

# Let's Talk Sex and Magazine Covers

☒ Last week a huge controversy broke out over the use of a particular photo of Boston terrorist, Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, by Rolling Stone magazine. A lot of people thought the use of that particular photo, showing a “sexy” Tsarnaev, rewarded him with “celebrity” status while I’m sure the lunatics who think this creep is innocent, loved it. I don’t read Rolling Stone magazine so I have no idea how good or bad the article is. I wouldn’t have used such a photo if it were my magazine. But that’s just me.

But while at the airport last weekend, I noticed something very interesting. Darkened plastic sheets covered Playboy and Penthouse magazines. I know the smoky-colored plastic has been around for quite a while and, I presume, it’s used by retail merchants to hide sexy covers from children and others who are offended by the photos.

In the store I was in, these magazines were on the top shelf and out of sight and reach of any child. What was even more interesting is that I lifted the plastic of each cover and couldn’t quite understand why the covers were hidden in the first place.

First, the Playboy cover was a graphic of one woman, in a one piece bathing suit (yes! a one piece) replicated and arranged in different positions to form the Playboy bunny logo. It took up the entire cover.

The Penthouse cover showed a model/actress/nobody in lingerie.

Anyone watching a Victoria’s Secret commercial will see a whole lot more skin than either of these two covers offer.

Honestly, I can’t imagine who would actually be offended by

either of these magazine covers. But, then again, this is this month and perhaps the covers are racier in others.

The reason I bring any of this up is that while I'm perusing the rest of the magazines, I see ESPN magazine which was positioned on the very bottom shelf – not against the wall but parallel to the floor. Anyone – man, woman or child – need only lower their head and the cover was right there. So, you're wondering why is she writing about this?

### **Here's the cover:**

☒ So, the Playboy cover is blacked out even though it doesn't have a photo of a scantily-clad woman on it but a graphic composed of a woman in a one-piece bathing suit and the Penthouse cover is blacked out even though the person on it is wearing lingerie, both of which were on the top shelf so that no child could possibly see, yet, the ESPN cover showing a completely naked woman with one hand strategically covering her breast is at floor level for everyone to see.

The clerk behind the counter merely worked there and probably had nothing to do with the store's policy to black-out the Playboy and Penthouse covers while leaving ESPN out in the open for all to see, so I wasn't about to question or harass him about the store policy.

The ESPN magazine was far more explicit and accessible to children. So, what's the point of covering over Playboy and Penthouse? It makes no sense to me.

I just don't get it; if you do, God Bless you.