

# MORAL CRUSADES AND MEDIA CENSORSHIP

**BILL  
THOMPSON**

## **Sociological Notes No. 11**

ISSN 0267-7113 ISBN 1 85637 036 4

An occasional publication of the Libertarian Alliance,  
25 Chapter Chambers, Esterbrooke Street,  
London SW1P 4NN

www.libertarian.co.uk email: admin@libertarian.co.uk

© 1991: Libertarian Alliance; Bill Thompson.

This article was first published in *Franco-British Studies*,  
No. 9, Spring 1990, and is reprinted with permission.

Dr. Bill Thompson is Lecturer in Media Studies at the  
University of Reading, having taught previously at the  
Universities of Cambridge and Essex. He has written on  
various topics within the field of criminology, and the  
sociology of moral panics and fundamentalism. He has  
delivered papers to academic conferences in Britain, France  
and America. He addressed the LA Conference on  
“Censorship, Free Speech and Pornography” in 1986.

The views expressed in this publication are those of its  
author, and not necessarily those of the Libertarian  
Alliance, its Committee, Advisory Council or subscribers.

Director: Dr Chris R. Tame  
Editorial Director: Brian Micklethwait  
Webmaster: Dr Sean Gabb

**A**GAIN the word of the Lord came  
unto me, saying,

2 Son of man, speak to the children of thy  
people, and say unto them, When I bring  
the sword upon a land, if the people of the  
land take a man of their coasts, and set  
him for their watchman:

3 If when he seeth the sword come upon  
the land, he blow the trumpet, and warn  
the people;

4 Then whosoever heareth the sound of  
the trumpet, and taketh not warning; if the  
sword come, and take him away, his blood  
shall be upon his own head.

5 He heard the sound of the trumpet, and  
took not warning; his blood shall be upon  
him. But he that taketh warning shall de-  
liver his soul.

6 But if the watchman see the sword  
come, and blow the trumpet, and the  
people be not warned; if the sword come,  
and take any person from among them, he  
is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood  
will I require at the watchman's hand.

*Ezekiel 33: 1-6.*

**Libertarian  
Alliance**

**FOR LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY**

# MORAL CRUSADES AND MEDIA CENSORSHIP

BILL THOMPSON

Media censorship in Britain is increasing, especially in the area of sexually orientated material designed for entertainment rather than instruction. This censorship has two forms: direct control through legislation of 'pornography'; and the not so obvious 'chill factor', which effectively extends that control to mainstream broadcasting.

Direct control includes: the Child Protection Act (1978), outlawing 'child pornography'; the Indecent Displays (Control) Act (1981) curtailing graphic advertisements for sexually orientated material; Clause 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act (1982) closing 500 sex shops; the Cinematographic Acts (1982 and 1985), eliminating sex cinemas; the Video Recordings Act (1984), reintroducing pre-censorship into Britain; and Clause 28 of the Local Government Act (1988), forbidding public funding of any art form deemed to be promoting homosexuality. Prosecutions and prohibitions under these Acts extend far beyond the 'pornographic'; survival manuals, rock records, computer games, and women's wrestling have all been targeted. A Broadcasting Standards Council (hereafter BSC) has also been established to oversee the content of television programmes.

The 'chill factor' is widespread; the following examples merely illustrate the range, not the extent.<sup>1</sup> Bookstores withdrew a children's sex education manual called *Make It Happy* and video stores removed *Possession and Contamination* from their shelves, while TV companies purchased but did not transmit *Rambo: First Blood* and *The Life of Brian*, for fear of causing 'offence'. Episodes in series like *Miami Vice* are frequently dropped. Benny Hill, Britain's most popular comedian and TV export, was recently 'retired'; and two of Britain's top comedians, Rowan Atkinson and Mel Smith, had to reshoot scenes for the film *Camden Town Boy* to be shown on London Weekend Television. The Head of Drama at LWT, Nick Elliot, admitted: "In today's climate we feel there is no alternative but to tone it down." It is this climate that forces the BBC constantly to revise its codes for self-censorship, but fails to halt the growing number of 'pulled' programmes, which even include an AIDS documentary. The most striking example, however, is the growing number of programmes censored for political reasons. These include TV plays like *Urban Jungle* and a documentary, *Brazil: Cinema, Sex and the Generals*, covering the subject of censorship! During 1987, BBC journalists were even forbidden to interview the cast of the musical comedy *Burgess, Philby & Maclean* because spying is a 'sensitive' subject.

Taken together, these measures which censor both the explicit and the not-so-explicit create an anomaly within Europe. Despite difficulties presented by increasing

cross-border trade and broadcasting within the EEC, British authorities are extending control of material deemed harmful to moral standards - be it sex or 'gratuitous' violence. The Government dread 1992 with its threat that shops and airwaves will be flooded with pornography; in September 1989, they announced an intention to prevent the transmission of sexually-orientated material by satellite.

This policy has faced little opposition. Although most opinion polls show that the public do not want censorship on television and videos for adults, anti-censorship groups have little active support. Even Liberty, the British civil rights organisation, supports the censorship of 'pin-ups' in papers and magazines. So why does Britain take an attitude to depictions of sex and morality which is so radically different from that of most other West European countries?

The origins of media censorship, demands for more controls, and public acquiescence can be traced to well-organised fundamentalist Christian media reform movements; their crusades against 'immorality' create the climate in which wider controls flourish. For reasons covered elsewhere, I will call these groups 'moral crusaders'.<sup>2</sup> Academics tend to ignore, play down or misunderstand the crusaders' role<sup>3</sup> and create erroneous accounts of British censorship. The most popular version claims crusaders form part of the 'New Right' within the Conservative Party.<sup>4</sup> Not so: there has always been a symbiotic link between media moral crusades, evangelical protestant revivals, and changes in production or distribution of the material involved, especially when they have meant larger audiences at cheaper prices. The contemporary demand for more censorship is no exception, and the crusaders' activities are vital to an explanation of British moral attitudes. Their philosophy has never completely dominated society; but the extent of media censorship reflects the strength of these movements.<sup>5</sup>

## CRUSADERS: ORGANISATIONS AND BELIEFS

Contemporary moral crusade organisations include: the National Viewers and Listeners Association (hereafter called NVALA), Christian Action Research and Education (hereafter CARE), Family and Youth Concern; and local groups like Portsmouth Area Family Concern (hereafter PACS). Membership ranges from 200 in NVALA to 80,000 affiliates in CARE. These organisations draw most of their membership and support from the growing number of Independent fundamentalist Churches experiencing revival.<sup>6</sup>

According to sociologists, the crusaders are suffering from a loss of respectability and status, they come from declining classes and are suffering social and economic dissonance, and seek public affirmation of their values which

they regain through a crusade as a form of compensation.<sup>7</sup> This speculation ignores the religious dimension. Moral crusaders have always been drawn from the ranks of evangelical Christians,<sup>8</sup> they promote values inculcated during their socialisation and maintained by their church community,<sup>9</sup> and their motives are religious.<sup>10</sup>

Though their public rationales have changed over time to suit their audience, including a move away from moral to causalist justifications,<sup>11</sup> their motivation follows the attempt to apply Biblical standards to contemporary society, seen as a battleground between good and evil.<sup>12</sup> Crusaders are also in awe and fear of God's 'collective judgement'. They can point to numerous examples in the Bible where God punishes Cities and nations turning from His Grace, by spreading disorder. This belief stands behind the crusaders' analysis of contemporary society.

There is considerable sociological evidence to suggest that we are already witnessing the beginnings of the collapse of the moral order in Britain [...] It is worth remembering that of the twenty-seven civilisations the world has so far known each one has collapsed through moral disorder, and corruption [...] The same fate will overtake Britain in the near future with the systematic perversion of our children and the corrupt personal morals of large numbers of our citizens.<sup>13</sup>

But the judgement will not end their:

The Bible clearly shows that when one form of judgement fails to bring a people to repentance, God has to visit them with another judgement - of a more severe kind. And often he has to continue with another, and yet another ...<sup>14</sup>

This knowledge and tendency to see many aspects of modern society as evidence of further judgement leads the crusaders to seek a return to 'Victorian standards' to demonstrate our collective repentance.<sup>15</sup> The imperative is reinforced by the Book of Ezekiel: extolling Christians to alert the faithless to the dangers of secular and lustful life styles.<sup>16</sup> This 'Ezekiel factor', and avoiding further judgement - upon believers and non-believers alike - stands behind all the crusaders' secular rationales, such as defending 'family values'.

## HISTORICAL MORAL CRUSADES<sup>17</sup>

In the late seventeenth century Societies for the Reformation of Manners targeted 'immorality' in the theatre, fairs, masquerades, and 'obscene ballads', enjoyed by the non-churching public and the illiterate. This crusade established pre-censorship of the theatre from 1735, and created a climate for literary censorship through a new offence, obscene libel. The Government prosecuted numerous printers and booksellers between 1728 and 1757. In 1738, the National Society disbanded, its work done.

During the late eighteenth century, improvements in printing technology increased the availability of sexual material.<sup>18</sup> Wilberforce, however, convinced George III to issue a proclamation during 1787 'For the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue, and for the Preventing and Punishing of Vice, Profaneness and Immorality', including the suppression of all 'loose and licentious Prints, Books, and Publications, dispersing Poison to the minds of the Young

and Unwary, and to Punish the Publishers and Vendors thereof.'

The Proclamation Society then initiated numerous obscene libel prosecutions before an ancillary, the Society for the Suppression of Vice (hereafter SSV), maintained a permanent crusade against printers, distributors, broadsheet hawkers, writers and artists of cheap literature, ballads, and prints. The SSV's activities effectively determined what was labelled obscene. Using the 1824 Vagrancy Act against 'obscene displays' and the entrapment tactic,<sup>19</sup> the SSV inhibited sales in the provinces and steadily reduced the number of 'obscene' bookshops in London. The 1857 Obscene Publications Act finally closed the London shops and increased the range of targeted material. The new definition of obscenity was a wide one: "Something offensive to modesty or decency or expressing or suggesting unchaste or lustful ideas or being impure, indecent or lewd." By 1870, the crusaders claimed credit for the confiscation of 129,681 prints; 16,220 illustrated books; five tons of letter press; 16,005 song sheets; 5,503 cards, snuff boxes and similar items; and a "large quantity of infidel and blasphemous publications", i.e., tracts denying the Trinity, birth control literature, and French novels published in English. The resultant chill factor forced 'artists' abroad, encouraged Bowdlerisation,<sup>20</sup> and ensured that the morality of authors' characters became the standard criterion of literary criticism.<sup>21</sup>

The situation began to change in the last third of the nineteenth century when new inventions and improved techniques enabled sexually explicit photographs and books, produced in France and Belgium by Carrington and other exiled Englishmen, to flood into Britain via the postal systems. The National Vigilance Society (hereafter NVA) and 300 local groups, led by Born-Again Christian William Cootes, were created to stop the flow. New laws like the Customs & Excise Consolidation Act and the Indecent Advertisements Act helped create a prosecution rate of 200 per year. Once again, the definition of obscenity was not restricted to sexually explicit material. The NVA's priorities were revealed in 1888, when at the height of Jack The Ripper's reign of terror, it was preoccupied with prosecuting Henry Vizetelly for publishing English language versions of Emile Zola's novels! Fine art and education suffered too: Jules Gamier's illustrations of Rabelais and Havelock Ellis's *Sexual Inversion* were both targeted.

If the moral crusaders' activities appeared less numerous in the first sixty years of the twentieth century it was only because their beliefs about sex, obscenity, and morality had become widespread; government, the police, and courts enforced the obscenity laws. Literature suffered from the chill factor. The potential threat of controls on the cinema encouraged self-censorship - hence the British Board of Film Censors (hereafter BBFC). And the BBC under Reith, who shared the crusaders' beliefs in public, if not in his personal behaviour, was under strict control. The cost of transgression was high: in 1937, William Hamilton, who ran a book store on the Charing Cross Road, London, was imprisoned for three months and fined £100 with ten guineas costs, for selling the *Autobiography of a Flea* to an undercover policeman.<sup>22</sup> The crusaders' grip on morality appeared so tight that the NVA voluntarily disbanded in 1953.

Britain owed its reputation for 'Victorianism', censorship of sexually orientated material, and media controls, to the accumulative effect of campaigns by moral crusaders, inspired by their religious beliefs, against any and every new form of media which could be used to promote non-Christian values.

### PERMISSIVENESS AND PORNOGRAPHY

After the Second World War, developments in the structure and demands of both Industry and the State helped to undermine the foundations and values upon which the crusaders had built their obscenity-free society. Numerous reforms decriminalising prostitution, homosexuality, contraception, abortion and divorce removed discussion of these subjects from the obscenity rubric. Although the reforms were less permissive than has often been alleged,<sup>23</sup> fundamentalists were provoked back into action by what they saw as the abdication of the established Church of England from its one remaining sphere of influence - the legacy of sexual morality - and State withdrawal of institutional and legal support for crusaders' beliefs.<sup>24</sup>

The one major exception to the crusaders' cultural and political isolation was pornography. The 1959 Obscene Publications Act sought to strengthen controls over the production and distribution of sexually explicit material.<sup>25</sup> It was from this last barricade that the crusaders sought to turn back the tide of 'permissiveness' in the media.

Between 1959 and 1970, individual crusaders fought numerous court cases to maintain the pre-1959 definitions of obscene material. They lost; birth control, sex education and 'serious' literature were all freed from prosecution. Despite gaining some success after 1970, against the radical sexual politics of *Oz* and *The Little Red School Book*, the crusaders were losing the battle against pornography in the courts. What was once the height of obscenity sold under the counter in Soho was now surpassed by publishers like Paul Raymond and sold by newsagents. Amid the confusion, sex shops and cinemas expanded, aided by a loophole in the 1954 Cinematographic Act and by police corruption.<sup>26</sup> By 1971, there were 100 sex shops in the country, thirty of them in Soho, turning over £3 million a year. Early attempts to turn the tide with the Longford Report on pornography, a Petition For Public Decency, crusades against provincial sex shops, and a Sale of Offensive Literature Bill failed. Although crusaders managed to persuade several local authorities to ban films, including *Quiet Days in Clichy*,<sup>27</sup> the Department of the Environment rejected intervention against sex shops, arguing there was no support for control because of "the current climate of public opinion".<sup>28</sup> The Williams Committee, established by the Labour Government in 1977, even threatened to offer legal protection to pornography.<sup>29</sup> The campaign which followed, however, marked a watershed.

### THE FUNDAMENTALIST REVIVAL

The growing chorus against permissiveness in the 1970s reflected a religious revival within evangelical churches, from which crusaders draw their strength.<sup>30</sup> By 1977, crusaders were strong enough to defeat the William Committee.

NVALA, which had struggled alone for over ten years, was joined in the early seventies by the Nationwide Festival of Light (now CARE) and provincial Community Standards Associations. The crusaders also convinced new converts that evangelicalism requires active involvement in moral issues.<sup>31</sup> PACS was typical of this development.

Formed in 1977 following a protest meeting against a new sex shop, PACS established links with other crusade organisations, and drew support from the local Elim, Pentecostal, and Community Churches. PACS members made themselves available to anyone who would listen: Parent-Teacher Associations, Townswomen's Guilds, Wives' groups, and Church organisations; letters were written to the local paper, and meetings 'advertised' on the local radio. Campaigns against sex shops and newsagents' displays of soft-core magazines were seen as part of an overall strategy to maintain a civilised society based upon the unit of the family. Policy and specific campaigns were determined by committee members. Public meetings on a wide variety of subjects, complemented letter writing campaigns, the lobbying of politicians and opinion leaders, and the mobilisation of members of local churches. Distribution of the newsletter to supporters, public libraries, Citizens' Advice Bureaux, churches, and Christian bookshops spread the word. Early crusades included closing two sex cinemas; campaigns against child pornography, 'X' films in school and college film societies, contraceptive advertisements, existing television standards; the demand for a family viewing channel; and the removal of Jane Cousin's *Make It Happy* from local libraries. In the last thirteen years PACS have drastically limited the number of sexually orientated entertainment and products available in Portsmouth.<sup>32</sup>

Other CSAs have led crusades against: 'Dungeons and Dragons' games, electric video game violence; sex education in schools, the choice of English literature and the decline of religious instruction in schools; popular records, communist papers in public libraries; abortion, contraceptives for young girls in local authority care; and Occult Centres.<sup>33</sup> The revival, as well as new groups, continued to increase in the 1980s. As we enter the 1990s the lead is now being taken by CARE, which has a group of supporters in almost every Parliamentary constituency in Britain. Whereas NVALA tended to work through private lobbying or court cases, CSAs and CARE have a higher public profile.

### THE TURN OF THE TIDE

In 1977, the crusaders were able to halt the tide of 'permissiveness' by raising the issue of child pornography. This success has enabled them to extend controls in other media.

Pornography involving children was nothing new. In the late Victorian and Edwardian period sets of 'green fruit', as pre-pubescent children were known, made up to 30% and more of British pornographers' catalogues.<sup>34</sup> Since then, child pornography has always occupied a minority part in the industry. But the emergence of the Paedophilia Information Exchange (hereafter PIE) - defending and justifying an interest in adult-child sexual contact - in the 1970s gave the crusaders the opportunity to discredit the Williams Committee's impending recommendations for legalisation

of pornography; crusaders claimed that PIE was proof that pornography was dangerous and ultimately led to the desire to sexually abuse children.

Working closely with the Conservative Party, the NVALA organised a massive letter lobby campaign to MPs and 270 newspapers, and a nation-wide petition. They flew Dr Gerber, leader of a similar American crusade, to England to give press conferences, television interviews, and speak to MPs.<sup>35</sup> Amid claims that Britain was being swamped with child pornography, Mr Townsend MP, the Chairman of the Saint Christopher's Fellowship, initiated a Private Member's Bill, which despite little evidence of a real threat, outlawed child pornography. Victory became a means of raising previous issues again, and the first step to further media and moral reform. A poll by the crusaders conducted among 163 Conservative MPs in May 1978, revealed that 92% favoured a new obscenity law, 87% were concerned about the context of sex education, and 85% supported retaining the blasphemy law. The Act's most important effect, however, was to demonstrate public support for controls which six years before senior members of a Conservative government believed did not exist.<sup>36</sup> The Conservative Party then promised further support at NVALA's annual conference in 1978, asserting both organisations had "a duty to conserve the moral standards on which our society has been based and so preserve them for future generations." The protection of children rather than the threat of moral decline now became the crusaders' major public justification for further controls, and marked a movement away from trying to enforce existing law in the crusaders, favour towards gaining alternative legislation, and justified controls in the wider media.

It was at this point that American money enabled Ben's Books (the Holloway family), to expand with 'Dr Johnston's Love Shops' and a printing complex into Soho. Aided by an ambivalent local council, there was a rapid expansion of the sex industry in the area. David Sullivan, who had already established huge mail order companies, was also expanding his enterprises: into newsagents via generous sale and return deals - 50% of the retail price - on the new style 'open crutch' magazines; and a growing number of Sven and Private sex shops in provincial towns. Having, apparently, defeated the Williams Committee, crusaders inevitably turned their attention to these newsagents' displays and sex shops. Once displays were outlawed in 1981, the crusaders moved on to the growing number of sex shops. By convincing Portsmouth City Council to promote a Private Bill to outlaw the shops, the crusaders forced the Government, which preferred a more limited measure covering only Soho shops, to provide national legislation in 1982.<sup>37</sup> This Act was then used by the crusaders to persuade local councils to close 500 sex shops by 1988. However, the imminent arrival of cable TV (swiftly dealt with by lobbying Government against porn channels) and videos threatened to undo this work. Hard-core pornographic films were no longer available in cinema clubs, but they were available on video until the crusaders intervened and gained legislation making *all* video recordings subject to Government censorship. Although lack of time prevented further legislation to control soft-core pornography in newsagents' shops, the Government promised legislation controlling television.

The crusaders, therefore, were seeking to reverse the legacy of the 1959 Act, and were forced constantly to challenge the threat posed by ever-changing distribution patterns.

## THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND THE CRUSADERS

Despite their own activities, crusaders would not have obtained their success without tacit Government support; but the relationship between the Thatcher administration and the crusaders is completely misunderstood by academics who argue crusades are engineered to elicit public support for the Government's coercive policies of social control.<sup>38</sup> Apart from not explaining why so many of the contemporary crusades concern sexual material, it underestimates the crusaders' objections to the Conservative's economic policy; unlike the American Moral Majority, British crusaders do not believe the free market automatically promotes moral responsibility, and are actively seeking an alternative.<sup>39</sup>

The reason why the Conservative Party has promised to enact a major crusader demand before each election - sex cinema/shop controls, video controls, broadcasting controls - is that media morality concessions are easier to make than other economic demands such as: no Sunday trading, restricting the availability of credit cards, and restrictions upon company mergers.<sup>40</sup> These demands would require a complete change in the Government's economic policy; but legislation covering 'pornography' and screen 'violence' can still buy crusaders' votes.

In a sense the Government is trapped. It has always been divided over morality. One group, including Conservative lawyers, have considered morality a vote winner since 1971; Ian Lloyd MP has openly admitted that they sought to test voters' reaction to anti-pornography legislation. The child pornography crusade of 1977 helped strengthen this faction. Others considered turning Soho into a rue Saint-Denis, to control the industry. And the Home Office is steadily introducing sections of the discredited Williams report through the back door, establishing a framework for the dissemination of material if the climate ever becomes more liberal!<sup>41</sup> Although various Conservative MPs had been quick to help the crusaders, Ministers have been more reluctant. William Whitelaw and Michael Heseltine, for example, preferred Westminster Council's pilot scheme licensing over sixty sex shops in Soho to national controls, which have now limited Soho's shops to ten. Mr Whitelaw also preferred voluntary controls on the video industry. The crusaders realise this and have frequently voiced their displeasure.<sup>42</sup>

The Conservative Party is, therefore, playing a balancing act. While a complete overhaul of the Obscene Publications Act might divide the party, certification of videos, like licensing sex shops, keeps the moderately moral happy and avoids the charge of total censorship. By supporting action against soft targets - child pornography, unlicensed hard-core cinema clubs, etc. - they also avoid bringing the numerous contradictions between their own and the crusaders' wider philosophies into the open.

The ultimate effect, however, is to increase controls in other areas, because arguments voiced in support of cen-

sorship against pornography - direct affect models - can easily be repeated in the case of television and other non-explicit media. The arguments originally used to outlaw forty horror videos, for example, are now used to justify the censorship of American TV series like *The A Team*, and even news broadcasts. What tipped the balance in the crusaders' favour was that the alleged affects of TV violence also can be used to rebut the charge that it is the Government's own economic policies that provoke rising crime rates and so on. In recent years the Government has also sought to curb political and personal criticism in the media, and the threat of further controls inhibits criticism.

As long as this situation continues the crusaders will advance their cause, and increase the extent of the chill factor.

## TOWARDS THE FUTURE

The crusaders' ultimate aim is to re-moralise society. They know that censorship will not achieve this aim by itself; success rests with the fundamentalist Churches' ability to convert the nation.<sup>43</sup> Only time will tell if the energy spent on their media crusades and their alliance with Mrs Thatcher's administration, would have been better spent elsewhere. At the moment, the alliance clearly benefits the crusaders, despite their declining electoral support for the Conservatives.<sup>44</sup>

Members of the Conservative Party, however, will attempt to maintain media censorship after 1992 and even extend it. Various MEPs, like NVALA support Richard Simmonds, press the EEC to accept British standards. They are succeeding. In September 1987, the European Parliament amended its 'Television Without Frontiers' directive, and called upon member States to:

ensure that internal broadcasts do not include programmes which might seriously harm the physical, mental or moral development of children and young persons, in particular those that involve pornography, gratuitous violence or incitement to race hatred ...

This initiative followed the NVALA's submission to the Council of Europe in 1983. Although the decriminalisation of pornography in Europe ensures it cannot be a soft target, the protection of children is clearly a means by which crusaders could extend their influence across the Channel.

If Europe fails to be converted, the task of monitoring foreign broadcasts has already been given to the BSC, which NVALA demanded and the Conservatives see as a means to ensure censorship following deregulation. The BSC's chairman, Lord Rees-Mogg, has publicly agreed with many of NVALA's demands.<sup>45</sup> He is supported by Mr Davey, Director General of the Cable Authority, who oversees Britain's cable TV networks, and adopts most stringent controls. As the Government plans to merge the Cable and Independent Broadcasting Authorities, which oversee independent TV companies, censorship will increase.

Together, the broadcasting authorities, the police - numerous high-ranking officers are NVALA supporters - and the theme of the protection of children (which now preoccupies academics, teachers, doctors, and social workers) could ensure censorship of the British media for

many years to come, irrespective of the crusaders' own motives and the strength of the religious revival. At the very least, these authorities and groups will ensure that censorship extends far beyond sexually explicit material. British television restrictions are fast approaching the standards set by the Hay's Office for Hollywood in the nineteen-thirties: European viewers would not recognise the British version of *EuroCop*, there have been so many cuts.

Ironically, this speculation about the future raises an interesting question about the past: how is it that the combined strength of the media, which the crusaders claim can have such a powerful effect upon our behaviour, has not been able to convince the public they should oppose censorship? The answer to that question - that the media do not support free speech and distribution *per se* - should worry us as much as the allegations regarding the effects of sex and violence in the media.

## NOTES

1. These and the examples which follow throughout the paper were taken from the Campaign Against Censorship's press cuttings file. I am indebted to Ted Goodman for making this collection available to me. I am willing to furnish any correspondent with the original source.
2. See W. Thompson, *PornWars: Moral Crusades, Pornography, and Social Policy*, PhD thesis (University of Essex, 1987).
3. See D. Kavanagh, *Thatcherism and British Politics* (Oxford, 1987); C. Manchester, *Sex Shops and the Law* (Aldershot, 1986) and 'Much Ado about the Location of Sex Shops', *Journal of Planning and Environment*, February 1982; J. Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society* (London, 1981) and *Sexuality and its Discontents* (London, 1985); M. Tracey and D. Morrison, *Whitehouse* (London, 1979).
4. See R. Levitas, ed., *The Ideology of the New Right* (Cambridge, 1986).
5. Although I cannot cover the issue here, there is clearly a class dimension to crusade activity; in its simplest form it implies that popular culture is brutal, uncivilised and unGodly. This fact, like the article in general, is not intended as criticism: my intention is merely to outline and explain the crusaders' role in media censorship.
6. See P. Brierley, ed., *United Kingdom Christian Handbook*, 1989-90 edition (Bible Society, 1988).
7. See J. R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusades: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement* (Illinois, 1963); Tracey and Morrison, *op. cit.*; L. A. Zurhcer and Kirkpatrick, *Citizens for Decency: Anti-Pornography Crusades as Status Defence* (University of Texas, 1976).
8. See C. Davies, *Permissive Britain* (London, 1978); E. J. Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance* (London, 1982).
9. See R. Wallis, 'Moral Indignation and the Media', and M. Wood and M. Hughes, 'The Moral Basis of Moral Reform', *American Sociological Review* (Vol. 49, 1984).
10. See W. Thompson, *op. cit.* and M. Ammerman, *Bible Believers* (Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 1987).
11. See C. Davies, *op. cit.*
12. The apparent emphasis upon sexually orientated material follows from the fact that the Bible appears to be clearer and more consistent on issues like sexual immorality than other 'sins' like greed. Pornography, for example, is wrong because nakedness and sexual union should be out of public gaze (*Genesis* 9: 20-27; 26: 8). See *CARE Handbook*, 2nd edition (London, 1989).
13. See C. Hill, *Towards the Dawn* (Glasgow, 1980) and *The Day Comes* (London, 1982).
14. See D. S. Gardner, *The Trumpet Sounds for Britain*, Vols. 1 and 2 (Altrincham, 1983).
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ezekiel* 33: 1-6.
17. This section on the historical background draws upon P-G. Boucé, ed., *Sexuality in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Manchester, 1982); E. J. Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance* (London, 1982); C. Pearl, *The Girl with the Swansdown Seat* (London, 1955); G. Robertson, *Obscenity* (London, 1979); and D. Thomas, *A Long Time Burning* (London, 1969); supplemented by my own research.
18. Material included verses like *The Electric Eel*, Harris's *List of Covent Garden Ladies*, and reprints of the few novels available, including *Fanny Hill*, *The Bon Ton* and other 'Gentlemen's Magazines'.
19. Entrapment involved a crusader entering a shop to purchase material, then finding a magistrate to make a complaint against the bookseller; then, armed with a warrant and a police constable, re-visiting the shop to arrest the bookseller for selling obscene material.
20. Shocked by the lasciviousness found in the Bible and Shakespeare's works, Bowdler produced heavily censored versions. Together with special stories and rhymes written by Evangelical women, this helped establish pure literature for children.
21. See W. Thompson, *The World Turned Inside Out*, MA thesis (University of Essex, 1983).
22. Occasionally the crusaders' efforts backfired: in 1926, a film, *The White Slave Traffic*, endorsed by crusaders, was censored by the BBFC!
23. See *Permissiveness and Control* (National Deviancy Conference, Basingstoke, 1980).
24. See M. Whitehouse, *Whatever Happened to Sex* (Hove, 1977), *A Most Dangerous Woman* (Hertford, 1982); and *Mightier than the Sword* (Eastbourne, 1985).
25. See G. Robertson, *op. cit.*
26. See M. Tomkinson, *The Pornbrokers* (London, 1982).
27. PCC 1/27, Portsmouth City Council files.
28. *Ibid.*
29. See *Report of the Committee on Obscenity and Film Censorship* (HMSO, 1979).
30. See *UK Christian Handbook* (*op. cit.*); E. Gibbs, *Ten Growing Churches* (London, 1984); R. Forster, *Ten New Churches* (London, 1986).
31. See O. R. Johnston, *Who Needs the Family* (London, 1979); F. A. Schaeffer and E. Roop, *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* (London, 1982); and M. Whitehouse, *op. cit.*
32. See W. Thompson, *PornWars*, *op. cit.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. Album 7 (A collection of late Victorian and Edwardian 'pornography' catalogues contained in the Private Case of the British Library Reading Room).
35. See M. A. McCarthy and R. A. Moodie, 'Parliament and Pornography: The 1978 Child Protection Act', *Parliamentary Affairs* (Vol. XXXIV, Number 1, Winter 1981).
36. Mr Townsend demonstrates the importance of 'public' opinion when he admits: "I was very conscious that without massive public opinion on my side [...] in particular, some one and a half million signatures on a petition by the [...] campaign, I do not believe we would have the Bill on the Statute Book." (quoted in M. A. McCarthy and R. A. Moodie, *op. cit.*).
37. See W. Thompson, *op. cit.*
38. See S. Hall *et al.*, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging the State*, Law and Order (Basingstoke, 1984); M. Barker, ed., *The Video Nasties* (London, 1984).
39. See P. Marshall, *Thine is the Kingdom* (Basingstoke, 1984).
40. See *The Family Charter* (FamilyBase, Cambridge, 1987).
41. The Indecent Display (Control) Act (1981) restricted public display, and introduced warning signs: recommendations 8(a) and 8(b). The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act (1982) licensed sex shops making material available in separate premises with no access to people under eighteen years of age: recommendation 8(b). See also the Child Protection Act (1978): recommendations 19(a), 20, 22. The Video Act (1984) established a statutory body to review films and video cassettes: (effectively) recommendations 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41 18(R), 42, 43, 44(a) & (b), 51, 52, 53, 54. See the Cinematograph Act (1982) and the Consolidation Act (1985): 45, 49. See also *Report of the Committee on Obscenity and Film Censorship* (HMSO, 1979).
42. See W. Thompson, *op. cit.*
43. See O. R. Johnston, *Who Needs the Family* (London, 1979).
44. Although numerous authors assert the crusaders support the Conservative Party, (e.g. R. Levitas *op. cit.*), they have never provided any evidence. My impression is that older crusaders do support the Conservatives, but younger members, in organisations such as CARE, are more likely to be spread across the political spectrum. CARE as an organisation advises supporters to join the Party of their choice and vote on the basis of whether or not candidates are Christians or support CARE's moral programme.
45. See W. Mogg, Speech at Walgrave Hall, Langham Place, London (11 March 1989), published by the NVALA (Colchester, 1989).