

# The Function of the Christian within the Realm of the Ongoing Power Struggle

*The writer of this contribution is Dr. John H. Court, Senior Lecturer in Psychology, Flinders University. He is a leading member of the Community Standards Organisation in South Australia and the author of the booklet "Changing Community Standards" published by Lutheran Publishing House this year. The present contribution is based on a talk given to the Melancthon Society at Luther Seminary, on November 7 of this year.*

## 1. SOME POSSIBILITIES FOR ACTION

In speaking to this topic, I must confine myself to the restricted area I know from personal experience. It has become clear that the injunction 'Come ye apart and be ye separate' is in danger of being over-interpreted to suggest we must totally divorce ourselves from the power structure of society. By contrast, I would first state that there seem to be a number of areas where Christians can, and should, become involved. This involvement may be individually or collectively (though probably not through the vehicle of the local congregation - see Triton<sup>(1)</sup>).

In general the Christian should expect to

- (a) be able to inform when he has specific knowledge (e.g., professional, scientific, commercial) which can guide those in authority;
- (b) engage in debate with those of other viewpoints;
- (c) take a calculatedly moral stand - if he does not, it is likely no-one else will;
- (d) seek enforcement of existing laws;
- (e) combat actively the minority group of radicals who are seeking power;
- (f) use the media as much as possible, while recognizing opportunities may be subject to strong bias;
- (g) attract opposition and hostility as he begins to become effective.

## 2. SOME FORCES TO COMBAT

(a) There has grown up in recent years an increasing powerful force under the name of scientific humanism which is influencing our way of life beyond what is commonly recognized. Its influence is such that their support appears to be great, yet in fact they are only a small but militant minority at the present time.

Since Humanism of an earlier time has had such positive connotations, and because of the rational and optimistic viewpoint presented by contemporary *scientific humanism* it is easy to lose sight of the underlying assumptions which provide its driving force.

Its basic position has been succinctly described by Alan Walker of Sydney - "Humanism rejects God. It claims there is no need for anything beyond man. It projects man into the place which belongs only to God. It therefore severs itself from the grace of God. Humanism lacks understanding of evil. Absurdly optimistic about human nature it opens the gates to corruption." (2)

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 10102577 7

MOORE COLLEGE  
LIBRARY



It is after identifying that philosophy that we can proceed to spell out the aspirations of humanists for social reform. The widespread pattern of change takes shape as one recognizes that it represents the efforts of humanists (among others) with clearly defined goals. Their seven point plan is -

1. Legalisation of homosexuality between consenting males.
2. Legislation for easy abortion.
3. Legislation for easy divorce wherever the marriage has "broken down."
4. Legalisation of euthanasia.
5. Abolition of all censorship or control of pornography.
6. Abolition of religious education in schools.
7. Permissive laws on the use of soft drugs. (3)

That a substantial measure of success has already been achieved with this programme should be a warning to all who hold a different philosophy of life. While plausible arguments may be put forward for most of the programme whereby public support is readily attracted, the whole pattern needs to be examined before parts of it are endorsed. Christians exposed to the prevailing teachings of situation ethics are particularly ill-equipped to offer any alternative to the humanists' programme. They will readily ally themselves with much of it. A cautionary note must therefore be sounded.

(b) Some for *personal* and essentially psychopathological reasons are seeking to influence the community to change its norms to accommodate them.

When we turn to problems of the political and social regulation of culture, it is obvious that "total permissiveness" cannot be the answer, but in this sphere of human experience our essential freedom demands a degree of coercion. This is necessary to retrain the fanatical immoralist whose aim is the destruction of meaning, and the destruction of that love which he feels he can never know . . . . To maintain our humanness, we must protect ourselves from those who having failed to find their own humanness, seek to attack and diminish ours - and who have a special inclination, it seems, to make this reductive attack on children. (4)

(c) The small but militant group of *radicals* and *revolutionaries* must be taken seriously since they, like the humanists, have a programme to which they are dedicated. Though identified with university campuses, their sense of personal frustration and hostility against society finds an echo much wider. They share the concern of many Christians about the sick state of contemporary Western society with its hypocritical standards and its failure to come to terms with significant human values. But their proposals for change are diametrically opposed to any Christian thinking about reconstruction or reconciliation. Whereas the Christian answer is directed to analysis of society's problems in terms of personal sin and need, the revolutionary seeks the overthrow of the establishment in order to make way for the "alternative society." In order to achieve such a goal, anarchy is seen as a necessary step which must be facilitated.

(d) The radicals have well-defined means for achieving the goals of overthrow of the establishment and creation of anarchy, even though the form of the alternative society is less clearly specified. However, this may be unimportant since there is ample support for those goals from explicitly *Communist* influences to ensure that at the appropriate point, conditions will be ripe for the introduction of a communist way of life. This force, collaborating with or at least moving in the same direction as the others, is producing a powerful alliance capable of infiltrating traditional values and standards over a very short space of time. In other words, while it would be clearly foolish to suggest that all the forces seeking major reforms of a "permissive" kind

are Communist-inspired, it may well be that there are many who for different motivations are inadvertently providing the direction and impetus which would be endorsed by those openly seeking to promote communistic ideals.

Because it has been unpopular since the American McCarthy era to identify such aspirations publicly it becomes particularly important to give at least a few examples of areas where expressions of intent have been made, both in relation to revolutionary groups generally, and Communists in particular. These examples will be drawn only from areas with which I am familiar, and the obvious power of Communism within the field of labour relations will be taken for granted.

### 3. SOME AREAS OF STRUGGLE

Within the area of *sexual permissiveness*, a radical student writing in a university newspaper clearly expressed the goal that some are seeking.

We are certainly at the crossroads. So-called permissiveness, sexiness, moral relaxation have gone as far as they can without beginning to alter *radically* our civilisation. (5)

The calculated use of sexually explicit *entertainment* was endorsed by the Communists in a response to enquiries from party members in Italy on how to react to it.

We are interested in encouraging this type of play, and are likewise prepared to praise actors of such plays as champions of artistic freedom. We want to encourage this sort of production, and must lead people on to produce others that are, sexually speaking, more daring still. As a tactical policy our aim is to defend an enterprise which is pornographic and entirely free from the restrictions of ordinary moral rules. The producers and actors are, in effect, like ants working voluntarily and without pay for us as they eat at the very roots of bourgeois society. Why should we stop them at their work? Why should we place obstacles in their path? (6)

The very *language* we use is the subject of attack for explicit reasons too. Those who think the increasing acceptance of blasphemies and obscenities is simply part of an evolving contemporary society are being dangerously naive. Behind the natural developments of language associated with a fast-changing society we need to recognize explicit encouragement of some changes rather than others.

James Michener says "numerous committed revolutionaries have preached that the debasement of language is one of the most powerful agencies for the destruction of existing society. They argue 'if you destroy the word, you can destroy the system, and they have set out consciously to do both.'" (7)

Similarly, Richard Neville, one of the subjects of the OZ trial in London, has written that "the incidence and intensity of this 'filthy' language will increase as the new revolutionaries become less concerned with immediate issues and more determined to create total social chaos . . . . If anarchy is an essential precursor of the creation of an alternative society, so the deflowering of language, rendering it obscene and useless, is merely part of the process of structuring a new one." (8)

The traditional Christian restraint in use of language, including injunctions against swearing, may now be seen to have a deeper significance than appeared in earlier times when traditional values were not being openly challenged.



The forces seeking to change *family* and society are gaining wider acceptance. A milestone of change occurred with the distribution of *The Little Red Schoolbook*. This calculated indoctrination of the young was so open and yet so skilful that few governments saw the need to inhibit its distribution. In spite of its direct assault on the established pattern of authority within the family and society, it has been widely distributed. Its title should have been enough to alert responsible authorities to its message. Those who have tried to rationalize its acceptance as a healthy exposure of limitations in the education system must come to terms with the admission of one of the authors who now acknowledges that the book was never intended as a comment on education, but as an exercise in anarchy.

A government that fails to restrict the influence of material of the kind found in *The Little Red Schoolbook* may be challenged in terms of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whose Article 16 (3) states that

The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by Society and the State. (9)

Similarly, the terms of the UNICEF Declaration of the Rights of the Child are relevant.

Principle 2. The child shall enjoy special protection, and shall be given opportunities and facilities, by law and by other means, to enable him to develop physically, mentally, morally, spiritually and socially in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration. (10)

If an ideology is to gain maximum acceptance in the community, it will most readily do so by influencing the mass communication media, especially TV. That there has been a major shift in standards of acceptability in recent years is undisputed, bringing about the creation in Britain of the National Viewers' and Listeners' Association, and in Australia the Community Standards Association.

Recently the Federal Attorney-General (Senator Greenwood) was involved in an uproar over the degree of control which should be exercised over the ABC and he stated that "a substantial group of ABC employees was trying to ensure that there would be no control over the ABC. The ideology of the group could be called 'New Left.' He referred to an article in the Communist Party publication *Tribune* of June 3rd, 1970: "A powerful body of mass media employees are setting their sights on a struggle."

It is the calculated distortions of information and ideas which make the criterion of "prevailing community standards" in the area of censorship a peculiarly hazardous one. This might appear to be an argument against having censorship. However, it is better to see this as an argument for censorship properly conducted than against it with consequent lack of protection.

It is my contention here that a pattern of change in prevailing standards is occurring. Examples of such changes have been taken from the areas of entertainment, news, the use of language, and standards of sexual morality. These changes have been identified with the aspirations of three groups (humanists, radicals and Communists) who should not be seen as necessarily in collaboration with each other. Yet they do have this in common that all are explicitly anti-Christian in their philosophy, so a similarity of goals is not surprising. These groups also have in common a clear sense of purpose and a dedication to the achievement of their goals. Many with emotional problems ally themselves with one or other of these ideologies.

Members of a democratic society cannot just call for suppression of the ideas of other in the hope that they will go away. Yet the need to inhibit the expression of ideas that will damage the society can be defended since one function of the law is to protect society. But more constructively, there is a real need for those who believe in Christian values to rise up to express them, defend them, proclaim them and, above all, *live* them. If there were an equal dedication to change, and an equal certainty about goals among professing Christians as there is among those who seek the overthrow of Christian values, there would be a very different pattern of change. We live in a society where person responsibility for involvement is at a premium.

#### 4. SOME COMMON OBJECTIONS

Anyone prepared to question a prevailing trend is soon enough called upon to defend his actions. Not only those who favour the present changes in prevailing standards seek to discourage those who speak out; even those who dislike the changes will often find reasons to criticize, sometimes because they cannot see how a stand for high standards can be justified; sometimes because of guilt as their conscience is pricked to participate but preferring not to "rock the boat."

Many of the objects revolve around the extent to which the State should involve itself in peoples' private behaviour. The importance of civil liberties is stressed by those who wish to see the State exercise less control, and the philosophy of John Stuart Mill is given prominence. Others stress the importance of distinguishing sin from crime, referring to the Wolfenden Report for support. Behind these issues arises the difficulty of defining what standards should prove acceptable in contemporary society, with the obvious conclusion that if there are no agreed standards, then no clear principles can be established.

All these issues are sufficiently complex to deserve detailed attention by experts, and much has been written. Broadly the writing is from one or another of two positions. The 'civil liberties' position, which stresses individual freedom of choice, denies the right of the State to intervene in personal morality, and rejects absolute standards of moral conduct, is popular today. Briefly this could be labelled as a "my right" position. The other position derives from Christian teaching and might be labelled a "my responsibility" position. It recognises the needs of others which may take priority over one's own wishes. It questions whether personal behaviour can ever be divorced from its consequences for others. And, to be able to offer anything constructive at all, it involves a belief in revelation which does provide rules for living for all.

Having distinguished these two positions some of the common issues may now be considered briefly. A fuller discussion of these issues may be found in books by Barclay, (11) Triton, (1) and Anderson. (12)

##### (a) What right have you to interfere in the affairs of others?

This question is a central expression of those who proclaim a civil libertarian viewpoint. It illustrates well that we are moving towards not a permissive society but a "laissez-faire" society, in which one does not break rules because no-one makes any, and in which "you leave me alone, and I'll not interfere with you." At first sight this sounds like freedom for all, but in fact the result is licence for some at the expense of many.

The question as asked usually has an aggressive undertone as a sense of personal threat is implied. However, the question may be legitimately rephrased: "What responsibility have I to be concerned for the welfare of others?" So expressed, it is clear that all in a democracy must exercise



this relationship if the rights of all are to be protected. It does of course mean that one must have reason to believe one's intervention in the affairs of others is for good reasons and on a sound basis. The ethic of Christian concern can provide such a basis.

Interestingly, one sees this activity in others too when some of the less personal issues of morality are at stake. For example, the reasons advanced for seeking to prevent French nuclear testing in the Pacific Ocean have a very close parallel to those which may be advanced for seeking restraint of pornography. Consistency would demand concern and action in both areas. Both involve intervening in the plans of others on the ground that harm could occur, and the risk is sufficiently great to override the freedom of others to act unilaterally. Both relate to harm which would be delayed and hard to specify exactly, but one need not doubt the reality in either instance.

The responsibility is especially pressing where the needs of the young, the weak and the disadvantaged are concerned, but Biblical teaching includes one's neighbour more broadly, even one's enemies. Such a willingness to put the needs of others before one's own self-interest is a concept which is increasingly little understood in our contemporary hedonistic society.

(b) *The law has no place in the bedroom*

This cliché is widely quoted to imply that what a person chooses to do in private is his own affair and should not be the subject of legal sanction. As a *general* proposition it makes a worthwhile point, as indeed the law must intervene as little as possible in private lives. But it derives from the view that we can distinguish private from public behaviour - an arbitrary distinction not fully sustained even by Mill. The development of psychological knowledge has blurred the boundaries to the point that such a distinction is meaningless. What a man does in privacy affects his subsequent behaviour and relationships.

The point is made commonly in the context of justifying pornographic materials in private homes but not in public, and to defend the removal of legal sanctions against homosexuality. However, the principle is only usable up to a point. Other considerations may need to override the principle. The law recognizes this in its retention of sanctions against rape and incest. There are, in other words, restrictions on what can be done in private. To subscribe without restrictions to the view that the law shall *never* intervene in the bedroom is to strike a blow for the legalisation of rape and incest. Not many will seriously advocate this. Failing this absolute position, it is proper to assess the relative importance of personal liberty and social responsibility.

(c) *Censorship is anti-democratic*

This is a superficial assessment of the real value of censorship. A serious consideration of the implications of having no censorship makes clear that a generally agreed scheme of quality control is far more compatible with democratic principles than removal of such controls.

Traditionally the law has accepted this responsibility for interpreting community standards even at the risk of infringing individual freedom. As long as the majority was prepared to accept that it was proper for the law to act in this protective way, censorship and similar constraints on freedom of action operated with little question. Today, however, personal freedom is often prized more highly than the good of society more generally, so politicians and legislators are being forced into the position of extending the

boundaries of personal freedom so widely that those least able to object suffer most. The law must surely recognize a human right to protection from offence that many anti-censorship enthusiasts have forgotten. In the words of Ruth Brine, "If some have the right to pornography, others have an equal right not to have it foisted on them." (13) Or, as Haynes has put it, "If individual freedom demands that person X can read document A, it also demands that person Y may avoid reading it if he so desires. Thus, there must always be restrictions on the *display* of material." (14)

Strangely enough, it could easily happen that the minority group seeking the complete abolition of censorship for the sake of personal liberty if successful would bring about the very opposite of their intentions. Reo Christenson puts the argument for the American scene succinctly when he says: "Paradoxically, the existence of censorship probably assures *greater freedom* in America than its absence. If, somehow, the tiny minority (Gallup estimates 5-6%) which wants no censorship were to have their way, it would be an open invitation for vigilante groups to take over. Outraged at the irresponsibles, the Middle American would employ extra-legal pressures as a substitute for law. And a sorry substitute they would be. Controlling pornography by legal means and orderly institutions gives us the best assurance that society's concern will be dealt with in a civilized manner." (15)

The case has been argued at considerable length and with force by Walter Berns, a Professor of Political Economy, where he puts the acceptance of pornography in opposition to the demands of democracy. In part his argument runs as follows:

When obscenity is employed as it is today, merely in an effort to capture an audience or to shock without elevating, or in the effort to set loose idiosyncratic "selves" doing their own things, or to bring down the constitutional order, it is not justified, for it lacks the ground on which to claim exemption from the law. The modern advocates of obscenity do not seem to be aware of this consequence of their advocacy. They have obliterated the distinction between art and trash, and in so doing they have deprived themselves of the ground on which they might protest the law . . . censorship, because it inhibits self-indulgence and supports the idea of propriety and impropriety, protects political democracy; paradoxically, when it faces the problem of the justified and unjustified use of obscenity, censorship also serves to maintain the distinction between art and trash, and therefore to protect art, and thereby to enhance the quality of this democracy. (16)

## 5. LET A MAN GO TO HELL HIS OWN WAY IF HE WANTS TO

Such a policy of non-interference has only the superficialities of compassion. It is only in the area of obvious moral conduct that such suggestions are made. Taken logically, this would require us to allow a man to commit suicide without intervening. It also runs counter to an increasing amount of legislation which seeks to protect people from themselves. Compulsory forms of insurance, and consumer protection laws assume that people cannot always be relied on to act wisely even for self-interest.

An interesting example of the results of a "hands-off" policy was seen early in 1972 when Governor George Wallace was shot by Arthur Bremer. It was reported that in his diary he showed how his murderous impulses had been significantly affected by seeing the film *Clockwork Orange*. He wrote "I saw *Clockwork Orange* and thought about getting Wallace during the film." When found guilty, he was asked if he had anything to say and responded "All I wish is that you had protected me from myself."



Clearly, mature adults will be able to see such films and not be obviously affected adversely. But it is the emotionally unbalanced or criminally inclined whom we may properly fear.

## 6. THERE ARE MORE IMPORTANT ISSUES

The presence of pornography and salacious literature in a community may not be the world's greatest evil. It is easy to point to major issues like poverty, war, racism, etc., etc. as more pressing issues deserving attention. Commonly those who so object are doing little enough in a self-sacrificial way there, so the criticism loses some of its edge. Nonetheless, there are others who do see such issues as more pressing and who are involved. Especially is this true of the student generation who demonstrate real involvement over issues like war and ecological destruction.

First, therefore, one may say that each person is responsible for combating evil where he can. To be concerned about declining standards of morality is not to ignore major and obvious issues, but to be active where action can be effective. Barclay notes that "there is not a problem threatening this or any other country just now which is not a moral problem." (11)

Second, it may well be that the real driving force of moral involvement in issues like war and poverty will be progressively sapped as we permit the media to saturate us with hedonism, violence and trivial materialism.

Whatever may be the motivation behind the present flooding of western society by porn, the fact remains that sex, which is God-given and which is the fount of man's greatest creativity, is becoming in-turned and therefore destructive. Addiction to porn involves people in themselves. It can so preoccupy them as to change their attitudes to life. As their obsession grows, so they become less and less concerned with the great political and social questions of their day and consequently more and more ripe for dictatorship. (6)

Thirdly, we must not underestimate the powerfully eroding influences of salacious and pornographic material. The resulting shift in perspective on what values are worth preserving, the attitude of exploitation of others so readily cultivated, and the acceptance of lust as the norm, will all detract from any wish to involve oneself in wider needs of others.

These examples should be sufficient to caution against an unthinking fanaticism for repression or unwarranted intervention in the affairs of others. Men of good will are seeking a balanced position where good can prevail and evil be rejected. We are in danger of being moved too far away from effective control of those unhealthy and calculatedly destructive influences which are at work in society and which, if left to develop, will produce a very different pattern. Those who are optimistic enough to believe that the developments are worth promoting experimentally are irresponsibly refusing to take account of the evil in man's hearts which will triumph if not countered with continuing vigilance. The removal of restrictions against exploitation of many kinds has now gone too far. Unless we respond soberly at this point and press for a healthy corrective, we shall eventually be forced into an extremist reaction or "backlash" of a most undesirable type.

## 7. SOME GUIDELINES FOR CHRISTIAN INVOLVEMENT

Ways in which individuals or groups may play their part as responsible citizens need special thought in contemporary society, since the Christian must not seek to impose his will on others. On the other hand he must not withdraw from presenting clearly what he believes. Albert Camus is re-

ported as saying:

The world expects of Christians that they will raise their voices so loudly and clearly and so formulate their protest that not even the simplest man can have the slightest doubt about what they are saying. Further, the world expects of Christians that they will eschew all fuzzy abstractions and plant themselves squarely in front of the bloody face of history. We stand in need of folk who have determined to speak directly and unmistakably and come what may, to stand by what they have said.

A recent impressive demonstration of Christian concern arising within the existing power structure is the completion of the Longford Report on Pornography. The large committee of enquiry, set up privately by Lord Longford, expresses its viewpoint on the Christian's role:

In a free country like Britain, the Church is entitled to have its view, that pornography causes damage to the family and to the dignity of women. But is it entitled to impose this view on others? It is a long time since the Church has been in a position to impose its views. It certainly cannot do so today. But Christians are as entitled to express a view on the laws of the land as anyone else. They cannot impose, but they can reason and argue and try to gain support for their point of view, and while Britain is not a Christian country in the sense that a majority of the population are practising Christians, it has not yet adopted any other system of morals in place of Christianity. The only other philosophy in this country with a substantial following and claiming a comprehensive way of life is Marxism, and Communists are so far a smaller minority than Christians. But in trying to translate Christian ideals into the law of the land, Christians have to take into account the state of the nation. If Moses, despite the moral law, was entitled to allow divorce, so that the cast-off wives had some legal rights, then Christians today must accept that the civil law cannot be as strict as the moral law. On the one hand, private morals cannot be imposed by law. On the other hand, the law can support morality to which the vast majority agree. Most people want a country where sound morality - in the broadest sense - has public encouragement. So the Christians must gain the broadest measure of public consent by putting the case for Christian morality. (17)

Finally, a brief summary of principles presented by Triton serve as a useful guide to assessing how far and in what ways the Christian should influence the law.

... the Christian view is that, whether they admit it or not, all men are under this authority because all are created by God and all men have more than an inkling that this is so. Of course they can repress what they know, or they can try to argue it away. The New Testament, however, teaches that, as all men have an innate knowledge of God strengthened by what they see in the created order (Romans 1), many yet try to escape it and even repress it into unconsciousness. So also in the realm of ethics (Romans 2). In both areas they know enough to make this repression culpable and in both areas the Christian has the responsibility to re-evoke this knowledge and to reinforce it by all appropriate means. In relation to a society which does not acknowledge God, therefore, the Christian's task is threefold:

1. To get the basic moral law acknowledged as widely as possible, reinforcing it by argument from experience and where appropriate by appeal to the authority of God. We want people to realise that if we break God's law we and our society are injured.



2. To get this moral law embodied in legislation and custom as far as is possible and wise, even when a minority do not accept it, because it is known to be the Creator's law and therefore the best for *all* men.

3. To let men know that to flout this Creator's law is not merely a matter of opinion or temporary fancy, nor is it merely a question of social convention, but it is basically to rebel against our loving Creator and the way he made us. (18)

Triton adds later:

We are not advocating that every moral precept of the New Testament should be embodied in legislation. There are in fact three criteria . . . . The evil must first of all be clearly definable . . . . It must be something which has sufficient general support so that the law will not be brought into contempt . . . the law must be enforceable . . . . It becomes clear that the church, and Christian in society, have got to work all the time to increase awareness of our moral responsibilities. (19)

#### Footnotes

- (1) Triton, A.N. *Whose World?* (I.V.P., 1970).
- (2) Walker, A. Quoted by Traill, J.D. See (3)
- (3) Traill, J.D., "Humanism and the campaign for 'reform' of social laws," in *Why Abortion? Proceedings of a Public Meeting in Melbourne, June 1st, 1971.* Human Life Research Foundation.
- (4) Holbrook, D., *Sex and Dehumanization.* (London: Pitman, 1972).
- (5) *Empire Times.* Flinders University student newspaper. October, 1971.
- (6) Quoted in Whitehouse, M., *Who does she think she is?* (New English Library, London, 1971).
- (7) Michener, J., *Kent State - What Happened and Why?* (Secker & Warburg, 1972).
- (8) Nevill, R., *Play Power.* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).
- (9) United Nations. Office of Public Information, 1948.
- (10) UNICEF Declaration of the Rights of the Child, 1959.
- (11) Barclay, W., *Ethics in a Permissive Society* (Fontana, 1971).
- (12) Anderson, J.N.D., *Morality, Law and Grace* (Tyndale, 1972).
- (13) Brine, R. Quoted in *TIME*, 5.4.71.
- (14) Haynes, J., "Problems of Censorship," *Interchange*, 1970, 2, 4.
- (15) Christenson, R. in *Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography* (Bantam Books, 1970).
- (16) Berns, W., "Pornography vs. Democracy: the Case for Censorship," *Quadrant*, 1971, 70, 15(2), 19-32.
- (17) Longford, Lord, *Pornography/ The Longford Report* (London: Coronet Books, 1972).
- (18) A.N. Triton, pp. 90-91.
- (19) A.N. Triton, pp. 100-102.