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Above is one of Larry Flynt’s many “cartoons” “jokes” about sexual assault of children, dated September 1976, by his cartoon maven and convicted incestuous child molester, Dwaine Tinsley.

At left May 1984, p. 15, Tinsley’s cartoon of a father sexually molesting his daughter helped convict him several years later of that daughter’s incestuous abuse. Below a March 1977, “cartoon” of Chester waits to assault a small girl in a public park.

Hugh Hefner’s early Playboy cartoon rapists used seduction, rape while she was “under the influence” and systemic development of children as sexual objects. Early Guccioni rapists used light gang rapes with added violence, seldom murder, or mutilation. Early cartoon rapists for Larry Flynt used kidnapping, mutilation, murder, cannibalism of women, rape of children, and mutilation of male genitals. Whatever happened in these magazines would soon appear, criminally copied, in the general society.

Former U.S. Surgeon General, Dr. C. Everett Koop, declared pornography a “crushing public health problem ... a clear and present danger, blatantly anti-human.... We must oppose it as we oppose all violence and prejudice.”

Serial rapist-murderer Ted Bundy illustrated this danger in January 1989 in his confessions to psychologist Dr. James Dobson on the eve of Bundy’s execution. The media was livid, challenging Dobson’s credibility for listening to Bundy, who maintained that “drug store pornography” helped change him, as a vulnerable boy, into the brutal mass murderer of over thirty women and girls. He said:

“This is the message I want to get across, that as a young boy, and I mean a boy of twelve and thirteen certainly, that I encountered….in the local grocery store, in a local drug store, the soft-core pornography that people call “soft-core”. . . . [W]hat I am talking about happened twenty, thirty years ago in my formative stages.”
Moments before he was electrocuted Bundy observed that the sadosexual material children consume today is significantly more vile than the images he consumed as a boy:

...when I see what’s on cable TV, some of the movies and some of the violence in the movies that comes into homes today, with stuff that they wouldn’t show in X-rated adult theaters thirty years ago ... as it gets into the home to children who may be unattended or unaware that they may be a Ted Bundy.

Pornography apologists argue that Bundy cannot be believed because he was about to die, and he was a murderer after all. Yet, what did the man have to gain by this confession? About to face his maker, he predicted a future that most academicians, sociologists, psychologists, and sexologists struggled to deny and ignore:

There are lots of other kids playing in streets around this country today who are going to be dead tomorrow, and the next day and the next day and next month, because other young people are reading the kinds of things and seeing the kinds of things that are available in the media today.

Criminal statistics and scholarly studies confirm Bundy’s predictions of worse crimes to come. Toxic sadosexual media now floods America. At is clear now that adolescents use pornography even more than adults.’ Younger and younger children are exposed to sadosexual stimuli on television, in comics music videos, films, books and of course, on the Internet. On the evidence, globally, millions of children are now trained by measurably more violent media than anything Ted Bundy saw as a boy.

What happens to many million children raised on violent, pornographic, child abusive sexual images-toxic images? Sex was not graphically displayed until the early 1970s. In 1959 Bundy was thirteen years old and *Playboy* (1953) was the only “soft-core” sex magazines boy would have been likely to find in a local drug or grocery store. *Penthouse* did not appear on newsstands until after September 1969 and, *Hustler* after July 1974. At left is a March 1972 *Playboy* “cartoon” of a child abuse and probable incest scene with the child charging “$50” (her naked breasts are redacted by this reporter). The data find that *Hustler* simply expanded the already established coarsened consumer population conditioned by *Playboy* and *Penthouse*. By then, Bundy, in his twenties, had already raped, and apparently murdered, numerous young girls and women.

Dr. Koop ad warned that pornography “can prompt violence in people already leaning toward deviancy.” Bundy and his generation used *Playboy* to stimulate their undeveloped sexual emotions. Typical of its impact on most serial rapist-murderers, *Playboy* took Bundy beyond his own immature, inexperienced imagination. It comes as a surprise to most people that in the
In the 1950s and 1960s, *Playboy typically* mixed shiny layouts of smiling, naked women, colorful sadosexual cartoons, and photo stories of sex, rape, and pain. Articles, letters, and graphics glamorized sexual deceit, rape, and sex with children. National rape and child abuse statistics reveal that Bundy was not unique in his response to these stimuli. The Bundy’s have been multiplying.

If Bundy represents the worst effect “drug store” pornography had on the vulnerable youth of the 1950s, what is the worst we ought to expect from children—both boys and girls--influenced by later, more explicitly violent sexual images? Our current harvest of serial rapist-murder-mutilators are well over twenty years of age—roughly the age of *Penthouse* (1969). *Hustler* (1974) has been a regular image in millions of children’s lives for decades.

The availability of increasingly more graphic magazines to new generations of innocent consumers should concern any normal, mentally balanced human being. It is well known that premature exposure to sexually stimulating images affects children negatively. Should we not expect a crop of offenders who reflect what they learned in the newer, more graphically explicit and violent sex publications? These offenders would copy a special brand of brutality from their early sadosexual indoctrination. If so, *Penthouse/Hustler-type* magazines and their video spin-offs have had the anticipated effects. The current flood of sexual atrocities scarcely resemble the more “tame” sexual abuses men in their fifties plus were reared on in *Playboy*.

If pornography has the effect this theory claims, the future promises an avalanche of sexual violence unsurpassed in our nation’s history. And this is happening. Recall the rape, murder, and decapitation of little nine-year-old Adam Walsh in 1984 and the vicious rape and genital mutilation of an eight year-old Tacoma, Wisconsin boy in 1989. And, on 26 October 1990 the Associated Press reported a nine-year-old in Norman, Oklahoma whose genitals were mutilated and an eye was gouged out. Police called for *Hustler* to be taken off local store shelves following the discovery that a recent *Hustler* issue featured a scene where a child endured a similar torture.

The “fantasies” displayed in “soft” pornography are often indeed blueprints for real crime. The Pollyanna’s who argue that sadosexual pictures do not encourage and stimulate anger, aggression, and crime in some children and adults are either themselves involved or in stunning denial. The deniers should start reading the reports—like the FBI study which found that nearly all serial rapist-murderers admit pornography as their major interest.

The media falsely allege that Bundy was unusual among a new cadre of serial rapist-murderers. Yet most of these men have admitted an often blind, consuming passion for pornographic stimuli. Perhaps the most tragic aspect of Bundy’s story is that it is *not* news. His testimony about the critical role that pornography played in his life and in his crimes actually typifies the confessions of most incarcerated serial rapist-murderers.

**INCREASING BRUTALITY**

A significant portion of society’s concern about pornography should be leveled toward the chilling increase in sexual violence so brutal it compares only to the marauding male hordes of primitive folklore. Although centuries of civilization should separate our enlightened society from the days when savages freely tortured, raped, mutilated, pillaged, cannibalized, and destroyed the lives of men, women, and children, today the term “wilding” has become
commonplace to describe the growing phenomena of our own brand of subhuman sadosexual violence.

In 1989 a young woman jogger was the victim of a notorious gang-rape-battery-mutilation by a horde of upscale teenage boys in New York City’s Central Park-dubbed “wildeing.” Six weeks later a group of high school star athletes from an affluent New Jersey suburb raped and violently sodomized a retarded young girl. The young sports stars used a broomstick and a miniature baseball bat in carrying out their sexual attack on the innocent child.

The New York and New Jersey attackers’ common view of rape and sex transcended racial, economic, and geographic differences. These boys, the *Playboy Penthouse Hustler* generation, are conditioned to view sexual violence as a part of a fun night out. Both brutal attacks occurred the same year that *Playboy* celebrated thirty-five years of changing American boys into its revolutionary brand of American sexuality:

> “*Playboy* freed a generation from guilt about sex, changed some laws and helped launch a sexual revolution or two.... So you may not think it is modest of us to say *Playboy* is the magazine that changed America.”


**SEXUAL VIOLENCE BECOMES ACCEPTABLE AND FUN**

What most people, including most *Playboy* consumers, do not recognize is the dark side to *Playboy’s* humor—the humor made more violent by *Penthouse* and *Hustler*. *Playboy’s* highly orchestrated and heavily promoted sexual assault on “the girl next door” has been thoroughly documented and replicated in *Hustler*. Standard fare are jokes about women drugged lot gotten drunk), then raped; jokes about gang rape; and, jokes about the rape of coeds, girlfriends, unconscious patients, students, secretaries, maids, neighbors, and children. *Playboy* publisher Hugh Hefner bragged about eradicating the diligently erected Judeo-Christian traditions, the barriers that once helped to protect “good girls” (the Madonna) from being viewed as “bad girls” (the whore):

> In the prudish moral climate of the Fifties, *Playboy* unabashedly championed sexual liberation. Before *Playboy* women were typecast either as Madonna or as whore. But the wholesome, unselfconscious sexuality of *Playboy’s* “girl-next-door” Playmates conveyed-to men and women alike-the unsettling and exciting message that nice girls like sex, too. 10

The “nice girls like sex” message has also helped change “nice boys”’ attitudes toward sexual violence against nice girls” (even the view of rape as “tough sex”). In May 1988, after fourteen years of *Hustler* as well, the Rhode Island Rape Crisis Center asked seventeen hundred sixth- to ninth-grade students about rape. More than half of the boys and girls said sex was acceptable after six months of dating—even if rape was necessary. Roughly half of the children agreed that if a boy spends ten to fifteen dollars on a girl, he has the right to force a kiss. Nearly a quarter of the boys and a sixth of the girls accepted rape if a boy had spent money on a girl.
What does it mean when boys and girls grow up believing “rough sex” is just erotic play? According to the *Washington Post* (6 May 1988), of 1,035 rapes reported to the Rhode Island Rape Crisis Center in 1987, 79 percent of the victims were raped by someone the female knew. Moreover, experts estimate one in four girls and one in seven boys will be sexually assaulted before they are eighteen years old generally by a relative or another trusted acquaintance.”

In 1988 Michigan reported on 681 juveniles convicted of sexually assaulting younger children. The average age of the offender was fourteen, the average age of his victim was seven! Almost 60 percent of the sexual assaults involved penetration, and further, “93% of sex offenders were acquaintances, friends, baby-sitters, or relatives of the victims.

The horror of this new wave of juvenile sexual assaults is just the tip of the iceberg. On October 1, 1984 the *Washington Post* reported that a high school girl was raped in a boys’ school bathroom while at least ten other boys looked on cheering. The *Boston Herald*, on 28 June 1984, ran a story that a twelve-year-old, Massachusetts boy raped a ten-year-old girl on a pool table in a reenactment of the infamous “Big Dan” pool table gang rape of a woman. The “Big Dan” pool hall case had recently received wide media coverage. Similar pool hall sex photographic scenes were in Hustler.

**SEXUALLY IMPAIRED CHILDREN**

Mimicking pictures in their mother’s pornography magazines, a nine-year-old boy and his seven-year-old brother penetrated and killed an eight-month-old baby with a pencil and coat hanger in St. Petersburg, Florida, according to a report in the *Buffalo News* (24 April 1984). Similarly, on 21 July 1990 the *Washington Post* reported on a ten-year-old boy who watched an X-rated film then raped an eight-year-old girl and her four-year-old sister.

Does any normal person seriously deny that American children are increasingly victimized by toxic media-sadosexual stimuli? How can society, particularly the media, continue to deny that children have been receiving clear instruction and stimulation from pornography, in rape and murder? When Shakespeare sought to stir Hamlet’s murderous uncle to action, he had Hamlet whisper, “Ah, the play’s the thing!” Today, the film and video industries ate the “play,” which is “the thing” that stirs viewers to action.

The key question is, what “play,” is stirring sadosexual violence against women and children? When did the script become so mutant? Consider this: If youngsters suddenly began to attack elderly people coast-to-coast, we would question how their view of the elderly had changed, and we would research when and where the change began. Since children have begun to sexually attack women and children coast-to-coast, we should ask how their view of women and children was changed, so that we may research when and where that change began.

By 1970 the *President’s Report on Obscenity and Pornography* already identified extensive use of pornography in the informal sexual education of younger children. In *Teenage Sexuality, back in 1979*, Dr. Aaron Hass found most children had been exposed to some form of pornography. Out of more than six hundred children, 91 percent of the girls and 99 percent of the boys had examined “pornographic” books or magazines. Forty-two percent of the girls and 58 percent of the boys had seen a “blue” movie. Both boys and girls frankly reported being aroused by reading explicit material or viewing explicit photographs. Further, not only were
they aroused, but more critically, many admitted they attempted to copy what they saw and read. Even in 1979 Hass found that youngsters viewed the magazine’s information as believable:

Many adolescents turn to movies, pictures, and articles to find out exactly how to have sexual relations..... The children said, “you really learn allot in the Playboy Advisor ... I wanted to lean the real facts.... These magazines give me something to go by.”

Youthful sexual experimentation has long been encouraged by Kinseyan sex experts such as Dr. John Gagnon. Writing in Sexual Scene, Gagnon gives a glowing recommendation of Playboy for children. As a past colleague of Dr. Alfred Kinsey, founder of the Kinsey Institute in Bloomington, Indiana and author of the famed Kinsey Reports, Gagnon is a major player in the contemporary promotion of Kinseyan sex education in the classroom. He and co-author William Simon describe Playboy as a “Boy Scout Manual” of sexual etiquette. Both sexologists are pleased with Playboy’s “creating (highly conventional to be sure) scripts for the playing out of sexual dramas.” It is out responsibility to know what “sexual dramas” the children are “playing out.”

A NEW MIND SET TOWARD RAPE

As Playboy laughed about drugging and raping girls and women, the Playboy manual provided rape etiquette for their little “Boy Scout” readers. While in college, the leaders of each generation show a propensity and a willingness to change their view of rape. In 1984 Neil Malamuth and James Check reported on a study in which they showed UCLA college males a series of films depicting three common rape myths: 1) the victim enjoyed the rape, 2) the victim deserved the rape, and 3) the victim was not bothered by the rape. Prior to viewing the films, the students had expressed normal, nonviolent sexual attitudes. After the films, more than half of the college men claimed they would rape a woman-if they were sure they would not get caught.”

It is common knowledge that rape is now practiced sexual “etiquette” for many college males. In campus rape, “Joe College” acts out suggestions which are historically found in Playboy’s “Boy Scout Manual” and its “highly conventional ... scripts,” including the more recent categories of campus rape, boyfriend rape, date rape, acquaintance rape, gang rape, and, now, “wlding.”

The nature of these attacks indicate that Joe College knows many of the women he rapes—the very “nice girls” whom, in the past, he protected. Now the conventional rapist frequently knows not only the co-ed he rapes, he is also well-acquainted with the families of his victims, suggesting a whole new middle-class script that reflects a conventional twist to rape and retribution. Victims are often left with the sense that not even father, brothers, and the police themselves will serve as her protector. 16 Note that in cases of rape, the convicted felon is not required to be tested for AIDS, which introduces a new element to the victim’s violation. The new Playboy sexual script always defends offender’s rights over victim’s rights.

The Hass findings of the spectrum of Playboy’s consumers support the marketing statistics that identify millions of children living in the homes of Playboy Penthouse Hustler consumers. Given this fact, it is significant that in 1985 USA Today claimed the “Playboy Advisor” is USA’s most widely read ... sex education resource.” The “Playboy Advisor” is a regular Playboy feature that advises juvenile and adult consumer on everything from oral sex and cocaine protocol to selecting fashionable cars, clothes, travel spots, and wines.
Playboy’s “etiquette” requirements for juvenile sex and violence are reflected in the escalation of reported juvenile sexual violence between 1960 and 1969. Popular periodicals like the Reader’s Digest showed concern when the FBI Uniform Crime Reports revealed:

> Between 1960 and 1969 the number of forcible rapes committed by males under 18 had increased by 86 percent. It could be concluded that some force impelling toward sex crime has been operating on younger males in the United States.”

The Reader’s Digest was justified in its concern. Juvenile sex crimes have statistically skyrocketed since 1969. And remember, children rape available children. Patents seldom report the rape of a young child by their older sibling or cousin. I have worked with scores of victims, who as children, were assaulted by an older family member. Understand that the pornography seen today by nearly 100 percent of our youth creates walking targets out of women and children—a holocaust of outrage and carnage never seen before in any free, or even enemy-occupied, western nation. Hefner said:

> In addition to that, there are the young people who dig us and understand us. The older people who object will be dying off, and the young kids who were Playboy fans when they were in college (and grade school] will be the top executives, the presidents of corporations, etc., the decision-makers. So our future seems not only established, but extremely bright. I think that the best is all ahead.'

**ONE NEEDS PROBABLE CAUSE TO INVESTIGATE**

On 22 May 199 the Washington Times (the Washington Post did not print the story) reported to the public that cartoonist Dwaine Tinsley, creator of Hustler magazine's "Chester the Molester" had been arrested for child sexual abuse. Just as one would expect a racist cartoonist to victimize blacks whenever the opportunity presented itself, Tinsley's child abuse cartoons suggested that he molested children when he could (as well as blacks, racism and anti-Semitism was also a Tinsley-Hustler theme).

One's art product is a strong indication of one's attitudes. Tinsley alone produced 145 child abuse cartoons for Hustler with violence and rape as the overriding theme. Hefner produced 3,045 child images (1,196 child cartoons and 1,849 child visuals). Roughly three-fourths of Hefner's child materials were sexual or violent. Men who glamorize child sex abuse are revealing pedophile ideas and beliefs. Currently, these men would be completely unable to tell the truth to the press and the public about their motives. For example, in 1988, Dwaine Tinsley was interviewed for a video called Rate It X (available from Women Against Pornography in the Media-California). In the rape several "Chester the Molester" cartoons ate shown. The Hustler cartoonist was questioned about the feature:

> Q: Who is Chester the Molester?

> A: Chester is a character that I do for the magazine [Hustler]. You have this dirty old guy who would do anything to trap a young girl ... the younger ones, 10 or 12. [H]c would layout candy for them like he was trying to trap ... a bird.... First of all if he's going to trap a little girl the idea for him would be to knock her out or something.... I mean, he didn't have to ... actually use a club or bat. He could have smacked her, but just the idea of the bat is a little goofier. What's better than a baseball bat? It was always with him [Note the Glen Ridge High boys used a baseball bat with which to rape the young girl they had kidnapped].
Q: Don't you think that by making him [Chester the Molester] such a lovable, goofy type of guy, that somehow legitimizes what he is doing?
A: No, I don't think I was legitimizing child molesting. Chester was just a goofy kinda guy.
Q: And by laughing at him, it doesn't make it fun on some level?
A: You mean that child molesting is okay?
Q: Not okay. That's too strong a word. But more okay.
A: More acceptable? More palatable? No. I really don't think so. I don't ... think that people were saying that it's okay to be a child molester. If I thought that, I wouldn't have done the character.... Most of the letters I received were "I know he's a nut, really. He's such a goofy guy." .... Chester ... has restrictions now ... he can't go after minors, you know' It's almost acceptable if this goofy guy goes for a woman that's at least 18 years of age ... it's not such a lovable offense anymore if he goes after a young girl.

As reported in the Washington Times, Dwaine Tinsley was convicted on multiple counts of child molestation in the spring of 1989. He had drugged his daughter, put her on birth control pills when she turned thirteen, and violently sexually abused her until she reached the age of eighteen. By then, she was a suicidal drug addict. Several years later a “special” group of judges had the convicted molester released based on the idea that the cartoons his daughter stated were of her, “enflamed” the jury. Strange indeed.

SLAVISH DEDICATION TO PERFECTION

Until very recently, Hefner personally selected about four hundred cartoons for publication out of roughly two hundred thousand submitted annually. A careful reading of all Hefner biographies notes that the publisher himself chose every Playboy cartoon (including child cartoons). He would handpick each cartoon, rejecting others that did not suit his interest. Said Brady in Hefner:

Hefner labored over the editing of the magazine and demanded such slavish dedication to perfection from his editors and contributors that he made Captain Ahab appear benign. Every item that finally saw print in Playboy, from the color of the lower eyelash of Little Annie Fanny to a misplaced semicolon…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cartoons</th>
<th>Number of Appearances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Home/doorway/yard</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Streets and sidewalks</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Country/nature/beach</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bed/bedroom/hotel room</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unspecified</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Medical setting</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Playground/park</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School building or grounds</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Store</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photographs and Illustrations</th>
<th>Number of Appearances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unspecified or other</td>
<td>1,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home/doorway/yard</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Country/nature/beach</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bed/bedroom/hotel room</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other cultural/national milieu</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TWO OUTDOOR SCENES

Examples of children being victimized in outdoor scenes are represented in two "Chester the Molester" cartoons by Dwaine Tinsley published by Hustler. In the first cartoon, an adolescent girl jumps up, shocked, from a park commode. "Chester the Molester" had hidden inside the commode hole. The reader sees Chester's soiled face raised up through the toilet seat, beneath the youngster (August, 1994).

Another scene was the subject of a 7 May 1984 Senate Oversight Hearing, which attempted to halt my Justice Department investigation. Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa) and Sen. Howard Metzenbaum (D-Oh) opposed the Reisman study claiming it was a waste of money. (What was unknown at the time was that Sen. Metzenbaum had recently been a paid Penthouse interviewee and that Senator Specter was compromised as well.) Sen. Specter asked to see a cartoon showing a crime being committed against a child. He was given a copy of a "Chester the Molester" cartoon. The Hustler scene shows an adolescent girl, standing with her legs wide apart and reaching up to catch a beach ball (see our first page in this report). Chester is underwater. He wears goggles and a snorkel. His arm is outstretched before him and his fingers are wriggling through the water as he reaches up toward the innocent girl's crotch (September 1976).

Although the title itself left no room for doubt as to the planned assault by the "hero" (Chester), the senator felt compelled to explain away the obvious depiction of criminal intent:

I have never n an actual picture of a crime being committed against a child.... You are seeing a different picture than I am.... He is moving toward her. There is not a touching here.

Why would Sen. Specter pretend to the press and public that "Chester the Molester" was an innocent cartoon? Why did he obscure the name of the monthly cartoon feature? "Molester" is a recognized term for the crime of child abuse. To reasonable persons "Chester the Molester" is a man who molests children. This and most other Chester cartoons either show "a crime being committed against a child" or a crime planned, and about to be committed against a child—evidence of criminal intent.

In fact, both scenes were in the press a few years later as true crimes. A child was assaulted in a park outhouse exactly as depicted in the first cartoon. Reports of children assaulted by underwater molesters in local pools are now part of the evidential files. Moreover, Dwaine Tinsley, Chester's creator was convicted of several felony counts of child sexual abuse. These cartoons and this report were part of the evidence that convicted him.

ABUSE OF CHILDREN IN FAIRY TALES
Beyond Santa Claus and "where the children ate" (the home, school, playground, etc.) other cartoon and visual themes were examined. These themes, including fairy tales, were important since they revealed the shocking increase of sexual photos mixed with other brutal images. Fairy tales are close to the hearts of children, We welcome fairy tales as adults because they stir our memories of warmth, love, and childish trust. Hence the fairy tale played a very important role in conditioning readers to accept the child as sexual. The change from fairy tale cartoon stories to photo stories was telling. Cartoons were the frequent art form used to display fairy tales; 209 (10 percent) of all child cartoons focused upon these fairy tale fantasies.

Having been around for fifteen years longer than even Penthouse, Playboy had the most, 125 (60 percent), of overall fairy tale cartoons. Ten percent of Playboy child cartoons were fairy tales. Penthouse contributed thirty-two (15 percent) to the pool of overall fairy tales; but a slightly higher percentage, 12 percent of child cartoons, were fairy stories. Hustler contributed fifty-two (25 percent) of fairy tales, but only 9 percent of their own child cartoons were fairy tales. In sharp contrast, photographic fairy tales appeared only 2 percent of the time, with thirty-one of these in Playboy, eight in Penthouse, and forty in Hustler. Playboy set up the fairy tale cartoon first (e.g., Cinderella having sex with the prince or Dorothy raped by her Oz companions), following which Hustler put the fairy tale into a sexually violent photo story.

**PORNOGRAPHIC ENCHANTMENT**

In fourteen years "soft porn" cartoons of children progressed in levels of violence: In 1954 Playboy boy scouts solicited sex from adult prostitutes and were refused. Twelve years later, in 1968, a Playboy "Wizard of Oz Straw Man" hinted that he wanted to have sex with flat-chested Dorothy. Ten years after that first attempted assault, in 1978, Playboy's Dorothy has been given larger breasts—and she is cavalierly gang-raped by the Straw Man, the Lion, and the Tin Man.

*Then four years after that, in 1982, Hustler photographs a "real" Dorothy—with shaved genitalia—smiles as she appears in graphic, close up coitus, including oral and anal sodomy with and drinking the urine of her three beast and object co-adventurers.*

Further sexual violence conditioning techniques are found. In 1969 Playboy has children raped by a policeman on the school bus, and later that year, a child has sex with an adult while an uptight mother asks about love. And as early as 1967, a little girl scout is supposed to have sex with a cookie-buying adult male customer. These "jokes" preceded the entry of Penthouse into the “soft porn” world by months, or even years. How “soft porn” abuses children is a gauge of the level of atrocities against women, Children were increasingly brutalized because images of adult women had long passed the point of human sexuality and had plunged these women into an ongoing, artistic agenda of malice, revulsion, terror, and desperation.

Remember, these artistic lies and hatreds had fed the imaginations of the Ted Bundys’ of society—long before the availability of "hard core" porn.

So, although Penthouse and Hustler participated in, promoted and made more sadistic adult rapes of children, Playboy showed boys as sexually precocious in 1954, late adolescent girls as sexually precocious in the early 1960s, and little girls as sexually precocious and available by the late 1960s.

*Again, Penthouse was not on the newsstands until 1969. Now, subtle and blatant uses of adult women in bestiality, anal and oral sodomy, masturbation, sadism, scatology (feces, urine), necrophilia (sex with the dead), Satanism, and the like ate all currently standard fare in all "skin" magazines and*
increasingly on the Internet. Playboy artists presented seventy-three exploitative fairy tale cartoons, Penthouse twenty-one, and Hustler thirty-nine, with Little Red Riding Hood, Cinderella, and Snow White appearing more often than any other single tale. In addition, Hansel and Gretel and Goldilocks each appeared on several occasions.

CHILD PORNographers Go Mainstream; MAL oF THE WASHINGTON POST

Mal is an editorial cartoonist for the Washington Post. He draws small creatures engaged in various silly and sometimes sadistic activities. However, while Mal does not tend to evidence strong political views on his Washington Post editorial page, he does use his artistry to show children as appropriate sexual targets for gang rape and sodomy in pornography. Mal portends to be so taboo, so "ahead" of the test of society, that his beliefs would not easily lend themselves to realistic drawings. In March 1976, Mal cast Alice in Wonderland in a blatant oral sodomy solicitation scene:

SCENE: Alice in Wonderland stands on an empty "stage." In the background, looking up toward the right hand corner of the cartoon frame she is addressing her annoyance at a wide, grinning mouth with teeth that leers down at her. Alice is dressed as a little girl. The sketch is black and white typically Mal. She complains to the mouth: "Oral sex! Is that all you Cheshire cats are interested in?"

We are asked to consider if Alice is denouncing the cat's desire for oral sex with her, or if she is angry at the cat's disinterest in additional straight or other sex acts. In any case, Mal's special pleading shows children as sex objects, suggests sodomy with children (one can only see the "mouth," which could be the mouth of the cat, and so on), and bestiality-in 1976. In February 1974, another half-nude Alice by artist Ramonde has sex with an elf, after which she asks: "That was magic?" Ramonde's Alice has exposed Playboy-exaggerated breasts. For Christmas 1986, Mal cast the fairy tale story of Goldilocks:

SCENE: Mal has Goldilocks in bed. The three bears are examining Mamma bear's "vibrator" which is shaped like a dildo (a false phallus). Goldilocks can be seen through the open bedroom door, in bed, smiling broadly to herself. Mamma Bear is holding the phallic object before Papa and Baby and she says: "Never mind the porridge-who's been using my vibrator?"

Again, Mal lies about child sexual development. The artist claims a happy child will seek sex-using a phallic shaped vibrator when she has the opportunity. The bestiality implications, and such, are best left for another book. Mal's consistent fairy tale message is that children pursue sex, adults are helpless before them and yield.

Penthouse (August 1978) erotically illustrated a full-breasted, lactating woman, from her chin to waist, holding her naked infant with her hands, blood oozing down her neck and from the infant's lips and body. The most egregious example, however, of sexualizing the newborn may be in the September 1977 Hustler magazine.

SCENE: A hospital-viewing window for newborns. A neonate has jumped up from his hospital bed, laughingly grabbing onto the hair of his attending nurse; as he plunges his oversized phallus into her mouth. The father, looking into the viewing window says to his friend, That's my boy!"

In celebration of Valentine's Day, the magazines often published angels copulating. This is especially troubling since Valentine cards given annually by children in the schoolroom resemble the
"angels" pictured copulating in these periodicals. Although there had been objection from critics, insisting that our research should ignore these angels as images of children, the entire history of western art with its role of the cherub/angel as child counters such critical nonsense. Note this Playboy cartoon from the 1970s (in February, of course):

SCENE: A full color, two-page cartoon cameo collection for Valentines Day—all of the images of children ate sexually compromised, with Little Boy Blue holding a whip, about to torture a naked little girl (with Playboy's exaggerated breasts). The blonde child is bound and gagged and stands in high heels, garters, and black stockings. Nearby are nine little angels, two of them engaged in sex.

**LIES THAT WOULD SEXUALIZE INFANTS**

The December 1974 Playboy story "Getting Off" follows a full-page, full color rendering of an infant. Still in diapers, the baby has broken his tattle, and with his hand deep in his diaper he has seized his reproductive organs while a depressed adult expression settles over his face.

Either due to the artist's ignorance of child development or out of sheer malice, the "Getting Off" illustrator and his publisher provide false visual information regarding an infant's older youth. Moreover, parents shocked at youthful coitus in 1971 became more accepting of peer sex and incestuous participation themselves in 1977. Again, in the June 1971 Playboy:

SCENE: A young couple is nude, on the living room couch, as the parents of the girl enter the room. The boy, holding his pants up so that we do not see his phallus, signals the two-fingered 'peace' sign to mom and dad, saying: "Peace." (A John Dempsey cartoon)

Six years later, in January 1977:

SCENE: Mom and dad have burst into the living room where two youngsters are having sex on the couch. Mother, ugly and bizarre, is shouting to the girl: "Charlene! You promised to wait until we got slip covers." (A Brian Savage cartoon)

Or, as mentioned, pregnancy commonly occurs to a secretary, maid, or other working girl impregnated by her boss. (She had not anticipated single motherhood as a Christmas bonus.) The publications regularly laughed about the fact that the young woman was tricked, manipulated, and probably even drugged and raped by her boss, boyfriend, etc. And it laughed at the mother-teenage or adult—because she had to assume responsibility for the infant.

The spirit of these educative "jokes" centered as much upon the father's nonplused rejection of his baby as upon the ridiculed mother's foolish plight. While the young mother was often clearly the victim of sexual abuse, the cartoonist found his humor in her tragedy, suggesting she was stupid to trust a man's promises of love and marriage.

While jokes and cartoons which ridiculed pregnancy were a staple, there were few actual photographs of pregnant women. As noted, in the 373 Playboy issues and 1,849 child scenes, only 30 visuals (29 in-wedlock and 21 out-of wedlock) portrayed pregnancy, while at best, 2 scenes touched on venereal disease. Out of 1,196 child cartoons, most of which involved some sexual scene or conduct, VD was mentioned only eight times in Playboy.
However, as skittish as *Playboy* was about VD, the nasty disease was never mentioned in 265 *Penthouse* cartoons, and got two comments out of 555 *Hustler* cartoons. These same figures were reflected in adult sexual humor as well. Venereal disease just didn't exist in the sexual fantasy land. Promiscuity and sex with children did, of course—but no VD.

Since *Playboy* and its imitators are, on the evidence, teaching youth and adults about "love," sex, values, responsibilities, problems, and joys, the absence of any visible sign of joyful birth or horrific venereal disease in the midst of coitus (anal, oral, bestial, multiple copulations) sends a powerful message and spirit to impressionable young readers and viewers. Creating the view of costless, painless, "recreational" sex would "have an impact that nobody feels." The price for male-female relationships to survive has been costly and disastrous.

**NUDE AND PREGNANT**

*Playboy* balanced its twenty-nine apparent in-wedlock visuals with twenty-one out-of-wedlock visuals. *Penthouse* carried almost the same number of visuals as did *Playboy* (thirteen and twenty-two). The highest number of pregnant visuals was carried by *Hustler*, whose use of nude pregnant women is part of its sexually explicit format. An entire series of pornographic magazines exploits graphic, sexually explicit pictures of pregnant women and lactating mothers. These photos do not celebrate nurturing motherhood and birth. On the contrary, they are designed to violate and exploit the entire concept of procreation, motherhood, sanctity of life, privacy, and family.

**ABORTION AND BIRTH DEFORMATION “HUMOR”**

When abortion was involved in a cartoon, state of marriage was generally vague. Abortion turned up in twenty-five cartoon cases, mainly in *Hustler*, using full color, "bloody" displays. A major, alarming-finding was the unique category of "child as a thing." That is, objects were "born" to a human mother and father.

A nurse carried out a huge "10-pound tongue, *(Playboy, November 1974)* to a shocked father in the delivery room, saying: "Congratulations. It's a 10-pound tongue." Such "newborns" were said by these magazines to be the natural offspring of human parents. The humor ran along the line that perfectly normal persons (such as the adult or juvenile reader) could be expected produce to bizarre life forms and freaks of varied kinds.

However, the "freaks" were born largely into formal marriages—those our research team coded as "in wedlock." A man who did what the magazines had warned him not to do (to marry) found himself awaiting news of the successful birth only to find his child la deformed, or a dildo, or feces, or a wooden doll, or another object.

*Penthouse* presented several jokes about children born without arms with books for hands awaiting dad in the delivery room (*Penthouse*, January 1978). Disguised as good-natured humor, 'jokes" about birth defects and the physically impaired move the boundaries of brutality toward children and the disabled to ever more malignant levels.
Again, remember that cartoons of birth and children are "Child Magnets." They draw the child's attention to the story, and the images. While each adult or child consumer would process these magnets differently, all have some similar response. How do cartoons about deformed children affect a child-at a given age? How would such "jokes" effect a deformed child or his family?

It is fair to compare the sex magazine's description of children as "freaks" to racist propaganda of Jews or blacks as "freaks" (i.e., non-human). The idea here is that these notions of "freaks"-deformed children, Jews, blacks-serve the purposes of those promoting such a view. This argument takes on greater power if we consider these child images to be actual sex industry propaganda.

Remember, children are never shown as non-sexually charming, lovely, and treasured-in any pornographies. Contempt for children is in keeping with the belief that the primary use for women is as depositories for intermittent male sexual release and violence. Loved children undermine the power of the sex industry to control men. Hence, children are the natural enemies of the sex industry, as ate wives and mothers.

The following identify some of these categories of child as subhuman or otherwise despised:

The child as an anthropomorphic object, demon-like creature, deformed, monster, birth defect, etc:

*Playboy* - 30 children
*Penthouse* - 10 children
*Hustler* - 42 children

The child mysteriously deformed in some unique manner:

*Playboy* - 52 children
*Penthouse* - 38 children
*Hustler* - 59 children

*Combined deformations

*Playboy* - 3,045, 82 (3 percent)
*Penthouse* - 1,180, 48 (4 percent)
*Hustler* - 1,779, 101 (6 percent)

Any unbiased study of these magazines would confirm these cartoon findings, similarly confirmed by American, British, and New Zealand studies. It was vitally important to analyze the way in which the magazines described "what" was born of human patents. As might be expected, this category comprised 6 percent of *Hustler's* child images. Descriptions of birth as producing bizarre and deformed creatures would have serious implications for forty years of youthful consumers' view of birth and marriage.

*Playboy* 3 percent and *Penthouse's* 4 percent are not the result of chance. An examination of women's magazines does not find images of deformed children-unless this were a heart-rending report on the results of a poisonous medication or some other tragedy. Indeed, all sex industry materials consistently describe birth as a traumatic and totally undesirable activity—unless the infants are sexually used.
Again, classification of deformed birth objects as "children" came under attack by our research opponents, who preferred to ignore roughly two dozen newborns described as a ten-pound tongue, a vibrator, a doll or some other non-human object. However, the job of this research was not to please some special political, economic, or business agenda but to objectively record the products "born of human patents." Recording the way in which a child was portrayed by these magazines required a candid analysis of the way in which birth was described. The political positions of pornographers under study should be mentioned here. *Playboy's* political position is revealed in its traditional and public funding of legal campaigns. These included efforts to end alimony laws, promote "no fault divorce" and to legalize abortion-on-demand—these political agendas are expressed in the magazine text and art---its own sex education vehicle.

**SATANIC, RITUALISTIC SACRIFICE OF VIRGINS**

*Playboy* was identified in 43 child scenes involving murder (the William Tell joke would be one), *Penthouse*, 19 scenes, and *Hustler*, 114 scenes! The accuracy of the research continues to be reflected in the consistency of these numbers across the three magazines. Looking at the forty-three murder scenes in *Playboy*, one finds "virginity" as a key to several killings. *Playboy* found much humor in cartoons of very young girls who were ritualistically sacrificed. One such young girl is placed on a sacrificial alter, while another girl, waiting her turn to die, comments, "Takes some of the incentive out of being a virgin, doesn't it?" (March 1968).

The laughing exploitation of ritualistic sacrifice of virgins (traditionally underage) led to some disturbing questions, quite removed from the "child images." Psychiatrist Linnea Smith addressed these images in personal correspondence dated 11 April 1988:

> Public and professional concern is growing regarding ritualistic abuse cases. Bizarre and sadistic rituals, acted out as part of a cult, satanic church, coven, or other occult organization include systematic emotional, physical, and sexual abuse of infants, children, and adults. Linking religious, pseudo-religious, or supernatural symbols and ceremonies with the abuse of victims often involves wearing robes or costumes, drinking blood and urine, smearing feces, animal and human mutilation, multi-perpetrator, multi-victim sexual abuse, torture, and homicide. These cartoons from *Playboy* magazine glamorizing and trivializing this type of activity for entertainment are unacceptable.

Beyond the Match 1968 "virgin sacrifice" scene, which involved youths, note other *Playboy* examples of "glamorizing and trivializing" adult satanic sacrifice:

**SCENE:** A well dressed, middle class couple sits, drinking martinis, as the husband says to the wife, "This witches' coven you've joined—is it here in Stanford? I don't want to worry about you down in the city at all hours" (Match 1972).

**SCENE:** A group of hooded men are praying to a devil leader who holds up a knife over the sacrificial pyre. He is about to sacrifice a chicken. One member asks the other "How do you like our Wednesday-night get-togethers?" (October 1972).
SCENE: A buxom woman lies on the sacrificial pyre when the chief of the tribe says,
"Are you guys nuts? The gods would never be this angry" (December 1972).

SCENE: A nude, young girl lies on the sacrificial alter giggling, as ate the eight male coven members surrounding the alter. "Me coven leader is asking 'All right, who slipped me the rubber knife?'" (October 1978).

SCENE: A nude, young woman lies on the sacrificial alter surrounded by the male coven members who are drinking and waving the sacrificial knife about. One of the hooded men asks the naked Victim, "Was it good for you, too?" (November 1980).

Consider this material in concert with the review of Robert Mapplethorpe's photographs depicting child pornography, sadistic-homo-erotica, and "demon" symbols and the federal funding going to Andres Serrano to create "art works composed from human body parts and decapitated heads of animals exhibited in glass vats."

The Mapplethorpe and Serrano "art" stigmatizing sacred Christian symbols, symbolizes a breakthrough opportunity for thousands of new "artists" to gain attention, popularity, and income. Art gallery and museum pornography will be increasingly more visible. So those who disdain the reality of demons may still, as liberal academician Rollo May has said, understand the existence of demonic powers. In any case as our country is reeling from a recent "ritual sacrifice find" in Mexico among other shocking discoveries, symptomatic of criminal demon worship, we would do well to pay heed to the photographer’s exploitation of Satanism.

Recent reports on ritualistic sacrifice and cases of devil worship throughout the nation suggest that this humor is less than funny. All pornographers support the child pornography industry, including satanic pornography, in a myriad of ways. Initially, legal employment of naked models for commercial sex ventures established new employment standards. This then shifts the focus to "age" limits rather than prohibitions against the exploitive sex commerce symbolized by the employment itself.

Next, the trillion-dollar sex industry has established a full-scale publicity, legal, public policy, "buddy" network and a structure within which all of these players assist one another. Assistance includes providing good publicity and hiding damaging information, providing sources for models, and coordinating political bribery for legal and other services. Moreover, in creating social acceptance for deviance, "adult" pornography creates laws, policies, and a network of well-placed professionals at all levels who hamstring prosecution against their industry or its members. In this way, the adult pornographer makes it almost impossible for law enforcement to police any part of the industry, even the juvenile prostitution operation.

Below is a summary of the Basic Findings from Images of Children, Crime & Violence in Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler, 1989, US Dpt of Justice, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Grant No. 84-JN-AX-K007.

This report appears in its rough 1995 draft form.
SELECTED FINDINGS

Child Depictions

Basic Facts:
49% (2,971) photographs
34% (2,016) cartoons
17% (1,017) illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL CHILD</th>
<th>AND</th>
<th>OTHER CHARACTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47% female</td>
<td></td>
<td>49% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% male</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>35% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% both/other</td>
<td></td>
<td>16% both/other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39% 3-11 years</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% 12-17 years</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3-11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% fetus-2 years</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12-17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% pseudo children (*)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td>2% fetus-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td>85% Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Black</td>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>3% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Other minority</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Other minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Child Depictions (Nonadditive)
29% nude/genital display (visuals only)
21% visually exposed/sexualized
20% genital activity
16% sexual encounter with adult
10% force
10% killing/murder/maiming
6% internal vaginal (“pink”) exposure (visuals only coded)
4% sex with animals/objects

Share of Child Depictions by Magazine**
Playboy: 8 avg/issue (5% of Playboy cartoons/visuals)
Penthouse: 6 avg/issue (4% of Penthouse cartoons/visuals)
Hustler: 14 avg/issue (12% of Hustler cartoons/visuals)
Playboy highest year: 1971 (N=187, or 16 per issue)
Penthouse highest year: 1972 (N=131, or 11 per issue)
Hustler highest year: 1978 (N=228, or 19 per issue)

Over 9,000 scenarios in Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler were identified as depicting characters under 18 years of age. From this population pool, a mere 6,004 scenarios met the project’s unusually narrow criteria for the analysis of child depictions.19

* The description of “pseudo-child” provided in the Attorney General’s Commission on Pornography (1986, Vol. I, p. 618) reads: “Pseudo-child pornography or ‘teasers’ involve women allegedly over the age of eighteen who are ‘presented in such a way as to make them appear to be children or youths.’ Models used in such publications are chosen for their youthful appearance (e.g., in females, slim build and small breast); and are presented with various accoutrements designed to enhance the illusion of immaturity (e.g., hair in ponytails or bangles, toys, teddy bears, etc.). ‘Pseudo-child pornography’ is of concern since it may appeal to the same tastes and may evoke responses similar or identical to those elicited by true child pornography.”

** For rationale of estimates, see Overview Project (Volume I), Table I, “Average Total Number of Features Per Magazine,” and Table II, “Average Number of Cartoons and Visuals Per Issue Containing Child Imagery” (pp. 95-96).

*** For rationale of final 14,854 estimate, (originally 14,692) see Overview Project (Volume I), Table I, “Average Total Number of Features Per Magazine” (p. 95), and Tables “Crime and Violence Data” (p. 133), “Crime and Violence Cartoon Data” (p. 134), and “Crime and Violence Visual Data” (p. 137).