings system advocated was truly intended to be "voluntary," then what was the purpose of presenting the issue to a *government*-appointed committee? Since when do governments legislate *voluntary* behaviour?)

Opposition to the PMRC was highly compromised, to say the least. President of the *Recording Industry Association of America* (RIAA), Stanley Gortikov, recognized that the existence of a "review panel" was "an ad hoc first-stage form of censorship." Yet, after publicly stating his opposition to a ratings system, he nevertheless agreed to the placing of warning labels on newly-released recordings, claiming that a "compromise" with parent groups concerned about what their children listen to was both necessary and reasonable.

THIS TYPE OF OFFENSIVE MATERIAL ACCOUNTS FOR LESS THAN ONE PERCENT OF ALL RECORDINGS RELEASED...

Gortikov's "compromise" invited charges from critics that it was the price he had to pay to protect pending federal legislation he was seeking to deal with the problem of record piracy and blank tapes. Thus, his appeasement of the influential, lawmaking spouses of the PMRC was "necessary and reasonable" on the grounds that they would have opposed the bills he advocated.

If true, and if the piracy laws sought by Gortikov represented legitimate protections of copyright, then he found himself in the unfortunate position of having to choose between his right to freedom of expression and his property rights relating to the products being sold. The use of a censorship threat as a political bargaining tool is possibly one of the best arguments against censorship laws --- the subjective nature of such laws makes them excellent tools of intimidation.

ANTI-RATINGS PERFORMERS FORMED A GROUP CALLED MUSICAL MAJORITY.

Predictably, Gortikov's "compromise" did not appease the women of the PMRC. Even when they got what they wanted (or to be more accurate, what they *publicly said* they wanted), the PMRC still wasn't satisfied with Gortikov's agreeing to place a 'PG' warning label on certain albums. Now their objections were focussed on the *type* of label being applied. The PMRC demanded that the 'PG' label be upgraded to an 'R' rating, ostensibly because the 'PG' rating had already been "watered down," given its application to 'PG' movies. (If applied consistently, an 'R' rating would have meant, in the United States, that the purchaser of an album would have to be over seventeen years of age or be accompanied by someone of that age, effectively cutting off sales of such albums to a large younger segment of the music market.)

PAUL KANTNER OF STARSHIP WANTED TO INCREASE SALES WITH "TOTAL CENSORSHIP".

With the intentions of the PMRC becoming more obvious, and with Gortikov's "compromised" position on the issue, solidarity within the recording industry was compromised as well. Although several leading record companies opposed the ratings system from the very beginning (among them, *A&M*, *Geffen*, *Island*, and *IRS Records*), one industry giant, *MCA Records*, reversed its original support of the ratings scheme.

The Sounds of Censorship

Industry representatives weren't the only ones split on the issue; recording artists were similarly in disagreement.

Anti-ratings performers formed a group called the *Musical Majority*, whose committee was affiliated with the *American Civil Liberties Union*, and with representatives of performers like Tina Turner, Cyndi Lauper, Don Henley, Prince, Lionel Richie, the Pointer Sisters, John Cougar Mellencamp, members of KISS and Duran Duran. And on ABC TV's *Nightline*, singer Donny Osmond publicly stated his opposition to ratings.

Frank Zappa, in his presentation to the Senate Committee, argued that any ratings system "opens the door to an endless parade of moral quality-control programs based on Things Certain Christians Don't Like. What if the next bunch of Washington Wives demands a large yellow 'J' on material written or performed by Jews...?"

Zappa's extreme example was not so far-fetched, as other past experiences with subjective interpretations of musical lyrics illustrated. John Denver described how several radio stations once banned his popular song *Rocky Mountain High* on someone's assumption that it advocated drug abuse. And Dee Snider (of *Twisted Sister*) soon discovered that his song *Under the Blade*, whose lyrics were written to describe his fear of surgery, was being criticized for espousing themes of bondage, rape and sadomasochism.

Predictably, not all recording artists were opposed to the PMRA's efforts. Paul Kanter, founder of *Jefferson Airplane* and *Jefferson Starship*, was "all for total censorship. It's been one of the sounding boards of rock'n roll since Bill Haley. And it's probably sold more records than anything else."

Kanter's "support" of censorship probably had more of a ring of truth to it than any of the members of the PMRC would care to admit. If there's one thing that the censorship measures of the PMRC would definitely do, it would be to attract attention to products that might not otherwise exist.

One must wonder as to the sensibility behind an idea that demands the printing of "questionable" lyrics, the distribution of these lyrics to radio stations, and the segregation of all such material from the rest. Could anyone else have possibly devised a better marketing scheme to attract attention to their product?

Likely not. As Brian Robertson, president of the *Canadian Recording Industry Association* remarked, even with the ratings system in place, it would only affect that less-than-one-percent of recording artists "who are not well established, particularly heavy metal bands" who use shock value to grab attention.

Now they've been handed the best media "shock-value" of them all: **Censorship.** ●

'Cabbage Patch' Politicians...

CANADIAN WRITERS, ARTISTS, PLEAD FOR FORCED SUPPORT

With federal budget cuts to the arts, Canadian artists have decided to "adopt" federal politicians (favoring public subsidies and controls of the arts) on a "kind of Cabbage Patch Kid concept, only applied to MPs," according to Canadian writer Margaret Atwood.

The tactic was only one of the latest developments in the various lobby efforts of those Canadian writers and artists who feel that Canadians have to be protected from the type of art, writing, and movies they choose for themselves.

Vancouver film-maker Sandy Wilson, in her public opposition to "free trade" with the U.S., saw free trade as the lack of protection or support for Canadian film-makers. Under freer trade, she was concerned that the profit motive would decide the content of films: "There are other considerations besides just profits. I think it's very important for any culture to be able to see itself reflected in all the art forms."

While some artists were busy denigrating the profit motive, others had no reservations about confiscating the

actual profits of others, proving it was only the necessity of having to *earn* those profits that they were objecting to. *The Friends of Public Broadcasting*, a group of 2,000 Canadians formed early in 1985 to protest C.B.C. budget cuts, urged the federal government to *tax the advertising revenues of private broadcasters to pay for C.B.C. funding.*

In practice, this would have made private broadcasters responsible not only for their own economic survival, but for that of their competition as well. What a paradox! The better their performance, the better the income of the C.B.C.! But with many broadcasters and artists encouraging quotas against U.S. programming, the ability of private broadcasters to provide the profits necessary to subsidize the C.B.C. would have been seriously compromised.

Forcing *others* to subsidize their activities is no way for Canada's cultural community to "earn" a reputation; the reputation they *do* earn may not be that of the profession they've chosen.

CENSORSHIP!
Alert!

&

THE FRASER COMMITTEE
HEARINGS ON PORNOGRAPHY & PROSTITUTION

Editors Robert Metz & Marc Emery speak on pornography at the Royal Commission on Pornography. For a copy of our defence of sexually-related materials, send a stamped, self-addressed envelope to: P.O. Box 2214, Stn. 'A', LONDON, Ontario, N6A 4E3

"Men Love Death...Especially Murder" FEMINIST VIEW OF MEN IRRATIONAL & HATEFUL

Early in September 1985, feminist groups across the country staged their second annual *Take Back the Night* march. Men were barred from directly participating but their "money or help with child care" were welcomed to help support the parade of marchers and films --- for women only.

Take Back the Night, for those who don't know, has become one of the 'bibles' of the feminist movement; hence, the reference to the book in the naming of their annual march. Edited by Laura Lederer, the book contains various essays by "Women on Pornography", including a particularly offensive essay written by Andrea Dworkin entitled *Why So-Called Radical Men Love and Need Pornography*.

Leaning heavily on excerpts from the *Bible*, Dworkin writes:

Men love death. In everything they make, they hollow out a central place for death, let its rancid smell contaminate every dimension of whatever still survives. Men especially love murder. In art they celebrate it, and in life they commit it. They embrace murder as if life without it would be devoid of passion, meaning, and action, as if murder were solace, stilling their sobs as they mourn the emptiness and alienation of their lives.

...In male culture, slow murder is the heart of eros, fast murder is the heart of action, and systematized murder is the heart of history.

Take Back the Night, pgs 148-149

In their attempt to further increase the powers of censorship to ban materials with which they do not happen to agree, feminist groups who subscribe to this kind of thinking are resorting to the very tactics they publicly deplore.

How could anyone possibly objectively read the above passage without concluding that it was sexist, discrimina-

tory, untrue, and inciteful of hatred towards an identifiable group? Yet, charges have never been laid against the writers, publishers, distributors, or promoters of the book --- or of the ideas generated by its warped philosophy.

Instead of recommending that the book be banned, however, **Censorship Alert!** advocates that you *read* the book so that you can be alerted to the underlying pro-censorship, anti-freedom philosophy behind much of today's feminist movement. You will discover how these "violence-hating" feminists believe:

...that only by overthrowing this society will the violence against women cease. And I am prepared to use violence against an ideology that says that women are inferior to men. And I am prepared to fight against a government and the capitalistic economic system which strengthens such an ideology.

Take Back the Night, pg. 85

Referring to the "striking examples" of China and Cuba, the book's editors note how "pornography and the exploitation of women as prostitutes" has been virtually eliminated (though this is totally untrue) "where capitalism has been overthrown by workers' socialist revolutions."

Totalitarianism seems, to these feminists, to be a small price to pay in their war against "sexual exploitation." Though the violent, hateful tone of *Take Back the Night* may be offensive to some, we nevertheless recommend that this book be read. That way, the next time someone justifies censorship on the basis of the ideas in this book, you'll have the necessary intellectual ammunition to deflect his or her criticisms.

That is, of course, unless the feminists get their way. Then we'll have to start marching to Take Back Our Rights! ●

Write to us!

Here's an open invitation to share your views on *censorship*.

We'd like to hear from you! If you have any first-hand experiences with censorship laws (Maybe you run a business affected by such laws) or if you'd just like to let us know how you feel about *freedom*, please write!

Send your letters to:

Editor - Censorship Alert! P.O. Box 2214, Stn. 'A', LONDON, Ontario N6A 4E3



STICKS AND STONES MAY BREAK MY BONES but WORDS WILL NEVER HURT ME!

Presently in Canada, it is illegal, punishable by imprisonment, to communicate statements that wilfully incite hatred against any identifiable group other than in a private conversation. (So for now, shhhh!)

Some people are trying, not to *protect*, but to shield from criticism these identifiable groups by making tougher laws that limit opinions, words and thoughts expressed in various media. They are going so far as to argue that the offenders' willingness and intent to incite hatred should not even have to be proven to convict the offender.

If these tougher laws are passed, they will surely eliminate much debate, discussion and criticism about important issues and decisions that affect all of us.

There is no such thing as "a little free speech" or "free speech except for..."; it's either free speech for everyone or free speech simply doesn't exist at all.

Some people seem to think that the government should permit free speech only to those who hold "decent" or "acceptable" ideas. When the government outlaws certain ideas or opinions, freedom of expression is negated and something called **ENSORHSHIP** becomes the norm. Today's censorship advocates have clearly not learned the lesson to be learned from history when it comes to censorship and freedom of expression, and they are no different from their historical predecessors.

Protecting freedom of expression, not *limiting* it, ought to be among the first concerns among people and governments concerned with protecting the right to privacy and property rights, if we want to live in a nation where liberty is assured --- and where hatred is minimized.

SEX TOYS NOW RULED OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS

In October 1985, while the Supreme Court of Canada was ruling that sex toys were "obscene publications" (which effectively made the sale of penis-shaped vibrators and inflatable dolls illegal in Canada), the Ontario Court of Appeal struck down Toronto's municipal bylaw requiring exotic dancers to wear opaque coverings over their pubic areas.

According to the two decisions, we can only speculate that while all *artificial* items representing sex organs (male or female) are now illegal, it's OK to look at the real thing.

But someone had better advise Dr. Ruth to refrain from counselling women to use vibrators for sexual stimulation; there's a law against counselling people to perform illegal acts. (To be able to *use* a vibrator, one must first have the freedom to *purchase* one.) Or perhaps, given the regulatory and censorship powers of the state that exist in Canada today, it would be much simpler to delete her advice from the *Life Channel* which broadcasts her show nightly.

Suddenly, *Good Sex* has become *illegal sex*.

Free democratic nations are based on people's ability to reason, to choose for themselves, in their own best interests, without infringing upon the similar rights of others. Free nations rely on their people's ability to learn and on their free expression of conscience in moral issues. Censorship represents a complete denial of both these principles, and is therefore both anti-democratic and pro-totalitarian.

Censorship is the opposite of, and totally destroys intellectual freedom. No matter what the justifications for censorship have been, the *purpose* of censorship has *always* been to control the thoughts of others, or to control information or investigation. Throughout history, all traditional forms of government have used censorship to protect the status quo (those in power), and it has always come at the expense of liberty (and sometimes even the loss of lives) of the citizenry. Censorship has always paved the way towards *more censorship*, tyranny, and totalitarian powers.

The hate laws of this or any other country are not only dangerous and wrong but are generally a waste of effort --- because they usually create the opposite consequence sought by those who advocate them.

People should be punished for throwing sticks and stones, but not for throwing words, opinions, or ideas at people, no matter how childish or inaccurate those ideas may seem. In both cases, there may be winners and losers in the conflict, but only in the latter are both able to walk away from the fray physically untouched and unharmed. ●

"But now I am going to be immoral; now I mean to show things as they really are, not as they ought to be."

-Byron, *Don Juan*, 1824

Censorship as a 'Numbers Racket'...

'DISGUSTING' OBJECTS DETERMINED BY NUMBER ON DISPLAY

When in early 1984, Provincial Judge Harry Momotiuk of Windsor convicted two London, Ontario women for publicly exhibiting "disgusting" sexual objects (i.e., inflatable dolls, vibrators, sexual aids, novelties, etc.) at their store, the *Tender Trap*, he argued that *individually*, any of the items on display in their store might not be considered by some to be disgusting. However, as a *group*, the items represented a distasteful message (though *what* that message was wasn't defined) "to the majority of the Canadian public."

As a consequence of expressing this "distasteful message" to the "majority of the Canadian public," the owners were fined \$1,000 --- and awarded a criminal record. The conviction and fine were intended as the judge's manner of sending *his own* "message out to the community" that such conduct would not be profitable.

Disgusting.

...Alert! [continued from page 1]

As remarkable as it may seem, a solid 34% of Ontarians are completely opposed to any sort of government censorship whatever, while the remaining 66% claiming to support censorship are doomed to argue endlessly amongst themselves about *what* should be censored and by *whom*. But it is the fragmented efforts of this latter group that have led to the fragmented patchwork of laws, regulations, and outright bans that limit our access to a free flow of information, opinion, and ideas. Of necessity, the effort required to reverse this dangerous trend of censorship will also be fragmented and will force some frank, open discussions about the nature of various materials being censored --- and about the nature of censors themselves.

We need your input and support! Whether you choose to volunteer your money or your time (look for details elsewhere in newsletter), you may rest assured that *all* of that support will be channeled directly into our effort to fight censorship in Ontario.

There are other ways to help. Send us newspaper clippings, articles, or information on any area of censorship. Show this newsletter to your friends, your local librarian, your favorite bookseller, your local cinema, fellow students, workers, teachers, video buffs, --- *anyone* who may have an interest in censorship.

Put your friends on the *Alert!* Get involved in our fight against censorship today!

We recommend you make your choice now --- tomorrow may be too late. ●

...Ontario Teachers [continued from pg. 23]

Yet it is not the R-rated violent movies that the *Federation of Women Teachers' Associations* targets for censorship. Their pamphlet appeals to specific laws advocating government control for items "appealing to or designed to appeal to erotic or sexual appetites or inclinations."

We at *Censorship Alert!* caution all to be on the alert for this kind of misleading and highly manipulative political propaganda; there is only one ultimate purpose and goal in mind by its promoters: to increase the censorship powers of the state, while becoming a primary influencer in the determination of the standards that they would so readily have imposed upon us.

Be informed. Be on the *Alert!* ●

...Pro-apartheid Ban [continued from page 9]

The same South African ambassador previously mentioned was physically attacked by a high-school teacher (who was later charged with assault) on the University of Toronto campus in November 1985, while in London, Ontario during the same period, law professor Rob Martin appealed to the *C.R.T.C.* to halt a political parody called "Manuel Cruz for Mayor" from being broadcast on a local radio station. The "Joke-election" campaign was "hate literature," said Martin, because *Mexicans* were being portrayed as "idiots."

Who's next? Conservatives? Feminists? Christians? What unpopular point of view will our educators attempt to prevent students and the public from being exposed to next? And above all, what has happened to the environment of free expression we've come to expect from our learning institutions? ●

**NEXT
ISSUE**

of

CENSORSHIP *Alert!*

Our next issue features articles on all areas of censorship, but

features include:

TOWARD THE SECOND HOLOCAUST:

Zundel and Keegstra: The 'Hate Literature' Trials and their Effects on Freedom of Expression in Canada.

PROTECTING OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE:

---From *What?*

'CHIC' EXTREMISM:

Popular Extremism vs Unpopular Extremism:

---What's the Difference?

VICTORY DENIED:

What happened to the Supreme Court challenge to the Ontario Censor Board? Victory against censorship gone with new act.

'ART POLICE' AT WORK

The Liquor Control Board of Alberta barred fifty-one paintings owned by *Seagram's Distillers*, from being displayed in an art show in Edmonton (sponsored by *Seagrams*), on the grounds that the owner was a liquor company and liquor advertising is barred in Alberta.

- *New York Times*, January 23, 1964

20

BROTHERHOOD OF CENSORS

A "guild battle" dating back to the 17th and 18th centuries "when artists in various places were often at loggerheads with the Painters' Guild and other trade or labour unions" occurred in the dispute in Toronto between the *Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, And Paper Hangers of America* and the Canadian artist York Wilson over the execution of mural paintings in the O'Keefe Arts Centre.

Wilson, designer of the murals, was painting them himself with the aid of two assistants when the *Brotherhood* called on all three to stop their work "because it should be done by painters enrolled in the scenic artists division of the Brotherhood."

- *London Times*, February 6, 1960

NYETTO VIDEOS

Moscow police smashed a ring of video black marketeers making huge profits copying and distributing Swedish pornography and other Western films, the newspaper *Sovietskaya Rossia* reported.

"In the pursuit of profit they committed one crime after another, expanding from innocent westerns to art films, Swedish pornography, and horror films, to movies with mystical themes."

- *Buffalo News*, April 14, 1983

ARTISTIC FASCISM

The exhibition *Degenerate Art* opened at the art centre of the Third Reich in Munich as a demonstration of "Jewish-Democratic" and "Kultur-Bolshevistik" influences in the art banned by the Nazis.

The terms *Degenerate Art* and *Decadent Art* were applied by the Nazis to "all art other than the most commonplace naturalism." Schools of forbidden artistic expression included *impressionism, expressionism, cubism, futurism*, and others. Hitler had denounced modern art as the product of "morbid and perverted minds," and reportedly shouted at one painting: "There are no blue horses!" after which he pledged to rid Germany of "aesthetic atrocities."

Any German artist who demanded the prerogative of free expression was threatened with punishment, including even sterilization:

They would be the object of great interest to the Reich, which would have to take up the question of whether future inheritance of such gruesome malfunctioning of the eyes cannot at least be checked. If, on the other hand, they themselves do not believe in the reality of such impressions by trying to harass the nation with this humbug for other reasons, then such an attempt falls within the jurisdiction of penal law.

Public attendance at the *Degenerate Art* exhibit was three times that at the *True German* exhibition, held simultaneously in Munich.

- *New York Times*, August 6, 1937

Otto Freundlich, whose sculpture *New Man* was the cover of the exhibition catalogue of *Degenerate Art*, died six years later in a Nazi concentration camp in Poland.

CENSORSHIP Alert!

P.O. BOX 2214, STATION 'A', LONDON, ONTARIO, N6A 4E3

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ CODE _____ PHONE _____

Phone: (519) 433-3305

Yes, I agree that there is too much censorship in Ontario!

I'd like to help! Here's my contribution* of \$25 \$50 \$100 \$250

\$500 \$1,000 Other _____ cheque money order

Here's my steady support! Enclosed please find (no.) _____ post-dated cheques totalling \$ _____ as my contribution* to **Censorship Alert!**

Here's an extra contribution* of \$ _____ towards more newspaper advertising in the future.

I'd like to volunteer my active support; Call me and we'll discuss what I can do!

I'd like to find out more about **Freedom Party**; Please forward more information to my attention.

*Cheques or money orders should be made payable to **Censorship Alert!** Those who contribute a minimum of \$15 per year automatically receive a 6-issue subscription to the newsletter of the same name. *Contributions are tax creditable and deemed to be an official contribution to a registered political party in the province of Ontario. All contributions to **Censorship Alert!** are exclusively devoted to fighting censorship in Ontario and in no way obligate the contributor to become a party member. Official tax receipts will be issued in time for annual tax returns; until then, your cheque is your receipt.*

Contribution	Prov. Tax Credit	Net Cost
\$25	\$18.75	\$6.25
\$50	\$37.50	\$12.50
\$100	\$75.00	\$25.00
\$250	\$150.00	\$100.00
\$500	\$275.00	\$225.00
\$1,000	\$450.00	\$550.00

Canadian child porn 'serious problem'

VANCOUVER (CP) — There is not much commercial child pornography produced in Canada but it is a serious problem, says a federal justice department spokesman.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY THE CENSOR'S FAVOURITE MYTH

21

Although repeated opinion polls have revealed that the majority of Canadians oppose the prohibition of consenting adults depicted in sexual situations, many continue to support the concept that "some" censorship is necessary --- particularly to combat the "serious problem" of child pornography.

But *child pornography* is very rare in Canada --- and its rarity has nothing to do with the nature of our censorship laws, but with the plain and simple fact that *there is no significant market demand* for a product that most people (over 99%, according to a poll commissioned by the *Canadian Unity Information Office*, November 1984) find patently offensive.

Unlike the "underground markets" that develop as a result of legal prohibitions in areas dealing with narcotics, prostitution, gambling, sexually-explicit magazines, films, etc., no easily identifiable underground market for child pornography really exists.

Law enforcement agencies in Ontario *have never made a seizure of items or publications depicting child pornography in any commercial outlet*, nor have any arrests or charges ever been made as to the commercial manufacture or production of child pornography in Ontario.

In those rare, isolated cases where an issue of "child porn" surfaces, the most sophisticated equipment used in the manufacture of said material has generally been a *Polaroid* camera, and the offenders have more often than not been the parents or guardians of the children involved.

Not *child pornography*, but *child abuse*.

Just because a camera was present during the commission of a crime is no reason to justify changing the *nature* of the crime.

In any event, "child pornography" remains one of the primary justifications for the necessity of having censorship laws, laws that invariably find themselves aimed at popular *adult* publications like *Playboy*, *Penthouse*, and *Hustler*. The common distaste we all have for child porn has been used to emotionally trick us into believing that censorship is in some way capable of dealing with a *criminal* offence. It isn't. Of what value are vague, subjective, undefinable laws dealing with "obscenity" when the crime in question is very clear and definable?

It simply isn't necessary to have far-reaching and vaguely-worded censorship laws to deal with the legitimate protection of minors; existing criminal laws dealing with rape, statutory rape, or kidnapping should be more than sufficient to accomplish this task. In cases where such convictions could be obtained (based on the *evidence* available), all persons associated with the photography, printing, and retailing of such a product would be accessories to a felony.

Such protections would be specific and precise, open to far less interpretation than our currently-worded obscenity and censorship laws, and for a change, the target of the law would be the *criminal*, not the right to freedom of expression of millions of innocent and uninvolved citizens. ●

CENSORSHIP Alert!

AT THE
(KENT)

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON DAILY NEWSPAPERS

Editors Robert Metz & Marc Emery testify on the danger of government intervention in the area of the daily newspaper in these 1981 Royal Commission hearings.

This free booklet is yours if you just send a stamped, self-addressed envelope to:

P.O. Box 2214, Stn. A,
London, Ontario, N6A 4E3



Seka: - not degraded, and never known of anyone in porn industry to be...

"Ordeal" Continues...

LINDA LOVELACE STILL A "VICTIM"

They say pornography is a victimless crime. But is a five-, seven-, or nine-year-old child not a victim? Snuff films, where they actually kill the women... mutilation films... and me. Was I any less a victim at 21 than a nine-year-old?

*When you see the movie **Deep Throat**, you are watching me being raped. It is a crime that movie is still showing; there was a gun to my head the entire time.*

- Linda "Lovelace" Marchiano
[Toronto Sun, March 20, 1981]



Lovelace: ...rape of mind and body...

Anyone hearing the above testimony for the first time would surely be led to conclude that the commercial pornography industry is based on force, violence, and coercion. But when *Deep Throat* star Linda Lovelace made those comments in Toronto in March 1981, she was promoting her then-released book *Ordeal*, which was described as "the heartbreaking story of a young woman forced into a nightmare of terror, humiliation and abuse."

But Lovelace's promotional comments about her book were highly misleading, and in direct conflict with what she had to say about the commercial porn industry within the pages of her book. In fact, *Ordeal* had much less to do with the nature of pornography than it had to do with the nature of Linda "Lovelace" Marchiano herself.

Lovelace's "ordeal", apparently, began at a very early age:

When I was four years old, [my mother] started beating me --- first with a belt, later with the buckle of the belt. She would hit me for the smallest thing. One time she sent me down to the drugstore for nosedrops and I came back with the wrong [brand]. I was only eleven and she hit me with a broomstick for that mistake. She said I would have gotten the right bottle if I didn't have my mind on boys so much.

Boys. That was a laugh. Boys were the last thing on my mind. No one ever told me anything about sex. Only one message ever came through clearly: Sex was bad.

To escape her ordeal of childhood, Marchiano soon fell into the second stage of her ordeal --- her relationship with Chuck Traynor, who effectively led her into a life of prostitution during which, at one point, he forced her (at gunpoint, according to Marchiano) to perform a sexual act in front of a camera. It is to that single incident that Marchiano alludes, when claiming that "there was a gun to my head the entire time" --- and *not* to the production of *Deep Throat* or the commercial porn industry in general.

In fact, on the first day of shooting (film, not guns) on the set of *Deep Throat*, Marchiano had this to say:

Something was happening to me, something strange. It had to do with the fact that no one was treating me like garbage. And maybe it was just the chemistry of being part of a group. For the first time in many months, I was thrown in with other people, other people who weren't perverted and threatening. I became part of a group. I began to ease up.

...I was laughing along with the rest of them. And I thought my face would break. I hadn't laughed, really laughed, in so long that my face had to carve new smile lines... ...And no one was asking me to do anything I didn't want to do. - *Ordeal*, pg. 129

Deep Throat, says Marchiano in retrospect, became for her both "a low point and a salvation." It was the fame created by the movie's popularity that eventually proved to be her avenue of escape from the *true* ordeal she was experiencing at the time: her relationship with Chuck Traynor.

But none of these factors were brought to light during the U.S. Senate Subcommittee hearings on pornography (October 1984), or by the press that covered the proceedings. It did not seem inconsistent to anyone that, as a (former) porn actress, Marchiano stood virtually alone in her condemnation of an industry that many other porn actors, actresses, and producers spoke favourably of.

Why the change in attitude on Marchiano's part? Because of a *new* relationship --- with radical feminists --- feminists who have found in Marchiano the same basic characteristics supposedly exploited by the porn industry, and they were now exploiting them to their own benefit.

To help them combat pornography, Marchiano adopted their arguments ranging from "child pornography" to "snuff films" --- arguments that had nothing to do with *her own experience* and are therefore irrelevant to any public testimony based on such experience.

As was the case when, according to Marchiano, Chuck Traynor "raped her mind," the feminists (who are the very people cited in the **CA!** article 'Men Love Death...' elsewhere in this issue), have managed to manipulate Marchiano into advocating *their* cause --- the promotion of censorship --- which has little or nothing to do with the experience of Marchiano herself.

The "rape" continues... ●

ONTARIO TEACHERS FAVOUR CENSORSHIP

Parents joining or attending their *Home and School Associations* may have been surprised to find a pamphlet sponsored by the *Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario* entitled *Pornography --- Say NO* among the information packages handed out at their meetings.

The pamphlet, developed to "encourage political action" through an emotionally-based appeal, cited a "moral endorsement of the right of society, through its government, to limit freedom of expression."

Calling for a "strengthening of the Criminal Code" through a clear definition of "obscenity" and "pornography," amendments to the *Canada Broadcasting Act* to prohibit "any abusive comment or abusive pictorial representation of *any sex*," and display and distribution controls enacted by municipal councils, the *Federation of Women Teachers' Associations* relied heavily on sensationalism, inaccurate information, and on the popularly misused research conducted by Edward Donnerstein of Wisconsin to support its cause.

"We believe that no one would consider it appropriate for youngsters to view the amputation of several fingers from a woman's hand and the disemboweling of that woman for the sexual pleasure of a man," claims the pamphlet, as though there were some preponderance of individuals who would actually approve of such a thing. (Bringing 'children' needlessly into the debate is a clever way of manipulating emotional response.)

The Federation's example of 'amputation' and 'disembowling' was taken specifically from a fictional film entitled *Snuff*, which, in areas where there were *no* censorship bans on the film, lived an extremely short theatre lifespan. However, in jurisdictions where censorship exists, the film lives on and has probably been shown to more people through the efforts of the *Ontario Censor Board* than ever saw it where it ran uncensored.


Anyone who has had the displeasure of viewing the disembowlement scene from *Snuff* (and we at **Censorship Alert!** have) would have to wonder at the claim that it was carried out "for the sexual pleasure of a man." In the scene, as presented by the Censor Board's 'out-takes,' "sexual pleasure" was the *last* thing one would consider having been an element in the film. To begin with, the disembowlement was carried out by more than one person (including a woman), there was no nudity in the scene, and the "pleasure" experienced by the sickos engaged in their perverted act bordered more on some bizarre 'religious' experience than sexual. Strictly for pain and cruelty fans, there was nothing *sexual* about this scene at all.

Yet, the *Federation of Women Teachers' Associations* would like us to believe differently.

As to their claim that such material is readily available --- it simply isn't. In fact, that's one of the reasons why the scene is present in the Censor Board's out-takes; *it was censored*. Furthermore, material of this nature is relatively so rare that the Censor Board has been forced to repeatedly use the *same scene* from *Snuff* as its favourite example of the kind of material "readily available" since the film was first produced in 1975.

As to the research conducted by Edward Donnerstein (who is an *opponent* of censorship), we'd best let him speak for himself:

My material is misquoted. I would need a 24-hour-a-day person to handle all the misquotes about my research. When people discuss the research, they wrongly interpret my findings by saying that exposure to pornography leads to rape.



First of all, we don't study rape behaviour. We study laboratory aggression. Secondly, we don't study --- and I hate to use the term --- pornography. We study violent material.

In a 1985 interview published in *Penthouse* magazine, Donnerstein claimed that significant changes in attitudes about sexual violence toward women was *not* caused by X-rated films and magazines but rather came about after men viewed certain *R-rated movies* or *prime-time television shows*.

"One magazine, which I will not name, wrote that my research found 'pornography' leads toward a desensitization to rape victims. However, the material used in the studies was not pornographic movies, but *R-rated movies* --- very popular movies which most teenagers see."

(continued on page 19)

Wire Services

LOS ANGELES — The father of a teenager who killed himself after listening to a song about suicide by heavy-metal rock singer Ozzy Osbourne has filed suit against the artist and his record companies.

Alleging that CBS Records issued Osbourne's albums "with the knowledge that such would, or at the very least could, promote suicide," lawyer Thomas Anderson said Monday the case seeks unspecified compensation and punitive damages that could amount to millions.

John McCollum, 19, shot himself in the head with his father's .22-calibre pistol on Oct. 27, 1984, in his father's home in North Hollywood.

There seems to be a belief prevalent, or at least being seriously postulated in media, that individual's *actions* can be directly "manipulated" by words or visual means. Many people believe that since 'A' is associated (in whatever manner) with event 'B', then 'A' must be *caused* by 'B'.

Although ideas and images may certainly *influence* a person's behaviour, to attribute a *direct* link with a specific type of action is not consonant with scientific studies. A person's actions are, to a much greater extent, influenced by personal contacts, upbringing, and acquired values. The same word or image that may trigger violent or irrational behaviour in one person may trigger *positive* action in the behaviour of another. There is really no way to predict what will incite people to action --- or what kind of action they take.

Virtually anything could "trigger" some people to violence. To quote U.S. Supreme Court Judge William O. Douglas, "It would be a futile effort even for a censor to attempt to remove all that might possibly stimulate anti-social conduct."

Rock music, games (i.e., *Dungeons & Dragons*), television programs, film, books, religion, etc., are just *some* of the things that have been blamed for people's actions by those who seem to share the view of primitive cultures that words or images have "magical" properties that can affect events.

In January 1986, Jack McCollum brought suit against heavy-metal rock singer Ozzy Osbourne and his record

Lawsuit says rock lyrics led to suicide

Who's Responsible?

IDEAS vs. ACTION

We should have a great many fewer disputes in the world if words were taken for what they are, the signs of our ideas only, and not for things themselves.

-John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*

company, *CBS Records*, alleging that they issued the artist's albums "with the knowledge that such would, or at the very least could, promote suicide." McCollum's 19-year-old son, while drinking alcohol and listening to Osbourne's album, shot himself in the head with his father's gun in October 1984. McCollum argued that Osbourne's song promoted suicide; under California law, it is a felony to encourage anyone to commit suicide --- which encouraged the father to launch his suit.

Some important questions need to be considered here: for example, can we assume that *CBS* and Osbourne knew in advance what would motivate a person's behaviour? Should McCollum also sue the store that sold the record? --- the company that produced the alcoholic beverage? --- the store that sold the alcohol? --- the company that manufactured the weapon used? --- or the manufacturer of the bullet used? Or perhaps Jack McCollum was himself responsible for purchasing the gun in the first place?

Regrettably, the death of John McCollum (his son) came about directly as a consequence of only *one* person's *action* --- his own.

If we look for scapegoats to avoid such realities and responsibility, we will no doubt find them. But if censorship and the forcible restraint of ideas becomes the accepted reaction to such events, then who will be responsible for the consequences of the *censor's actions*?



FREEDOM OF CHOICE
is what
FREEDOM PARTY
is all about!



IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THE FREEDOM PARTY OF ONTARIO;

P.O. BOX 2214, STATION A, LONDON, ONTARIO, N6A 4E3 - PHONE 433-8612

FREEDOM PARTY believes the purpose of government is to protect *our freedom of choice, not to restrict it.*