

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:** Blackwell, Morton: Files

**Folder Title:** Moral Majority (4 of 5)

**Box:** 13

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

# Inside M.M. Inc.

M.M. Inc.  
Leadership  
Publication

An exclusive biweekly news update from the Moral Majority National Office

Volume 1, No. 8      November 19, 1982

## A PERSONAL WORD

As I dictate this front page, I am sitting in an airport one leg away from Washington, D. C. and a meeting with Secretary of Education Bell. At that meeting will also be key Christian school leaders from across the nation. We must commend Secretary Bell for continuing to provide access to his office and to himself. We must also recognize that he has made some effort to help with the problem in Nebraska and that Dr. Chuck O'Malley, Bell's private school liaison, has done a superb job of attempting to help. That is not to say we are pleased with the results, but we do have to give Secretary Bell in this particular area an "A" for effort; and we do need to understand that Chuck O'Malley has a wonderful attitude toward the Christian school movement and the church school problem and has traveled across the country trying to do what he can in our behalf.

After the Department of Education meeting, I must hurry to the White House for a meeting on voluntary prayer, across town to a meeting at Paul Weyrich's shop on tuition tax credits, and then back to the airport.

From Washington, I will fly to Indianapolis to speak for Dr. Greg Dixon and to discuss further strategies for helping the church schools in Nebraska. As we wind down 1982, I am more determined than ever, from the National Office level, to fight the battle for a pro-life bill that is passable, to promote the President's voluntary prayer amendment, to do all we can to protect infants from being used in the production of pornographic materials for profit, and to alter federal adoption legislation to make it easier for parents who want to adopt children to do so.

We will continue to fight our battle against violent crime and will carry on other high priority battles. But the ones I have listed above are of key importance. We commend them to your attention and solicit your support.

Before January 5, the Nebraskans involved in the church school battle there must decide two things: what sort of legislation they will promote and what methods they will use to gain passage of that legislation.

My plane is leaving so I must stop this dictation for now. God bless each of you, and please keep up the good fight.

--Dr. Ronald S. Godwin  
Vice President and  
Chief Operations Officer

IN THE NEWS

Norman Lear! Norman Lear!

Norman Lear, who once produced that inspirational program, "Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman," gave liberals something else to cheer about Saturday night-- a television assault on the religious right entitled, "People for the American Way." Broadcast late in the evening and in only a few big city markets, the Lear show would have been completely ignored had it not been for the attention the liberal press heaped upon it.

Essentially, the show was a collection of clips of New Right leaders talking about morality and values with appropriate handwringing in the background by leftists from the world of show business.

One cannot help but contrast this with the TV program put together by Jerry Falwell earlier in the year. Instead of attacking liberals, Falwell devoted his time to promoting prayer in schools. Instead of hitting only friendly markets, Falwell blanketed the entire country. Instead of doom and gloom, he spoke positively. Instead of Burt Lancaster, he gave them the Liberty Baptist College choir.

We are inclined to think that Falwell got the best of it. His school prayer program has resulted in 50,000 new contributors to the Moral Majority every month since they started showing it. Indeed, the Moral Majority is turning into a working majority, having grown to three times its size since 1980.

Back when Lear was blazing the trail for vulgarities on television, he probably said he was only giving the American people what they wanted to see. But one is left with the feeling that what the people want is not Lear's American Way but Falwell's, or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

--Washington Times  
November 2, 1982

Abortion Law Repealed Under Fire

Cape Girardeau, MO -- Faced with a lengthy battle in court, the Cape Girardeau City Council has voted to repeal an abortion ordinance requiring notification of fathers. Repeal of the ordinance, adopted September 20, came during an hour-long meeting Monday night. Under the ordinance, the City would also have had the right to inspect facilities where abortions were performed.

Dr. Bolivar M. Escobedo, Director of the Cape Girardeau Gynecological Center, challenged legality of the ordinance shortly after its passage. U. S. District Court Judge William L. Hungate granted the Center a temporary injunction against enforcement of the ordinance October 1.

--Washington Post  
November 3, 1982

CAMPAIGN TRAIL '82

Midterm Madness - Has the Reagan Era Ended?

Just as the frenzied television campaign ads came to a halt on November 3, news returns from all across the nation read: "Democrats Surge Back," "Reaganomics Rejected," "Democrats Make Substantial Gains." Yet, if we would just remove ourselves from the view of our television sets and the "Eyewitness Reports" of the liberal press, we might return to the realities of this year's midterm election.

First of all, the major question to be decided at the polls in 1982, only 24 months after the "Reagan Landslide," was: Will the Reagan conservative coalition in Congress be defeated? In order to best answer this question, factual observations should be presented regarding the results of the Reagan midterm.

It is of major significance to note that Republicans preserved their 54 to 46 Senate majority Tuesday, losing two seats to the Democrats but also gaining two, including the Nevada seat that for 24 years has been held by Howard Cannon. In the House of Representatives, only 14 of the 52 freshman Reagan Republicans elected in 1980 suffered defeat in this year's midterm.

In addition, three liberal Democratic incumbents were defeated. Of the surviving Democrats, many were the Boll Weevils who helped Reagan shape and pass his economic program in the last Congress; these conservative southerners suffered no losses. On the other hand, six of the roughly 30 northern Republican Gypsy Moths who banded together against Reagan policies were beaten.

Finally, it is a fact that the Democratic net gain in the House of Representatives was 26 seats. Yet, in view of the historical precedent in midterm year elections, how substantial were these Democratic gains?

U. S. News and World Report, November 1, 1982, reported that the average number of seats in the U. S. House lost by the party in the White House in non-presidential election years was 36. The highest recorded Democratic loss took place in 1938 under the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt totaling 71 seats; a Republican losing record of 75 House seats occurred in 1922 under President Warren Harding.

The statistical bottom line being that the average midterm loss of both parties combined is 36 seats in the House of Representatives. This year the Reagan Republicans lost only 26 and that's ten points better than the national average.

When American citizens closed the voting booth curtain in 1982, they also closed the mouths of liberal critics who are always quick to criticize, yet lacking alternative solutions to our national problems.

Has the Reagan Era ended? I'll let you make the decision --

### STATE LEADER SPOTLIGHT

#### Arkansas

The state chairman of the Moral Majority called Senator Jesse Helms' office on September 24 to apologize for what he called the rude behavior of Senator Dale Bumpers (D-AR) during debate on a prayer-in-the-schools proposal.

The Rev. Roy McLaughlin, pastor of First Baptist Church of Violonia, said Bumpers was rude to Helms (R-NC) on the floor of the U. S. Senate on Wednesday. McLaughlin said he did not talk with Helms personally, but told an aide in his Washington office to relay his apology.

In a nationally reported exchange between the two, Bumpers erroneously referred to Helms as "the Senator from South Carolina." "He moved me across the line," Helms said. "I apologize to the other state," Bumpers replied.

McLaughlin said in a telephone interview that he didn't fault Bumpers for being human and making a mistake, but did fault him for making the rude comment. McLaughlin also criticized Bumpers for supporting a liberal filibuster against a measure in favor of school prayer.

"It is very regretful we have a Senator who says he is personally opposed to abortion but continues to vote to continue federal funding for abortion," McLaughlin said. "Senator Bumpers also says he is not against school prayer, yet he continues to vote against school prayer."

#### Minnesota

Minnesota conservative leader Sandra Singer reported on November 11 that State Senator Allen Spear (D-MN) may be the new chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Minnesota Senate.

Spear, a self-proclaimed homosexual state legislator, was one of the first gay political leaders to "come out of the closet." Despite his tenure in the State Senate, he has no real legal or judicial experience as qualifications for this appointed position. There are many alternative ranking democratic leaders who are better qualified for the chairmanship.

Yet, Minnesota Senate Majority Leader Roger Mole insists that Allen Spear is "the man for the job."

The state's Democratic leadership has certainly made it evident that experience in a related field is not an important element for appointments to committee positions. What is important? In this case, it was so that the nominee could use the chairmanship to promote his amoral, liberal position on a particular moral issue -- HOMOSEXUALITY.

Moral Majority affiliates in Minnesota are expected to oppose the Spear nomination for the Judiciary Committee chairmanship.

*Moral Majority*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 25, 1982

Dear Secretary Watt:

Attached is my recent exchange of correspondence with Cal Thomas of the Moral Majority.

I think they have an excellent program beginning at their Family Center. If Dr. Falwell makes a success of this, I'm convinced that his example will be imitated by pastors throughout the country.

I hope you can accept their invitation to Lynchburg.

Sincerely,



Morton C. Blackwell  
Special Assistant to the President

The Honorable James Watt  
Secretary of Interior  
Washington, D.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 14, 1983

MEETING WITH DR. JERRY FALWELL

DATE: March 15, 1983

LOCATION: Oval Office

TIME: 4:30 p.m.

FROM: Faith Ryan Whittlesey

I. PURPOSE

To recognize firm support by Dr. Jerry Falwell

II. BACKGROUND

Dr. Falwell, an Independent Baptist, is head of four major organizations headquartered in Lynchburg, Virginia:

- Thomas Road Baptist Church, congregation of 19,000.
- Old Time Gospel Hour broadcasts, including Sunday programs on more than 400 TV stations and daily programs on more than 500 radio stations. Adding 50,000 supporters monthly.
- Liberty Baptist schools, with more than 5,000 students through the college levels.
- The Moral Majority, a national conservative lobby with \$60 million per year budget, adding 11,000 members monthly. Its monthly newsletter is mailed to 560,000 homes.

Unlike some other national conservative organization leaders, Dr. Falwell has never criticized you or Reagan Administration policy. He has been strongly supportive on economic and social issues. This week he announced Moral Majority's main goal for 1983 is to combat the nuclear freeze movement.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Jerry Falwell

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House Photographer

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

4:30 p.m. Dr. Falwell arrives

4:45 p.m. Dr. Falwell leaves

Attachement: Talking Points

SUGGESTED TALKING POINTS FOR MEETING WITH

DR. JERRY FALWELL

- I want to thank you for the strong support you have given me on your television programs, in your publications and in your public statements.
- Your full page ad on the nuclear freeze issue last week in the Washington Times was excellent. I really appreciate your support in this area.
- At a time when leaders of some conservative groups have begun to criticize our Administration, your steady support has been most helpful.
- I am interested in your view of what we should do to recapture the enthusiasm in the fundamentalist and evangelical community. Clearly their political activism declined between 1980 and 1982.
- What was the effect of my recent speeches to the National Religious Broadcasters and the National Association of Evangelicals?
- By the way, I'm told that my new Assistant for Public Liaison, Faith Whittlesey, has approved a full time volunteer slot here this spring for Ed Crowell, one of your student leaders from Liberty Baptist College

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 7, 1982

TO: Ken Cribb

FROM: Morton C. Blackwell 

I suggest no response to this letter.

Cal Thomas wrote me to this same effect. Sometimes he just blows off steam I wrote him a strong reply(attached) and subsequently spoke to Dr. Falwell about this matter.

Falwell suggested that my response closed the issue and that he saw no evidence that he was being held at arms length. Quite the contrary, he feels he has had good access. Falwell is a strong and consistent supporter.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 25, 1982

Dear Cal:

I presume that the tone of your letter to me of March 23 was at least to some extent calculated.

While there is surely room for improvement in the recognition and support which the President and his Administration have given to key elements of our winning coalition, it's far from accurate to say there has been a decision to hold Dr. Falwell at arms distance, much less to "turn a deaf ear, as well as their backs, and pretend that we don't exist."

Since the inauguration, we have been able to arrange numerous occasions for Dr. Falwell to be with the President, some of them rather intimate. The President has also, on his own initiative, phoned Jerry. I think it is fair to say that the President has had more contacts with Jerry than with any other religious leader.

I have sent your March 23 letter, per your suggestion, to Secretary Watt with a strong suggestion that he accept your invitation. I'm prepared to work diligently with you to obtain an appropriate Administration representative.

I think it's vital that we all keep the faith, realize that we are in a long ballgame, and recognize that major progress can be made only through the accumulation of incremental gains.

Cordially,



Morton C. Blackwell  
Special Assistant to the President

Mr. Cal Thomas  
Vice President for Communications  
The Moral Majority, Inc.  
National Capitol Office  
500 Alleghany Avenue  
Lynchburg, Virginia 24501

ID # 067053

SP

### WHITE HOUSE COUNSELLOR'S OFFICE TRACKING WORKSHEET

- O - OUTGOING
- H - INTERNAL
- I - INCOMING

Date Correspondence Received (YY/MM/DD) 82103120

Name of Correspondent: CAL THOMAS

CN Mail Report User Codes: (A) \_\_\_\_\_ (B) \_\_\_\_\_ (C) \_\_\_\_\_

Subject: Writer is concerned over statements that the President needs to "hold Jerry Falwell at arms length for fear of criticism."

ROUTE TO:		ACTION	DISPOSITION			
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
<u>CNHAMM</u>		<u>O</u>	<u>82103122</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>1 CN CRIB</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>82103122</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>82103130</u>
<u>CN MEES</u>		<u>I</u>	<u>82103122</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>82103122</u>
<u>1 PL Blac</u>		<u>D</u>	<u>82103131</u>			<u>1 1</u>
						<u>1 1</u>

**ACTION CODES:**

- A - Appropriate Action
- C - Comment/Recommendation
- D - Draft Response
- F - Furnish Fact Sheet to be used as Enclosure
- I - Info Copy Only/No Action Necessary
- R - Direct Reply w/Copy
- S - For Signature
- X - Interim Reply

**DISPOSITION CODES:**

- A - Answered
- B - Non-Special Referral
- C - Completed
- S - Suspended

**FOR OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE:**

- Type of Response = Initials of Signer
- Code = "A"
- Completion Date = Date of Outgoing

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Keep this worksheet attached to the original incoming letter.  
 Send all routing updates to Central Reference (Room 75, OEOB).  
 Always return completed correspondence record to Central Files.  
 Refer questions about the correspondence tracking system to Central Reference, ext. 2590.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 6, 1982

Mr. Cal Thomas  
Vice President for Communications  
The Moral Majority, Inc.  
500 Alleghany Avenue  
Lynchburg, Virginia 24501

*file*

Dear Cal:

I have your letter of March 30 and the copy you sent of the March 24 letter from Newsweek.

In response to a question, Dr. Falwell said he was voting the straight Republican ticket last November. This statement, just before the election, was an endorsement and was reported as such.

In my view, that statement helped far more than it hurt, but it was too close to the election to have much of an impact. If certain party leaders and the decision makers in the Coleman campaign had encouraged rather than spurned the input from our people in the party, things almost certainly would have turned out better.

Whether or not Newsweek actually had sources in the White House who suggest Dr. Falwell's influence is on the wane, the suggestion is not correct. His access here is undiminished. By every measure the organizations he leads are growing, showing that growth in contributions, numbers of people involved, and expertise at all levels. If we let distrust be spread within our winning coalition by unattributed remarks in opposition publications, we only show political immaturity.

With respect to incrementalism, the fact is that it works. It is unrealistic to expect to undo fifty years of bad increments in one year or even in one presidential term. We can argue over whether or not the increments of change in the right direction have been as large as possible, but the incremental nature of the solution to our problems is to me beyond question.

Quintus Fabius Maximus used incrementalism to wear down the forces of Hannibal, one of the greatest military geniuses of all history. British socialists, calling themselves Fabians, incrementally dismantled the greatest economic and military power the world has even seen, the British Empire.

You are correct that we could expect incrementalism from a liberal Democratic administration. It worked for them. Like most political techniques, it is philosophically neutral. It will work for us if we do not slacken our resolve to do all that must be done over time.

Wish that our foes discard incrementalism. If they do, they will find themselves losing most battles. A foolish belief in the possibility of total, instant victory is a prescription for unrealistic hopes and early disillusionment at the grassroots.

I greatly enjoyed my trip for the President to Lynchburg for the opening of the Family Center. It is an excellent program and should serve as a model across the country. I particularly enjoyed the chance for a long conversation with Dr. Falwell.

Sincerely,



Morton C. Blackwell  
Special Assistant to the President

BCC: Dr. Ron Godwin  
Paul Weyrich  
Ed McAteer  
Terry Dolan  
Howard Phillips  
Richard A. Viguerie  
Ed Rollins  
Joe Coors  
Huck Walther  
Reed Larson



500 ALLEGHANY AVENUE  
LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA 24501  
(804) 528-0070

CAL THOMAS  
VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS

March 30, 1982.

Mr. Morton Blackwell  
Office of Public Liaison  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Morton,

In view of our recent exchange of letters, I thought you might be interested in Newsweek's idea of the White House relationship with Falwell. They are referring to a letter I wrote last December in response to a Periscope piece which asserted that Falwell had endorsed Marshall Coleman in the Governor's race and that's why he lost (Falwell did no such thing, but facts never get in Newsweek's way).

I was also intrigued by your use of the word "incremental" to describe the gains we are hopeful of making. I thought we could expect more than "incremental" gains with one of our "own" in the White House. It seems to me that "incremental" would be something one could hope for with a liberal Democratic Administration.

Appreciate the conflicting pressures you are under and thanks for staying in touch. If Elizabeth Dole can attend the Saturday opening, that would be nice. I understand she has been asked by Senator Jepsen's office.

Sincerely,

DR. JERRY FALWELL, PRESIDENT

# Newsweek

444 MADISON AVENUE • NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022

March 24, 1982

Cal Thomas  
The Moral Majority, Inc.  
500 Alleghany Avenue  
Lynchburg, Virginia 24501

Dear Mr. Thomas:

Thank you for your comments on our Dec. 7 Periscope item regarding the Rev. Jerry Falwell. Your analysis of J. Marshall Coleman's loss in last year's contest for the governorship of Virginia was read with interest here, and we wish our limited space had allowed us to publish it in our Letters column.

The fact remains, however, that political analysts at the White House viewed the election results in a somewhat different light, and as we reported, they concluded that Republican candidates would be well-advised in the future to avoid Falwell's endorsement. Whether or not the analysts (and the Republican National Committee) assessed the feelings of the electorate accurately, their reading of the situation does help explain a decline in Falwell's influence within the existing power structure of the GOP.

Since we receive more than a thousand letters a week, we are unable to answer most of them personally. But even if we cannot reply, we do consider all our mail for the Letters column and notify every reader whose letter we are able to publish. We appreciate your continuing interest in Newsweek and look forward to hearing from you again.

Sincerely,



Sam Seibert  
For the Editors

DRAFT

file  
Mount  
Majority

Dear Jerry:

Your administrative assistant, Nelson Keener, kindly sent me a copy of a news clipping apparently from a Texas newspaper, attached.

While I really appreciate your enthusiastic remarks about the President, I am concerned at the suggestion by the newspaper that you have "no plans for getting involved in the 1982 elections."

Jerry, I am sure you understand that our great public policy problems in this country developed over two generations. No single election year, no single Congress, no single President can put things aright. We are in a long ballgame.

Most of our important Congressional victories of 1980 were by very narrow margins. The Reagan winning coalition has the potential to become the normal governing majority in America, just as the Roosevelt coalition did in the 1930's. For this country to enjoy the turnaround it needs will require the enthusiastic participation for many years of all the major elements of the President's winning coalition. Absent any major factor, we are back on the road to certain disaster.

Conservative strength is today, as it has always been, at the grass-roots. I believe that responsible conservative leaders should have two general goals in 1982:

1. Maximizing conservative impact on the public policy decision making process.
2. Maximizing conservative grass-roots impact on the 1982 elections.

~~The trouble is that~~ Sometimes number 1 has the potential to conflict with number 2. Most of the new activists in the winning coalition are not politically sophisticated. Some of these

newcomers ~~are~~ filled with dedication and energy, ~~but~~ don't yet know that Senators represent whole states and have six year terms. ~~There is a danger that,~~ By focusing grass-roots attention on problems in the current public policy process, they might become convinced that the 1980 elections accomplished nothing, or, worse, <sup>that all campaign</sup> political action ~~in elections~~ is unavailing.

~~But,~~ Conservative leaders outside government <sup>now</sup> have an obligation to direct their supporters in constructive channels. This is a heavy responsibility.

~~I believe it is certain that~~ Our chances to make progress on issues which are important to the President and to you will be crippled unless we consolidate the victories of 1980 with further gains in 1982.

~~I firmly believe~~ The potential is there for such gains, <sup>Much depends on what</sup> contrary to what most pundits predict.

*the Administration does, but much also depends on you.*

Your efforts in voter registration also undoubtedly provided the winning margins for many fine candidates in 1980. You ~~are~~ have been a leader in awakening millions of Americans to their obligation to participate in our free political system.

The newspaper article implies that you may be on the sidelines politically this year. From our previous conversations, I believe that this is <sup>incorrect</sup> ~~wrong~~. I pray it is not so.

Cordially,



# THE OLD-TIME GOSPEL HOUR

LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA 24514

804-528-4112

JERRY FALWELL  
PRESIDENT

March 4, 1982

Mr. Morton Blackwell  
Office of Public Liaison  
Executive Office Building  
Room 134  
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Morton:

Enclosed are copies of several articles from interviews which Jerry Falwell gave to several newspapers in Texas and Louisiana last week.

Jerry wanted me to pass these on to you so the White House staff and the President would know he is standing behind the Administration.

If possible, would you please see that the President receives these.

Sincerely,

Nelson Keener  
Administrative Assistant to  
Jerry Falwell

NK/dew

Enclosures

P.S. I have also sent these copies to Ed Meese.

in January was 2,239. There were  
TIME, Page 8-B)

opening of a boat in New Orleans  
prospered, he wanted to leave state  
service.

appointment to administer the 32,000-  
(See \* FISCHER, Page 8-B)



The Rev. Jerry Falwell talks at a Baton Rouge  
press conference Monday.

# Falwell lauds God, Reagan

By RANDY McCLAIN  
Advocate staff writer

The Rev. Jerry Falwell oversees a \$70 million evangelical empire, but the television-age preacher doesn't like to dwell on how much money he raises.

"I don't think there's a problem with how much money comes in, it's what we do with it that counts," Falwell said at a press conference Monday in Baton Rouge.

What Falwell does with the cash is continue to run a multi-million dollar radio and television empire, fund overseas religious missions and unabashedly campaign for a return to that old-time religion and conservative politics in America.

Falwell, leader of Moral Majority Inc. and a nationally-known Baptist preacher with headquarters in Lynchburg, Va., came to Baton Rouge to speak at the Bayou State Bible Conference Monday night and to spread the gospel of a return to moral conservatism.

He used the opportunity to speak in favor of Republican President Reagan and Louisiana Gov. Treen, the latter whom he praised for signing into law a controversial bill requiring the teaching of scientific creationism along with evolutionary theory in public schools.

"I think Mr. Reagan is the finest president we have had in my lifetime," Falwell said. "There's no question what he's trying to do is turn this country around. This country has been on a 49-year drunk with socialism since Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, and President Reagan is redirecting the nation."

"The president has thrown himself with abandon into rebuilding this country. He knows we're not going to stay free if we don't stay strong."

"Our president is rebuilding the military, and we certainly support him in that. One of the four tenets of the Moral Majority is a strong military defense. That's the best defense against war,

(See \* FALWELL, Page 12-B)

# ★Falwell

(Continued from Page 1-B)

humanly speaking," Falwell said.

"But there is a question whether military might alone can stop what is happening around the world," the neatly groomed preacher said.

"The only real hope for men is through a personal relationship with God through Jesus Christ. Moral re-armament is the only way to be really strong. God blesses a people who live by his word."

"I have trouble looking 25 years down the road and seeing who is going to straighten out the world. The only hope I see is the coming of the Lord," Falwell added.

"I try to plan as if I had 100 years left, but I live as if this is the last day."

Falwell also lives by his belief that there is a place for God's word in the politics of the nation.

He uses funds raised through Moral Majority Inc. to campaign for conservative politicians. He threw his support behind Reagan's successful presidential campaign.

Falwell sees nothing wrong with using a religious yardstick to measure the worth of a politician.

"I believe the church and state should be separate, but a person's religious convictions will always well over into what he does. I don't think the founding fathers of this nation had in mind the separation of God and state, only the separation of church and state."

Falwell takes obvious pleasure in the success of his Moral Majority's campaigns on behalf of conservative candidates and

fundamentalist issues.

"I think we've been very effective lobbying on the pro-life issue, in exposing pornography as a cancer in this country and fighting against the drug traffic. We try to deal with traditional family values," Falwell said.

"Moral Majority members don't vote along Republican or Democratic lines, they vote along ideological lines. We all agree on the shared moral values that we espouse."

Falwell said he believes the Moral Majority's entry into national politics is a symptom of a return to moral conservatism in the United States.

"Our people are getting involved in politics. Because of that, many senators have become unemployed and many liberals in Congress are no longer there,"

Falwell said.

"It looks like we've come to the place in our history where the American Civil Liberties Union and the secular humanists couldn't care less what the people want," he added. "The liberal establishment in America is bankrupt. Liberalism has no message today for a world that is in trouble and is desperately looking for an answer."

Although Falwell said he believes he provides at least part of the answer with his televised sermons and frequent personal appearances across the country, he also says he supports other people's rights to hold different views.

"The news media across the nation have done a real job on the Moral Majority. The image that has come across is that we are thousands of religious ayatollahs out there preaching that everybody is going to have

to live by our rules. That's just not the case," Falwell said.

However, Falwell points to nationwide polls in support of the contention that his beliefs on major issues are in tune with those of the majority of Americans.

"When you speak of polls, 76 percent of all Americans want voluntary prayer and Bible reading in schools. I believe that voluntary prayer is a constitutional right," he said, adding that he doesn't support Bible reading in schools because he would want to know whose Bible would be read.

"Also, the majority of people support the teaching of creationism."

Falwell said his organization contributed \$5,000 toward the defense of a creationism law in Arkansas, and he said it would do the same in defense of the Louisiana law, if asked.

KIRSCHMAN'S CELEBRATES MARDI GRAS WITH A 7-H  
YOU'LL FIND FANTASTIC SAVINGS IN EVERY D  
AT KIRSCHMAN'S! AND HERE ARE JUST A FEW

Kirschman's

7-HRS

Famous Maker Sofas in  
Variety of Colors

Grain dealers  
books are

Off  
Certi  
curriculum  
Now  
a  
M

# Falwell predicts 1 term for Reagan

## *Evangelist says president makes right but unpopular decisions*

By Helen Parmley  
Religion Editor of The News

Evangelist Jerry Falwell said Wednesday he has doubts that Ronald Reagan is planning for a second term as president.

"The kinds of decisions he has made are so right and at the same time are so unpopular that I have to think that what he is doing is out of a deep heart-felt conviction, with no concern for Ronald Reagan," Falwell said.

"I sometimes think he has no plans for a second term in office."

Falwell is in the area for a speaking engagement in Fort Worth and fund-raising effort Thursday for his Liberty Baptist College in Virginia.

As founder and president of the Moral Majority, he is the most widely known and recognized leader of the religious New Right, which emerged as a political force during the 1980 elections.

The coalition of New Right political and religious organizations gave its support to Reagan as the most likely candidate to promote conservative causes.

Many of those leaders now are openly criticizing Reagan for loading his staff with "non-Reaganites," including Vice President George Bush, and for "weak action" on getting legislation passed to ban abortion, put prayer in schools and approve tuition tax credits for parochial schools.

But Falwell says the coalition

members do not have to agree on everything to unite "when it counts."

"I am so pleased with the President," he said. "I trust him so implicitly in the direction he is going that I don't feel he is selling out or shirking. I think he has a good team and Bush has been a good second man for him."

Unlike many of his New Right cohorts, Falwell also said he has no plans for getting involved in the 1982 elections.

"This year, crucial races don't exist," he said. "Most of the problem people were defeated in 1980. I suppose all conservatives would like to see Sen. (Edward) Kennedy defeated, but I don't think that's realistic."

Falwell said he is satisfied that some form of anti-abortion legislation — either a human rights amendment or a states' rights bill — will be ratified by Congress this year. He said he also is pleased that Reagan is holding to his promise for a military buildup as "the only deterrent to war."

On foreign policy, Falwell said he "probably would have been a little tougher" on the Poland issue than the Reagan administration has been. But he added, "Fortunately, we have a pope who is both Polish and courageous and does not hesitate to use the influence of the papacy."

Calling Reagan's speech Wednesday on El Salvador a

See ONE on Page 26A.



Jerry Falwell ...  
"I trust him (Reagan) so implicitly in the direction he is going that I don't feel he is selling out or shirking."



C  
V  
By  
Staff  
office  
from  
a fu  
tele  
told  
"An  
know  
prob  
chan  
first  
subs  
it pr  
have  
all c  
I  
ary  
site  
the C  
I  
dete  
avail  
tion  
com  
fran  
chan  
P  
m  
in a  
tag  
Arts  
said  
at R  
a \$3  
squa  
art n  
land  
isal  
the  
las  
erty  
last

weekend afternoons, with limited access to the area.

Blackburn said he wouldn't mind.

"I think it (the proposal) would be an excellent move," he said. "In two weekends, the authorities would be able to decide whether they have the problem controlled or not."

The Dallas Park and Recreation Board will consider the 1-way proposal Thursday. An aide to City Council member Lee Simpson, who helped

get  
car  
len  
erty  
ing  
C  
"  
Jam  
Law  
mail  
"

## Irving to oppose

*Mid-Cities Bureau of The News*

IRVING — The Irving City Council has voted to join other Texas Municipal League cities in opposing a \$188 million rate increase request by Texas Power & Light Co.

City Atty. Dor Wednesday that s  
ies have joined ir  
the state Public Ut  
will consider at  
March 1.

## One term predicted for Reagan

Continued from Page 25A.

"masterpiece," Falwell said, "What we learned is that the Western Hemisphere is us and we are in it to stand together and to fall together. We have to stand together against Castro, who is Brezhnev's stooge."

Speaking on another concern of the New Right coalition during and since the 1980 elections — sex and violence on television — Falwell acknowledged a "vast improvement."

He explained why Moral Majority has elected not to participate in a boycott being planned by the Coalition for Better Television against a particular television sponsor.

"I feel the networks are making a responsible effort to improve their programming," Falwell said. "Our suveys indicate improvement in they way they have been programming sex, profanity and violence."

"We were particularly surprised by a 6 percent improvement in the way they presented violence. Our goals are identical to those of the Coalition, but we would like to see if the trend (by the networks) continues."

## FW t

By Carl Freun

*Fort Worth Bureau of*

FORT WORTH Atty. Bill Wood sai will file suits agair pharmacist who se Worth City Council to collect \$6,382.53 i and interest.

*The Dallas Mo* ported Wednesday owed more than \$ taxes dating as far b

"The city tax c advised me that it l additional accounts are due and that th owed is \$6,382.53," have instructed my the necessary pape

## Wright

Continued from should be approved,"

A \$1 million alloce Kleberg school was in 1976 bond program projects from the p including Kleberg — when the bond fu Wright estimated it v

pizza pickup

men had her  
anks. When  
zza and cold  
gave him the

ad them, he  
ity of one in

ing the piz-  
I can't eat it  
row up. My  
taco . . ."

ever shown

some older  
hosts. That  
ard a shriek

ho is minis-  
Side Baptist  
ran to see

ghost in his  
there was  
at God was

out another  
urried in to

an told her.  
oly Ghost."

# Group hasn't lost clout, Falwell says

By **BILL WALKER**  
Star-Telegram Writer

The Moral Majority has lost none of its political clout and is not softening its stands on moral issues, the Rev. Jerry Falwell said here Wednesday.

If either case seems true, it is because Moral Majority is no longer an outsider in religious and political circles, said Falwell, president of the group that gained prominence in the 1980 national elections. He was in Fort Worth to address the national convention of the Bible Baptist Fellowship, with which his 16,000-member church in Lynchburg, Va., is associated.

"When we first came on the scene, we were looked at as stepchildren in American society," Falwell said in an

interview before his speech at Will Rogers Memorial Auditorium. "When you're on the outside, you have to yell pretty loudly to get in. Now we're inside."

The past year has been checkered for Falwell and his religious-political lobby group. Media researchers said the audience for his televised church services was far less than what Falwell had reported. Moral Majority officers committed verbal gaffes for which Falwell apologized.

And Falwell's claims of political influence with President Reagan after the elections was clouded by the president's appointment of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor,

**Please see Falwell on Page 2**



Star-Telegram/VINCE HEPTIG

**REV. JERRY FALWELL ... "Now we're inside"**

Reagan accused Cuba of systematically fomenting violent revolution in Central America by training and arming guerrillas. He specifically blamed the Sandinista government

"neighbors by the sea" who are "under economic siege," Reagan made five specific proposals:

● Creation of a one-way, free-trade zone that will enable Caribbean prod-

uct investment in the region.

● Expansion of economic assistance this fiscal year to particularly hard-hit countries. Of the \$350 million increase, Reagan said, much

da and Venezuela to coordinate development efforts. Each of the three countries has its own development program for the region, Reagan noted.

providing their be and their time, hav the mystery of th pearance.

Denton County Douglas had led th Monday, but he an places Wednesday

# Falwell says group still has clout

Continued from Page 1

against the wishes of the Moral Majority and other New Right groups.

Falwell agreed Wednesday that his profile has been lower in recent months, but he said the Moral Majority actually is gaining support. He said his organization received 33 percent more letters from supporters in 1981 than in 1980, and revenues from his various ministries — estimated at nearly \$60 million annually — rose by 25 percent.

The increase in support has come not because he deliberately has moved toward more moderate views, but because people now understand more clearly what his views really are, Falwell said.

"I think I've shown in the last year that I'm not an ayatollah trying to force what I believe down everyone else's throats," he said.

One indication of that may be the Moral Majority's refusal to join next week's planned boycott against the sponsors of network television programs. Last summer, Moral Majority and the Coalition for Better Television threatened that their members would stop buying sponsors' products if the sexual content of programs was not reduced.

That boycott was canceled when Procter & Gamble, television's biggest advertiser, told Falwell and coalition President Donald Wildmon that the company was "listening carefully" to their concerns. Wildmon is expected to announce Tuesday which sponsoring company has been picked for a boycott by members of the 1,800 churches and organ-



Star-Telegram/VINCE HEPTIG

**REV. JERRY FALWELL**  
... at Fort Worth speech

izations he says are members of the coalition. But this time Moral Majority is staying out.

"We believe it would be irresponsible to participate in the boycott," Falwell said. "We simply believe the networks have made an honest attempt to clean up their programming."

Programming surveys by Moral Majority members over a three-month period show "a 27-percent decrease in gratuitous sex scenes, a 13-percent improvement in profanity and 6-percent less violence than last year," Falwell said. Last year's

threatened boycott was a main force behind those trends, he said.

Falwell said Moral Majority wishes the Coalition for Better Television well and still considers itself a member. But in a telephone interview Wednesday from Tupelo, Miss., Wildmon said Falwell's group no longer is associated with his.

"Their support was not crucial," said Wildmon, a United Methodist minister. "If I thought that Jerry Falwell was crucial to what I am doing, I wouldn't be proceeding with this."

Falwell declined to comment on Wildmon's remarks because Wildmon has not communicated those feelings to him, he said.

President Reagan is another reason why Moral Majority is quieter now, Falwell said.

"We now have a president who agrees with every position Moral Majority represents," said Falwell. "I think he's the greatest president of my lifetime and he has our total support."

Reagan placed a personal call to Falwell before he announced Mrs. O'Connor's nomination. Falwell said he has not spoken personally with the president since then, but that "top White House aides" regularly brief Moral Majority staff members about presidential decisions affecting issues of importance to the group.

The Moral Majority sponsored a political-action workshop in Fort Worth last weekend. But Falwell said the group's involvement in the 1982 congressional campaigns will be slight.

"There are very few crucial elections this time," Falwell said. "Most of the people who were a threat to this country's moral and political conservatism, we got rid of last time."

Growing dissatisfaction with Reagan's economic policies, both by politicians and mainline clergymen, doesn't bother him, Falwell said. He said church leaders who criticize cuts in federal social-aid programs should instead respond to Reagan's challenge to provide more locally based charity.

"The country is just bankrupt and can no longer provide those services," he said. "The churches can and the churches must."

That means that churches and local charities must find ways to provide long-term care for the needy instead of the emergency aid they are accustomed to giving, Falwell said.

Conservative evangelical churches like his own and the 5,000 congregations in the Bible Baptist Fellowship traditionally have not been involved in organized aid to the needy, Falwell agreed. But he said that more fundamentalist churches are responding to those needs, and in his sermon he urged the 3,000 convention delegates to do their part.

Convention officials said they received reports that several groups planned to demonstrate outside the hall in protest of Falwell's appearance, but little of that materialized. Four members of the Tarrant County Gay Alliance walked outside the auditorium's main entrance, carrying signs with slogans such as "The Moral Majority is neither."



© Copyright Metal Vent 1

The Iron S

2-INCH S  
FRAM



Toro Roy  
Oc

\$189 \$20

Double  
K

Insurance proof broadened

Fort Worth Star-Telegram  
(USPS 206-260)  
MORNING—EVENING—SUNDAY

NEED EXTRA

# Inside M.M. Inc.

M.M. Inc.  
Leadership  
Publication

An exclusive biweekly news update from the Moral Majority National Office

Volume 1, No. 8      October 8, 1982

## A PERSONAL WORD

As we go to press with this Inside the Moral Majority report, Carl Godwin has just called me and told me that Everett Sileven's church will again be padlocked tomorrow at 12:00 noon. With the pastor in jail and the church locked, the State Department of Education will have temporarily, at least, stamped out one church school in the state of Nebraska.

But not only are we not giving up, we have, I think, the best plan of action yet conceived for winning a victory in the state of Nebraska. The plan involves several steps. Step #1 is to mount a media blitz beginning in one more week, which will blanket the state of Nebraska with television commercials, radio spots, and newspaper advertisements telling our story to the people of Nebraska. We intend to stop holding rallies to encourage ourselves and persuade the already persuaded and spend our time and money between now and the next meeting of the legislature to reach the 1½ million citizens of the entire state of Nebraska.

The second phase of the program involves hiring a person to contact the national media and get this story into the press on a national level in constant and repetitive fashion. This person will work out of Washington, D.C. and will constantly call national papers, magazines, and television producers.

The third phase will involve bringing in a professional lobbyist provided by my good friend, Mr. Paul Weyrich, who will personally lobby every senator running for office to see who stands where on this issue.

By taking our story to the people of Nebraska, by getting our story in the national media, and by professionally lobbying senate candidates, we think we can do something about this problem, or at least have the greatest chance of doing something about it, between now and January.

Oh yes, we are dedicating the major part of the next Moral Majority Report coming out next week to the Nebraska crisis, and we are also helping Carl Godwin mail an appeal for help to over 70,000 religious leaders around the country. It is an unprecedented move for us to allow Carl to mail to our mailing list, but that is how deeply we feel about this issue and how much we want to help Everett Sileven, Carl Godwin, and the other church school leaders in the state of Nebraska. We intend to spend over \$100,000 if necessary on this campaign, and we are asking pastors all over the country to help Carl, not us, in his fight to lead the 22 schools there.

## CONFIDENTIAL OPINION

Ann Campbell, Commissioner of the State Department of Education in Nebraska, was a paid lobbyist for the Nebraska State Education Association before becoming head of the Department of Education. Her husband, I am told, continues to support the Association. The Nebraska State Education Association is the malevolent force behind the closing of the church schools. This public union is manipulating and using Ann Campbell and the State Department of Education to harass these schools out of existence, and NSEA-financed state senators are voting to help the union accomplish its goal. This evil trinity, the Nebraska State Education Association,

the State Department of Education, and NSEA-financed senators are the problem in the state of Nebraska. The issue is not quality education; the issue is control of education. And for some reason, the NSEA views these tiny church schools as a threat to the union monopoly. We intend to tell the truth to the people of Nebraska, and we ask you to stand with us on this incredibly important issue. We will keep you posted on fast-breaking events as they occur.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DAY FOR NEBRASKANS: October 31, 1982

Carl is asking pastors to declare October 31 Religious Freedom Day for Nebraskans and to take up offerings to help him in his battle for the minds of Nebraskans. Our men should lead by example and do a great job of raising funds. We are paying for the entire mailing sending money to Everett Sileven and underwriting court costs. We, in fact, are going all out on this issue, and we hope you will also.

--Dr. Ronald S. Godwin

CAMPAIGN TRAIL '82

ERA'ers Target "Dirty Dozen" -- Or the Lack of Political Smarts in the Feminist Movement

On June 30, leaders of the pro-ERA movement issued a statement targeting 12 state legislators whom they said were "key players in key unratified states, men who engineered the ERA's defeat." The ERA'ers vowed to defeat these men in this year's election, calling the project: "The Dirty Dozen Hit List."

In reviewing the ERA hit list, some interesting political observations were raised as to the amount of campaign knowledge in the feminist movement.

- (1) Of the 12 men targeted for defeat, only two are anti-ERA'ers up for elections-- Senator Dempsey Barron in Florida and Speaker George Ryan in Illinois. This clearly points to a lack of research by the leaders of pro-ERA organizations.
- (2) Advocates of the Equal Rights Amendment have not provided adequate political incentives for voting for the ERA. Senator Craig Lawing and Senator Kenneth Royal of North Carolina both voted pro-ERA. Yet, they were targeted as two of the "Dirty Dozen." This has been typical of the feminist movement. President Carter gave ERA'ers everything they wanted, including the EXTENSION--and they backed Teddy Kennedy!
- (3) Rep. Thomas Hanahan of Illinois, Senator Floyd Lamb of Nevada, Lt. Governor Jimmy Green of North Carolina, and Senator Virgil Goode of Virginia are not running for re-election. Of course, the ERA PACS plan to take credit (as well as take the hard-earned financial contributions of uninformed citizens) for the retirement of these legislators. ERA leaders have yet to learn that you cannot be successful through deceiving the American public.
- (4) Carelessness is certainly not conducive to political victories. The remainder of the "Dirty Dozen List" are running unopposed in the election this year, so there is no way they can be defeated: Senator Richard Webster of Missouri, Senator Jim Gibson of Nevada, Senator Roy Boatner of Oklahoma, and Speaker A. L. Philpott of Virginia.

Boastful feminists with their unlimited access to the media are always making claims about how they are going to defeat anti-ERA legislators, but on election day the ERA'ers always come up short. The preceding observations may provide the women's libbers with some hard-sought reasons for their most recent failure at passing the ERA.

A special thanks to the members of Eagle Forum Inc. for disclosing the previous facts.

#### HUSBAND LOSES BATTLE, WIFE ABORTS CHILD

A Boonsboro, Maryland man failed last week to save the life of his child as his wife aborted the 9½ week old fetus.

Twenty-two-year-old Chris Fritz said he is ready to take his case all the way to the United States Supreme Court. Fritz's 22-year-old estranged wife, Bonny Ann Fritz, evidently aborted her child in the 18-hour period between the time Judge James C. Morton stayed a lower court injunction barring Mrs. Fritz from having an abortion and the time that the Maryland Court of Appeals reinstated the abortion ban.

The Fritz's have a ten-month-old baby girl. Mr. Fritz says he will seek custody of his daughter when his wife files divorce proceedings in the next few weeks.

"I feel if she's so cold-hearted she can kill one of my children, who's to say she won't take it out on my daughter because of how she feels about me," Fritz said.

#### PRO-ABORTION FILIBUSTER SUCCEEDS

Pro-abortion Senators last week ended hopes of enacting major pro-life legislation this year by employing their "Last Ditch" parliamentary defense -- the filibuster.

On September 15, pro-life leaders failed for a third time to obtain the 60 votes needed to curtail a filibuster which was conducted against the Helms Amendment. Immediately after the third cloture vote, the Senate voted 47-46 to table (kill) the Helms Amendment.

#### DEMOCRATS RAISE MONEY FOR HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS

The leading contender for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1984, Walter Mondale, gave the keynote address at a September 29 "gay rights" fund-raiser.

Mondale, Senator Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Senator Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) served as the sponsors of the dinner which raised money for the Human Rights Campaign Fund, the "gay rights" political action committee. Tickets for the dinner, which was held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York, sold for \$150 cash, and homosexual activists are said to have raised a minimum of \$150,000.

Awards were received by television producer Norman Lear, actor Tony Randall, and former Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman.

TAX-EXEMPTIONS THREATENED BY IRS

Democrats on the House Appropriations Committee have moved to strike amendments from the fiscal 1983 Treasury appropriations which have protected the tax-exempt status of thousands of private and parochial schools across the country for nearly four years.

These amendments to the Treasury Department Appropriations Bill have banned funds from being used by the IRS in carrying out controversial civil rights rulings designed to shut down private schools.

Democrats claim they plan to deny tax relief to so-called "Segregation Academics" by forcing the IRS to re-examine past department rulings. Of course, if the IRS had its way, schools failing to meet an arbitrary quota of minority enrollment would be guilty until proven innocent of discrimination.

At this point, there is great possibility that the private school protections amendments will be added to the appropriations bill when it reaches the floor. But whether they can succeed will depend on how much interest is shown by the voters back home.

JESSE NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT

Hanging on the office wall of Senator Jesse Helms is a plaque from his late dad, Jesse Sr., which reads: "Son, the Lord doesn't require you to win; He just expects you to try."

During the past several weeks, Senator Helms has been waging a seemingly endless battle against liberal, last ditch efforts to kill his pro-life and school prayer proposals. As you know, the Senator came up short in this session of Congress, but despite his opposition, he did "try." Jesse Helms is a winner regardless of how any vote count is ever tallied.

Moral Majority Inc. encourages you to write Senator Helms and thank him for all of his hard work in this session of Congress:

The Honorable Jesse Helms  
4213 Dirksen Building  
Washington, DC 20510

499 So. Capitol Street  
Suite 101  
Washington, DC 20003  
(202) 484-7511



THE MORAL MAJORITY, INC.

*sent to  
Debbie  
Hutton  
6/15*

June 2, 1983

Morton Blackwell  
Special Assistant for Public Liaison  
Room 134 Old Executive Office Bldg.  
17 & Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Blackwell:

Recently, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Bill Bennett, chairman of the National Endowment of Humanities. Mr. Bennett and I had the opportunity to discuss in detail the most recent report from the Commission on Education.

Mr. Bennett was extremely knowledgeable on the issue of education and very eloquently defended the viewpoint of the administration.

I would like to make the recommendation that the White House utilize the expertise of Bill Bennett in defending President Reagan's position on the educational issues. Mr. Bennett's credentials as a conservative and a supporter of President Reagan have certainly been manifested through his actions.

The President needs men like Bill Bennett who are willing to go out on the stump for him.

Sincerely,

Roy C. Jones  
Legislative Assistant

RCJ/jm

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 13, 1981

TO: Red Cavanay

FROM: Morton Blackwell

RE: Packet from Television Information Office

I have reviewed the material from Television Information Office which you sent me. It's obvious these people are feeling the heat from groups dissatisfied with current television programming.

The groups which they are planning to counter are, of course, almost all actively involved in support of the President's legislative program and also were supporters of the President in 1980.

Frankly, I see no great menace to the pro-family groups from this effort. It's a free society and if the Television Information Office wants to defend the increasing flood of vulgarity, profanity, and immorality on television, that is their right.

The House vote last week overturning the proposed D.C. sex law reform proposal is strong evidence that most politicians will feel constrained to support the pro-family leaders when the chips are down.

As part of our public liaison service, I have taken the liberty of sending copies of the packet to some of those attacked in it.

Moral  
Majority

October 13, 1981

TO:

*Jerry Falwell  
and  
Paul Weyrick*

FROM: Morton Blackwell

RE: Packet from Television Information Office

Attached is a packet of information sent to this office in a folder entitled "Television and Pressure Groups." It is published by Television Information Office in New York, which I presume is funded by the television industry.

There is nothing confidential about this, so please feel free to reproduce or use this material anyway you see fit. It is clearly these people feel under pressure from groups offended by current television programming.

# THE NEW TELEVISION PRESSURE GROUPS

---

a perspective on the drive against diversity

*File*  
↙

## INTRODUCTION

A confrontation is in the making which may sharply reduce the diversity of American television entertainment—perhaps even the scope and credibility of television news and information as well.

On the one side is an industry which has grown in the service of audiences who have given increasing evidence of their affection for television. This industry, supported by thousands of advertisers, has remained remarkably free (given the sad lot of free speech in many other lands) from government interference or narrowly-conceived pressure from special interest groups.

On the other hand, there are, as there have always been, the groups of individuals or institutions which have felt that their unique needs or perspectives are improperly or inadequately treated by the writers and producers of television's most popular element, prime time entertainment. Minorities, trade unionists, consumerists, women, all have sought to bring greater diversity to television. They have spoken out against the portrayal of stereotypes and have pushed for more variety, a broader, truer view of experience and potential. And they have seen clear evidence of success.

Today, a new force is in being. A force which wants less diversity, less choice for viewers and a turning away from realities it finds disquieting. In the pursuit of its aims, it threatens to urge public boycott—not the boycott of programs, but the boycott of advertisers whose commercials are associated with what is termed “unconstructive” programming. It would seek to punish economically any advertiser whose views of appropriate programming did not match its own. This new force takes its strength from the religious right, typified by organizations like the so-called “Moral Majority.”

What follows is a brief history of the fundamental political philosophy and of the men and organizations that constitute the “new right” politico-fundamentalist coalition. You will find evidence that “majority” is a gross misnomer and that the mixture of religion and politics sits very badly with many conservative Christians.

The views of prominent Americans from within communications and without are gathered here. So, too, are statements from leaders in advertising.

The historical context in which these religious movements evolved, going back to pre-Revolutionary times, is surveyed in broad terms in Appendix C.

ROY DANISH, Director  
*Television Information Office*

# The New Television Pressure Groups

New religious groups cast from old molds have thrust themselves into the limelight within the past two years in the United States. They have become a force to recognize and reckon with on the national political, social and business scene. They have sought political power by targeting candidates for defeat, attempting to shape and set the agenda of the newly elected Congress. To influence the content of television programming and advertising, they have threatened to boycott advertisers who sponsor "disapproved" programs or use "immoral" techniques in commercials.

This special report, covering fundamentalist pressure groups and the "Moral Majority" (so termed because of the prominence of that one group and its leader, Jerry Falwell, in the anti-television campaign), has been undertaken to provide an understanding of the implications of the actions of these religious groups. They have become of compelling interest not only for broadcasters and advertisers but for all segments of society.

## *"Coming Out of the Closet"*

In August, 1980, elements in the Christian fundamentalist movement joined hands publicly with the political "New Right." More than 15,000 fundamentalists, most of them ministers, convened in Dallas for a conference on how to mobilize congregations for political action. The Rev. James Robison, a leader of the Christian Right, exhorted the gathering to act: "I'm sick and tired hearing all the radicals and the perverts and the liberals and the leftists and the Communists coming out of the closet. It's time for God's people to come out of the closet, out of the churches and change America." Others on the platform included three preachers who owe their new prominence to television and the technology that has made satellite broadcasting and cable systems possible—Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson and Jim Bakker.

*Jerry Falwell, 47, is the symbol, organizer and leader of this new political religious movement. Falwell, pastor of the Thomas Road Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Va., is also President of Moral Majority, Inc.*

Founded in 1979, Moral Majority, Inc., is an avowedly political "educational" group which Falwell describes as a "special interest" group. Initially focused upon anti-abortion, "pro-family bi-

ble-based policies," the organization has taken on an increasing number of special and essentially political interests in recent months. Falwell claims support from non-fundamentalist individuals and groups, even from non-Christians. He has, however, stated as his basic objectives: "Get them saved, baptized and registered to vote."

As entrepreneur, Falwell is the classic American success story. A high school football hero and honor student, he was converted at 18, quit Lynchburg College to enroll in the Baptist Bible College in Springfield, Mo., and in 1956, valedictorian of his class at 22, returned to Lynchburg. Within a week he and a group of 35 laymen had taken the first steps to found a new church; their resources totalled \$1,000. The church took its name from its first one-room location, and by the end of the first year, The Thomas Road Baptist Church in which Falwell was pastor, fundraiser, carpenter and janitor claimed to be the second largest congregation in the city. Falwell had also launched a half-hour radio program.

Today, in a town of 125 churches, more than one-fourth of the population of Lynchburg belongs to the congregation. It is the second largest church in the United States, with 17,000 members. It is his broadcasting efforts, however, that support the multi-faceted Falwell empire. Falwell's Sunday service, the "Old-Time Gospel Hour," is carried by 390 TV stations and 400 radio stations in the United States, Canada and other parts of the world. Revenues from various appeals made in the broadcasts and from direct mail merchandising are close to \$60 million per year. It is estimated that the Falwell operation, which uses the latest business, merchandising and fundraising techniques, employs about 1,000 people on a full-time or part-time basis. The operation includes a children's academy, a Bible institute, a correspondence school, seminary, and the Liberty Baptist college with nearly 2,000 undergraduates. After visiting the College, one reporter wrote, ". . . there is no real point in talking to more than one of them on a topic of general interest, for there is a right answer to every question . . . . It is not a moral and intellectual quest that involves struggle and uncertainty. It is simply the process of learning, or teaching, the right answers. Falwell told his congregation that to read anything but the Bible and certain prescribed works of interpretation was at best a waste of time. He said that he himself read all the national magazines just

to keep up with what others were saying, but that there was no reason for others to do so."

Falwell's life style is that of the successful entrepreneur. In addition to a salary of \$42,500 a year, he enjoys many perquisites of power, including a private jet for pursuing his extensive activities. Interviewed by *Newsweek*, Falwell had this to say about his lifestyle: "Material wealth is God's way of blessing people who put him first." Recent press reports indicate, however, that he has over-extended himself and his financial empire may be in trouble.

*Pat Robertson*, 50, with a law degree from Yale and a master's degree from New York Theological Seminary, shares most of the fundamentalism of the others in the movement. In a letter to his television followers he wrote, "We see a virulent humanism and an anti-God rebellion of which blatant homosexuality, radical feminism, the youth revolt and the Year of the Child, drug abuse, free sex and widespread abortion are just symptoms." Robertson's show, "The 700 Club," based in Virginia Beach, Va., originates from studios with dazzling electronic equipment in a \$20 million complex of buildings. He is now soliciting another \$100 million to build a new network, which he expects will compete with the three commercial networks. His current Christian Broadcasting Network has 162 affiliated stations, augmented by 2700 cable systems and 126 radio stations. His paid staff of 800 oversees the 10,000 telephone volunteers attached to counseling centers across the country. His original "700 Club" was organized with 700 viewers who each gave \$10 a month; today viewer contributions, coded by computer, total about \$1 million per week. Robertson, who appears to be less political than Falwell, although sharing his views, has recently dropped out of the Religious Round Table, of Rosslyn, Va., a council of conservative clergymen and a major activist group. Robertson has been quoted as saying, "God isn't a right-winger or a left-winger. The evangelists stand in danger of being used and manipulated."

*Jim Bakker*, 40, attended North Central Bible College in Minneapolis, and for a time assisted Pat Robertson. For the past several years he has been headquartered near Charlotte, N.C., where he has founded the "PTL Club" (for Praise the Lord), modeled after the "700 Club." His show, too, now generates approximately \$52 million annually and supports a paid staff of 800. There are also 800 local volunteers and 4,000 pastors for follow-up in prayer and contacts. In addition to having an efficient computer system and first-rate electronic equipment, his operation, on 1200 acres located about 10 miles from Charlotte, contains a barn for services and a Christian university. Plans are being made to add an amphitheater, trailer parks, condominiums,

and restaurants. Of the three "stars," he is the least involved in politics.

### *The Moral Majority*

Falwell's drive for broader influence began when he entered the political arena with the founding of Moral Majority in June, 1979. The group of men who first persuaded Falwell to head up the organization were political professionals on the New Right. The core group included: Paul Weyrich, 37, who heads the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, runs a training school in Washington for conservative candidates and is a former aide to some conservative congressmen; Howard Phillips, 39, organizer of a lobbying group called the Conservative Caucus; Senator Jesse Helms (NC); Robert Billings, who had once run for Congress from Indiana, is now on the staff of the Dept. of Education and is "unofficial religious adviser" to President Reagan; Ed McAteer, a veteran marketing man familiar with the activities of evangelical preachers around the country, organizer of mass mailing operations in Falls Church, Va., and editor-publisher of the *Conservative Digest*; and Terry Dolan, 29, head of the National Conservative Political Action Committee.

The linking of Falwell and other fundamentalists with the political right proves mutually advantageous—in terms of Falwell's apparent ambition to become America's moral arbiter and the New Right's drive for political victory.

The Moral Majority, claiming membership that includes 72,000 ministers, has as planks in its platform opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment, to gay rights, sex education, drugs, pornography, Salt II, abortion and defense cuts. Some of its past actions include fighting shelters for battered women and advocating capital punishment for gays. It supports voluntary prayer in the schools, military spending, free enterprise and a secure Israel. According to Falwell: "You can't be a good Christian and a liberal." Weyrich, like Falwell, has said the long-range goal is "to Christianize America."

During the 1980 campaign, Moral Majority claimed that it had registered some three million new voters from the ranks of born-again Christians. It also joined with the Christian Voice in support of its "morality index." This was a system devised to rate all members of Congress on how they voted on 14 "key moral issues." Many of the issues, however, had nothing to do with morality, but with secular politics, such as votes on the status of the Panama Canal and whether to retain the Department of Education.

Moral Majority also has taken credit for helping to defeat a number of Representatives and Senators

whose views and voting records they claimed were violative of Christian morality. In fact, many of these issues were political. Whether the Moral Majority's targeting was a key factor in their defeat remains open to question. Although five of the six northern Democratic senators they targeted were defeated, the decline in their vote was almost identical with that of Democratic senatorial candidates in 18 non-targeted states. In several instances, the defeated candidates garnered a greater percentage of the vote than President Carter.

Seymour Martin Lipset, co-author of an article in *Commentary* and editor of *Public Opinion*, a journal of the American Enterprise Institute, says: "The Americans who 'turned right' in the last election did not by any means agree with the Moral Majority or New Right programs. These Americans were not supporting specific political solutions any more than they usually do. They wanted a government that would more demonstrably reflect their mood: a more assertive America on the world scene, and on the domestic front a serious campaign to fight inflation and refurbish American industry." Lipset also cites a *New York Times*/CBS election day poll which shows that Carter lost less support among his fellow born-again Protestants than among others.

Nevertheless, because of perceived triumphs, Falwell and the Moral Majority have continued in the spotlight since the election. And because it is too early to begin an overt campaign for issues and candidates in 1982, in the interim they are turning their attention to the medium that has publicized and sustained them—television.

### ***Reverend Hurt's Boycott Campaign***

Early in 1980, the Rev. John Hurt, a Church of Christ minister in Joelton, Tenn., riding the crest of publicity generated by the Moral Majority and the Presidential campaign, launched his own "Clean Up TV" campaign. Members of his congregation queried thousands of other Churches of Christ members asking which five television shows they found most morally offensive. Those named were *Soap*, *Three's Company*, *Dallas*, *Saturday Night Live* and *Charlie's Angels*. Three others—*The Newlywed Game*, *The Dating Game* and *Three's a Crowd*—were added to the list. The chief sponsors named were General Foods Corp., American Home Products and Warner-Lambert. Warner-Lambert withdrew its advertising and Hurt removed the company from his boycott list. American Home Products refused to negotiate. General Foods met with Hurt and then issued a statement. In the statement, General Foods made clear that it did not intend to bow to pressure, and noted that the prime responsibility for program

selection rests with the broadcasters. It then made these points: it is aware of its own responsibility and places its commercials on programs it considers meritorious; it prescreens individual programs to make certain they meet its standards of propriety; it has declined to advertise on more than 100 programs each season. General Foods also said that program selection is a subjective matter and it intends to reach its own determination as to which programs it will sponsor.

In October, the Joelton congregation intensified its boycott efforts, distributed five million forms and a wallet-size card listing products manufactured by the companies they had targeted. As far as can be determined, Hurt's campaign has had no effect on sales at General Foods or American Home Products.

### ***The Coalition for Better Television***

On February 2, 1981, a new organization was formed to exert pressure on television advertisers—the Coalition for Better Television (CBTV). Leaders are the Rev. Donald Wildmon, chairman, who gave up his United Methodist congregation in Tupelo, Miss., in 1977, to head the National Federation for Decency, dedicated to reforming television; and Ronald S. Godwin, executive director, who is also Moral Majority's vice president and chief operations officer.

Other members of CBTV's board are Phyllis Schlafly, of the anti-ERA Eagle Forum; Judie Brown, of the American Life Lobby; Beverly Lahaie, of the Conference of Women for America; and Lottie Beth Hobbs, of the Pro Family Forum. The Rev. Hurt, who initially had been involved with CBTV, has since dropped out.

CBTV's announced purpose is to cleanse television of programs that its members consider offensive in terms of "sex scenes, gratuitous violence intended to injure, and abundant profanity." The campaign was planned to be carried out by some 4500 individuals, all members of coalition groups, and trained by coalition leaders with the aid of program videotapes.

The first step, a monitoring project, was conducted from March 1 to June 1, 1981. Volunteers working from forms counted scenes of sex and violence, wrote down profane words, and noted the advertisers for each program. Also to be noted were commercials found to be suggestive, that, according to Wildmon, "use sex to sell products."

The information is intended to be tabulated both by hand and by computer. It will follow the pattern established last year when Wildmon's National Federation for Decency had a similar project of grading prime-time shows. For instance, said Wild-

mon, it will produce information such as "For each 30-second advertisement last fall, (Advertiser X) helped sponsor 18 sex scenes," according to NFD's definitions. (Given the permitted ratio of advertising-to-program material permitted, such a finding would have to be an enormous exaggeration.) Objectionable sex scenes, as defined by Wildmon, would include "implied sexual intercourse and sexually suggestive comments." Also, "if a camera zoomed in on a girl to expose her breasts, that would be a skin scene." A program on birth control is considered "objectionable"; abortion "immoral"; and homosexuality "perverse." An expression of "Oh God" is termed a profanity.

Offended by a word a performer used on *Saturday Night Live*, Don Wildmon demanded of NBC that the offender be dismissed summarily. NBC apologized, but declined to accede to the demand. Subsequently the following paragraph appeared in a Wildmon mailing:

"In light of the above, and because NBC refused to take proper disciplinary action, NBC WILL BE SCORED DOUBLE IN OUR MONITORING REPORT DURING MARCH, APRIL AND MAY. In other words, each score for violence, sex and profanity will be doubled for those advertisers sponsoring NBC programs. If a program normally would score 10, and if it is an NBC program, that score will be 20."

Mr. Wildmon's response to NBC raises further serious questions about the objectivity of his entire survey. At the very least, this behavior must be called arbitrary and capricious.

Once the results of the volunteers' work had been computerized, the Coalition proposed to select one or more advertisers who rank among the most frequent sponsors of shows CBTv finds objectionable and "ask for a voluntary one-year boycott of all their products."

Jerry Falwell, when speaking of the project, claimed that the withholding of viewer dollars is the "key weapon in making the wholesome difference." Falwell also mentioned bringing forth from the monitoring "consensus" views of what the majority likes. He later acknowledged that those doing the monitoring would not be scientifically representative of the society at large, but rather would be members only of groups working under the coalition umbrella, of a particular religious and political persuasion.

A byproduct of the coalition's efforts, which conservative strategists admit only reluctantly, will be a potentially massive boost in their mailing lists for the next political campaigns, in 1982.

The New Right groups rely heavily on these mailing lists. Falwell's Moral Majority itself mails

more than 1.5 million pieces per week to gain support for its enterprises and raise money. Richard Viguerie, consultant and mailing mastermind for conservative groups' fund-raising admitted to the *Boston Globe* that the names and addresses obtained through various causes, including the campaign against television, end up in the computers to be used for mailings that have nothing to do with television. Said Viguerie: "The networks may beat us . . . but in the meantime, Jerry Falwell and others may increase their list of supporters by three- or four- or five-fold. And we can do something the networks cannot do, which is get involved in political campaigns."

### *The Vision Projected and the Reality*

A subsidiary of Pat Robertson's Christian Broadcasting Network has just offered for syndication its first show—a 30-minute soap opera, "Another Life"—aimed at providing an upbeat alternative to network fare. It will emphasize the importance of family, hope and optimism, and the power of God, in contrast with what its fundamentalist and conservative critics have decried in the subject matter of popular daytime television.

The Rev. Wildmon wishes for a return to what is remembered as the moral climate of the 1950's. He is convinced that it is television, rather than a wide range of social and economic factors, that has caused the changes in society and in value systems. The vision Wildmon projects is of bygone days when the nuclear family—with an employed father, homemaking mother, and at least two children—was considered the standard. He wishes for a world before the political assassinations, the Vietnam war, civil rights, women's rights and gay rights movements, before OPEC, Watergate, inflation, before the quest for self-fulfillment and with it the changes in cultural norms relating to sexuality, childbearing, marriage, divorce and sex roles.

Today, only seven per cent of all American households are cast in the mold of the traditional family. A few other statistics:

- More than 1 out of every 5 households consists of a person living alone.
- Seventeen per cent of all families with children are maintained by the mother alone.
- During the last decade the ratio of all divorced persons to husbands and wives with intact marriages nearly doubled.
- More than one-half of all women are now in the work force. This includes more than 69 per cent of women aged 20-24; 62 per cent of women aged 25-34; and 57 per cent of women with children aged 6-17.

These changing patterns have dramatically altered the social landscape. Daniel Yankelovich, veteran pollster and analyst, in a major new work excerpted in *Psychology Today* (April, 1981) entitled "New Rules in American Life: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down," says:

"Many observers have concluded from the news coverage of the past year—the Reagan sweep, the disarray of political liberalism, the tighter constraints of our economy, the emergence of fundamentalist groups opposed to the ERA, abortion, and sex education—that the United States is swinging back to the disciplined, self-sacrificing habits that ruled American life before the heyday of affluence. But that inference is incorrect. Tomorrow is not going to look like yesterday. In fact, tomorrow—to the extent that research data can yield clues about it—is being shaped by a cultural revolution that is transforming the rules of American life and moving us into wholly uncharted territory, not back to the lifestyles of the past. Irreversible in its effects, this cultural revolution is as fateful to our future as any changes in the economy or politics."

He later cites twenty major changes in the norms guiding American life, based on surveys by a number of research organizations (such as Roper and Gallup) in addition to his own. They include: a drop from 85 to 37 per cent in those who condemn premarital sex; a rise to 75 per cent in the number of women who would go on working for pay even if they didn't have to; three-quarters of the people

saying it is morally acceptable to be single and have children; and 52 per cent agreeing that it is not morally wrong for a couple to live together even if they are not married.

The surveys document the changes that have taken place in the thinking and attitudes of many Americans. Jerry Falwell may be speaking for a particular segment of certain sects. But in terms of morals, clearly he is not speaking for the majority. What is the true measure of this "majority," characterized by the evangelical right?

Sociologist William Martin, writing in *Atlantic Monthly*, examined audience claims of the "electronic evangelists." One of them (Rex Humbard), whose publicity materials once claimed "over 100 million," currently admits to the more modest 1.4 million viewers weekly. Another (James Robison) concentrates his publicity on potential figures of 50 to 60 million, while in actuality there are about a million viewers. Still another (Bert Clendennen) has broadcast that his program reaches "one out of every two people on the face of the earth." Estimates of Jerry Falwell's audience were erroneously given as anywhere from 6 to 30 million per week, but in fact numbers less than one and one-half million. Jim Bakker's claims to an audience of 20 million were termed a "total fabrication" by his own associates in an article in the *Charlotte (NC) Observer*. Demographically, the audience is centered primarily in the rural areas, small cities and towns of the South and Midwest, are predominantly middle-aged females of working-class or lower-class backgrounds and "true believers, mostly members of conservative Protestant churches."

Martin published the following chart to show average weekly audiences for the top ten programs:

#### AUDIENCE DATA ON TEN SYNDICATED TELEVISION MINISTRIES

Ministry	Stations	Rating (% of viewer households in coverage area)	Total Audience	Total Households	% Change in Total Households since Febru- ary, 1980
Oral Roberts	177	2.1	2,351,000	1,553,000	-21.6
Robert Schuller	161	2.0	2,130,000	1,427,000	- 3.6
Rex Humbard	209	1.8	2,079,000	1,308,000	-21.0
Jimmy Swaggart	207	1.5	1,789,000	1,148,000	-10.0
Jerry Falwell	244	1.35	1,440,000	986,000	- 2.3
Day of Discovery	180	1.3	1,267,000	879,000	-14.1
PTL Club	193	1.3	1,050,000	776,000	-11.9
700 Club	123	.9	705,000	569,000	- 4.7
James Robison	69	1.2	575,000	383,000	+ 7.3
Ken Copeland	69	.7	381,000	277,000	-14.4
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>13,767,000</b>	<b>9,306,000</b>	

SOURCE: A.C. Nielsen Company, *Report on Syndicated Programs* for February and November, 1980. Used with permission. Arbitron data report slightly smaller audiences than Nielsen.

## *Implications of the McCarthy Era*

For many who are over age 45, the Rev. Wildmon's yearnings for a return to the 50's carry other memories of that decade: the pressures and threats of the McCarthy era (roughly 1950-57). James H. Rosenfield, president of the CBS Television Network, referred to that time in a speech that included comments on the current social changes and attempts to censor television shows:

"... Well-meaning and well-intentioned people are not well-directed in their efforts to censor television. For such efforts invariably bring with them larger threats to freedom of expression, much as attempts to inhibit movies, television, and yes, even comic books, were corollaries of the incredible climate of the repression America experienced during the McCarthy era in the 1950's. It may seem to some that the issue of freedom of expression in entertainment isn't all that important, just as it has from time to time seemed that freedom to dissent wasn't all that important, or that academic freedom didn't much matter. But yet, we know that when our tolerance of intolerance increases, so does the level of intolerance."

During the McCarthy era, organizations arose, such as Aware, Inc., dedicated to rooting out "the Communist conspiracy in the entertainment world." *Counterattack* magazine began publication in 1947, listing names of people who had been associated with a Communist-front organization, no matter how briefly or remote in time. No effort was made to prove that those listed were indeed members of the Communist party or sympathizers. Names from vague sources were added to the lists. The mere mention of an individual in a news item about an allegedly subversive group was enough. And since broadcasting was so active and visible, its writers, producers, newspeople, announcers and others were eyed with suspicion. In June, 1950, shortly before the outbreak of the Korean War, the publishers of *Counterattack* issued a book entitled *Red Channels: The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television*. Using the same questionable criteria as in the earlier publication it listed 151 persons, including some of the most talented and popular professionals in the television industry—mostly writers, directors and performers. Erik Barnouw, then Columbia University Professor, wrote in *Tube of Plenty: The Evolution of American Television*: "They were people who had helped make radio an honored medium, and who were becoming active in television. Many had played a prominent role in wartime radio, and had been articulators of American war aims. In short, it was a roll of honor." Barnouw

goes on to report that to many observers the list seemed a preposterous hoax, but it was not an era for calm appraisal.

Most copies of *Red Channels* were quickly hidden in desk drawers of executives at networks, advertising agencies and sponsors. Few people discussed its contents openly. Many who were listed did not learn about it for weeks. Others found themselves fired from roles even though contracts were already signed. A former Navy intelligence officer, Vincent Hartnett, who had written the introduction to *Red Channels*, developed a thriving business as "the nation's top authority on communism and communications" and consultant to sponsors, agencies and networks.

Soon blacklist administration became part of the built-in machinery of the industry. Producers had to submit to superiors the names of writers, actors and directors being considered; they awaited a "yes" or "no" on every name. Even child performers had to be checked, and those with controversial parents were banned. The blacklist gradually dropped out of the headlines, but its presence remained. Drama plots were affected, too; numerous topics became dangerous to discuss.

During the Congressional hearings on subversion in the Army, the public got a close-up view of McCarthy the man, as well as his methods. It was not until after the hearings that the Senate voted to condemn McCarthy. He then retreated from the limelight and, in 1957, died of alcoholism. It was years later, however, before many of those who had been blacklisted were able to recover their reputations and careers. Some never recovered.

## *The Public's Right to See and Hear*

The key question, beyond the effect of McCarthyism on the rights of the individual in broadcasting, was its effects on the rights of the audience to see and hear a full spectrum of ideas and opinions.

The role of government is limited in the American system of broadcasting. Congress and the Federal Communications Commission are barred from interfering with the content of television programs. Governmental intrusion into content of the media is antithetical to the American system, because it would constitute manipulation of people's minds. Aware that television and radio are so pervasive and reach the young and impressionable as well as the sophisticated, broadcasters recognize their significant responsibility for what goes out on the air.

The Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters, professional principles and standards born out of broadcast experience and practice, was created in 1952.

The Code, now in its 21st edition, contains voluntary guidelines on program standards, including the areas of violence, crime, sex, costume, profanity, special protections for children, and the use of materials relating to minorities and ethnic groups. It covers the handling of controversial public issues and makes clear the responsibility of television broadcasters in regard to religious programs. Other sections are devoted to establishing special standards for the content of television advertising and the amount of time permitted for it.

To implement the Code—to which the national networks and individual stations subscribe—takes a heavy commitment of personnel, time and money. The three networks and the Code Authority employ on a full-time basis 150 people at an annual expense of \$5,000,000. In the course of a year these editors screen and evaluate 40,000 commercials and 10,000 hours of entertainment programs prior to their production and broadcast. In addition to network and Code Authority staffs there are people at every station who are responsible for enforcing standards.

In addition, national advertisers consult broadcasters early, before actual production begins, to resolve areas of conflict so that the finished announcements will be acceptable. The same is true in the production of programs. In dealing with themes or treatments that may raise Code-related questions, the networks in particular, and the Code Authority, on request, are actively involved very early in order to reduce the possibility that a program will have to be scrapped or substantially modified to meet broadcast standards.

Given the range of tastes and standards in this country's pluralistic society, it is impossible for networks or stations to control programs so that they will never displease nor offend anyone. Broadcasters attempt to see that program content falls within a general range of acceptability. They tread the tightrope with caution and balance—neither a force for change in national morals nor so far out of touch with change that audiences won't watch the programs they air.

To assure that entertainment programs are meeting current generally accepted standards, program executives keep in touch with the highly segmented, incredibly diverse American public in a variety of ways. Station personnel are deeply involved with the people in their communities and their responses to television content. Broadcasters study audience behavior, viewer attitudes and desires. They participate in conferences, talks and interviews throughout the country; and also meet with groups to discuss, for example, stereotyping of women and minorities, racism, sexism, children's programming, portrayals of the elderly, of blacks, Italians,

Poles, Arab-Americans, Native Americans and members of various faiths. In addition they confer with voluntary organizations of every stripe, along with government agencies, recognized religious and ethical organizations, parent and citizens groups, psychologists and sociologists. Altogether, the groups surveyed represent constituencies of tens of millions of Americans—a substantial and effective means, along with program ratings, by which to gauge people's preferences.

### ***Responses to the Moral Majority: Religious Community***

There is a growing reaction among a variety of religious denominations, conservative as well as liberal, to the philosophy and tactics of the Moral Majority and its efforts to achieve recognition and supremacy as the arbiter of America's moral agenda. Here is a sampling:

*The Rev. Billy Graham, in an interview in People magazine:*

- Q. How do you feel about the political activities of groups like Moral Majority?
- A. This is not my cup of tea. I think where political issues invade moral situations, spiritual leaders have to speak out. But I do not intend to use what little influence I may have on secular, non-moral, non-religious issues like the Panama Canal.
- Q. How do you deal with issues like abortion, gay rights, and women's lib?
- A. I am against abortions except in cases of rape and incest or pregnancies which affect the mother's life, but I do not support a constitutional amendment to ban them. If we start fooling around with the Constitution, we're going to have problems. . . . my main thing is the Gospel of Christ, and I want to preach to homosexuals and women's libbers without having them feel I'm already prejudiced against them.
- Q. What bothers you about the new electronic preachers?
- A. Let me say that after all the crime and sex, I'm thrilled that there is so much gospel on TV and radio. . . . But I see dangers. One is financial gimmickry—for instance, when you use half your TV program talking about the need for money. We may rely on sophisticated direct mail campaigns or an advertising agency with a

proven track record instead of trusting God to supply our needs. . . . We must have the highest standards of morality, ethics and integrity if we are to continue to have influence.

*Terence Day*, president of the Pullman Elders Quorum of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons), from the *Christian Science Monitor*:

“ . . . I am deeply concerned at the rising tide of that narrow, shallow, simple-minded, uncompromising bigoted brand of conservatism practiced by knee-jerk conservatives . . . who are so intolerant that they are hell-bent on bringing the yoke of government down on the necks of all the rascals who have the temerity to disagree with them. . . .

“To defend the right of expression is to be labeled a pornographer, or a lover of pornography. . . . Never mind that the censor’s axe cannot be laid to the roots of pornography without also cutting the roots of religious and political freedom. . . .

“To defend the rights of non-Christians to be free from prayer in the schools, or the right of Christians to be free from forms of prayer that they may disagree with, is to be labeled an atheist, if not an anti-Christ. . . .

“Yes, I am a conservative and shall remain so—despite the humiliating, mindless arrogance of those who would heap upon my head the sins of the world for having the audacity to care not only for my own rights, but for the rights of those who disagree with me as well.”

*Father Joseph O’Hare*, editor-in-chief, *America*, in a symposium covered in *Reform Judaism*:

“What is misleading and dangerous about this movement is the temptation to lump many issues together and to fail to address each one separately. The Catholic community, for example, is concerned about abortion. Some pro-life Catholics, therefore, might join the evangelical right, even when it supports a host of other issues that stand counter to Catholic traditions.

“A further problem is the dangerous tendency to moral absolutism, to say one particular position is the only legitimate Christian position. . . . Such narrowness destroys the possibility of civilized debate within a pluralistic society. We have to be able to debate and disagree. . . . The Moral Majority doesn’t allow the conditions for disagreement. A tremendous amount of authoritarian power is being brought to bear on particular issues. It comes close to a kind of moral fascism.

*The Right Rev. Paul Moore, Jr.*, Episcopal Bishop of New York, in a speech reprinted in part in the *New York Times*:

“As Christian citizens of the United States, we are also called to a true conservatism. Our national scripture is the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution. . . .

“However, this is not what is meant by conservatism in the parlance of the Moral Majority. (It) spells a series of positions with which to replace the ancient foundations of our church and nation, including the following:

“The slogan ‘right to life,’ by which they mean the denial of safe abortions to the poor—a right which continues to be available to the rich. These same pro-life forces neither condemn capital punishment nor dread the threat of war.

“The protection of the family. ‘Pro-family’ to them means lack of compassion for broken families and all other hapless people who do not have the blessing, usually through no fault of their own, of tight and happy nuclear families.

“As the so-called conservatism of these positions does not honor the flag, their alliance with Christianity does not honor the cross.

“The answer to false conservatism is true conservatism.

“The answer to the dangerous political action of the right-wing churches is renewed vigor on our part for the cause of economic justice, personal freedom, and peace built upon the just distribution of the world’s resources which our Creator has provided for all his children.”

*The Rev. Daniel Maguire*, a director of Moral Alternatives, when debating Moral Majority leaders on a recent David Susskind show:

“You have the supreme arrogance to claim you know what God thinks.”

And *Gabriel Fackre*, professor at Andover Newton Theological School in Newton Centre, Mass., writes in “Immoral Majority”:

“When the Moral Majority does take a stand on a matter of public morality, they often go counter to the hard-won middle axioms of the church at large. . . .

“When a partisan of the New Right declares that a specific position is ‘of God’ or ‘the Christian view,’ a move has been made from political-moral judgement to divine oracle. A human opinion is elevated to the status of

revelation—a violation of the sovereignty of God.”

### ***Responses to the Moral Majority: Social Action Groups***

As the movement of the Moral Majority has increased, countervailing forces have been growing as well.

One group responding to them is People for the American Way, with a board of lay and religious leaders. These include Norman Lear, producer of *Archie Bunker's Place*; Colin Williams, former Dean of Yale Divinity School; Notre Dame President Theodore Hesburgh; Rabbi Marc Tannenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee; Editor Norman Cousins; former FCC Chairman Newton Minow; President M. William Howard of the National Council of Churches, and other representatives of Protestant denominations. PAW's first efforts involved the production of radio and television spots. It is also working on educational programs with leaflets and articles to be distributed to schools, churches and libraries.

Former Senator George McGovern, the son of an evangelical minister and one of the candidates defeated in a bid for re-election in 1980, has organized Americans for Common Sense. Its purpose will be to “return our system to rational political discourse and public discussion and to do so at the grassroots level.”

The American Civil Liberties Union, the NAACP, and the Americans for Democratic Action are also taking stands against the Moral Majority's activities.

Action for Children's Television (ACT), headed by Peggy Charren, long known for her efforts to mobilize parents for action to achieve improvements in children's television, will be conducting its own campaign against the Coalition for Better TV and the Moral Majority. ACT will organize a national petition drive in which citizens will collect signatures and speak out against the concept of blacklisting programs.

Charren, in announcing the drive against CBTV's censorship tactics, said: “Perhaps no one will miss the first program forced off the air in the name of morality. But the New Right's censorship crusade will not stop there. What will be the next target? A production of ‘A Streetcar Named Desire’? A documentary on teenage pregnancy? The news?” She also opposes CBTV “because the process of monitoring and boycotting is not a process that allows for discussion or changes in the networks' decision-making processes. Having more programs on television, a wider choice of material, is a more effective antidote to trash than just removing offensive programs.”

Moral Alternatives, a task force of the Center for the Study of Religion, based in Milwaukee, is a multi-denominational group affirming a “commitment to a religiously pluralistic and culturally diverse society by responding to efforts to violate the separation of religion and state.” The group's specific goal is to inform and encourage members of the clergy to promote discourse, discuss the ideas and trends of modern life in a rational context and to speak from their pulpits and in public places to “answer questions raised by doctrinaire religious movements,” as well as to “identify the dangers inherent in the manipulation of religion and fear in order to achieve political ends.”

The National Coalition Against Censorship, active since 1974, recently organized a conference on The Religious Right and Freedom of Expression, to examine the rights of religious groups to participate in the political process and exert pressure on television and public schools. The Coalition is comprised of more than 30 organizations, including the American Association of School Administrators, National Council of Churches of Christ, National Education Association, American Council for the Arts, and the Writers and Directors Guilds of America. Articulating its concern over activities of pressure groups, the Coalition issued this statement: “Freedom of communication is the indispensable condition of a healthy democracy. In a pluralistic society it would be impossible for all people at all times to agree on the value of all ideas; and fatal to moral, artistic and intellectual growth if they did . . . (We) are united in the conviction that censorship of what we see and hear and read constitutes an unacceptable dictatorship over our minds and a dangerous opening to religious, political, artistic and intellectual repression.”

The Foundation for Alternative Religious Broadcasting, headed by a Paulist Catholic, is an inter-faith coalition which supports a national Campaign for Viewer Responsibility. The campaign was launched “in response to current efforts of religious/political pressure groups of the New Right to influence or censor the television programming of the American viewer by hit-listing advertisers who sponsor programs that do not reflect their views.”

In announcing the campaign, Tom Osborne, F.A.R.B. president, said: “We are taking this to the mainline churches of America. The New Right has gone too far. The legitimate Christian agenda in this country in 1981 is to deal with the serious abuses of the public trust that are being carried out in the name of Christianity by these various religious/political pressure groups. Cleaning up our own house is something that no one else can do for us.” The campaign is based on the assertion that the goal of better television should not be expedi-

ently purchased at the expense of viewer responsibility; and it focuses on dealing with "this latest and irresponsible effort of the New Right to deny the American family the responsibility of choosing what they will or will not watch in the privacy of their own home."

Speaking out in various forums—radio spots, news releases, lectures, debates—Osborne has stated, "Viewer responsibility is a religious responsibility which cannot and must not be pre-empted. No single group or lobby should be given such responsibility. If the churches of America remain silent in this debate then they are trading (what some consider to be) bad television programming for the far more dangerous threat of 'religious' demagoguery."

### ***Reactions to the Proposed Boycott: Advertisers and Agencies***

Two groups representing the advertising industry have issued clear statements opposing the CBTV and its proposed boycott of selected advertisers.

The American Association of Advertising Agencies said, "Advertiser censors should be no more acceptable than government censors." And that would be the end result of pressure group action upon advertisers. Besides diluting broadcasters' direct responsibility to the general public, boycotting would limit individual choice and disregard the wishes of the true majority. "The fact that programs targeted by vocal organizations are also those with the highest audience ratings argues quite dramatically that their judgements do not necessarily represent a majority of television viewers," states a pamphlet issued by A.A.A.A. It is their conviction that "broadcasters have been and will continue to be responsive to serious and constructive criticism without the necessity for advertisers to be held as economic hostages." (The complete text of the A.A.A.A. statement can be found in the Appendix.)

The Association of National Advertisers (which speaks for television sponsors) has commented on the Coalition's plans and also developed specific recommendations for companies to follow.

Peter Allport, president of the ANA, said: "We do not take issue with the Coalition's goal of improving the quality of television, but reject coercive means to achieve that end.

"Attempts to control newspapers and magazines, or radio and television, by threatening or boycotting the advertisers who appear in these media lead down a dangerous road. In fiction, the threatener, wishing to control a crusading editor, usually wore a black hat. In reality, the hat can be of any color, and the outcome will be the same. If efforts to subvert or destroy a medium's economic base are successful, the public's freedom of choice, as well as

a free and diverse press, are jeopardized.

"The Coalition," Mr. Allport went on to say, "has indicated that it intends to boycott advertisers. Its purpose in so doing can only be to gain control of television's economic base and thereby impose its own wishes and standards on both the television medium and on television viewers. Such means are coercive and contrary to the spirit and purpose of our free institutions. Were it to succeed, the Coalition would usurp:

"The obligation of broadcasters, licensed in the public interest, to determine and serve the needs of their communities;

"The responsibility of individual advertisers to adopt standards and strategies appropriate to their individual advertising requirements;

"The right of viewers and the public at large to select that which they like on television and tune out that which they do not.

"Thoughtful advertisers," Mr. Allport concluded, "will reject the means adopted by the Coalition no matter how worthy they believe its eventual goal to be. Were advertisers to do otherwise, they would be party to subverting the medium's economic base and jeopardizing the greater good of freedom of choice and freedom of the press."

In essence, the ANA advises that advertisers spell out their own policies defining standards of acceptable program content. They should insure that top management be familiar with the policies and prepared to defend them, both with the press and activist groups. Having established standards, the company will then be better prepared, when faced with critics' requests for modification of program selection, to assess the broader consequences of policy changes. Networks and independent stations should be informed of the advertiser's policies and program selection should be based upon advance review of individual programs. Advertisers, then, can speak from a defensible, conscientious position, not having abdicated responsibility to others.

One advertiser highlighted the advantage of having established standards by its response to group pressure: ". . . our company (for several decades) has had written policies on sponsoring tasteful programs and avoiding programs that are offensive. What is tasteful . . . comes down to judgment . . . The standards I apply are our own. We cannot responsibly adopt others . . ." (The ANA guidelines are reprinted in the Appendix.)

A major advertiser, General Foods, threatened with a boycott by one of the pressure groups, issued this response: "While we are committed to acting as a positive influence on programming, we have to function in the marketplace. We're in the market to

buy time, and not everything we buy will please every viewer. But that's the essence of the pluralistic society in which we live. We don't believe any one group should be able to dictate to all others what their choices should be, and we decline to meet (the Clean Up TV campaign's) demands."

### *... and from the Broadcasters Themselves*

In brief statements and in formal speeches, leaders in the broadcast industry have spoken out against the tactics of the Coalition for Better Television and the Moral Majority. Here is a brief round-up of what they've said.

"The Coalition campaign is clearly an attempt at a form of censorship . . . to replace diversity, freedom of choice and the public judgment with one group's view of what is right and moral for all of us to see and hear. . . . Make no mistake, what this group seeks to do is to control the content of TV."

—James E. Duffy, president,  
ABC-TV Network

"I have no problem with the preacher who preaches or the teacher who teaches that any program should not be watched for any reason. I am concerned when the individual seeks to make certain that no one will watch, by having that program disappear through lack of advertiser support. In doing so, that pressure group is seeking to deprive us all of our freedom of choice by imposing a decidedly minority view, and asks the advertiser to be his partner. . . .

"That economic boycott will not work. . . . One group involved actively in the boycott approach declared that last November (1979) would be turn-off CBS month. The group's leader harangued the nearly 100,000 subscribers to his house organ; he received considerable publicity in the church and secular press and we received a number of petitions from his supposed followers.

"The result? You may recall . . . that CBS won the November sweeps.

"I think the same will prove true with the economic boycott. Lip service will be paid to the boycott, but when the consumer goes to the marketplace, he or she will not be guided in the choice of soap or cereal or automobiles by someone with an imagined grievance. . . .

"There are advertisers who do indeed submit to the demands of pressure groups. And when that happens I worry for all of us. I would hope that the advertiser would stand

tall, as the broadcaster has, for advertising is important to everyone."

—Gene Jankowski, president,  
CBS/Broadcast Group

"Innovation is daring. We have to stand firm in our defense of the right and responsibility of broadcasters to be innovative. . . . We cannot innovate, cannot serve our total audience, if the networks—and advertisers—live in fear of coercion by special interests like the Coalition. The only thing fear will produce is bland, timid programming.

"In our open marketplace, it is possible for programs as different as 'The Dukes of Hazard' and 'Sixty Minutes' to be among the top five rated network television shows. Certain elitist critics to the contrary, that's a fact that we ought to be proud of. It shows we serve our pluralistic democracy well. . . .

"Those programs serve different interests, different values, but those different interests all have a legitimate place in our society. And having them represented in a national broadcast service vividly demonstrates this nation's faith in diversity. . . .

"Thanks to our diversity of programming, groups with differing views, values, and tastes can see each other, understand each other, and, we hope, become more tolerant of each other. . . .

"Marching under the banner of 'decency', the Coalition is threatening not just particular programs. It is threatening the democratic soul of television. And, ultimately, because television is the central information medium in our society, it is threatening democracy itself. . . .

"A good and decent life can have many shapes; it can mean many things to many different people. And in a democracy that's the way it's supposed to be. Diversity is our lifeblood. By its diversity of programming, network television helps keep that lifeblood flowing.

"I would hate to think that our marketplace of ideas rang with only one voice because we, you and I, were frightened into silence."

—Fred Silverman, then president  
and chief executive officer, NBC

"While there have been isolated instances of networks bearing intense pressure on productions in the past, it's obvious that pressure group tactics are going to be an increasing fact of life in the Eighties for all of us in the entertainment business. The difference is that increasingly, the pressure will involve all aspects of our business—from the networks and

advertisers and agencies, to the affiliates, and straight on to the production community and the actors themselves.

"The future for entertainment is going to have to include not only a commitment to do a production—but a commitment to weather the roadblocks as well.

"As an industry based on the principle of expression of free speech, and as a business serving many people and having to be concerned with being fair, we've gone out of our way in recent years to listen to others' opinions. I would not deny these groups their right to express their views, but neither do I expect them to try to silence others who want to express theirs.

"I recognize that commitments to certain productions may well cost us financially in the future, but I want to go on record . . . as saying that I feel this principle is worth the commitment. We've got to be absolutely certain of our judgements in selecting a project that has validity and can enrich the lives of our viewers, we have got to join hands as a community and stand firm. Belief in a project will become more important at every level, because faith in the relevance of a project will make the difference when the protests begin.

"These commitments—by each of us, at every level—will become increasingly important in the years to come . . . to the future of quality television . . . and to the future of free speech."

—*Frederick Pierce, executive vice president, ABC, Inc.*

Responding to a threat four years ago to boycott advertisers, a representative of television broadcasters commented:

"Advertisers look at programs differently than broadcasters. Those who buy time have a single obligation, that is to seek suitable audiences for their commercial messages. Broadcasters have different objectives. Not only must they attempt to please large audiences much of the time, they must also offer a balanced schedule of entertainment and information. It includes programs that deal with controversial matters. It includes programs that annoy or offend some people, without being either overly violent or permissive. In other words, programs that are not expected to please everyone, but which do meet specific needs. Unlike the broadcaster, no advertiser is accountable to your community or the Federal Communications Commission for the balance and quality of a broadcast schedule.

"I predict that if you make advertisers your go-betweens, you will drain the vitality out of television and you will also invite far more mischief by others whose political or social views you may find distasteful.

"Broadcasting had its brush with this kind of boycott in the Fifties and the results were shameful and long lasting. Please, let's not open that Pandora's Box again."

—*Roy Danish, director, Television Information Office, February, 1977*

### *Implications of a Boycott*

When all the arguments, both pro and con, are taken into consideration, the essential fact of the proposed boycott is that it is a misguided strategy that will produce more evil than it hopes to cure. However logical, legal or necessary a boycott may appear to be in some circumstances, in this particular situation it is wrong:

1. It places too great an emphasis on the role of the advertiser. Program policy, by law, is the responsibility of broadcasters, who respond to the ascertained needs and preferences of the viewing public.

2. Using an economic weapon to achieve an ideological point of view, especially when that view would entail a narrowing of viewing choices rather than a multiplicity of choices, can have stultifying and even dangerous consequences.

3. Other groups with a different outlook may have stronger economic weapons at their command at some point. Establishing the precedent of a boycott would make it that much easier for other boycotts to be effective in the future, with results that may be unpredictable today and, in fact, at odds with the goals of the present boycotters.

4. Our entire social system is based on an open marketplace of ideas and values. The use of injudiciously applied economic pressure is inimical to such a system. When a product is boycotted, consumers may buy substitutes. But when the ultimate target is a program with its ideas and values, freedom of speech and thought is threatened.

It is interesting to note that a recent survey commissioned by ABC has found that "more than 91 percent of Americans have never at any time in their lives boycotted a product because of something on television they disliked." In addition, the study learned that of the *small* percentage of respondents considering themselves members of the 'Moral Majority,' "more than half disagree with the tactics of economic boycott."

Americans feel strongly about making their independent choices in program selection. A TIO-commissioned study by the Roper Organization in 1978 showed that 67% of the American public

believe the individual viewer should have responsibility for determining program acceptability by deciding what to watch while only 13% felt that social action and religious groups should have a voice in it. A recent ABC poll substantiated that public preference for individual responsibility, and showed further that in 1981 only 2% of the people believed that religious organizations, special interest groups or advertisers should have primary responsibility in deciding what programs should be aired.

The public also expects the networks to provide them with program diversity so they may have a choice. When asked whether they agree or disagree with the idea that "Television networks have an obligation to provide the viewer with a wide range of choices, leaving it up to the viewer to decide what programs are appropriate to watch," only 7½% of the total population disagreed with the statement. More importantly, 7 out of 10 agreed, with 56% registering "strong agreement."

Along with the notion of choice, it was found that people reject any special interest group activity which would potentially diminish the viewers' choices of television programming, or which would force other people's standards on them. Two-thirds oppose organized groups whose goal is to influence television programming to conform to their standards, with some 56% in strong opposition.

Thus the public expects diversity, wants the primary responsibility to decide what programming is or is not appropriate, and is opposed to any groups which would attempt to decide programming for them, or take their choices away.

Another study, conducted by the Roper Organization and commissioned by NBC, surveyed public opinion about "sex, profanity and violence" on television. Approximately 2500 adults (18 yrs and older) were contacted during Spring, 1981.

Nine of the 17 programs selected for study had been identified by the National Federation of Decency or other conservative religious groups as "immoral." Seven other programs were chosen because they might be considered similar to the previously identified programs; and one program recommended by the NFD—"Little House on the Prairie"—was included for comparison. The programs included series on all three networks.

Only one program received criticism on sex/violence grounds from as much as 10 percent of those surveyed; eleven programs received such criticism from 5 percent or less. Only one program was criticized by as many as 13 per cent on violence grounds; fourteen programs were criticized by 3 per cent or less. Asked if programs should be "taken off the air" because of sex, profanity and/or violent content, 3 percent of the respondents said each of two of the programs should be taken off; 12 addi-

tional programs were similarly condemned by 1 percent or less.

More than half of the programs on the list of so-called "objectionable" programs received more positive comments than negative comments for the way they handle sexual themes.

In addition, a series of questions was asked of all respondents to establish their degree of adherence to fundamentalist religious beliefs. Strong fundamentalists, it was found, represent "only a fraction of the nation's population."

It was found that those of strong fundamentalist persuasion were more concerned about sex and profanity in a number of the programs studied than were non-fundamentalists. However, the fundamentalists watched these programs to the same degree as others and were "more likely to express favorable than unfavorable opinions on them" Only one-quarter of the fundamentalists queried objected to any one of the 17 programs on the grounds of sex, profanity or violence. Fewer, the study showed, would choose to "remove them from the air."

Like the general public, the Roper study concluded, fundamentalists show little concern about violence in these programs. They differed from the general public, however, on a number of issues relating to freedom of expression. They were more likely to think that there should be "more regulation of what is allowed in newspapers and magazines," and to think that "television should not deal with different kinds of values, ideas and lifestyles"—but in all cases these were minority opinions.

Part of the ABC study, too, included an analysis of those who claimed they were "members" of the Moral Majority, to see how they differ from, or agree with their leadership or the general population.

First, Moral Majority members are not a unified group in terms of the major issues the organization has taken a public stand on. In fact, a substantial portion of Moral Majority members disagree with many of the major positions of the national organization.

Second, Moral Majority members are not consistent in their attitudes towards television. The position of Moral Majority members quite frequently parallels the position of the general public in its attitude towards TV issues and determining where the responsibility for program acceptance lies.

Third, with minor exceptions, the Moral Majority members tend to watch the same programs as the population at large.

And finally, Moral Majority members are very similar to the total population in their attitudes towards television and program acceptability.

Overall, it can be said that the leadership of the Moral Majority is following a path differing from that of most of its members.

A national poll by the Roper Organization (not commissioned by TIO) recently found that the general public rates television second only to "family" as giving them the most personal satisfaction in their everyday lives. Responding to questions in a general survey, including a list of 15 diverse things of which they were asked to name the three or four most satisfying to them day in and day out, the national sample of adults rated "family" first by 72%; behind it was television in second place (48%); ahead of "friends" (47%); "music" (31%) and reading (28%) and far ahead of such items as

"socializing" (20%); "meals" (18%), "hobbies" (17%) and "car" (16%).

R. H. Bruskin Associates, surveying the three most important items in the home (an open ended query), found that television ranked higher with the American public than anything else, and by a greater margin than previous surveys showed.

What we are left with then is a small but vocal minority seeking to impose its conception of morality on the true majority of American viewers. The minority's threat of a boycott is not to be lightly regarded, but, if our principles of freedom and progress are to be preserved, neither should it be allowed to influence the discourse between viewer and broadcaster.

# Appendices

## *A. Statement of the American Association of Advertising Agencies*

The A.A.A.A. believes that advertiser boycotts represent a serious long-range danger to the proper functioning of a commercially supported broadcasting system in a free society.

The most important tradition of our broadcasting system in the United States is its freedom from undue influence not only by the government, but also by advertisers. This freedom permits the media to seek a direct and honest relationship with its viewers and to concentrate on serving their needs and tastes.

It is naive to contend that advertisers have no influence on programming. Advertising support is a vitally important factor in programming decisions, but this influence is a secondary one. The judgments made on the purchase of advertising time are based for the most part on research data and projections of the nature and size of the audience that will be watching. They are business judgments made individually by a variety of companies, and not intended to exclude or deny programming choices.

A.A.A.A. believes that any technique which has as its end result increasing the influence of advertisers and agencies in the editorial and programming judgments of broadcasters on a systematic basis is unhealthy for the proper functioning of our free broadcast industry. Such influence would not be in the long-term interest of the very groups that recommend it, since it would dilute the broadcasters' direct responsibility to the general public. Advertiser censors should be no more acceptable than government censors.

How then to properly express concern over trends or styles of programming that individuals might find objectionable? Clearly the most telling weapon in the arsenal of viewers is their ability to choose which programs they watch, and how much programming they watch. Changes in viewing patterns, in ratings of individual programs, and in total viewing speak very loudly to the broadcasting industry.

The fact that often the programs targeted by vocal organizations are also those with the highest audience ratings argues quite dramatically that their judgments do not necessarily represent a majority of television viewers.

Beyond this, individuals and groups should continue to voice their feelings directly to the networks and stations. The privilege of a broadcast license brings with it the very serious responsibility of

operating in the public interest. A.A.A.A. believes that broadcasters have been and will continue to be responsive to serious and constructive criticism, without the necessity for advertisers to be held as economic hostages.

## *B. Association of National Advertisers Television Committee Guidelines*

Following discussion of the issues raised by the Coalition for Better Television, the ANA Television Committee issued this statement: "These and other groups have decided to exert their leverage against advertisers. Although broadcasters and producers clearly have the primary and direct influence on television programming, these critics believe that the advertiser can be more easily affected. Following extensive discussion of the issues involved, the ANA Television Committee has developed the following recommendations for your consideration:

"1. If your company does not have a written policy defining standards of acceptable program content, you should initiate the development of such a policy. It should indicate what degree of responsibility your company believes it has for the content of television programs. It should also define the basic guidelines for choosing programs for the company's advertising.

"2. If your company already has a policy, it should be reviewed to make sure it represents your position as accurately as possible. Since this policy may find its way into the news media, it should be written so as to be understandable and defensible under such circumstances.

"3. In either of the foregoing circumstances, it is important to develop a firsthand awareness of the issues and consequences at the highest levels of management. Top management must understand and commit their support to the policy, including the particular buying decisions which will flow from it. As the preferred contact for activists groups and the press, top management should be familiar with the company's program policy and be prepared to defend it.

"4. When a critic requests you to modify your program selections, assess the consequences as a basic policy change. Such a change will almost always have broader consequences than just the specific programs involved in the request.

"5. Establish a procedure for the company management person responsible to screen individual program episodes/movies far enough in advance of air date to withdraw company commercials, if necessary. One A.N.A. member company writes to pressure groups: '...each individual prime time

program or episode in a series scheduled to carry our commercials is reviewed by the company prior to air time, and individual programs which do not meet our company's standards are rejected for placement of our ads.'

"6. Inform the networks and independent stations with whom you have contacts of your policies. Advise them of your decisions not to advertise in specific programs. It has been suggested that this information should be conveyed to the broadcasters' general managements as well as the individuals responsible for programming, sales and standards and practices.

"For perspective, it is useful to keep two additional thoughts in mind.

"Advertising placement, like most other business decisions, is one that must be made in good conscience by each company. It should not be delegated to people outside company management. The Vice President of Marketing Services for one large A.N.A. member company has responded to activist pressure groups, in part, as follows: '. . . our company (for several decades) has had written policies on sponsoring tasteful programs and avoiding programs that are offensive. What is tasteful . . . comes down to judgment . . . our company has vested in one individual, the responsibility for making these judgments on its behalf. For the past several years, I am the individual. The standards I apply are our own. We cannot responsibly adopt others. . . .'

"The programs deemed 'unacceptable' vary from group to group. Certain groups have stated their intent to expand their lists of such programs. For the advertiser who abdicates his responsibility to make his own program decisions, the list of unavailable programs can grow very long indeed."

### C. *The Roots of the Religious New Right*

The Puritans sailed to these shores to practice freedom of religion and to establish "the New Israel" in America. For more than 100 years their clergy were the intellectual leaders and set the moral and religious standards for the colonies. By the 1740's new forces were challenging their authority and dominance. On one side were the currents of the Enlightenment—a growing secularism, rationalism and skepticism. On the other, the Great Awakening—a wave of revivals from Maine to Georgia, stimulated by English evangelists, with eloquent preachers bringing Christian doctrine and experience to the common, uneducated people.

The characteristics and beliefs of those Evangelicals and their differences with the liberal leaders of the Enlightenment are very close to those being

articulated today by the Religious New Right. The New Right's enemies—those they call "secular humanists"—resemble closely the proponents of Enlightenment philosophy. Here is how the sides lined up from approximately 1734 to 1765:

<i>Evangelicals</i>	<i>Leaders of the Enlightenment</i>
Appealed to the masses	Attracted intellectuals such as Jefferson, Washington, Madison, and Franklin
Enthroned presence of God	Enthroned reason of man
Began with revelation	Began with reason
Emphasized obedience and service	Stressed freedom and tolerance
Began with the Bible	Emphasized individual authority
Stressed a philosophy of the heart	Stressed a philosophy of the mind*

During this period, Evangelicals had the majority—three-fifths of the nation was converted before the Revolution, while established Protestant sects were increasingly divided by class as well as doctrinal differences.

The next generation of Evangelicals helped launch and win the Revolution and accepted the enlightened leadership both on the battlefield and in the political arena. When it came to religion, however, each sect continued to believe in the absolute correctness of its own interpretation of the Scriptures. All agreed that no one denomination should dominate, and all agreed to the first Amendment of the Constitution calling for separation of church and state. This spirit of freedom and tolerance prevailed through the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights in 1791.

However, by the end of the century, a second Great Awakening took place; it emphasized conversions and letting God into one's life or suffering eternal damnation. It was to set the pattern for domination by evangelical/fundamentalist sects (especially Methodists, Baptists and some Presbyterians) of the country's moral agenda—the tone for America's community life—for the next 125 years (1800-1925). All groups, of course, including Catholics and Jews, were permitted to worship

\*See Richard R. Gilbert, *Religion and the Bicentennial*.

freely, but orthodox Protestant religion was supreme and its leaders set the ideals of what family life should be and how the Ten Commandments should be interpreted.

By 1925 the great forces for change in the 20th century—including World War I, mass communications, the rise of science, with its conceptions of human nature and human behavior and the impact of Freud—were evident. Evangelicalism split into two camps—fundamental and liberal. The liberals accepted science, reason and many of the ideas of the Enlightenment, and integrated them into their religion. The fundamentalists rejected Darwinism, and after the Scopes trial, in which a high school teacher was publicly tried for teaching the theory of evolution (Scopes was defeated legally but not intellectually), retreated to follow their own precepts remote from the center stage. Even when Billy Graham and other evangelists emerged on the national scene after World War II, they emphasized

religious matters but steered clear of secular, political issues.

Gradually new divisions occurred among evangelicals in the fundamentalist camp. There is now a clear split between middle-of-the-road and liberal factions, on the one hand, and right-wing fundamentalists on the other. All evangelicals, including the fundamentalists, still agree on essentials—i.e., conversion, spiritual experience. However, the right-wing fundamentalists believe in the “inerrancy” of the Scriptures—that every word of the Bible is literally true—while most other evangelicals are less rigid. Of more relevance for laymen attempting to understand the groups is this distinction: while the more moderate elements, such as those led by Billy Graham, are ecumenical and willing to hear other points of view, even though they believe they themselves are right, the right-wing fundamentalists have shown little evidence of such democratic flexibility.

Those prized and paramount tenets of American democracy — Freedom of Expression and Freedom of Choice — have been besieged and threatened many times throughout the history of this country. In this capsule account of the news media in America, journalist and educator John Tebbel reviews their great diversity, service and importance — and the many efforts by various factions and governmental agencies at control and regulation. The freedom of broadcasters and journalists to program and to print — and the public's freedom to choose to watch and to read — “cannot be qualified without imperilling the whole (of democracy),” says Tebbel. “The opening of one door leads to the opening of a thousand others.”

Volume 38 / Number 1 / Winter 1981

*The*  
**Quarterly Journal**  
OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

## From Rags to Riches

The Media in American Society

by John Tebbel

Except for a few specialists in the field, historians are not given to examining the role of the media in American life. While nearly every American president has been concerned to some extent about his treatment by the press, few academic historians of presidential administrations have considered the effects of the press much more than in passing. Whether, for example, William Randolph Hearst played a significant role in starting the Spanish-American War was once a subject of popular controversy, but serious historians of the McKinley administration, and of the war itself, scarcely do more than mention Hearst, if they refer to him at all.

This neglect may have been unwise, even unscholarly in some cases, but it has come to an end. If one examines the literature of journalism from

its beginning to 1960, roughly some four thousand volumes of it, the work of professional academic historians is scant indeed; but if we look at the literature of the past twenty years, it is easy to see that examination of the media has become almost a cottage industry, especially among sociologists who have drawn heavily on the techniques of the historian, and vice versa.

The dismaying fact about this phenomenon is not that it is abundant but that it is almost entirely critical. In thousands of monographs, essays, articles, reviews, and books, the number of those defending the media or presenting their work in a positive way is less than 5 percent. How much the impact of this massive assault has trickled down to the public is hard to say. But perhaps it is more than coincidence that the outpouring has occurred at a time when the media are under fierce and sustained attack from every quarter of American life, a time when the government and the courts between them are steadily narrowing the original meaning of the First Amendment until it promises soon to have little effect, and control will become a reality.

Why this change in the public's perception of the media? Are they doing nothing worth defending? Or is there some deeper reason for the widespread, pervasive hostility on the part of both the general public and the articulate portion of it which creates and transmits opinion, ranging

---

During his career as a writer, journalist, and educator, John Tebbel has been affiliated with *Newsweek*, the *Detroit Free Press*, *American Mercury*, the *Saturday Review*, the *New York Times*, and the journalism departments of Columbia University and New York University. His recent publications include the four-volume *History of Book Publishing in the United States* and *The Media in America*.

This article was commissioned by the Center for the Book in the Library of Congress.

Copyright © 1981 by John Tebbel

from the academician to that new specimen the "media critic," who is paid to bite the hand that feeds him on the grounds that he is somehow fulfilling a responsibility and performing a public service. The hostility of the government and the courts is much more understandable. That is quite simply a power struggle, with important ramifications for all of us.

There has never been a time, of course, when the media were universally beloved. That is not their nature. Newspapers, especially, were born out of controversy, out of the struggle for power. As soon as the printing press was invented, it was apparent to both the primary sources of power in that day, government and the church, that whoever controlled what the new invention produced would be in a position to influence profoundly what people thought. Consequently the press was licensed at once by government, with the full approval of the church, and there was no semblance of freedom of the press from the fifteenth century until the first part of the eighteenth century when a few brave printers in colonial America risked their fortunes to defy the Crown and the provincial authorities. The print shop became the center for dissent in the eastern centers of population and carried the news of it inland to those removed from the daily spectacle of British rule.

In colonial America, the press was only secondarily a purveyor of news. Printers were generally not editors but were only craftsmen used by partisans of both sides, Tory and patriot, to advance their causes. The issue in the celebrated case of John Peter Zenger was essentially the right of dissenters to attack corrupt public officials. No one expected objectivity or responsibility; those concepts were more than a century away.

It is important to remember the totally partisan nature of the press before and after the Revolution, when it was again in the hands of political zealots, in order to understand the climate of opinion that produced the First Amendment. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention did not believe the press needed any special guarantee of freedom, but when the document they produced was sent to the states for ratification, that was foremost among the deficiencies which produced the grassroots revolt that resulted in the Bill of Rights. Remembering the vital role the press had played in helping to secure their freedom from tyranny, the people of the new nation, still distrustful of giving too much power to government, insisted on a free press as the best means of making their governors accountable. They did so notwithstanding that the press of that time was guilty of the wildest, most irre-

sponsible partisan excesses.

Jefferson and Madison understood the role that the First Amendment was intended to play better than anyone. When the Prussian ambassador strode into President Jefferson's office waving a Federalist paper full of abuse of the president and demanding to know why Jefferson did not have it suppressed and the editor punished, the president observed quietly, "Put that paper in your pocket, Baron, and should you ever hear the reality of our liberty, the freedom of the press questioned, show them this paper—and tell them where you found it." It had been lying in the waiting room.

When Madison was president during the War of 1812, and the nation was on the verge of disaster, papers in Boston and Georgetown argued that New England should secede and make a separate peace with Britain. Many thought Madison should use his wartime powers to suppress these seditious gazettes, but this chief architect of the First believed in its absolute character and refused. He considered a country without a free press hardly worth saving.

Thus a general pattern was set. People hated the newspapers that advocated ideas which were not theirs, but at the same time they supported those they agreed with. The same citizens who sacked Tory printshops before the Revolution continued to express their anger against opposing views in the same way well into the nineteenth century. Shops were destroyed and editors shot or horsewhipped, as Mark Twain amusingly "documented" in his *Journalism in Tennessee*. As for government, presidents made no attempt to shut down newspapers even when provoked—and they were all provoked. In 1846 many newspapers fought "Mr. Polk's War" with Mexico, the most unpopular American conflict until Vietnam, but the president did not move against them. Lincoln, subjected to the greatest abuse from the Copperhead press—and even from papers of his own party—that any president had endured since the days of Washington and Jefferson, refrained from taking the measures he could have taken and restrained his generals' attempts at suppression.

Meanwhile, a great change occurred in the public's perception of the media between 1835 and the close of the Civil War. The central factor in this movement was the creation of a mass audience through introduction of the cylinder press. Newspapers, magazines, and books had earlier reached what was essentially an elite audience, but the cylinder press, the first major change in printing technology since Gutenberg, made it possible to reach millions with all kinds of printed materials.

The paperback revolution that began in 1842 had reached such proportions by the Civil War that these volumes were shipped by the bale to the fighting fronts, and civilians were reading them just as avidly. The press acquired a new respectability in 1835 when James Gordon Bennett introduced the modern newspaper, with news and editorials strictly separated, and set up as the ideal the notion of getting the news first and accurately. From then until the end of the century, the nation's important newspapers would be in the hands of great editors, many of them well known nationally. For the first time, one heard that phrase so often abused later, "the power of the press."

For they did have power. It mattered whether editors like Bennett, or Horace Greeley, or Charles Anderson Dana, or any of the others endorsed a presidential candidate or supported him after he was in office. A powerful newspaper could do much to swing an election. Moreover, in the midst of the most bitter partisanship before the Civil War, Henry J. Raymond introduced a new paper, the *New York Times*, which he declared would try to be objective. People turned to it with relief, and the concept of responsibility for news columns was introduced, or at least carried to a new level. Newspapers then and later were as partisan as ever, but people recognized that an effort was being made to report the news as fairly as possible, despite many failures imposed by human limitations.

As for magazines, their explosive proliferation after 1825 was one of the phenomena of the century, and by 1900 they had become a national habit. Civil War issues were argued chiefly in their pages. General magazines arose to reflect literary and social tastes. Specialization began to give every kind of interest a printed outlet. After the war, magazines began to rival newspapers with their investigative reporting, and by the turn of the century, the ten-cent periodicals were in the forefront of the great reform wave that led Theodore Roosevelt to call their writers "muckrakers." People might quarrel over what the newspapers did, but they regarded magazines highly. Book publishing proliferated in much the same way and enjoyed the same kind of prestige.

In the early years of this century, however, advertising was the prime factor in bringing about another major change. Slowly, newspapers became less dependent on circulation as advertising increasingly became their main source of revenue. Magazines, too, changed in character as advertising also became their lifeblood. These media were, in fact, becoming institutionalized and, as the century wore on, they

were no longer the product of individual entrepreneurs who had to rely solely on public favor, expressed by circulation figures. They were now businesses themselves, and they were delivering specific markets to advertisers who wanted to reach those markets. As business institutions, they were also becoming predominantly conservative.

The rise of radio and television completed the transformation. Here were mass marketers who reached far larger numbers of people, presumably had much more influence on them, and in the case of television, had the capability (as many people believed) to shape national tastes and affect the political process.

All this has changed our perception of the media. We say "the media" do this and do that, and the "mass media" are endlessly analyzed by every kind of expert and nonexpert. We see the media now as sources of power, and in a divided, contentious, litigious nation, every political, social, and ethnic group wants them to serve its interests. If they do not, these groups are prepared to bring activist pressure against them to make them conform. As every editor knows, it is absolutely impossible to edit a newspaper or prepare a news broadcast that does not offend someone or elicit charges of bias. The cry from every group is that all it asks is fairness, but it is not fairness that is really desired. What all these groups want is advocacy, or news coverage that makes them appear as they want to be seen.

The situation is further complicated by the inability of the public to separate the editorial pages from the news columns. Often when people complain about a particular newspaper, it turns out that what has offended them is something in an editorial, or more likely, a political column, and so they condemn the whole paper as being biased. Not many people are qualified to pinpoint bias in a news story, but those who go looking for it are certain to find it, by their own lights. Although three-fourths of the nation's press is conservative, there are many people who are convinced it is liberal, even leftish, because a few of the largest and best known papers are either liberal or moderately so. There are no major dailies in the United States that could be considered left wing by any sane measurement, but there are many that are far to the right.

No one would think of telling a surgeon how to operate, or a lawyer how to conduct a trial,

FOLLOWING PAGES: *The first and last pages of the November 25, 1734, issue of the New-York Weekly Journal. On November 17, 1734, John Peter Zenger was arrested for libel and so was not able to issue his paper that week. On the first page of the November 25 Journal Zenger describes his arrest and imprisonment. Serial and Government Publications Division.*

THE  
New-York Weekly JOURNAL

*Containing the freshest Advices, Foreign, and Domestic.*

MUNDAY November 25th, 1734

*To all my Subscribers and Benefactors  
who take my weekly Journall.*

*Gentlemen, Ladies and Others;*

**A**S you last week were Disappointed of my Journall, I think it Incumbent upon me, to publish my Apology which is this. On the Lords Day, the Seventeenth of this Instant, I was Arrested, taken and Imprisoned in the common Goal of this City, by Virtue of a Warrant from the Governour, and the Honorable Francis Harrison, Esq; and others in Council of which (God willing) yo'll have a Coppy, whereupon I was put under such Restraint that I had not the Liberty of Pen, Ink, or Paper, or to see, or speak with People, till upon my Complaint to the Honourable the Chief Justice, at my appearing before him upon my *Habias Corpus* on the Wednesday following. Who discountenanced that Proceeding, and therefore I have had since that Time, the Liberty of Speaking through the Hole of the Door, to my Wife and Servants by which I doubt not yo'll think me sufficiently Excused for not sending my last weeks Journall, and I hope for the future by the Liberty of Speaking to my Servants thro' the Hole of the Door of the Prison, to entertain you with my weekly Journal as formerly.

*And am your obliged  
Humble Servant,  
J. Peter Zenger.*

*Mr. Zenger;*

AS the Liberty of the Press is justly esteemed and universally acknowledged by Englishmen, to be the grand Paladium of all their Liberties, which Liberty of the Press, I have rejoiced to see well defended in Sundry of your Papers, and particularly by your No. 2. 3. 10. 11. 15. 16. 17. 18. 24. & 54. and by an anonymous Authors Observations on the chief Justices Charge of January last; now, for as much as it may not only be of present Use, but of future Advantage, that such Matters of Fact, that concern the Liberty of the Press, may be faithfully recorded and transmitted to Posterity, therefore I have sent you a Detail of such particulars that concern the Liberty of the Press within this Colony; and because I would not have you or my self charged with the Publication of a Libel, I shall confine my self to a plain Narration of Facts without any comments.

*On Tuesday the 15th of Octo. 1734.  
The Supreme Court of New-York, began, when the Honourable James De Lancey, Esq; Chief Justice charged the Grand Jury. The Conclusion of which Charge was as follows.*

*Gentlemen; I shall conclude with reading a Paragraph or two out of the same Book, † concerning Libels; they are arrived to that height, that they*

ca 11

Publisher. It is therefore Ordered by the Courts, That the said Virulent, Scandalous and Seditious Songs or Ballads be burnt before the City-Hall, fitting the Court, by the hands of the common Hang-man, or Whipper, on Monday the 21<sup>st</sup> of this Instant, at 12 o' Clock, and that the High-Sheriff of this City and County do take Order accordingly.

Per Cur. J. Hughes,  
Cl. in Cur.

On Monday the 21<sup>st</sup> of October, the Grand Jury of this City, address'd his Excellency the Governor to issue a Proclamation, promising a Reward to discover the Author, Printer and Publisher, of the two Songs mentioned in the above Order, which is Printed in the *New-York Gazette*, No. 470, and on the same day the above Order of the Supreme Court was put in Execution.

From the Votes of the Assembly.

Die Martis 9 ho. A. M. 22 October,  
1734.

The House according to Order proceeded to take into Consideration the Request of a Committee of Council, delivered to a Committee of this House, on the 16<sup>th</sup> Instant, as likewise of the several Papers therein referred to, and after several Debate upon the Subject matters, it was ordered that the said Papers, and Request lye on the Table.

New-York, November 25, 1734.

We hear from *Sbrewsbury* in *New-Jersey*, that the Honourable *Lewis Morris*, Esq; late chief Justice of this Province, and one of the Members of the General Assembly thereof, and President of His Majesties Council of *New-Jersey*, did on Saturday last (together with his Son *Robert Morris*) Embark from that Place, on board of *Capt. Payton* for *London*, to sollicit Matters of great Importance at the Court

of Great Britain, as well relating to this, as other the Northern Colonies in *America*. He was attended at his Departure by several Gentlemen of that Colony, the News whereof gave great Satisfaction to the Inhabitants of this City, who heartily wish him a good Voyage, Health and Success, and we believe it will be equally great to the Body of the People of this Colony.

And in all the Churches of this City, Prayers were yesterday publicly offer'd in their behalf.

Custom House, New-York, Inward Entries.

Sloop Two Brethers, Leonard Johnson from Virginia, Ship Prince William, T. Bayse from Jamaica.

Outward Entries.

Sloop Wheel of Fortune, J. Bofch for N-London & R-Island, Sloop Catharin, J. Johnson for St. Christopher, Sloop Mary, P. Neelson for Jamaica, Ship Beaver, T. Smith for London.

Cleared for Departure.

Sloop Ropal Ranger, R. Fowle, Sloop Rose, F. Burrows to Coracoa, Sloop Catharine, T. Ware to Jamaica, Sloop John and Mary, J. Vanpelt to N-Carolina, Sloop Wheel of fortune, J. Bofch to New-London & R-Island.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

•• There is to be Sold, on reasonable Terms a Certain Messuage or Tenement and 300 Acres of good Land, with two Grist-Mills, and a fine Stream of Water there unto belonging situate at the Fish-Kill, on the East Side of *Hudson-River*, in *Dutches County*, now in the Possession of *Catherine Brett* Widow, the same is very Convenient for Trade, and has been Settled for Near Five and Twenty-Years past. Whoever has a Mind to purchase the same may apply to *Mr. Joseph Keels* in the City of *New-York* Merchant, or to the said *Catherine Brett*, and be Informed of the Title and Conditions of Sale.

† That the following Tract of Land and Lots, are to be sold by *Richard Van Dam*, of the City of *New York*, viz. A certain Tract of Land, laying and fronting *Rariton River*, near by *Capt. Philip Folkersons*, containing 33 $\frac{1}{2}$  Acres.

One upper Water Lott of Ground, being within the City of *New-York*, fronting *Queen-Street*, over against *Phillip Daylys*, broad about 25 foot, and in length as far in the *East River* as to the Water Mark.

Three Lots of Ground being within the City aforesaid fronting *Anne-Street*, jeyning to the *Brewhouse*, of — *Holt*, deceased; now in the Possession of *Jacob Trombert*, each Lott, broad in front about 27 foot and, in Length about 140 Foot.

One Lott of Ground Lying and being near the *Cripple Bush*, and also the House, where he now Lives, is to be for to be Lett, Inquire of said *Richard Van Dam*.

**N. E. W. Y. O. R. K.** Printed and Sold by *John Peter Zenger*: By whom Subscriptions for this Paper are taken at three Shillings per Quarter; and Advertisements at three Shillings the first Week, and one Shilling every Week after.

but there are any number of people ready to tell editors what news is and how to handle it. Many are the same people who regard writing as something they could do just as well themselves if they only had time. Newsmen and women make mistakes in their professional work—inevitably, when one considers the millions of facts handled every day—but they make no more than those in other professions, probably fewer. Doctors bury their mistakes, and lawyers write off theirs, but those that editors and reporters make are perpetuated in type, or preserved on film or tape, to be criticized freely by anyone.

Consider for a moment a few of the pressures from the public that the news media work under these days. Ethnic groups are perpetually dissatisfied with the way they and their affairs are depicted in the media. Militant Italian-Americans want the media to make the Mafia nonexistent by ignoring it, in the quite erroneous belief that media coverage leads the public to believe all Italians are criminals. Blacks complain that they are viewed only as lawbreakers or as welfare cases. Jewish organizations charge that the news from Israel and the Middle East is biased unless it perfectly reflects the views of the Israeli government. Feminist groups assert that only 10 percent of news content is about women and demand equal representation whether the content of a day's news justifies it or not. Homosexuals, Indians, and dissident political groups from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and European countries declare that the media either do not represent or else falsify their interests.

All these groups, and others, charge the media with bias and bring every kind of pressure they can summon to make them change. The media resist, reacting only to the occasional legitimate complaint. What possible resolution can there be to this conflict? Some advocate what they call access, meaning that the columns of newspapers, the pages of magazines, and time on news broadcasts be open to citizens for complaints or advancement of their interests. Only someone without imagination could seriously advocate such a course. The resulting chaos would be indescribable, even if such access were physically possible, and the media would cease to function.

What else, then? Take away control of the media from those who now own them, or impose some kind of legislative control on behalf of the "public interest"? Obviously, that would mean scrapping the First Amendment, and if that seems unthinkable to those in the communications business and others who understand the structure of our government, it is not at all unthinkable to large numbers of people. A

recent Gallup poll showed that two-thirds of Americans cannot even identify the First Amendment, and repeated polls of high school students and young adults show a high percentage (more than half, in some instances) who think all news about government should be monitored by public officials before it is printed and that controls of some kind should be imposed on the press. 1984 is no farther away in many people's minds than it is on the calendar.

This public hostility toward the media has not yet crystallized, but there is every indication that it would, given the proper circumstances and the right leadership by a president who shared these attitudes. The Nixon Administration was well on its way toward imposing comprehensive controls, especially on broadcasting, before its work was interrupted.

The hostility of government and the courts is another matter. Although the Founders clearly intended the press to be the means of making government accountable to the people, government has always resisted, since the time George Washington attempted to keep John Jay's treaty secret until he and Congress had discussed it and was frustrated because the story was leaked to a Philadelphia paper. In our time, now that technology has put the activities of government under a daily scrutiny that it has never known before, the resistance is greater, perhaps because there is so much more to conceal.

The courts have come to believe themselves threatened by the media, primarily because of their conviction that the Sixth Amendment supersedes the Fifth, but also because the deficiencies of the criminal justice system are so often in the news that courts tend to be sensitive about their prerogatives and their conduct.

Government and judicial pressures have come together in the actions of the Supreme Court in recent times. The Court did not really begin ruling on First Amendment cases until 1919, when the media had become large enough and institutionalized enough to be considered a threat by some interests. Until recently, most decisions favored the media, particularly during the days of the Warren Court and in the time of Justices Hugo Black and William O. Douglas, both of whom agreed with Jefferson and Madison that the First Amendment was absolute. Those decisions produced a complacency that proved to be unwarranted. Many political writers, lawyers, and even a few First Amendment specialists came to believe that no matter what the shifting ideological complexion of the Court might be, on balance the First Amendment would be preserved.

Then came the Burger Court, four of whose

members were appointed by President Nixon. Chief Justice Burger was unabashedly hostile toward the media, and Anthony Lewis, of the *New York Times*, reporting on one session of the Court, noted that press claims in one case were greeted with "extraordinarily open expressions of scorn and hostility." A majority of the court appeared to believe that the press should have no "special privileges," that it had no rights the ordinary citizen did not have.

The fruits of this philosophy were most evident in 1978, when a series of decisions shocked the communications industry, if no one else. In successive months, the Court made these decisions:

That government agents could obtain a warrant to search a newsroom for photographs, notes, and research files if they were seeking criminal evidence.

That radio broadcasters could be censured by the government—by "censured," they meant that the stations might get their licenses revoked—if they broadcast "indecent" words at times when children were likely to be in the audience.

That a reporter could be jailed for contempt if he refused to turn over his notes to a defense attorney or a judge.

Meanwhile, a U.S. appeals court gave police and government officials the right to secretly subpoena long-distance telephone records of reporters and news organizations.

Since then, courts have ruled that reporters could be compelled to answer questions about their state of mind when they were writing a story. In the case of former CIA official Frank Snepp and his book *Decent Interval*, the Court's refusal to hear the case meant that the United States had created the equivalent of the British Official Secrets Act by establishing that any government employee under contract who wrote about his work after he had left the job would have to clear it with the agency involved, whether or not classified material was involved.

This ruling means that no one who has had a government job, or who has one now, can write anything critical about his work or the government unless the government approves. The government can censor what he writes before it is published—prior restraint, by any measurement—and if it is published anyway, the government can take all royalties involved. It was not simply Snepp's First Amendment rights that were mocked by this decision, but the right of all of us to make government accountable. The Court, apparently, believes that a government contract supersedes the First Amendment.

There have been other dismaying decisions since then, but the net result of all of them is that it is now more difficult for the press to investigate the government and much easier for the government to investigate the press. If these

trends continue, the press will be excluded entirely from pretrial hearings, as they already have been in a growing number of cases. Government officials will be able to withhold information on grounds of secrecy, privacy, or simply government contracts with employees. The press would become an investigative arm of the police and the courts, through search warrants, subpoenas, and contempt citations. In Washington and elsewhere, whistle blowers, from future Deep Throats on down, would be gagged.

Serious questions are raised. Does the people's right to know have any meaning—and does anyone care? Does the right to gather news stop where government secrecy begins? Is the right to broadcast nothing more than a polite fiction, dependent on what government decides can be broadcast? It seems clear that government and the courts, between them, are bringing print and broadcasting together under one large umbrella of control. In the talk about deregulation, including the controls over broadcasting exerted by government through the FCC, not much is heard about removing the so-called Fairness Doctrine and the equal time provisions of the Communications Act—rules which, if applied to newspapers, would be patent denials of First Amendment rights.

With a hostile public, government, and court system, it would seem that the media's place in American society is under sufficient threat, but there is another large and powerful segment that has recently joined the attack. The business community has long regarded the press as its enemy. Having spent millions of dollars on public relations and institutional advertising, business sees its efforts to create a favorable public image blunted, if not negated, by newspaper and television reporting of its affairs. Like government, business does not like to see its misdeeds disclosed. When it cries for fairness, it is no different from the other pressure groups who really mean that they want the news written and displayed as they would have it.

Business is in a position to do something about it, however, and it is bringing pressure to bear in various ways. Increasingly businesses are suing broadcasters, newspapers, and magazines, and they have now begun to hint at using their ultimate weapon, that is, withholding advertising from a medium they consider unfair—a kind of refined blackmail. It has been getting results. Since advertising is the lifeblood of all the media (except book publishing), without which they could not exist, some newspapers and television stations have already fired or reassigned reporters and editors who have antagonized business interests with consumer-oriented stories. The *Los Angeles Times*, in a

recent report on this phenomenon, disclosed that the number of full-time consumer reporters in the news media has already fallen from 500 in 1974, the peak, to only 200 today. If this general campaign succeeds, the ability to alert the public to business abuses needing correction will be diluted to the point where laissez-faire will prevail. Business is already extremely effective in blocking any kind of media investigation of its practices.

Government has shown that it can and will censor books it doesn't like, but businessmen cannot retaliate in the same way. Consequently, book publishing emerges as the one remaining relatively free forum, tolerated by its enemies largely because of the relatively low circulation of individual books. Television, obviously, is a far greater threat to any institution which has something to conceal.

It will do no good for any of the media to cry *mea culpa* and swear that they will henceforth do their utmost to be fair and accurate. They will never be perceived as being so by government, business, or the public unless they convey images that reflect the way these elements want to see themselves. Nobody wants to read bad news about himself, which is why the press of authoritarian countries offends no one except those who want to know what is happening. As the old Moscow joke goes, referring to *Pravda* ("truth") and *Izvestia* ("news"), "There's no news in the truth, and no truth in the news."

What *are* the American media, in any case—that collection of institutions which we are forever asserting do this or that or should be doing something else? In spite of the fact that so many people see them as some kind of monolithic attackers of American values, they are in fact incredibly varied. They consist of 1,744 daily newspapers, predominantly conservative; 8,000 or so weeklies or bi- or tri-weeklies, again almost entirely conservative if they have any ideological bent at all; 8,434 broadcasting stations, two-thirds of them without network affiliation and providing the greatest possible multiplicity of voices because the great majority (three-fifths) of news and public affairs broadcasts originate with local stations (all but a small fraction of radio stations are local); at least 22,000 magazines and probably many more (the industry does not keep accurate figures), representing the most diverse array of interests and

opinions on the globe; and several thousand book publishing houses, only a few of them "giants," and like the magazines, serving the widest possible spectrum of opinions and interests.

When we hear people complaining about "the media," then, it is certainly legitimate to ask them what media they are talking about. More often than not, it turns out they are thinking of something they have just read or viewed that runs counter to their own ideas. There is, plainly, a vast difference between the way the media are viewed in this country and what they really are.

Americans like to talk about the freedoms they enjoy in comparison to other nations. But there is one area that history has proved over and over again is vital to freedom, and that is the right embodied in the First Amendment, the right to print and broadcast, to gather news and opinions and disseminate them without hindrance. We have seen repeatedly the brutal seizure and control of communications in authoritarian countries everywhere, and rightly deplore it. Democracies do it differently, by nibbling away through laws, through ideologically motivated court decisions, and by pressure from groups who want to suppress what they do not like. It is one freedom that cannot be qualified without imperiling the whole; the opening of one door leads to the opening of a thousand others.

There is another kind of control to which all the media, individually and collectively, are subject—and must be in a free society. Every citizen has the right to switch off his television set or change channels; to do the same with his radio; to not buy the newspaper he doesn't like, or the magazine or the book. It is utterly misleading to say that the choices are narrowing. Taken together, the media in America offer a diversity not even remotely equaled anywhere else on the planet—more than any individual can cope with. These choices are increasing and with the advent of new cable and satellite technology, they are going to multiply in a staggering way. Controls of any kind can only limit these multitudinous choices, especially if they are dictated by ideology or internal power struggles.

At the moment, we still have the freedom to choose.