1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2	COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
3	In re: House Bill 1141
4	* * * *
5	Stenographic report of hearing held in Majority Caucus Room, Main Capitol
6	Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
7	Friday, April 28, 1989
8	10:00 a.m.
9	HON. THOMAS CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN
10	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
11	Hon. Jerry Birmelin Hon. Christopher K. McNally Hon. Richard Hayden Hon. Nicholas B. Moehlmann
12	Hon. David W. Heckler Hon. Robert D. Reber Hon. Gerard A. Kosinski
13	Also Present:
14	David Krantz, Executive Director
15	Mary Woolley, Minority Counsel
16	
17	Reported by: Ann-Marie P. Sweeney, Reporter
18	Ann narro r. Swooner, mapor our
19	ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY
20	536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011
21	camp Hill, Fr 17011
22	
23	
24	
25	

02-04-029

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2		PAGE
3	Frank Wagner, Southeast Regional Dir., Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography	3
5	James West, Esquire, United States Attorney	57
6	Robert Peters, Esquire, Legal Counsel, National Obscenity Law Center	74
7	Carl Brown, Southeast Coordinator, Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography	78
8	Burners V Demants Instinct and	96
9	Francis Viglietta, Director, Justice and Rights Department, Pennsylvania Catholic Conference	90
LO		
<b>.1</b>		
L <b>2</b>		
L3		
L <b>4</b>		
<b>L</b> 5		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	11	

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We'll start the proceedings. Members will be coming in. We do have some members of the Judiciary Committee present - Jerry Birmelin, Bob Reber, Chris McNally, and the staff Executive Director, Dave Krantz. There will be others

that will be coming in as the proceedings go on today.

I'd like to introduce myself. I'm State
Representative Tom Caltagirone, chairman of the House
Judiciary Committee. Today's hearing is on House Bill
1141. I'd like to welcome everybody that's in attendance
here today, and I'd like to call as our first witness
Frank Wagner, who is the Southeast Regional Director of
the Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography. Frank.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, I'm here today to testify on behalf of Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography. PVP is a congress of anti-pornography works located here in the Commonwealth and includes some 43 county anti-pornography organizations, the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference, Pennsylvania Council of Churches, Pennsylvanians for Biblical Morality, Concerned Women of America, the Eagle Forum, and the Pennsylvania Knights of Columbus.

During our first three years of existence,

PVP has worked hard to educate the residents of the

Commonwealth as to the effects of the hard-core

pornography industry and to seek the enforcement of existing obscenity and RICO laws in our home jurisdictions. The pornography industry here in the Commonwealth has literally exploded during the last decade. If I wanted to purchase hard-core pornography in my own home county of Berks in 1980, I would have had to get it from one of four places - three adult book stores in Reading and one in Muhlenberg Township. Today, due to technological changes, the exact same material is now available through some 32 outlets, an eight-fold increase. The video cassette recorder has turned every home in America into a potential adult movie theater.

Besides the adult book stores, theaters and video dealers, we now also have family-oriented businesses, such as Rite Aid Corporation, renting triple X-rated videos. Not only are there an increasing number of outlets for hard-core materials, but we also know that these materials are getting into the hands of our children and giving them a totally distorted view of their sexuality. The research of Drs. Dorf Zillman, Jennings Bryant and James Weaver at the Universities of Illinois, Kentucky and Houston, have shown that about 43 percent of junior high school children and 84 percent of high school children have seen at least one hard-core video. In a recent visit to Berks County by child abuse expert Dr. Ken

Wooden, he questioned the children in our schools and in an informal survey, over 50 percent indicated to him that they had easy access to hard-core videos. He duplicated those results in other meetings that he had with children throughout the country. They gave him the names of the videos and told him the material that was contained in them.

What type of videos are these kids getting access to? I'd like to talk about two of them. First of all, a video called "Barbara Broadcast." In this video, most of the sex acts take place in a restaurant. If a waitress drops a plate, she's forced to have oral sex with the maitre d'. It depicts people masturbating into salads. In one scene, a woman has oral sex with a man, he ejaculates semen into her face and she turns to her girlfriend and says, "His rod and his staff, they comfort me." It depicts a woman urinating to entice a man. The last 10 minutes depict a bound woman called a "Pure Protestant Princess," who has every conceivable sexual act performed on her. This video is available from your local Rite Aid store.

Another video being rented by Commonwealth video dealers is called "Taboo II." The theme of the video is a middle-class neighborhood where a home is the place where all the sexual acts take place. The video

with a brother and sister fondling each other. In another scene, there is some incestuous type activity between the brother and the sister where fellatio and intercourse are performed. In a later scene, the son and the mother are on a couch performing intercourse and fellatio. The movie closes with the mother and father asleep in their bedroom, at which time the daughter enters and sleeps next to her father, where they perform incestuous acts of intercourse and she performs fellatio on her father. Honorable committee members, this is the type of material that is going unchallenged out into the communities of the Commonwealth, and much of it is finding its way into the hands of children.

Is it any wonder that the National Institutes of Health estimate that the incest rate in American's homes has now reached 14 percent? I've included copies of a portion of a Rite Aid adult video guide and the adult portion of a video guide of a typical video dealer, in this case Wall-to-Wall Video, and I've identified them with this testimony as Appendix B.

Another problem with the hard-core pornography industry is that it is heavily controlled by and the third leading source of revenue for organized crime in this country. This has been clearly stated in the reports of the Attorney Generals of Ohio, New York and

California. I've enclosed information on the history of organized crime's involvement in this industry as Appendix A with my testimony.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Besides the problem of increasing number of outlets for hard-core pornography in the Commonwealth, its availability to our children, and organized crime's control of the industry, we also have a developing book of evidence of a causal relationship between the use of this material and an increasing incidence of violence towards women and children. The rape rate in this country has increased 700 percent since 1933; 43 percent in the last decade alone. According to recent FBI statistics, one in four 12-year-old girls in this country will be sexually assaulted in her lifetime. Children have fared no better. Between 1981 to 1985, reported child sexual abuse rose 175 percent. The studies of researchers like Dr. William Marshall of Queens University, Canada, on inmates at Kingston Penitentiary who were convicted of rape indicated that 86 percent used pornography, with 57 percent admitting actual imitation of pornographic scenes in the commission of their sexual oftenses.

In a 20-year statistical study done by the Sexual Crimes Unit of the Michigan State Police, they found pornography present during or immediately preceding 41 percent of the 38,000 sexually violent crimes that took

place. Research by Ken Lanning of the FBI Behavioral Sciences Unit on 36 serial killers found that 81 percent, 29 of the 36, reported pornography as one of their highest sexual interests. Pornography was, in fact, the most common profile characteristic among the serial killers. Child abuse detectives regularly find pornography present in cases of molestation they investigate. In a recent study published by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children done in Louisville, pornography was present in all 40 major cases completed. The report states, and I'll quote, "Over four years, the Exploitation and Missing Child Unit Team learned to expect to always find 'adult' pornography, as such, was used by adult offenders for their own sexual arousal, for selfvalidation of their own sexual deviations, for extortion of child victims or other adults, and for deliberate and planned lowering of inhibitions of child victims." I've also enclosed further evidence of the negative effects of pornography as Appendix C with this testimony.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With all this in mind, I'm not about to tell you that the passage of House Bill 1141 is the answer to the obscenity problem here in the Commonwealth. The answer to that problem rests with public education, which Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography is actively involved in, and in enforcement of the existing Pennsylvania obscenity

and RICO laws, of which obscenity is a predicate offense. I believe it is fair to say that the State's attorneys of this Commonwealth have either refused or neglected to enforce these laws and have therefore left the good people of this Commonwealth at the mercy of the pornographers. They have not protected their communities and instead have allowed the pornographers to establish our community standards by default, a right which the Supreme Court has given to the local communities of the Commonwealth to establish through the jury process.

Since our district attorneys are elected officials, getting them to enforce the law is our responsibility. Giving them the best laws possible to enforce is the responsibility of this good body. House Bill 1141 seeks to do just that. It seeks to take our present obscenity law and give it the up-to-date wording which the Supreme Court has approved for use.

First of all, the legislature, in the present wording of 5903, has not given children of the Commonwealth the same protection against the distribution of sexually explicit materials to them that has been given to adults in prescribing the distribution of obscene materials. The current third prong of the "harmful to minors" test requires that materials distributed or displayed to minors be "utterly without redeeming social

value." This creates an impossible proof for the prosecutor. The third prong of the obscenity test uses the current Miller wording of "no serious value."

Performances. Under current law, the residents of the Commonwealth have no protection, even though the Supreme Court in its 1973 Kaplan v. California case stated that obscenity could manifest itself in conduct. Thirdly, the definition of prosecutable sexual conduct would be extended to include sadomasochistic abuse and sexual bestiality. The Supreme Court allowed its Miller guidelines of hard-core sexual conduct to be extended to S&M and bestiality in it's 1977 Ward v. Illinois decision.

House Bill 1141 will give our prosecutors one of the best obscenity laws in the country to work with. If it is used, and that is a key question, along with our RICO law, the illegal pornography industry in our Commonwealth could be dismantled within a four-year period. It's an important fact to remember that the obscenity industry in this country is not like the drug industry. It's not like the drug problem. Federal studies of the industry, the obscenity industry, indicate that it is run by about 60 to 70 key individuals. With effective enforcement at a Federal, State, and local level, this industry could be put out of business.

This is a winable war. One need only look at the success of the North Carolina Federal/State/local task force, which put about 90 percent of the industry out of business in that State in only 24 months. Other areas have implemented the task force approach, including Cleveland, Boston, Tampa, Miami, Los Vegas, Los Angeles, the States of Vermont and Utah, just to name a few. might mention that the whole State of Utah is entirely free of hard-core pornography. This is our challenge. House Bill 1141 is part of what needs to be accomplished. It is the hope of the organizations we represent that this committee and hopefully the full House will agree with us. On behalf of Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography, I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the honorable committee members of this committee for the privilege of testifying before you this morning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Frank.

Let's start off with questions. We do have two other Representatives, Hayden and Heckler, that have joined us, and also legal counsel, Mary Woolley.

Are there questions?

BY REPRESENTATIVE HAYDEN: (Of Mr. Wagner)

- Q. Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Wagner.
- A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

'7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. I share your concerns about the

dissemination of pornography and pornographic materials to minors and the access, the ready access, that now minors have, apparently, to a lot of the material which is, I think, correctly been labeled as pornographic materials. What troubles me is that, and if I recall the California vs. Miller case, you make reference also in your testimony to the establishment of a community standard, determining what is and what is not permissible, and in my memory of that case and similar cases was that in some situations the Supreme Court literally reconvened into another room and actually viewed certain video tapes or certain materials before they wrote their decisions in the areas of obscenity and pornography, which it might have been Justice Jackson said, if I recall, "I don't know if I can label it, I don't know how I can describe it," -- Justice Stewart who said, "but I certainly know what it is when I see it." And I think that most of us here in this room would share that same sort of assessment about our own individual ability to identify what is certainly offensive to ourselves and which is without any sort of redeeming societal value.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I think that the problem, and as I follow some of the literature, it seems to have suggested that with the introduction of VCRs, it seems that the pornographic business and industry has taken on a new

trend and a new tact and the old pornographic movie theaters and the abandoned out-of-the-way kind of stores and places where people used to go to purchase pornographic materials seems to have been on the wane and in substitute for that has been in a sense almost a mainstreaming of the pornographic industry through the use of the VCR. And if you look at -- and in your testimony I think you accurately recorded some of the material which is available at Rite Aid, some of the material which is available at other basic retail outlets.

Now, what that seems to suggest to me is that what may be my particular standard or what I would deem to be a community standard does not appear to be the same community standard across the community. It suggests to me that there is a greater market for this material out there than I had ever had reason to believe and I'm sure that you had ever had reason to believe. But what I think it also suggests is the difficulty in trying to define what a community standard is, particularly when you have private individuals making in-private decisions as to what they're going to view in their own home. And that's where I think it's difficult, although, you know, your goals are certainly laudable and I share many of your goals that you have with this legislation, and I suggest that the same difficulty that Justice Stewart had with trying to

identify what he thought was patently offensive I think is what causes me to pause when I look at this legislation.

I notice there's a definition of what is characterized or qualified as "nude" in the bill, and it talks of about "a fully opaque covering, or showing the temale breast with less than a fully opaque covering of any portion thereof below the top of the nipple." I think the problem is what we get into is trying to decide, at the governmental level, what in and of itself should — either should not be depicted or should not be available to the consuming public.

So I have some real difficulties with -- and then the other characterizations of what is literary versus what is art. It's just awful difficult, I think, to try to regulate private conduct, and I'm certainly not talking about minors, but private conduct that adults apparently have found to be of some sort of value, otherwise I would suggest that the market for this product wouldn't be there. The role of, I think you accurately pointed out the problems of the role of organized crime in this kind of material, but it seems to me that the channels for distribution are no longer the brown paper bag through organized crime. It's walk right up into your Rite Aid, go back to the rack and make your choice and go home and view the video tape.

So I just wanted to let you know that those are some of the problems, I think, in trying to formulate legislation on this kind of issue.

A. You had quite a few questions there, as far as my testimony is concerned, and I'll try to address some of them.

First of all, I don't think anybody with our organization or anybody who has studied this issue for any amount of time denies that there is a market for this material. There's a market for drugs out there also; a far greater market, I would dare to say. To the best of my knowledge, there were approximately 100 million XXX-rated video cassettes rented as of last year. I would also say that at the same time there were about 1.6 million Disney cassettes rented.

I would also state that people who normally use this material, and later on you're going to have an opportunity to see a video dealing, you know, many people say this is a victimless situation as far as the use of pornography. Well, I've put together a tape for you that you'll have an opportunity to view which is strictly victims and offenders talking to you personally about their addictions and the use of pornography in the commission of their offenses.

I would say that the material is addicting.

We will have plenty of psychologists in the tape who will speak to that, and people who rent one XXX-rated video cassette don't normally rent just one. They use them, okay, and they use them regularly. Even if an individual only rented 10 films a year, that would indicate that only about 10 million of the American people are regular users of the XXX-rated material. We all know that there are millions of people in this country who practice addictive behavior, whether it's alcohol abuse or drug abuse or any other form of abuse, and I'm also not trying to say that everyone who uses alcohol or drugs goes on to be addicted to them and goes out and commits offenses, but some do.

There is a market, we admit that. However, that's one issue. Okay. I don't think that the market is as vast as everyone thinks that it is. I don't think that everybody goes out and rents one of these. Maybe through curiosity they look at one sometime in their lifetime, but I don't think that many people use them regularly.

The other issue deals with the difference between public morality and private morality. The Supreme Court, in a key case called Stanley, established that we don't have the right, nor should we, to go into people's homes and tell them what they can view in the privacy of their home. That is something between them and the people who live within the home. However, the Supreme Court has

established that it is the crass commercialization of sex that the community has a right to regulate, and this is what our obscenity statutes seek to do. They seek to regulate the public commerce in obscenity, which is really an area where we all have a vested interest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. It you regulate the trade, then aren't you regulating the content?
- A. To some extent. I will tell you that from a legal standpoint, obscenity goes back to common law. has a well -- I'm not an attorney, and we have an attorney here who wrote the amendment who will speak on a legal basis with you, but from my background, we have a long history out of common law in the development of obscenity. There is no question that the court, during the '60's, vacillated. In 1965 they moved to the Memoirs definition, which is the third prong of the test they made "utterly without redeeming social value." That created really an intractable obscenity problem in this country, and the court just had appeal after appeal dealing with obscenity, and in 1973 the court formed its Miller tripartite test, and it has stuck with that test ever since. They really have not vacillated from that. And they have clearly said, for instance, many of the pornographers say, well, how do I know what is obscene? How do I police my stocks to know what is obscene? And the court said that the

three-part Miller test is enough advance warning to people who are going to be involved in this industry that their activities may bring prosecution. And that is something with someone who is going to get involved in the commercial sex industry, that they have to take into consideration in viewing the material that they're distributing and making sure that it does not violate the community standards.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As to community standards, that is something -- in Pennsylvania, the community is defined as the Commonwealth, and local juries have to apply what they feel the average person in the Commonwealth would find appeals to a prurient interest, a shameful, morbid or unnatural interest in sex, and which is patently offensive in the sexual representations that are shown. In other words, it's not the sex that is shown, it is that it is presented in a patently offensive way, and thirdly, they have to see whether a reasonable man would find whether the material has any reasonable value -- or serious value, I'm sorry. But I can tell you that many juries across the United States have absolutely no problem in coming to those conclusions. You have communities like Atlanta, Georgia; and Cincinnati; and Orlando, Florida; Jacksonville; Fort Lauderdale; Buffalo, New York; and I can go on and on, and I already said the whole State of

Utah, that have virtually freed themselves from hard-core pornography.

Now, the court, the Supreme Court, has clearly drawn a line upon which the community can go. It has said that you can only regulate as it pertains to adult's hard-core sexual conduct that is presented in a patently offensive way and appeals to a prurient interest and lacks serious value. By that they mean ultimate sexual acts normally perverted, actual or simulated, masturbation, excretory functions, or a lewd exhibition of the genitals. You cannot regulate nudity per se to an adult. However, they came out in a later decision called the Ginsberg case which established a "harmful to minors" test whereas sexually explicit material can be found to be in violation of the law if it is judged to be harmful to the minor that it was displayed or distributed to.

So I think that the case law that has been developed here, we have excellent case law here in Pennsylvania: Commonwealth vs. Stork, Commonwealth vs. Kroll, Commonwealth vs. Hulehan, Commonwealth vs. Dole. The Pennsylvania obscenity statute has been upheld by the Superior Court many times and we have a good RICO statute. We have also used prostitution, the prostitution statute, successfully right here in Harrisburg against two adult book stores where anonymous sexual acts were taking place

on the premises and where there was semen on the walls of the peep booths. They brought a prostitution action against them and closed them down for a year because they were declared to be a house of ill-repute. But, you know, these laws have a long tradition. If they are enforced, they can be enforced successfully, and I personally believe to the betterment of the public community, the public morality.

Q. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HAYDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Chris.

REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: Yes, sir.

BY REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: (Of Mr. Wagner)

Q. I think, and I've got a preview of Francis
Viglietta's testimony, that we can identify a particular
harm to the public welfare, morals, safety. The one thing
that I would like to ask you about is that your testimony,
and I think other testimony later on will establish or
attempt to establish that there is a connection between
pornography and sex abuse, rape, serial murders, et
cetera. And I guess my question is that if in fact we are
able to win the war against pornography and eliminate or
substantially cut back the dissemination of pornographic

material and performances, will we be able to at the same time and will a result of that be a reduction in the incidence of child molestation, rape, serial murder, and other violent crimes?

And the reason I ask the question is that clearly not every person who views obscene or pornographic materials performs or engages in violent activity, and you have described a circumstance in which people actually become addicted to pornography or obscene material or performances, and it seems to me that there must be some trigger or some mechanism that draws an individual to imitate the pornographic performance or materials, and whatever that trigger is may not be -- we may not be able to eliminate that trigger by eliminating the pornographic materials and performances. And perhaps you can elaborate on that connection or correlation between pornography and violence.

A. Well, first of all, I'd like to differentiate between that which is defined as pornography, in other words sexually explicit materials that has as its intent to arouse erotically, and that which is obscene, obscenity being a legal term.

Governmental regulation has a place in the regulation of obscenity or material that is harmful to minors being distributed to minors. It does not have a place in trying

to regulate what I would classify as soft-core pornography out in marketplace. That would be an inappropriate use of governmental power. So that that is a responsibility of the free exchange of ideas within the local community to fight for the hearts and minds of men on whether they want to sell or use that type of material. And we have been extremely careful in trying to speak to either legislative bodies or enforcement officials, prosecutors, in trying to have them fully understand that we're not asking them to regulate into the area of pornography, soft-core pornographic material. That is better dealt with through friendly complaint and boycott of those establishments that sell it, and people are free to distribute that product the same way as Bell of Pennsylvania made a free choice to remove Dial-A-Porn from its 976 service, because they are a private enterprise and that is not a governmentally regulated portion of their business, where Mountain Bell dropped it or Southern Bell dropped it. That was an independent, private business decision.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As to the issue of victims, I think you get into a real area of problem here in that how many years of testimony have we heard from the standpoint of the social scientists dealing with the issue of smoking? Okay? And I would say we're probably no closer today to having all social scientists say that smoking is harmful to our

health than we were. Maybe there's more evidence in that area than there was, but the tobacco lobbyists still have their social scientists that are willing to say that there is no problem, and the other side who oppose smoking have their lobbyists who are willing to say that there is. And I think when you're dealing with a controversial issue, and I'm willing to admit that any time you're trying to regulate people's behavior, years ago people were saying you have no right to tell me what drugs I can use, and you hear the same arguments in our area. However, we're not telling them they don't have a right to use it, we're just saying we have a right to control the commercial distribution of it if it violates community standards.

But what I'm saying is that it gets very difficult to get social scientists to agree on an issue like that, and this is why, for instance, in the Mease Commission hearings they really wanted to hear more from victims, offenders, prosecutors, vice officers, they wanted to hear from the people who had first-hand contact with it to try to make their own judgments as to its harmful effects. So I don't think that we will ever find agreement. I can just present testimony to you as to what various victims have said concerning the material, what some social scientists are saying concerning the material, what some prosecutors are saying, what some vice officers

are saying in the investigation of their crimes. I mean, with some people who have a presupposition on the issue, for instance the ACLU, I will never convince as to the harm of the material because they have a presupposition that says that they don't believe in any governmental regulation of expression, period. And I'm not saying, you know, I've debated Barry Steinhardt. I fully understand his position, he fully understands mine. He surely has a right to advocate that position, but there are both sides of the issue and we are asking people to make judgments. You're making judgments as our Representatives on where you stand on this issue, on whether you would support this type of legislation or not. It's not an easy issue.

- Q. Well, maybe I could elaborate on my question a little bit more.
  - A. Sure.

Q. If you weigh the importance or the harm of two different problems, one obscenity and the other sexual violence, and clearly at least in my mind sexual violence is a far more serious problem in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania than obscenity, the argument that I think you've tried to make, and it's persuasive to a large extent, is that obscenity causes sexual violence, therefore eliminate obscenity and the result will be to eliminate or cut back on the incidence of sexual violence.

Although I see a correlation and a connection between obscenity and sexual violence, that does not mean that obscenity causes sexual violence.

A. Sure.

Q. So therefore, even if we eliminate the obscenity, or severely restrict it, the sexual violence may still remain, and that problem will remain on the agenda of this General Assembly. And it would be irresponsible for us to represent that, you know, if we support the prosecution of obscene performances and materials that we are in some sense promising or pledging that the result -- promising to the public, that is, that the result will be a decrease in the level of sexual violence.

And the other problem is that certainly in the minds of the members of the General Assembly when they hopefully pass this bill, they may forget about sexual violence as a problem because they may have felt that they have dealt with it accordingly. And so to that extent, you know, I believe that regardless of what action is taken on this particular piece of legislation, I suspect that the level of sexual violence will not be substantially affected and that that problem is still going to remain.

A. Well, let me try to address it a little bit

maybe from another angle. You know, there is an old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." I'm not telling you that -- I do believe with my whole heart that there is a cause and effect relationship between this material and the increasing incidence in violence towards women and children. I'm willing to let the testimony of the individuals that you're going to listen to later on deal with that directly.

You're back really to the whole issue of does what we put into our brain eventually affect our behavior? And, of course, this Commonwealth spends an awful lot of money on education every year, and if we can't make people any worse by showing them S&M and bestiality and other forms of rape and violence, then we can't make them any better by putting them through a school system and spending a lot of money to try to make them into better people. So really, my argument is that of course this material, you know, I would just challenge each of you to possibly look at a copy of a film, let's say, like a dirty western or "The Story of O" and see people have their genitalias pierced and hung up and just draw your own conclusions on whether we feel that this is the type of imagery that is to the benefit of our society.

Take, for instance, my testimony with Ken Wooden coming into Berks County and speaking to the

children in our school system. How advantageous is it for children to have material like the "Taboo" series of films, which deals with incest starting with brothers and sisters working up to incest in the extended family with grandparents, how much good does that do for our children to have that view of their sexuality? This has an effect upon a marriage. Common sense tell us, I believe, it does. I don't believe that you can -- I spoke to 150 women -- I spoke 90 times in the last year on this issue, I spoke to 150 women over in Montgomery County the other day and I had quite a few of those women come up to me afterwards and tell me of their own personal experiences, and this happens repeatedly as I speak, of where pornography was brought into the home, where it affected their sexual relationship and the overall marriage, many of them end up in breaking the marriage up, where the husband is trying to get the spouse to perform to the level of the prostitutes that are depicted in these In some cases, it causes the husband to go outside the home. The husband then has the chance of bringing certain diseases back into the home.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I believe that social science evidence speaks to its causal relationship. I think victim testimony speaks to its causal relationship. I feel that common sense speaks to its causal relationship.

1 As I look at myself, and I've been around 2 for 42 years, as I look at myself, I know that what I've 3 put in my brain through the years has had some effect upon 4 And I believe that pornography is highly addictive. 5 Highly addictive. Otherwise, well, when I first got 6 involved in this work, I was involved with a gentleman who 7 was addicted to pornography and was spending -- he took me 8 on my first tour of an adult book store, first time I had 9 ever been in one. I've been in a few since then to try to 10 find out exactly what's going on in them. I didn't feel I 11 could speak about them without understanding what's going 12 on in them. But this gentleman used to spend two, three 13 hours in the adult book stores every day cruising, picking 14 up people, having anonymous sexual acts taking place on 15 the premises. We did raids in Berks County in Cumru 16 Township. We did scrapings in the booths. There was 17 semen on the walls, by the State Police crime report that 18 came back. We have an AIDS epidemic in this country and 19 we can't even control what's going on in those peep 20 booths.

21

22

23

24

25

So I think there's many victims within society and I believe that it will have an effect. I believe that government has a certain role and responsibility in this, but I'm not one who is advocating that you assume responsibility for this problem. You can

assume responsibility for a certain segment of the problem, but I am as strong an advocate for educational work as anybody. I spend -- I was at 90 meetings last year where I tried to explain to people the harmful effects of this material and have them make their own choices not to use the material. So I think there's a place for both. But I do believe that eventually what you put into your brain has an effect upon your behavior.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Well, again, maybe the last comment, you 0. know, that I would like to make is, you know the expression that where there's smoke there's fire. Okay, smoke doesn't cause fire. Where there is sexual violence, there's a likelihood that there's going to be obscene materials or a connection with obscenity. Again, perhaps the reason that -- perhaps people who engage in sexual violence also are addicted to obscenity for some other root cause. And I don't know -- you know, I believe, you know, I don't dispute that there's a harm that results from obscenity. I agree with you entirely. But again, you know, I want to be sure that we're not making promises that we can't keep, that if we strictly regulate and reduce the level of obscenity in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that we will also consequently reduce the level of sexual violence.
  - A. I can tell you that there's been

international studies done on the availability of pornography in various nations and I'll be glad -- I don't have the study with me but I'd be glad to get a copy to Dave to distribute to the committee, and those countries that have the highest regulation of pornographic imagery have the lowest corresponding rape rates. There was a study done by the University of New Hampshire on the availability of soft-core pornography and corresponding State rape rates, and those States that had the least control had the highest corresponding rape rates, the highest being Alaska, that has no obscenity law on the books.

1.3

So I'm trying to play both sides of the issue in saying that I believe there's good evidence out there, but at the same time, if you're looking for it to be cast into concrete, then you're not dealing with science any longer, you're dealing with axioms, and you're also dealing with the individual's mind set, who you're trying to present the evidence to in that with some people who have presuppositions on the issue you will never present any evidence that will be enough. That's my only point.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Chris. Bob.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY REPRESENTATIVE REBER: (Of Mr. Wagner)

Just briefly, Mr. Wagner. On page 6 of your testimony, starting on line 4, you made the statement, "First of all the legislature has not given the children of the Commonwealth the same protection against the distribution of sexually explicit materials to them that has been given to adults," et cetera, et cetera. find that very troubling if it is, in fact, in your mind a true fact. I think the whole problem we have here and the manner in which it has manifested itself to the point of, as you say, ruining people's lives in various aspects really has its genesis in my mind in children being conditioned to grow up being used to this. And I guess my concern is if we can cut this off at its root source in the developing mind as opposed to trying to deal with it in the adult mind, because from my personal feeling, I find the Jimmy Swaggarts of the world obscene and what I do when I see them on TV is I hit the button and I turn off the set. And I think an adult can do that. I'm not so sure that a developing mind of a child can do that.

So my thoughts to you today would be simply to express to us in some additional detail your thoughts on how we can go about keeping this from polluting the minds of our children and hopefully over the course of a

	32
1	generation or so we may wipe out the need for the product
2	in that type of form. Even if we don't, we're certainly
3	then keeping it from those developing minds from being
4	polluted. I'd be glad to hear any kind of suggestions you
5	can offer and what was the real root idea in your
6	statement that leads up to this question.
7	A. It may have just been an oversight that the
8	legislature in its last revision of 5903 retained the
9	third prong with the old Memoirs wording, which is the
10	"utterly without redeeming social value." I really I
11	was not involved with the issue at that time, nor was
12	Q. When was that? When did we do that? Does
13	staff know?
14	A. I believe it would have been 1980, or
15	somewhere right around that time was the last time that
16	the statute was revised.
17	Q. '78 or '79, when there was a total
18	codification there?
19	MS. WOOLLEY: It looks like '78. '80.
20	REPRESENTATIVE REBER: 1980?

well before that, so you have the availability of the

value," which comes out in Miller in--

BY REPRESENTATIVE REBER: (Of Mr. Wagner)

easier test for a prosecutor, which is the "no serious

MR. WAGNER: Well, the Miller decision was

21

22

23

24

25

- \_\_\_

- Q. That was my thought and the reason I asked.

  I don't think there really was a change when the Crimes

  Code was codified in '80. It was a carry-over of that.
- A. Well, you would have had an opportunity at that point where it could have been updated. Okay? It was updated to the Miller wording for the obscenity tests in prescribing obscenities, so they did, you know, it did take the easier test on distribution of obscenity to adults. In the area of that which is harmful to minors, I don't know why it happened, and I'm not blaming anybody, I'm just making a statement that why not give the prosecutors the best wording? I can tell you, for instance, that I know of some prosecutors that are not enforcing the harmful to minors display portion of the statute because they feel that the proof required by "utterly without redeeming social value" is too difficult in a court.

But back to the other issue as to the development of children -- I believe it's Representative Reber?

- Q. Yes.
- A. I agree with you, and the difficulty is that children who get access to sexually explicit material mix masturbation with fantasy, and in some cases get themselves addicted to continuing to use the material on

into the later part of their life, many of them carrying it into the marriage, if they eventually get married, or into their sexual life in the future. That has been proven it a London hospital where they've been able to create fetish addictions through the mixing of masturbation and sexual fantasy. So yeah, this is material that I think needs to be kept from children during their developing years. I am not at all advocating not teaching children about the positive aspects of their sexuality. When I spoke—

- Q. That's a whole other day and a whole other committee.
- A. That's right. But I don't want you to think that Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography is anti-sex. Sex is the neatest thing since sliced bread, but it can also be perverted to become a destructive thing rather than a productive, positive--
  - Q. If I can just interrupt?
  - A. Sure.

Q. Getting back to the technical side of it, because we have to be procedural technicians, in my mind, if we are to appropriately craft the necessary legislation which you feel is necessary for our prosecutors to rely upon in the prosecution of such violations, and I'm just concerned as to the language that is replacing the

"utterly without redeeming social importance for minors" that is proposed in the legislation, and I guess to some extent it's the political value of minors. What's the logical relationship there as that would relate to pornography? I'm trying to the this definition so we can use it appropriately to accomplish what you want to do, but I would hate to see it break apart because of what I fail to see as some ambiguities in the way it was drafted.

- A. Well, you may want to address that question directly to Attorney Peters, who construct it.
  - Q. Fine.

A. However, I would say that, you know, the Supreme Court in the Ginsberg case, which is the case that drives the "harmful to minors" test, the Supreme Court established in that case what would be acceptable wording for the "harmful to minors" three-pronged test, as well as they did in Miller in 1973. And the court, let's face it, this issue is driven by the Supreme Court, and if you move away from their guidelines, you stand a very good chance of having the statute declared unconstitutionally overboard.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: I think that's all I have, other than to Representative Hayden. It was Justice Potter Stewart in <u>Jockobelous vs. Ohio</u>, where the comment was made.

REPRESENTATIVE HAYDEN: Thank you,

2 | Counselor.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Dave.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. A couple of questions.

BY REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: (Of Mr. Wagner)

Q. As somebody who's spent a number of years in prosecutor's offices, I have some concerns about the ability of prosecutors, really whatever the standard is, to be effective in this area. I was interested by your testimony that, and you listed quite a number of rather substantial communities had freed themselves of pornography by virtue of prosecutions in which presumably juries returned, consistently returned, guilty verdicts. Are you saying that, for instance, I think Jacksonville was one city you mentioned, that you can't buy or rent, say, any of the videos that you refer to in your testimony? And I'm sorry, I missed the first part of it, but I certainly caught up with the written testimony. You just can't get those materials in those cities?

A. No, what I'm saying is that it is an ongoing responsibility of the local prosecutor to continue to work to control the distribution of the material within the community. Take, for instance, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Fort Lauderdale, through the use of their

obscenity statute and the RICO statute, have been able to stop the distribution. It just happens to be via -- it was via adult book stores in that town. They've been able to stop them, and through RICO the people have agreed that they'd rather close up shop and move out of State rather than lose their assets. They also have been successful in controlling the video cassettes really by just making the video dealers aware in town of what the State obscenity statute is and that the prosecutor has asked them to review their material and make sure it is in compliance with the law and that in the future he will be enforcing the law.

But all these cities are at various stages of controlling hard-core pornography, and I'm not telling you if it's controlled today that it could not be out of control tomorrow. It is a vigilance that the community has to undertake over a period of time. As to prosecutors and their ability to fight the battle, I think first of all you have to try, okay. And, you know, I've had many prosecutors tell me, well, Frank, you know, we only have so many resources. And I say to them, I understand that. However, we'd like -- you know, it's been a decade since an obscenity case was tried in the county, and are we entitled to some resources over a decade? And quite frankly, you can work -- it is -- and I'm not saying,

Representative, that it is the sole responsibility of the prosecutor. Everyone has a role, okay?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, the community has a role to educate, and that has to start because how can you get the convictions until the community standard will bring the convictions? So education is the starting point. Next, your prosecutor needs to bring some well-prepared cases, and there are organizations like the National Obscenity Enforcement Unit that can give them motions and briefs, copies of briefs, that can be filed so that they don't have to reinvent the wheel, so that they can even the balance between their prosecutor and the out-of-town prosecutor that has a tendency sometimes to come in on these cases. I think that the local municipality has a role by enacting constitutional zoning regulations. establishments cannot be prohibited via prior constraint but they can be controlled in where they're going to be placed within the community so that you don't have property values plummeting or you don't have the crime that is associated with where they're located hitting into those parts of the community that are going to suffer the most. We can be enacting other type of ordinances, such as local obscenity ordinances, that can deal with the problem on a summary offense with a potential for appeal to the Court of Common Pleas. It is everything working

together, when it works together well, that starts to turn the problem around.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Well, I'm interested, and my recoilection had been that you had used the term that those communities had "freed" themselves of this problem, and to--
- A. I believe my testimony was that they're working to free themselves. It is ongoing work. There's no question.
- Okay. Well, then fine. Because my 0. experience leads me to believe that most of the prosecutions I've seen in these matters are frankly much more tokenism to respond to pressures to do something about a problem that we all agree is something that's distasteful to us and harmful in our society, but I've yet to be aware of a prosecution anywhere in this State that has made even the slightest impact on the general availability of what I would consider to be pornographic material in a community. Certainly book stores have been closed down or chased out of one place, but in terms of general availability, am I as someone who is going to want to get my hands on this stuff going to have much trouble finding it? Maybe I have to drive to the next town, and the answers would go--
- A. Well, if we do nothing else than send a message to our children that Mom and Dad don't think that

this is okay, I think we've done something very important. Number one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Number two, I can tell you Butler County is probably the first to really go at this problem in an effective way, and they have been extremely successful in cutting the amount of material available, and maybe Carl Brown later on, because he's from that part of the State, can speak to that specifically. I can tell you, for instance, the difference in ideas about the whole problem. If a prosecutor starts out with that mind set, he's not -he doesn't have the proper mind set to begin with. prosecutors should be looking at this as a service to the community that is called upon to serve, rather than just succumbing to a pressure group. It is our responsibility to win the support of the local citizenry to support him in his efforts. However, I don't believe that it's right for a prosecutor to establish a community standard by default which is no standard at all and to permit the pornographers to set our community standard.

Q. Okay. Let me ask you, and I'm very happy to hear you talking about the role of the development particularly in our children of a perception of their parent's standards and a perception of what people in the community believe is an appropriate view of sexuality.

Because a gentleman with a long experience as a prosecutor

who has stated that drugs are the number one problem in this Commonwealth in terms of law enforcement sat, I believe, in exactly the chair you're sitting in a few days ago and said that he was, unfortunately, confident that he would be back in a few years telling us that drugs were still basically as available, perhaps in greater quantities and cheaper costs, in a few years than they are now despite what he envisioned as a very substantially enhanced law enforcement effort to get at the drug problem, and of course there we're talking about situations where clearly you have the support of the community and the court system and people who are arrested for either possession of a large quantity of drugs or for sale do have to go to jail for lengthy periods of time.

notwithstanding, the executive director of the Crime
Commission sat here and said we're still going to have
that problem, and the key effort has to be education, has
to be turning peoples' attitudes around about drug demand.
My perception would be, because I agree with the
sentiments that have been echoed here that the impact
particularly upon youth of their emerging concept of their
own sexuality and how they fit into the greater scheme of
things is a very critical time, is a time when the
materials you're talking about can do a lot of long-term

damage. I have to wonder what is happening, what you folks are doing to reach out to the community as a whole and develop those standards?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Well, let me give you an example. When I started this work in Berks County in Tom's home area, and Tom, Representative Caltagirone, will tell you that it's been a long, hard road. But I will tell you that in speaking to 90 groups over the last year, the one thing I've heard from those groups were, Frank, we didn't know it was as bad as it is and we didn't know there was something we could do about it. So there's a lot of ignorance on the part of the public out there and really understanding what they can do, and it's our job to let them know that. Secondly, it's also our job to try to win their hearts and minds, and I couldn't agree with you more that our primary responsibility is educational. And we now have, as I said, when we started three years ago in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, there was one anti-pornography work, and that was in Lancaster County. Today in the eastern district, the Federal district, we have 9 anti-pornography chapters in the 11 counties of the eastern district, and I would say that probably 90 percent of our time is being spent educating the community, 10 percent of our time being spent trying to get our law enforcement officers and prosecutors to enforce the law,

because both have a role.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I'm not disagreeing with you that education is a primary role, but both have a role. In other words, let me explain. I don't think, no matter how much I educate, I'm working on the market on this, and I'm a marketing vice president, so I understand the market. Okay? I'm working on the market on one end and trying to do away with demand by educating people. However, there are people who are pushing the market on the other end and pandering to people's baser instincts, and they're called the hard-core pornographers; the adult book stores. really don't think my going to the adult book stores and trying to explain to them the harm they are going to do to the community is going to have much of an effect on them, because they're in it to make a buck. So what I'm saying is that both have a role. The law needs to be brought to bear on those who will continue to violate the law, and at the same time we need to do as much educational work as we can do.

Q. Okay. In looking at the bill, House Bill 1141 that we have before us, my impression is that while there are, you know, perhaps some tune-ups, some adjustments, that may be helpful to prosecutors, the most -- really the one significant change in the law is the provision regarding minors, and I wonder, again, it's been

mentioned by a number of my colleagues who have spoken with you already that we plainly in the law and I think in our own minds have a different standard for children and adults. We're plainly concerned and feel we can set a much more aggressive standard with regard to materials which would be distributed to minors and are more constrained with regard to materials that are going to be distributed to adults. The law, as I understand it right now, and we're not really proposing to change it with this bill, provides enhanced penalties for sale or delivery or distribution to minors. My perception, however, is, from talking to the prosecutors at least that I talked to, that the X-rated book stores in particular are fairly careful about not selling to minors. That may be incorrect, and I'd be interested to hear your response to that, but I'm particularly interested in some of the comments in your testimony indicating that a very substantial number of junior high or high school children have been exposed to what we can agree is really hard-core stuff, and I'm wondering how that came about, because my guess would be that most of it would have been in their household as a result of the activity some of adult.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. I'm sure that it's a little bit of both.

How many kids, for instance, in our society today are in
latch-key homes? The parents bring the adult video

cassettes, you're going to see testimony by Dr. Victor

Cline about children that he was -- some of the children
he's been treating who are 12- and 13-year-olds who the
parents left the video cassettes lay around in the house,
the kids watched them and the kids did what the video
cassettes showed, and one of the children became pregnant,
who was impregnated. Yeah, they get access to them. What
we're finding over and over again is parents think that
the kids aren't finding this stuff, and they are.

And yes, there's the other situation, if you contact the district attorney in Lancaster he would tell you that he prosecuted Maxims down there about a year ago because they found 14- or 15-year-old kids, they were 14, 15, they were minors I know that, in the store, in the adult bookstore down there. So I think it's both.

- Q. Well, my impression has been that whatever difficulties you may have in getting district attorneys to prosecute, you know, pornography cases, is this particular tilm or video or book obscene, that they'd have no difficulty getting those prosecutions. I know there have been some in Bucks County that where a minor is found with materials that can be directly traced back to somebody that pandered them to them or found it in one of those settings.
  - A. I know of no district attorney in the

Commonwealth who is not prosecuting for the distribution to minors. I know plenty of them who are not prosecuting for the display to minors.

Q. And what do you mean by "display to minors"?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Well, let my give you an example. You can go into an establishment in our home district called Berkshire News. Berkshire News has racks of magazines. The Commonwealth statute, the display portion of 5903, says that if minors have access to that thoroughfare along with adults and if there's explicit sexual activity or depictions on the covers of those magazines, that they have to cover them up. And what I'm saying is that they are not covered up and that the average DA isn't doing a thing about it. And believe me, you don't have to look at the magazines in many cases. The covers are clear. down about a month ago and there was a depiction of a man mounted on the back of a female. Now, it didn't show him penetrating her, but, I mean, it still is a sexual depiction of simulated sexual activity and any child could walk past there the same way as I was walking past there. That's the display portion of the statute.
- Q. It's my understanding, you mentioned Berks County, that's where you've done a good bit of your work, that there was a prosecution involving the film "Debbie

Does Dallas," and I'm not familiar with the contents of that film but I think I can probably make a pretty fair guess, and that a jury found that film not to be obscene by the standards of Berks County, is that correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. That's correct. I'll explain the issue in detail. It's going to take me some time.

First of all, the prosecutor in Berks County was reluctant to enforce the law. We had an assistant district attorney who had about six months in the prosecutor's office right out of law school. He was up against Howard Stark, who fought his first obscenity case over a decade ago, and we had a situation where we, to my own personal feeling, the case was lost in voir dire, and we even talked with some members of the jury after the case was tried and they did not even consider the material. They decided the case based upon the fact that charges had been dropped against the adult bookstores in the Reading area and that they felt the video dealer who was being tried in this case was being singled out when the adult bookstore people had been left go. Now, a jury had no business deciding the case that way. They are to decide the case on the merits of the law, however, that's what happened.

Now, at the same time, right up the road a case was won in Schuylkill County against Howard Stark.

Howard Stark was beat in Commonwealth vs Kroll. Howard Stark was beat in Butler County in a case out in Butler County. And also you have the syndrome on the part of a prosecutor, and many prosecutors have what I call a one-case syndrome whereas, well, I'll try one and if that goes okay, okay. And then they prosecute the case and the media in some cases tar and feather them because many members of the media have presuppositions as it deals to any regulation of expression, they get discouraged and then they want to back off.

However, there are other prosecutors who will move forward and they don't take a one-case syndrome approach. They prosecute. I thought Paul Mageadie's comments from Morality In Media, the general counsel for Morality In Media, when we met with the heads of the Major Crimes Unit with the U.S. Attorney's in Philadelphia, Glenn Broadson, to talk about enforcement in the eastern district, they were talking about community standards and Paul made the statement, "Well, I guess if you lose 50 or 100 cases in the eastern district then we can say that the community standard won't tolerate it." And I think if a prosecutor makes an attempt to try some cases and after some cases though, not one case, after a period of time he cannot get convictions, then I think he has to decide where his resources are going to be used. But one case in a decade is not exactly a great demonstration of trying to establish a community standard.

- Q. Isn't one of the problems, though, with the narrow test which the Supreme Court has given to us to work with on this the problem that if you get a conviction for, you know, "Debbie Does Dallas" or one of these other titles, that that is really applicable to that case alone? That unless you are then going to have judges imposing sentences that are sufficient deterrent to make it economically unfeasible for the people you've been prosecuting to pursue this, that if you're really going to try to cut back on the availability of these materials, you're going to have to try a case for "Debbie Does Dallas III" and "Taboo VII" and each of these specific films, of which there are quite a number of them.
- A. Well, I think we have to differentiate between the use of injunctive action in trying to regulate the distribution of a specific film where, yeah, you bring an action against that film and they have another hundred or so to replace it. When you take that one off the shelf as versus the use of a criminal prosecution where we're talking about a misdemeanor conviction that can bring a five-year prison term and a \$7,000 fine on a first conviction and a third-class felony on a second conviction, these are good penalties. And, yes, we need

to have court-watched programs the same as we have in any area of the law to make sure that people are getting punished. However, I believe that we've probably done more in the last three years to work on the educational aspect to prepare for working in conjunction with effective prosecution and working with our legal officials of the community than in many cases have been done with the whole drug issue in the last umpteen years that we've been trying to solve the problem, plus the fact that we have an industry here that is not controlled the same way that the drug industry is.

knowledge, has not lost an obscenity prosecution since they created the National Obscenity Enforcement Unit that they've brought and they've gotten RICO convictions, and they are in the process of doing an excellent job in attacking the organized criminal element of this industry, and that's where their resources should be spent. The local district attorneys should be attacking the local book stores, the local video dealers who are violating the law, and the community should be educating to the best of their ability to try to work on the market within the local community. When those all three work together - Federal, State, local - that's where you start to see the greatest impact. And the Federal authorities have done a

tremendous job since they started. Obscenity prosecutions last year were up 800 percent over prior periods, and their prosecutions, to the best of my knowledge, they have not lost a case yet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I would say to the DA, any DA in this Commonwealth who feels that he does not have the expertise, and that's nothing to be ashamed of, okay. These cases haven't been fought for decades. See, years ago, it was you, Mr. District Attorney, up against a local attorney in your town who was defending them. Nowadays there are specialists who come in and you really don't have the level of expertise, so admit that and try to get help from people like the National Obscenity Enforcement Unit or prosecutors with organizations like CDL who can be assigned as special counsel, who have impeccable trial records. People like Ben Bull, who worked in Norfolk, Virginia, is a counsel with CDL and closed up 35 massage parlors, all the live sex shows, 16 adult book stores. has never lost an obscenity case in his entire career. This is the type of talent that is available to local district attorneys if they want it.

Q. Well, are you aware, we went through that syndrome in Bucks County back when I was in the DA's office, and that goes back a long time, that dealt with out-of-town counsel successfully. Are you aware of

whether -- to your knowledge, has there ever been a sentence of incarceration, even for one day, given for a conviction of our obscenity laws in the Commonwealth?

- A. Yes. Just recently out in Butler County.

  I'm not sure of the exact incarceration, it may have been

  90 days to 120 days, but I know the individual was given a

  prison term. Now, it's on appeal, but that's not unusual.

  And I will say that obscenity cases have one of the

  highest upheld on appeal types of cases that you're going

  to find. I also might say that the prior prosecutor in

  Bucks County, I believe it's now Judge Kane, moved out

  very effectively to move against book stores. He was

  using a local assistant district attorney by the name of

  Goodwin who did an excellent job, and every one of his

  cases were upheld by the Superior Court.
- Q. Do you have any idea what the sentences were in those cases?
  - A. I'm not aware at this point.
- Q. Well, I'm pretty sure that there wasn't a fine imposed in any of them over about \$300. And I'll tell you, Mike and I shared an office for seven years together. A bunch of book store clerks were convicted, had relatively light fines imposed, and so far as I'm aware, those book stores didn't miss a beat in terms of continuing in business, in terms of continuing to sell

materials to people who were in a position to want to buy. And that, among other experiences, is what makes me somewhat doubtful that we are going to, through the use of the criminal justice system, stop this activity so long as — I think we can certainly make a dent as to minors. To the extent anybody's actively dealing with minors, but that you're going to turn this around without turning around the public understanding of this issue, whether or not you get convictions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. That's my point entirely. Times are a-changing, okay? When they brought those cases, there weren't nine organizations in the eastern district of Pennsylvania. There weren't grassroots organizations we now have springing up throughout the Commonwealth who are trying to raise this issue before the public. I am not trying to say that this is the problem of governmental -of the government. There's no problem you have that is a problem of the government. We're already seeing that. lawlessness is out there within our society, you can't do a thing about it. There aren't enough jails to build to hold all the people. We're willing to work with you. That's what we're saying. But at the same time, we need your help, and that's what we're here for. We'll work with you. We need your to help us in the governmental area where the Supreme Court has given us the right to get involved in governmental regulation, and we'll do our work. We'll work and spend our time out there trying to turn the community to understanding the effects of this material.

- Q. All right. In the spirit of help, I thank you for your comments. Counsel Woolley has pointed out, I believe, that there is, and I think really more of a typographical error, on page 6 of the bill, the incorporation of the Miller standard as to minors, and we may want to take this up with Counsel when he testifies. It would seem to me that the language should read, "educational 'or' scientific value for minors," as opposed to "and."
- A. I'm going to let that up to an attorney, to speak to an attorney on, and Attorney Peters is well-versed and understands obscenity law very well that he should be able to address that issue.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: All right, thank you.

Frank, at this time, what I'd like to do is,
begging the indulgence of the members, you do have this
video that I think is important that we take the time to
view. If we could get that video on, I do want to
recognize Chairman Moehlmann and Representative Kosinski,

1 and at this time--2 REPRESENTATIVE KOSINSKI: Is this the Bundy 3 video? CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No. We will have the 4 5 Bundy video also, but at this time this is a video that 6 has--7 MR. WAGNER: This is a video that has been 8 prepared for you here today dealing with victims and 9 oftenders which speaks, I think you have to have a 10 prevailing governmental interest for wanting to do 11 anything, and this is designed to let you know that 12 there's a prevailing governmental interest. 13 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: All right. If we 14 could turn that on and if the members would care to just 15 come to the front of the meeting room. 16 (Whereupon, a video entitled, "Pornography: 17 You Are Its Victim, " was shown.) 18 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Frank, any closing 19 comments? 20 MR. WAGNER: No. I'd just like to thank

MR. WAGNER: No. I'd just like to thank the committee and you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify before you this morning. I hope that this committee in its attitude and concerning this issue will remember the children that they saw today, and I think that they also need to remember Annie's father, because

21

22

23

24

25

maybe Annie's father never wanted to be a perpetrator, but he made a conscious decision to start down the road of using material of which debased human sexuality, and eventually that led him to abusing his own child and his own children and children outside the home. Our hope, as an organization, and I think as many of your constituents, because over the last three years I've talked to many of your constituents, I feel that they have a deep concern over the continuing explosion of this problem, and they feel helpless. They know that in taking care of the problem within their local communities through friendly complaint and boycott that they can get action, but from a governmental standpoint, they seem frustrated.

We're just asking you to give us the laws. We'll work with our enforcement people to try to enforce the law, and we're committing to work with you to try to address this issue within the Commonwealth and to make Pennsylvania a model State in trying to reduce the availability of obscenity and pornography, child pornography, within the Commonwealth. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very much, Frank.

At this time, I'd like to call court-appointed U.S. Attorney for the middle district,

James West. And I want to thank him personally for taking

time out of his extremely busy schedule to be here with us today.

MR. WEST: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much for having me here today. I'm very glad to appear and make whatever slight contribution I can make.

My background is basically as a prosecutor, and I've been a prosecutor for 19 years in the Federal system, as well as in the State system for 3 1/2 years. And I guess I should start by just outlining what I have seen in the area of pornography, both obscenity as well as child pornography, and perhaps define some of the problems and maybe be helpful to the committee in answering whatever questions you might have.

an assistant U.S. Attorney out in Pittsburgh, I got involved as a co-counsel in a case involving obscenity. It involved a gentleman named Reuben Sterman from Ohio who had opened warehouses in the city of Pittsburgh and was bringing what was then considered obscenity into the Allegheny County area and selling it at rather large profits. The case was a massive undertaking. In fact, I think our former Governor was a U.S. attorney at that point in time when the case was originally initiated in 1974, but after an extensive investigation, execution of

search warrants, we entangled ourselves with what I come to call first amendment lawyers. Indictments were about to be handed down, but before we even got to the indictment stage we found ourselves going to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals on three occasions on grand jury Substantial delays were incurred, and finally, motions. the case was indicted in 1979, but I had come here to the middle district of Pennsylvania, had left the prosecution team and become the Deputy Director of Criminal Law Enforcement for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And at that point in time, I learned that the charges had been dismissed against Mr. Sterman, after approximately a four-year investigation, on the basis that Mr. Sterman would remove his warehouses from Allegheny County and put them somewhere else. And that was the end of the Reuben Sterman case. And Reuben Sterman was just identified in the Mease Report as now being the largest pornographer in the United States of America. So the problem did not go An opportunity was lost, and I certainly would not away. assess blame for the loss of that opportunity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The emphasis that I saw there was the fact that when you undertake a case involving a major pornographer and when you are seriously investigating, using all the tools of Federal government - the FBI, the Internal Revenue Service, and such - you have a long

uphill fight. It's much the nature of undertaking a complex antitrust case, such as the AT&T antitrust case. It far exceeds the resources that are available to your average State prosecutor, and in many instances even to a Federal prosecutor.

Pornography is there for one reason, because there's a lot of money to be made in pornography, and that money is used to protect those business interests through the hiring of what I referred to, and I referred to it respectfully. I believe in the law and I believe first amendment lawyers should be around, that they know their job and they know their job very well, and even as a seasoned prosecutor at that point in time having four or five years as assistant U.S. attorney, I knew I was in a fight when I got involved in that case, and the other two attorneys assigned to that particular matter also knew they were involved in a fight.

When I came to the middle district of the Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, in my position at the Attorney General's Office, and naturally learning what happened to the Sterman case in Pittsburgh, I made a lot of inquiries to district attorneys throughout the Commonwealth in Pennsylvania. Obscenity, pornography, was not within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General's Office. We had jurisdiction over the statewide investigative grand jury,

organized crime and public corruption, and only in the case of a supercession of a district attorney would we get involved in the pornography area or in the involvement of organized crime. But I came to learn that there was a perception that the pornography laws in Pennsylvania were impossible to enforce either because of the difficulty and lack of resources that the district attorneys rightfully perceived that they suffered under or because of a belief that the Pennsylvania statute was unconstitutional, and this was almost universally acknowledged by the district attorneys that I talked to, and I talked to many over the years.

When I returned to the Federal system, I discovered that we had been given some new tools since I left, and that would be around 1983, and one was a statute that was passed by the Congress and the Senate and was sponsored by Senator Specter of Pennsylvania and dealt with the use of the mails to transport child pornography. We began to implement that statute in the middle district of Pennsylvania, a district that really has a sort of -- the outside view being that there are a lot of Amish people that live here with buggles and it's a rather sedate, countrified and rural area. But for two years we led the country insofar as prosecutions of child pornography being transported through the mails, not

because there was a great volume of the problem here but because we began enforcing the statute and really believed that all you needed was four or five cases at that point in time. The last time I looked, we were fifth in the country because a lot of the U.S. Attorney's offices throughout the country have begun to enforce that particular statute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I wouldn't want to mislead you. When we began enforcing that statute, we did not find the Reuben Sterman's of the world that were involved in the business. The Reuben Sterman's of the world don't involve themselves with child pornography because of the enforcement effort that would be directed in that direction. It is something that any prosecutor, I think, would undertake having been exposed or having seen child pornography, and basically the people that were prosecuted were pedophiles who have really started a cottage industry insofar as child pornography is concerned. They manufacture their own child pornography. They send it back and forth from one to another. They even have computer link setups where they can dial in and through their modems order up various types of child pornography. But it's not a commercial operation, it is truly a cottage industry.

Recently, the attorney that handled those matters for the United States Attorney's Office in the

middle district, Mary Spearing, was taken to Washington where she is now with the National Obscenity Unit. was a great loss to the middle district of Pennsylvania, but we have initiated several cases involving traditional adult obscenity. We started by using the income tax laws and went against a gentleman named Goodwyn Hecht, who was down in the Lancaster area and I believe owned two or three book stores in that area. He received a two-year jail sentence, and the investigation is continuing, but the jail sentence was under the tax laws, and we were one of the districts that joined in what has been called Operation Post Porn, which was an effort by the National Obscenity Unit to indict particularly egregious pornography in four or five districts throughout the United States simultaneously and to bring prosecutions to bear against that particular company in a simultaneous fashion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, I was surprised that when we brought our Operation Post Porn indictments to find out that there was an injunction action brought in Washington, D.C., that delayed that case in fact until last week. There was approximately a one-year delay, and again, we are faced with the first amendment lawyer issue where even the National Obscenity Unit, quite frankly, found out that when they brought their simultaneous indictments, the

legal eagles, if you will, of the first amendment community were capable of having prosecution and further investigation enjoined for a period of one year. I point that out simply to emphasize that what you're involved in is a very sophisticated business that has unlimited resources and that is prepared to expend those resources in every way possible to protect the generation of income from those particular businesses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That would basically be my outline of what I've learned in 19 years as a prosecutor. I listened with great interest to many of the things that Mr. Wagner had to say. I agree with almost all of what he had to say. I don't think I could express it quite as articulately. As a prosecutor who has a feeling of guilt for not enforcing these particular laws, but there's also a balancing that goes into it and a knowledge that there's a lot demanded of the U.S. Attorney's Office and certainly of any district attorney's office. The war on drugs has to be a priority right now, and you dare not and should not take resources from that effort. It is only with a lot of soul searching and a lot of economizing that you can find the resources available to use in prosecutions of obscenity and pornography type crimes. I think the U.S. Attorney's Offices across the country are endeavoring to find those resources. I heard Mr. Wagner's figure of an 800-percent

increase in prosecutions. Numbers wise, that's probably
not that great. Percentage wise, it is great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But there is an attitude now where the U.S. Attorneys are attempting to set the community standards. What the Supreme Court has done in the Miller case and in other cases is quite frankly say that each community is to determine their own standards of what is tolerated. is tolerated at Broadway and 42nd Street may well not be tolerated in York, Pennsylvania. But unless prosecutors will devote the resources to go forward and be armed with good and constitutional laws, and that they will establish those community standards and bring the necessary number of cases to establish those community standards, we're going to continue to see what has been occurring for the last 20 years, which is a continuous downward spiral in the community standards generally. And, in fact, through the television media, through now cable television and the greatly enhanced communications abilities that we have, we have an almost homogenization of what the community standards are. In other words, we become closer every day to in York, Pennsylvania having the community standards of Broadway and 42nd Street because we are being exposed to more and more each day.

The tide has always gone the same way. It's always been rising in the area of pornography. There's

never been a rolling back of it, and for the last 20 years, there has been a desensitizing. What we were prosecuting Reuben Sterman for in 1973 is probably right now available on cable television, and we were convinced that the community standards were being violated then. And I will say there was probably material that would exceed also what was on cable television now, but some of it, when you're talking the Midnight Blue cable network and such, I am certain is comparable to what we were prosecuting Reuben Sterman for in 1973. And at some point there has to be a concerted effort to stop this. When I see things like Pennsylvanians Against Pornography, it's a clear, if you will, call it the duty or it's a clear signal to me that the time really has come to establish those community standards.

Those would be my observations. I would be glad to answer any questions that I could as best I can.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, sir.

Questions from the committee?

Yes, Dave. Representative Heckler.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

BY REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: (Of Mr. West)

Q. Mr. West, and I confess that I speak with some of the provincial attitudes of a local prosecutor who

over the years has seen U.S. Attorney's Offices be kind of picky in deciding what they will or what they won't prosecute in ways that the local prosecutors rarely are. What do you, now that you have been summoned to duty by all of this, what do you expect? What initiatives do you expect to make in the middle district about this matter?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The FBI is devoting a number of resources Α. I indicated the Goodwyn Hecht case, I to this area. indicated the child pornography prosecutions, and we are, through our prosecutors, participating in the Operation Post Porn prosecution, which will establish a community standard. It is an adult obscenity prosecution. are other things that are coming, and I really can't talk about them. I guess you've got to take it on faith that there are active investigations, and some have borne substantial truit. Usually through the Internal Revenue Code and through tax violations, although I was very disappointed, in that case we gave a very vivid description of the business that the individual was in right down to the descriptions of the peep holes and such that were present, and it is a very, very seedy business. I think many average people don't realize what a full-blown pornographic book store is, and it is sort of an eye opener and almost incredible what goes on in those particular places. We did try to get an enhanced penalty and a district judge told us, and I think quite rightfully, come back and bring an obscenity charge, and of course, we're exploring that and that particular area.

I look to Operation Post Porn setting a community standard, and I look for cases to follow after that.

- Q. Okay, so those will -- that will involve actual obscenity prosecutions in--
- A. In the middle district of Pennsylvania, yes.
- Q. Okay, thank you.

  BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Mr. West)

- Q. Mr. West, have you had an opportunity to look over House Bill 1141?
- capable of commenting on it. Of course, the child aspect of that, the Supreme Court has held that children are not part of the community but rather a separate community that can be considered separately, different rules apply, and the Ginsberg case, the Pinkus case that I heard Mr. Wagner refer to, would be the benchmarks, but I would not be the one to render a legal opinion on it. It really takes study on one of these statutes. I saw that some of the language was being parsed and Mr. Wagner was being asked about it, and I frankly would have to go to the law

library and read Miller, read Pinkus, read Ginsberg, and make sure that language was in there and was being used appropriately, but I don't feel that I would be doing the committee a service by trying to comment on the legality, constitutionality of that statute.

- Q. Let me ask you one other question then. We've heard the term RICO statute--
  - A. Certainly.

- Q. --used here. Is that accessible to you in what you're doing currently?
- A. Absolutely. The Racketeering Influence and Corrupt Organization statute was amended, and pornography can be brought under it. And I view that as the real, real hope for what can be done. That plus another thing that was done by the United States Congress, they put forfeiture into the new pornography statute. In fact, it came part in November of 1988 as part of the narcotics legislation. They amended the pornography statute and made forfeiture part of it. Now, I heard the comments here about sentencing, and they're well taken. If we would have convicted Reuben Sterman any time between 1974 and 1979, we were expecting a sentence of 1 year, 1 1/2 years, 2 years, would have probably been a harsh sentence. But if you have a forfeiture provision in there and even attack this matter civilly, and more so if you can put an

incentive into it where the forfeited proceeds, like the Pennsylvania narcotics forfeiture statute, would go to the district attorney for use for law enforcement purposes, it could solve a lot of problems, and I think that if we vigorously use the forfeiture provisions that have been given to us in the Federal side, we'll do a lot more to solving the problem by taking the book stores and the property from the people that are involved in this business than by advocating lengthy jail sentences. don't think we're going to get more than one or two years, maybe three years, unless we can show particularly egregious circumstances. But if we can take the property off of them, if we can say this was used for an illegal purpose and we're taking your book store and we're going to convert it back into a gasoline station or we're going to put it up for public sale and use the money that we generate from it for law enforcement purposes in Carbon County, or whatever, I think it provides an incentive to prosecutors, almost a reward to prosecutors, plus it eliminates the problem right at its source. It takes the assets away from people who would pervade pornography. I think that's something they would fight real hard because it's a powerful tool.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. I have one other question for you. If the State's Attorney General were to institute a sort of a

anywhere in the State of Pennsylvania where you may have a reluctant DA or whatever, would you in your capacity be in a position to aid and assist what they're doing, or is it a duplication of what you're doing or would you be able to work hand-in-hand and accomplish more than you would individually?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. We work hand-in-hand now. A lot of the competition that was in law enforcement has been put aside. A year and a half ago we had a conference, the United States Attorney's Office, and 150 local law enforcement officials attended. It was put on by the National Obscenities Center in Washington, D.C., and it was sponsored by my office. Those officers were highly, highly motivated. They received three good days of training. They were very interested in getting out in the field and implementing these laws. I think the district attorneys are interested in implementing these laws, it's just that they're constantly chasing resources through their county commissioners and through their court system and whatever. The type of strike force that you describe there modeled after the Federal National Obscenity Unit I think is a very desirable thing, and I think Attorney General Preate, if he would support that, would be doing a desirable thing. You need highly specialized attorneys to go into this area and they've got to have a lot of perseverance, they've got to be ready for a lot of frustration. In criminal law, the one thing we like, we like to get into court within our 70 days, get the case tried, get our sentence and say we did our job, and it is sort of a quick process. In the obscenity area, it's a completely different process. You've got to be prepared to dig in, to spend three or four years, to have them lay every piece of paper they can possibly lay on you and to have the perseverance to see it through, and I think the centralization in the Attorney General's Office would be a very good idea.

Q. Thank you very much.

A. Thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I think--

REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Excuse me.

MR. WEST: I'm sorry, sir.

BY REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: (Of Mr. West)

Q. Mr. West, you had indicated that you felt it would be appropriate at this time for the General Assembly to establish community standards for the State. And presumably we would be raising the community standards with respect to obscenity. One thing that concerns me really about this particular piece of legislation is that

perhaps at least for some communities we would actually be lowering the standards. And one example that I would point out is that sadomasochistic abuse is defined as in a sexual context. Now, in my community at least, in the district I represent, sadomasochistic abuse in any context would violate the community standards of obscenity, and, you know, typically many of our obscenity enforcement and legislation has been in local ordinances. One concern I would have, as I've indicated, is if we adopt a statewide definition of the community standard, perhaps for some areas that may raise the community standard, but perhaps the statewide standard would be lower than it is in some neighborhoods around our State. You know, that might be an unintended result, might protect some people that folks in my neighborhood wouldn't want to protect. Do you think that's a fair argument? Using the example I just cited?

A. Well, it's an argument, but I sort of misled you if I led you to believe that I was saying the legislature should adopt the community standards. Under the Miller Supreme Court case, the jury is supposed to determine what the community standards are and whether this violates the community's standards, and I view the legislation as sort of generally saying, well, you know, this is what we define as obscene, and eventually the jury has to determine whether or not it is obscene under this

Miller test and this community standard test. And maybe I can help in this way, that the community varies. Federal Court, the community would be the 32 counties that comprise the middle district of Pennsylvania would be the community that the jury would be instructed to consider. And I've never done a State obscenity case, but I think the community you'd consider there would be the county, and they would say Susquehanna County, Carbon County. And as long as you properly define obscenity, the jury is still free and has to, under the Constitution in the Miller case, decide whether or not the community standards are offended, and it's probably best if the community is the county, the small community, so that you're not dealing with, you know, Philadelphia's standards trying to be imposed on York, Pennsylvania, or on Scranton or Wilkes-Barre. I think that happens through operation of the Miller case and through the court's jury instructions more so than by operation of this statute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And otherwise I don't think I could shed any more light on it. When you don't define sadomasochistic activity in any way, yes, you probably put that outside of this law, but I don't think it would be any reason to stop this law. I think things can be fine tuned and technical amendments could come in later. What's needed is to get something out into the field, and frankly, let the

district attorneys know that the legislature is interested in seeing this type of activity and seeing these laws enforced. They want to see the public support, the legislative support, for engaging in this kind of activity because it's such a drain on their resources.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Again, thank you very much.

MR. WEST: Thank you.

Attorney Robert Peters, Legal Counsel for the National Obscenity Law Center, come up, and if we could also have Carl Brown, Southeast Coordinator for Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography, if he would come up also, and Francis Viglietta, Director of the Justice and Rights Department of the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference. Would the three of you sit down there so that we can try to expedite the proceedings? I would appreciate it, and I'm sure the members would.

If you would like to start with your presentation.

MR. PETERS: My name is Robert Peters. I am a staff attorney any with Morality In Media in New York City. I have submitted a somewhat more detailed statement in support of this bill, and I'm not going to attempt to read that statement here.

House Bill 1141 would do four things. It would expand the scope of the current obscenity law to include obscene live performances. It would specify that Section 5903 of the penal law encompasses video tapes. It would clarify that the obscenity definition encompasses sadomasochistic abuse and sexual bestiality, and it would eliminate the "utterly without redeeming social importance" requirement in the current definition of the statute's "harmful to minors" law.

encompassing live obscene performances, the Supreme Court has clearly indicated that obscenity can manifest itself in conduct, not just in pictures, and as I put it, I think it's really somewhat ridiculous that we can have a law that reaches obscene publications in the front part of a book store but there might be men or women in the back part performing the same acts and you do not have a law in Pennsylvania which could reach that. I mention in my memo that the language of the performance part of the amendment comes directly from the New York State penal law. It also happens to be found in the Texas and Kansas obscenity laws.

The second part of the amendment regarding sadomasochistic abuse and sexual bestiality. I think the case is much better for stating that the current

definition would encompass sexual bestiality because it's certainly not limited to humans, but I think since we're amending the law or we're proposing an amendment, it would be best to specify that the current definition encompasses that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, as I state in my memo on the subject of sadomasochistic abuse, again, sadomasochistic abuse would clearly be covered in the current law if the depiction also included sexual conduct currently specified, but I can assure you that a great deal of hard-core sadomasochistic porn does not include intercourse or lewd exhibition of genitals or masturbation. In many cases, you might have a studded strap or the groin area of the male or female so that the genitals would not show, and yet the person would be otherwise nude and unimaginable tortures being inflicted upon that person. Now, certainly one could argue that, you know, when they passed this law they weren't thinking of that and therefore it should be included, but arguably, it would not. You'd have to have some kind of hard-core sexual conduct in the sense of masturbation or intercourse also. And I state, and I will not go into the cases, but I personally believe that there could be no question that our Supreme Court has and will uphold the law which includes that type of material.

A third part is specifying video tapes, and

again, I think the current definition of material would encompass that, but this is an issue that has arisen. As I state in my memo, it most recently arose in the State of Wisconsin, where they passed an obscenity amendment, actually a new law, and did not specify video tapes, and the argument was made since you did not specify it, it won't be included. Now, I personally think they're going to lose in that issue, but they've spent a lot of the State's money trying to prove their point. And the last part of the amendment pertains to "harmful to minors" legislation, and I think it's been said, the "harmful to minors" concept was upheld by the Supreme Court in the Ginsberg case. The court indicated that what they were doing was simply taking the definition of obscenity for adults and modifying it for minors.

Now, in 1973, the court changed the definition for obscene materials to replace the "utterly without redeeming social value" component with a serious value test, and I think it's safe to say from my experience that the vast majority of States that do have these laws incorporate the Miller standard per se. And I would agree with one thing that a Representative said, the "harmful to minors" law is not often enforced, but it is a problem, and one thing that deters enforcement of the law is the fact that the standard of proof is difficult. It's

difficult enough as it is, I might add, and there's no reason for you to make it any more difficult.

In conclusion, I would say that this bill does not attempt to set sail on unchartered constitutional waters. Live performances, video tapes, and depictions of sadomasochistic abuse and bestiality are all the proper subject matter of a State obscenity law. The "utterly without redeeming social important" test in the Pennsylvania statutes definition of "harmful to minors" was abandoned by the Supreme Court in 1973. Passage of House Bill 1141 is a much needed and constitutional update of the Pennsylvania obscenity statute.

If you have questions, I will answer.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Before we get into the questions, if we could, I would like to go on to the next presenter, which would be Carl Brown, and then we will take Francis Viglietta. Then we'll open for questions.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman and other members of the committee, I'm the State Coordinator of Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography, and I wish to thank you all today for having us and for considering this bill which is very dear to our hearts. We believe that it is essential if certain things that are going on in this State are going to be successful. A similar situation

existed in North Carolina where the obscenity code there was updated this way and a couple other bills were also presented. And as a result of that, a young U.S. Attorney in North Carolina, and this was a Bible Belt State, but what happened was when Atlanta was cleaned up, most of what was in Atlanta went into North Carolina. And in bringing in a Federal/State/county task force, this assistant U.S. Attorney, who is Rob Showers, managed to in less than two years put the forces together where over 500 adult book stores, massage parlors, X-rated video stores, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, were legally driven out of the State, and they made a huge profit. I believe it was something like \$500,000 over and above all the costs of this from the entire State.

In western Pennsylvania, we already have a Federal/State/county task force in place. I was hoping that John Driscoll, who I anticipated being here but I don't see him here today, who was one of the founders of this would be here who at that time was president of the District Attorneys Association of Pennsylvania. It has been in operation, in fact it came into operation in November of 1987 at an MIM, Morality In Media, regional workshop. We have six regions in Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography, and in case Frank Wagner didn't tell you who we are, I'll get to that in a minute.

1 2 county, and there was something like nine district 3 attorneys, many police chiefs, citizens, chief leaders, 4 organization leaders, the U.S. Attorney Jerry Johnson, 5 some State Police, some investigative detectives from the 6 district attorney's offices, Paul Mageadie of the National 7 Obscenity Law Center was there giving part of the problem, 8 and we had a luncheon at which we sat at a table, and I 9 had just had meetings with Rob Showers at the Justice 10 Department in Washington immediately preceding this and 11 brought back a message that was so encouraging that they 12 decided on the spot that John Driscoll and the lawyer from 13 -- who was an assistant district attorney at one time in 14 Butler County on the Butler case, and Jerry Johnson would 15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take co-chairmanship of forming the 25 county western district of Pennsylvania into a Federal/State/county task torce against obscenity. As of March 4, 1988, they all met in Butler, at the request of Dave Cook, the district attorney there, and they've been investigating ever since and set their goals, and we are led to believe that in the very, very near future there will be some major indictments there. This investigation that was alluded to by Jim West, I think, I'm not sure because I sure don't have all the facts and I don't have any facts on what's going on, but

This was to educate key people from every

We understand that the investigation from western

Pennsylvania has spilled over into the middle district and also over into the eastern district. I know that we've had meetings with Jim West, he's been most cooperative, and that he is looking forward to forming the 32 counties in the middle district into a Federal/State/county task force. We've had meetings with the U.S. Attorney's Office in Philadelphia for the eastern district, which has 10 counties of the 67 counties. If successful, we hope in the near future that there will be a Federal/State/county task force in all 67 counties across the State of Pennsylvania and that some of the results that were accrued in North Carolina will be here.

I go on with this, there was some question about can you show relationship between crime and pornography? In Cincinnati, when it was cleaned up, Jerry Kirk, Dr. Jerry Kirk, who founded the National Coalition Against Pornography as a result of his experiences in working with the district attorney there and a very large civic organization there to clean up downtown Cincinnati. When they cleaned this up of all the adult book stores and the X-rated video stores and the massage parlors and on and on and on, they saw in the next year, and this has been documented, that crime in that intercity fell 83 percent

in one year's time after the intercity was cleaned up.

This included rape, child molestation, auto thefts,
muggings, every form of crime. Once you take the crud out
of an area, the people that go for that crud, that hang
around to that crud, that are drawn to that crud, just
don't come anymore. And crime dropped 83 percent in one
year's time. A very similar but not quite as high number
in Oklahoma City when they cleaned up their intercity. We
understand that, at least the cities claim, there are 20
of them in this country that are clean at least of
hard-core pornography, at least in the intercities, but it
is a continuing thing.

Here in Pennsylvania, Cambria County, with two district attorneys having fought through it, is clean. Crawford County, with two district attorneys having succeeded each other in keeping it clean, is clean, and just this past week Warren County got rid of its last X-rated video store and they don't have anything up there that we know about. So there are three counties we know of for certain in Pennsylvania that are clean. We understand that Utah is clean, North Carolina is coming very close to it, and Florida is sure trying hard to be a clean State. It's got a way to go, but it's trying very hard.

Now, just to backtrack a little bit in case

I wasn't here in the beginning of Frank's marvelous testimony, and I'm from the eastern region and I wanted to just make sure that you do know what Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography is and who we are. We started -- we were born a little over two years ago here in Harrisburg at the Sheraton East at a Congress Against Pornography in which the 28 then existing anti-pornography groups in the State came together for the first time, about 100 people with several organizations looking on, such as the Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs and many other organizations, to see if something could be done in a joint effort, because most of these organizations felt that they were not very successful in what they were trying to do when they were doing it alone. And this had been a dream of one of the founders of Morality In Media in New York City, that Pennsylvania might become the model State for the entire nation because, number one, it had rather good obscenity laws compared to what other States had.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Secondly, four years ago, for the first time in this country, and it was only four years ago, something like the heads of 50 denominations stood up, wrote a proclamation against obscenity and for prosecution, and it was the first State to have this happen in.

And third, there were these 28 separate groups of all different backgrounds, American Family

Association groups, Citizens for Decency through the Law groups, Morality In Media groups, National Coalition

Against Pornography groups, all the national organizations had groups here. It was so overwhelmingly accepted that the people there gave the name Pennsylvanians vs.

Pornography to this coalition, to this campaign, and the goal simply was as we were discussing this morning, public awareness, public information, and urging the law enforcement officials to prosecute those who break the law and to enforce the laws. Very, very simple goals and very legal goals. In fact, even the "versus" in the Pennsylvanians vs. Pornography is the small legal "V".

From there, we have grown to be more than 115 organized - local, State, national, regional. We represent or we work with the Concerned Women for America, with 26,000 members in this State; with the Knights of Columbus, with 93,000 members in the State. We now have 78 anti-obscenity groups in the State in most of the counties. I call your attention to that stack of papers over there. That is just about half. They just keep coming in. Last fall, for the White Ribbon Campaign, we asked people to have their relatives, their friends, their citizens, their church members, sign petitions simply urging the district attorneys and the police chiefs to enforce the laws and to prosecute those who break them. I

believe there's something like 150,000 names on those. There's 49 pounds of them right there, and we have an equal number that haven't been sorted out yet back in my office in Pittsburgh in the headquarters.

This is just one of the indications of community standards in the State. We have grown, as I say, to all these organizations, the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference, the Pennsylvanians for Biblical Morality, the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, the Eagle Forum, the Church Women United have just come in. In fact, I'm flying from here to Philadelphia to meet with them this afternoon, later this afternoon. I just can't even begin to tell you. I think I said the Concerned Women for America. The eight Catholic diocese, the Pittsburgh Presbytery with 182 churches has just come into it with our White Ribbon Campaign.

Last fall, as a way of very easily demonstrating and very visually demonstrating community standards, we are not proving them but we're demonstrating them, and the district attorneys I've talked to, which are many of them, are very grateful for this campaign. We had over 500,000 cars in Pennsylvania during National Pornography Awareness Week with white ribbons flying from their antennae as a statement of wanting to stand for decency and against pornography. We had thousands of

bows. We don't even know how many bows, we don't know how many lapel bows, but we did distribute - there were many, many more of these on cars, but we distributed and sent out for the orders from churches and organizations all over the State. I believe 55 of the 67 counties participated in this.

It was born here in Butler, and we took it as a State. Morality In Media got all the other national organizations to take it on, and all the 50 States last year and 220 cities celebrated White Ribbon. The largest event was in Miami where over 3,000 people were in the Motorcade For Decency there, and the Governor and the Attorney General were both in the motorcade. We had six rallies here and very large motorcades, and the one in Pittsburgh would have been bigger than this but we had a typhoon right in the center of the day, so we didn't quite match the Miami one, but we came close, dispite the weather.

The district attorneys tell us that we are giving them, through these petitions and through the white ribbons, that we are giving them some real visible evidence that they can use in their cases to help improve community standards. They are even more grateful for the education we're doing because they're starting to get much better educated jurors on these cases. When we started a

little over two years ago, there was one case, the Butler case, that we knew about in all of Pennsylvania. One obscenity case. I believe there have been at least 12 since then, and there are several in progress right now and several pending, plus the Federal/State/county task force.

We believe that this law is essential, this little sessential, as a cornerstone for the Federal/State/county task force. We believe there are a couple other areas that will have to be looked into legislatively, and we hope that you will give us an ear when we are able to talk to you about those, but that's in the future.

where I am on this little agenda. I have given for you, and I'm not going to go into it because I'm not an expert in it, but I have given you two summaries of where obscenity, the research, even professionals, I just heard one recently, the clinical psychologist was on with two researchers on this subject, and the researchers were not public relations people, they were researchers, and they had obviously done some very honest research in this, and while they were there to try to talk about their research, this psychologist was saying, "But there's no body of evidence to support any of this." Well, just for your

information, I've given you Dr. Victor Cline, who was in that tape, I've given you his summary of the research in this country, just a brief summary of the research that's going on and the results of that research, and I've also given you Dr. Doug Reed's summary of this, which is a little more complete but less information about it, just sort of the conclusions, so that you can have both of these for your file so that you will know that there is a body of research out there that does really give quite a significant causal effect to pornography and crime, and particularly crime against women and children and the family. Much of what you heard on the TV will be covered in that.

There are also two other things, and one of them is in the report, and that is that there is a study, it's actually a 20-year study in Michigan by the State Police and some researchers through all of their sex crime backgrounds in their files and they found a stunning, and I think very low and very conservative, 41 percent of these files showed that there was an absolute direct connection between pornography and the sex crime that was committed - the rapes, the child molestations, whatever. In a Chicago area, in a more recent study, just a two-year study, it was 69 percent. I don't think it was quite as conservative an estimate, but it was 69 percent.

here. Okay, there is a very, very big problem which some day may have to be addressed here. We are trying to raise the funds to bring together Dr. Victor Cline and many other national experts with the National Obscenity Law Center in New York City. You heard some reference to the fact that there are all these victims out there. Well, now we're told by the profession that it is the fastest growing field of counseling and therapy in the country is for sex addiction and sex abuse victims and those who have done it. These are very, very, very sick people.

We're in a position right now, as marriage counseling was a few years ago, where there is not one certification anywhere in this country, particularly in this State, but anywhere in this country for anyone claiming to be a sex therapist. They are dealing with women and children who are going to need long-term help to overcome what has happened to them so that they themselves don't do this to others. We are told by the FBI and many, many other sex studies that two-thirds of the children who are sexually abused on average will become sex abusers to children when they grow up. We are also told by the FBI and others in this research that on average before a child molester is caught, he will have molested 60 children, and it's usually a "he," on the first offense. Before he

dies, he will on average have molested 360 children. If the first 60 children, if 40 of those become child molesters and they're not caught until they've molested 60 children, that's 2,460 children this one man has just in one generation gotten into child molestation. This is from statistics from the FBI, from the Federal Customs, from the research that's in those reports I've given you there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is very important that we get some kind of certification. This is way down the road, but we have I get calls anywhere from three to seven times a day every day of the week. Any time I'm in the media people will stop cars and go to the phones to tell me right on the air that they have been molested. When I hold meetings, right over here in Camp Hill two weeks ago one woman stood up in a leadership conference and said, "I can't go on without speaking," and told of the three-generation abuse - her grandfather, her father, and her husband all abused her in one way or another and were all addicted to pornography. It is everywhere. Anywhere I go, any time I lift up a phone it is there, and I don't know where to send these people. I have worked with professional organizations and I know of three people in this State that I might be able to send people to. I don't believe any of them are even accepting a new client for

the next six months, they are so swamped, and many of these clinics don't know what they're doing. It is a very, very big problem, and it's not helping the victims at all, including the abusers who are addicted to pornography.

There is something else I want to talk about. I briefly discussed the White Ribbon Campaign to you. To give you a little idea of where it went, this is the new kit, national kit, for this year. It gives all kinds of information and help. This is the Pennsylvania vs. Pornography kit that we sent out last year to 25,000 churches, organizations, and individuals. The result of this was the 500,000 white ribbons, more than that, actually. Something in the neighborhood of 5,000-plus church services, several hundred community efforts to have films and expert speakers to let their citizens know what this is all about, educating them. And it has been most successful here and across the country.

We also, as a part of that, were able to raise funds for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation Foundation and from the PPG industry's foundation and from individual citizens groups, and we were able to spend \$20,000 last year to see that every prosecutor's office, every district attorney's office, received three books that the Justice Department says cuts prosecution by 95

percent in research time and costs by 95 percent. John Driscoll, then the president of the District Attorneys Association, said that you can't win a case without these three books. It's the two-volume obscenity law recorders which details every case and every law in this country in obscenity from 1808 to 1985 and is being updated, and the updates will be sent to all the district attorneys. And also Weaver's handbook, prosecutor's handbook, which details the handling of these cases. We are trying in every way we can to work with every district attorney and help them and to give all kinds of aid to them.

A final thing on what is happening across the country and here is, again, the white ribbon, and this has brought all of the major organizations in the country together. This is the CDL, Citizens for Decency through the Law, Victory Agenda. All of the leaders met with Dick Thornburgh, the Attorney General, in Washington recently and he seemed to accept this whole thing very much. There are three major points federally. There are points here. I'll be glad to see that you get a copy of that for your committee, if you would like to have that.

Finally, what else could be done? We are hoping that one of the things that was done in Butler was when this book store was closed legally, and if you know anything about the case, they bought the store. Two

churches put up their property as collateral, borrowed \$150,000, the citizens' group went out at the Sheriff's sale and bought 110 acres on Route 8 outside of Butler where this adult book store was and then took 2 1/2 years, they were able to sell off most of the property at a profit because it took \$60,000 to get them evicted. It took 2 1/2 years. They have no lease, they paid no rent, and they finally took, and all the continuances and everything else that went on with this.

In the meantime, Dave Cook, the district attorney, took them into court and, yes, the clerk there, the manager of the store who was a grandmother, unless her appeal works, is going to go to jail for six months. They would have liked to have done it to the owners, but this is where a Federal/State/county task force is so essential. After two years of investigations and five phony addresses and three phony names and all sorts of things, it finally got into Delaware, and they could go no further with their investigation. They believe Reuben Sterman owned the inventory in this store but they could never prove it, so all they could do was just go after the clerks. And they were unfortunate to stay around long enough to get the second felony conviction.

What they did in Butler is because this store said, okay, if you get us out of this spot, we're

going to go put it somewhere else in Butler County, so they went around to every municipality and got them to pass constitutional zoning codes, health codes, and nuisance ordinances that when the store was finally -- and this had all the peep holes and live girls and everything in it -- when it finally was closed, they had nowhere to go except to adjoining counties which were warned but they didn't take them to heed and they didn't have the zoning codes, they didn't have a nuisance ordinance, they didn't have the health codes, so there it was.

Anyway, we had a marvelous thing last year on March 7th with Senator Gibson Armstrong who called an Obscenity Conference for Lancaster County, 340 leaders of the county, 37 police chiefs, 54 pastors, heads of every organization, all the school boards, everything were there. He had people from the White House, from the FBI, from Federal Customs, from the children's county services, from the women's county services, a county detective, whom I had to follow. After he said there's no way to clean this up, he just told them that he was up to here in incest and all sorts of things in Lancaster County and said there's no way to clean this up, and I had to go on after this man. At any rate, I was able to convince them that we could do some things.

We're asking legislators to go back to their

counties, we'll be very happy to work with them on county-wide conferences on obscenity to educate their constituents about what this is all about, and we're also asking them to work with the county people like the commissioners and the district attorney to call conferences on municipal law so that the Solicitors all in one shot can hear someone like Bob Peters or a John Driscoll who can give them in one setting everything that they need to have in municipal laws to help them keep this out of their counties or help get rid of them, and I thank you for listening.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very much.

I do have a previous commitment that I have to attend to. At this time, I would like Chairman Moehlmann to come up and continue the committee hearing.

And I do want to mention that we do have this bill on the calendar for consideration, May 8 committee meeting, and I hope with the help from the committee that we may be able to consider it positively to vote it out to the full House for consideration. And with that, I want to thank you all and I'll be leaving and Chairman Moehlmann will run the rest of the hearing.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I forgot one thing. Dorn Checkly, who is our Southwest Regional Coordinator, I'd like to have it in the record I guess

1 sent all of you -- I just received it myself -- his 2 testimony on this. 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Certainly. 4 (Whereupon, Representative Moehlmann assumed 5 the Chair and conducted the rest of the hearing.) 6 ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Thank you, Mr. 7 Brown. 8 Would you like to proceed, Mr. Viglietta? 9 MR. VIGLIETTA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. 10 Chairman. 11 My name is Francis Viglietta. I'm the 12 Director of the Justice and Rights Department for the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference. My testimony today is 13 14 being submitted on behalf of the Pennsylvania Conference 15 on Interchurch Cooperation, a statewide ecumenical 16 organization comprised of representatives from 10 Catholic 17 dioceses and 46 Protestant church bodies in Pennsylvania. 18 In all, PCIC member churches serve the spiritual and 19 pastoral needs of over six and a half million people in 20 our Commonwealth. Since others testifying today have 21 addressed the extent, the nature, and the legal aspects of 22 the pornography problem, my brief remarks will focus on 23 the moral and social implications of the problem.

I ask you to forgive me if I'm a little bit repetitive of some of the things that have been said

24

25

before, but previous speakers have stolen my thunder, whatever thunder was there to start. But I want to speak from a Christian perspective. And from this perspective, pornography in any form must be clearly and forcefully condemned because it represents a philosophy that is directly contrary to God's high purpose for human love and sexuality.

extensions of God's love for each of us, a love that calls all people to mutual respect and concern. Pornography, however, distorts the goodness and beauty of human love and instead preaches a doctrine of lovelessness and self-gratification. Religion and morality are indispensable supports of our democratic form of government, but pornography undermines those beliefs and values which are essential to the stability of any society.

Our testimony goes on to refute the claims that pornography is victimless and harmless, and I leave that to your own reading, since you all have a copy of the text. Let me highlight some of the main points. Our conclusion is that everybody in society is a victim of pornography to a greater or lesser extent because pornography corrupts the entire society by violating society's greatest asset, and that's the integrity and

dignity of every human being. Our testimony proceeds to talk about the availability and leaders of the church about the availability of pornography. In effect, pornography has become a mainstream commodity. Previous speakers have attested to that.

Our particular concern is with the use or, if you will, the abuse of modern technology where lie the X-rated video cassettes, the suggestive rock music videos and songs, some cable television programming that is not intended for children. These are invading our homes today. What is the problem with this? If you believe that the media has the capacity to teach and to moralize, you must be concerned about some of the messages invading our homes and communities because our children and adults are being taught, and being taught a system of values through the modern communications media network.

We want to state quite simply our support for House Bill 1141. Realistically, it's not going to solve the pornography problem but it does constitute an appropriate step in the right direction. We urge the members of this committee to act on it and send it to the full floor as soon as possible.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, the Pennsylvania
Conference on Interchurch Cooperation is grateful to you
and to the members of this committee for holding these

hearings today and for allowing so many people to express their views. Pornography is a serious problem and must be treated as such, and with this in mind, we ask you to remain attentive to the problem, and within the context of protecting legitimate first amendment rights, to act upon House Bill 1141 and any other anti-pornography bills that will come before you in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Thank you.

adult book stores and magazines that are patently obscene that under the present Supreme Court standard for determining what is obscene, we can deal with that, under present law. But that doesn't appear to be true of the video, and I'm really talking about cable TV, I guess. Is that true with what we have coming into our homes now with cable TV? Do we need, in addition to State reaction, also a reaction by the Federal court to tighten up the standards? I would ask that of Mr. Peters.

MR. PETERS: Well, we think the indecency standard should apply to cable, but currently there is no Federal law that does that, but there is a Federal obscenity law that prohibits obscene cable transmissions, certainly in the interstate. I think it's all cable because the Cable Act applies to, I believe, both intra

and interstate. We recommend obscene or indecent on cable porn, but it's a question that the Supreme Court has not finally decided and it could decide the other way. But this bill does not pertain to indecent matter. This is an obscenity bill and I wouldn't want to in any way infer that we're going beyond that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Yeah, well, the primary purpose of this hearing deals with this House Bill, but may not be the entire purpose. Are there cases before the Supreme Court now that are in the process of decision having to do with cable TV?

A. There was a Utah law that we did not No. like. It was an indecency cable law which was struck down by the 10th circuit and the Supreme Court affirmed that summarily without giving reasons, and I think it's an honest analysis to say that therefore, the final question on indecent cable porn is yet to remain open. that there will be a middle road on indecent cable, that basic cable would be covered by indecent, but where people subscribe to a Playboy, perhaps in those cases an obscenity standard will be all that the court will permit. The Utah law did not address those issues and the court did not explain its averments. The district court indicated that it found the law vague and overbroad and by summarily affirming the court didn't explain what it

didn't like about the law. So I think it's still open. 1 2 would say that their decision on the Dial-A-Porn issue may 3 give us a real indication of what the final answer will be 4 on the indecent cable porn. 5 ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Did vou wish to 6 respond, Mr. Viglietta? 7 MR. VIGLIETTA: Just to add to what Attorney 8 Peters has mentioned, Mr. Chairman. As you recall, a few 9 sessions ago there was a bill introduced in Pennsylvania 10 that would regulate cable programming and it did include 11 an indecency factor. That bill got through the Senate by 12 an overwhelming margin but it died in this committee, in 13 the House Judiciary Committee, at that time. So there was 14 an attempt a few years ago to regulate cable programming 15 being broadcast in our Commonwealth, and I suspect that as 16 time goes by we may take up that issue again. 17 ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: I wouldn't be 18 surprised. Some of the names and faces have changed. 19 Representative McNally. 20 REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: 21 BY REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: (Of Mr. Brown) 22 Thanks very much for your testimony. Q. I would like to ask -- is it Mr. Brown? 23 24 A. Yes.

You indicated in your testimony that in

25

Q.

1 intercity Cincinnati after there was a clean up of a 2 variety of places engaging in obscenity and the 3 commercialization of pornography that there was an 83 4 percent, I think it was the figure you cited? 5 Α. Yes, this is the figures that have been 6 published on that, yes. 7 And so, you know, I have always admitted Q. 8 that there was a relationship between obscenity and 9 violence. I have not been able to determine, including 10 your own statistics doesn't show any evidence of a causal 11 relationship, and so my question is, of the people who 12 were engaged in violence in intercity Cincinnati prior to 13 the clean-up, how many discontinued their violence after 14 the clean-up? 15 Α.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I have no idea. I can't answer that for you.
- Q. I figured that you wouldn't, and so, I mean, that really doesn't answer the question as to whether these people were compelled and were caused to be violent by virtue of the fact that they were also drawn towards obscenity.
- A. Well, I think an 83-percent drop says something.
- Q. Well, it says that people who are violent are also drawn towards obscenity. It doesn't say that the

obscenity causes the violence.

A. Well, in the two surveys of research done in this country, there is a very direct causal link to pornography use and crime. Also the FBI, in a recent study, I suppose brought on by the Bundy case, investigated 39 recent serial killers and they found that definitely 28 percent of them were, and they themselves said that it was the prime cause of their getting into this whole area, that it forced them to do this. They were addicted to pornography, and I believe all 39 used pornography, but 28 percent admitted addiction. And it was a prime cause of their crimes.

MR. PETERS: If I may respond just two quick points. There are other governmental justifications for obscenity laws.

REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: I agree.

MR. PETERS: There's a second thing, at least from a legal perspective, the Supreme Court dealt with the question of whether there needs to be scientific proof of a causal relationship in the Paris Adult Theater case, and they said that that was not constitutionally required. So I think what they said is that you as legislators can come to a reasonable conclusion that there is a connection between obscene materials and anti-social behavior, so at least from a constitutional standard it's

not an issue that has to be addressed, although certainly it's one that socially would concern us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: Well, I agree with the points that you have made, but to repeat a point that I have made earlier, you know, I would be concerned that with this legislation we don't promise more than we can deliver, that we don't make promises that we can't keep. And that, you know, one of the promises that appears to be made with this legislation is that we will reduce sexual violence if we reduce obscenity. And I'm simply saying that notwithstanding the fact that I am a cosponsor of this legislation and I'm going to vote for it and I think it will pass and it ought to pass for some of the reasons that have been stated, I don't believe that we can promise to the people of this Commonwealth that if we reduce obscenity we're going to reduce sexual violence. I see violence of whatever nature as a result of people who are frustrated, who are angry, or who have other needs that are not being met and the outlet is violence. And reducing obscenity does not address those needs. It doesn't, you know, it doesn't solve the problem that those individuals have and, you know, so that notwithstanding the fact that we have to do something about obscenity, we also -- I think there is another problem which will remain and which needs further investigation. And I just hope

1 that you'll keep that in mind that there is still an 2 agenda to be fulfilled after we pass this bill. 3 MR. BROWN: We're going to be working for 4 years, I'm afraid. 5 ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Representative 6 Birmelin. 7 BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Mr. Peters) 8 Q. Attorney Peters? 9 Α. Yes. 10 I understand that you're the man who really drafted this piece of legislation? 11 12 A. I drafted the -- I prepared a draft. There 13 were what I consider minor changes made subsequent to 14 that, but I prepared the basic draft of the bill, which is 15 reflected in the one you have, and I don't personally 16 think that any changes that were made would have any 17 constitutional significance. It's more how your mind 18 thinks, you know, in terms of what words you would use or 19 what your position is. When Attorney West spoke to us he mentioned 20 Q. 21 to the committee the possibility of seizure laws where you 22 take the assets of those who are guilty of violating this 23 statute, and this is not included in this bill and I was 24 wondering if when you drafted it you had considered

25

including that?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I did not personally. We had a conference A. and there was a bill that had been prepared that included everything including the kitchen sink, so to speak, and yet when we sat down and talked, there were about four or five problems that came up, and ridiculous as it may be, and Frank Wagner would be the one, I believe, who could verify this, there have been prosecutors who have refused to prosecuted I think either S&M or bestiality because it wasn't specified, and then the problem of obscene performances and "harmful to minors" materials. So it was my suggestion that instead of preparing a bill that would include everything but the kitchen sink, why don't we prepare a bill that addresses the problems that you people are facing in the field? So I did that this is pretty much, you know, it's a reflection of that decision that a group of people made.

So the forfeiture question to me didn't even come up, and I would say this, that that's an issue that's probably going to be addressed by the Supreme Court very shortly because there are a number of Federal RICO cases where property has been seized and I suspect they will be back up to the court because those issues weren't addressed in the first RICO case that was just decided. I'd say within a year or so, if not sooner, those cases will be back up to the courts. And if they uphold

1 forfeiture, then that's a decision that you as legislators 2 can make in the future. I mean, you can do it now. Many 3 States permit it, but it's still, I think, an area where 4 what you can seize is open to the question and when. 5 MR. BROWN: Excuse me. May I make ask a 6 question there on this? Wouldn't it be more practical 7 with the State RICO that we have to have a forfeiture in 8 that? 9 MR. PETERS: I don't think your State RICO 10 includes real strong forfeiture. MR. BROWN: No, it doesn't at all. I'm 11 wondering if there shouldn't be something added to that, 12 13 rather than this. 14 ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: It might be a 15 place to start. 16 Representative Heckler. 17

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had one minor point which I had mentioned earlier, looking on page 6 of the bill, what I believe is intended to be the incorporation of the Miller standard with regard to the definition of what materials are harmful to minors. It would appear to me that those various criteria: "lacks serious literary, artistic, political, educational," and it should be "or scientific

value for minors" shouldn't it with that? Would that be correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PETERS: The bill that we prepared contains the word "or." We did that because your adult obscenity standard includes the word "or" and Miller used the word "or." We are of the opinion that the word "and" may be more accurate, and when you addressed the question, I tried to think of an analogy, and it may be a little bit ridiculous of sorts, but most of us had mothers that made very good potato soup, but let's assume we had a mother that made the worst potato soup, and the way to determine that would be, the test would be that if the potato soup lacks sufficient potatoes, salt, flour, and eggs it's Mom's because that's the bottom. Now, if you put the word "or" in there, it might indicate that if it just lacked salt it would be the worst potato soup. But it must lack all four. So to us the word "and" makes it clear that in order to be obscene, it must lack all four qualities political, artistic, literary and scientific. But the Miller court used the word "or" and we did use the word "or" in the bill that we prepared, and I certainly wouldn't object to going back to that. But I think the word "and" is permissible. I mean, it's a mental gymnastics to me, you know, but the idea is that it must lack all of them, and if you have the "or," it's arguable

that if it lacked just one could it be found obscene.

Q. Well--

- A. So I would not -- we certainly wouldn't object, and the bill we prepared used the word "or," but we're not opposed to the word "and" either, for the reason that I gave. We think it actually reflects better what the court intended because it expresses the view that it must lack all of these things in order to be obscene.
- Q. You're right. I see what you mean about mental gymnastics. I think I was one back handspring behind you and I think I'm now with you and I agree. I was concerned that by not tracking the Miller language we were going to go through this exercise and have something that would not ultimately pass muster, but I see what you're saying that really you're creating a slightly -- arguably a slightly heavier burden on the prosecutor, but as a practical matter, what we're all understanding is if this material has any of these criteria, presumably it would be deemed to have some merit as opposed to be utterly without. Okay, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: That's all I have.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Are any other questions?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Mr. Peters, Mr.

* 1	blown, in. vigiletta, thank you very much for giving ab
2	your time and the benefit of your expertise.
3	MR. BROWN: Thank you for having us, Mr.
4	Chairman.
5	MR. PETERS: Thank you.
6	MR. VIGLIETTA: Thank you.
7	ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: We have now, I
8	understand, a copy of the Bundy tape. We will show you
9	that and you are certainly all welcome to remain for that
10	And after that we'll adjourn.
11	(Whereupon, the Bundy tape was shown.)
12	ACTING CHAIRMAN MOEHLMANN: Thank you very
13	much, ladies and gentlemen. This hearing will now be
14	adjourned.
15	(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded
16	at 2:05 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the hearing of the within cause, and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same. ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER. Ann-Marie P. Sweeney 536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011