

[REDACTED]
June 18, 1965

b7C

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Having admired your work and your life for so many years, it is with trepidation that I write to you. But being a mother and a teacher, I have been disturbed by the alarming increase in pornography and abjectly implore your advice.

As a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, dedicated in the fight against pornography, this is how we --specifically the Flint Junior Woman's Club --became involved in a war of legal semantics. It all began this winter when a group of vocalists called the "Kingsmen" appeared at a local hall. They plugged their million dollar record, "Louie, Louie." In a matter of weeks the record was selling like hot cakes and rising on the "Top 40 Show." We became aware of the dual set of lyrics and that without a doubt, someone had masterminded an "auditory illusion." Our prosecuting attorney with whom we consulted said, in his opinion, there was nothing legally that can be done since he believed you cannot prove which set of lyrics they are singing. This seemed rather irrelevant since they were capitalizing on its obscenity, and when every teenager in the county "heard" the obscene not the copywritten lyric.

Our attempts to have something done about the record were met with frustration. But that is all prologue. We realize the damage is done and the "Louie, Louie" purveyors are getting away with setting a new precedence. That along with the movies, the magazines, the paperbacks -- our kids will now be hit with a fourth front -- records.

We have also been in contact with Mr. Lawrence Gubow, U. S. Attorney in Detroit, and he informed us that your bureau was investigating the record in question. He wasn't too explicit, however. Can you tell us what is being done? What can we do to help? Mr. Hoover, do you think more of these type records are inevitable? Is there perhaps a subliminal type of perversion involved?

In Mr. Gubow's answer to us, he stated that in order for matter to be declared obscene, it must be "objectively obscene." I am confused. How can anything be objectively obscene? Obscenity is not indifferent -- but has definite goals. It is not impersonal and unemotional -- how can it possibly be? By its very nature, obscenity is SUBJECTIVE.

24
25
8 | Ken | PJB
REC 8

145-2961-13

JUL 23 1965

CORRESPONDENCE
63

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover

- 2 -

June 18, 1965

What are the ground rules in this ridiculous legal game that benefits the pornographers? When does obscenity become pornography? And pornography -- perversion?

We do not conclude that curtailment of Freedom of the Press or that strong legislation is the only alternative. But how do you begin to reverse this trend? Can it ever be done? Is the Miller Bill S.173 a good one? Is it worth petitioning for?

Our club would like to do something positive. Do you think a questionnaire to high school students would be of value? Finding out what a cross-section of students reads - buys - thinks about the flood of obscene materials? Do you think such answers could be valuable or would it be superfluous? If you do think it has some merit, would you be willing to help us to construct such a questionnaire?

Perhaps I have asked all too many impertinent questions, but they are as genuine as is our concern at the alarming rise in venereal disease, perversion, promiscuity and illegitimate births in the teen groups. Is there a correlation to the alarming rise in the access to obscene materials by this same group?

Please, Mr. Hoover, let us know if and when we should take what course of action. We would appreciate any help and information you can give us.

Until I hear from you, I remain, ,

Most Humbly yours,

A large, solid black rectangular redaction covering the signature and name of the sender.

b7c

2/1/65

64