

January 1993

DON'T GET FOOLED AGAIN: ASSAILED IN BRITAIN

Avedon Carol

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/nyls_law_review

Recommended Citation

Avedon Carol, *DON'T GET FOOLED AGAIN: ASSAILED IN BRITAIN*, 38 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 183 (1993).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@NYLS. It has been accepted for inclusion in NYLS Law Review by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@NYLS.

DON'T GET FOOLED AGAIN: ASSAILED IN BRITAIN

AVEDON CAROL*

I. NOT MUCH ANARCHY IN THE UK

In the United Kingdom, we have something called "civil liberties," which translates roughly as anything the government has not yet decided it can take away from you. Because parliamentary law dictates that the hands of Parliament can never be tied,¹ a bill of rights is theoretically out of the question—rights belong to the Crown. This makes it difficult, of course, to find ways to fight censorship in the British courts. But that in itself would not pose such a problem if we had a culture in which progressives, at least, had a firm understanding of the dangers of censorship. On the contrary, however, it is very easy to get the feeling that no one in Britain is really sure that censorship is potentially a bad thing.

Without the equivalent of a First Amendment,² it was relatively simple to get laws against racist speech passed in the United Kingdom in response to hateful literature being distributed by the fascist National Front (NF). The campaign against the NF made censorship respectable on all sides. In every forum, it was taken for granted that the need for such laws was obvious, that no one could object to such laws, and that alleged parallels between the NF's racist speech and pornography's sexism mandated similar laws to protect women from incitement to sexual hatred.

What few people acknowledge, however, is that the anti-hate content of race-relation legislation would not have been passed in the first place if the NF's literature had not already been proven to be deeply unpopular with the majority of people in Britain. Materials of this nature would be found offensive even by most garden-variety racists who have opposed anti-discrimination legislation. It should be remembered that laws against racism are not enforced once racist sentiments become popular. But some

* A founding member of Feminists Against Censorship in Britain and a member of the executive committee of the National Council for Civil Liberties.

1. See generally S.H. BAILEY & M.J. GUNN, SMITH AND BAILEY ON THE MODERN ENGLISH LEGAL SYSTEM (1991) (discussing Parliamentary Sovereignty contained within the United Kingdom's constitution, which requires that Acts of Parliament not be questioned by courts and any prior inconsistent legislation be repealed).

2. U.S. CONST. amend. I. "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech" *Id.*

of us would say that the Incitement to Racial Hatred law³ does little more than sweep the issue of racism under the carpet, allowing a subtle but effective type of racism to prevail without comment.

America, however, is a bogeyman for censorship activists in the United Kingdom. America is a violent nation: the murder rate for a major American city in a single year exceeds that for the whole of Great Britain for several years running.⁴ In Northern Ireland, it took more than twenty-five years of civil war for the number of killings to catch up with the number of murders in New York City and Los Angeles in a single year.⁵ More rapes are reported in America, too.⁶ United States crime figures are cited as evidence that American freedom of the press—freedom to produce violent material and hard core pornography—leads to a violent society.⁷

The people who make these claims, however, neatly neglect to mention the other differences between the United States and Britain. In the United Kingdom, private ownership of handguns is illegal⁸ while guns are widely available in the United States.⁹ In Britain, our safety net reduces both the desire and the need for criminal activity—health care is freely

3. Public Order Act, 1986, ch. 64 (Eng.). The Act reads in pertinent part:
Use of words or behaviour or display of written material

(1) A person who uses threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, or displays any written material which is threatening, abusive or insulting, is guilty of an offense if—

(a) he intends thereby to stir up racial hatred, or

(b) having regard to all the circumstances racial hatred is likely to be stirred up thereby.

Id. § 18.

4. See, e.g., Fox Butterfield, *Experts Explore Rise in Mass Murder*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 19, 1991, at 6 (reporting that in 1988 there were 8.4 murders in the United States for every 100,000 residents as compared with 1.2 murders in Great Britain for every 100,000 residents).

5. Compare Editorial, *Tears Enough in Northern Ireland*, N.Y. TIMES, Dec. 18, 1993, at 22 (indicating that the 25-year conflict in Northern Ireland has taken 3000 lives) with FED. BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS: CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES 75, 101 (1991) [hereinafter CRIME REPORTS] (reporting 2245 homicides in 1990 in New York City and 983 in Los Angeles).

6. Compare *The Britain Audit: Crime; Bewitched, Bothered and Bewildered*, ECONOMIST, Aug. 28, 1993, at 56, 57 [hereinafter *The Britain Audit*] (reporting that there were 4142 recorded rapes in 1992 in Great Britain) with CRIME REPORTS, *supra* note 5, at 51 (reporting 102,555 rapes in 1990 in the United States).

7. See, e.g., Caryn Jacobs, *Patterns of Violence: A Feminist Perspective on the Regulation of Pornography*, 7 HARV. WOMEN'S L.J. 5, 11-12 (1984).

8. Firearms Act, 1968, ch. 27, § 5 (Eng.).

9. See Tom Morganthau, *Why Not Real Gun Control?*, NEWSWEEK, Oct. 11, 1993, at 33 (attributing increases in violent crime to general access to handguns).

available to all,¹⁰ while an uninsured American might lose her home to pay for medical costs.¹¹ Finally, the American feminist movement has kept rape activism so high on its agenda¹² that the percentage of rape victims who report the assault is bound to be higher than in Britain. It seems clear that British society has more to fear from emulating America's alienating contempt for the poor and unemployed than it does from freedom of the press.

Most statistics and theories used by British campaigners to support anti-pornography activism come from the United States although often in a highly distorted form.¹³ The situation is muddled by references to material that has never been sold in Britain, as if it is freely available in our corner shops—to say nothing of the undying rumors of “snuff” films.¹⁴ Without an anti-censorship background to impede them, arguments in favour of censorship seemed to flow through British culture in the 1980s without objection. Both the Labour Party and an increasingly visible segment of British feminists accepted anti-pornography rhetoric

10. See National Health Service Act, 1977, ch. 49, § 1 (Eng.). England has had nationalized free health care since 1946. See National Health Service Act, 1946, 9 & 10 Geo. 6, ch. 81 (Eng.).

11. See JONATHAN KOZOL, RACHEL AND HER CHILDREN: HOMELESS FAMILIES IN AMERICA 8, 32 (1988); see generally Allan R. Gold, *The Struggle to Make Do Without Health Insurance*, N.Y. TIMES, July 30, 1989, § 1, at 1, 22 (reporting the economic effects of catastrophic illness on families and individuals in America who cannot afford health insurance, and, as a result, lose their homes).

12. See LINDA BROOKOVER BOURQUE, DEFINING RAPE 3, 11-13 (1989); see generally SUSAN BROWNMILLER, AGAINST OUR WILL: MEN, WOMEN AND RAPE (1975) (arguing that rape should be a major concern of the feminist movement); KATIE ROIPHE, THE MORNING AFTER: SEX, FEAR, AND FEMINISM ON CAMPUS (1993) (arguing that feminists' concern about rape has distorted the difference between rape and consensual sexual relations between men and women).

13. See Alison King, *Mystery and Imagination: The Case of Pornography Effects Studies*, in BAD GIRLS AND DIRTY PICTURES 57 (Alison Assiter & Avedon Carol eds., 1993) (noting how some feminists repeatedly allude to particular research, despite the right-wing moralist perspectives of the researchers).

14. For example, charges of extreme images appearing in *Penthouse* refer exclusively to U.S. *Penthouse* (in fact, almost entirely to the December 1984 issue of U.S. *Penthouse*) without any clarification that this is not the same magazine as the one sold under that name in the United Kingdom, where such images can not be sold at all. See also Beverly LaBelle, *Snuff—The Ultimate in Women-Hating*, in TAKE BACK THE NIGHT 272 (Laura Lederer ed., 1980) (discussing the X-rated movie *Snuff*, which depicts the murder and dismemberment of a young woman).

undiluted.¹⁵ The moral right, of course, had a front-row seat and often sat next to lesbian feminists on anti-pornography panels.

Pro-censorship activists may have overstepped themselves at last, however, when a cadre of anti-pornography campaigners decided to make their case to the National Council for Civil Liberties (NCCL or Liberty),¹⁶ an organization, somewhat similar to the American Civil Liberties Union,¹⁷ operating principally in England and Wales (Scotland has its own SCCL).¹⁸ Attempting to promote a Dworkin-MacKinnon approach to pornography,¹⁹ these women introduced a resolution supporting laws to censor pornographic materials at the 1989 annual general meeting (AGM) of NCCL.²⁰ Its supporters made an emotional case for censorship, suggesting that the tepid soft-core available in Britain was overwhelmingly violent.²¹ The pro-censorship contingent was able to sway the meeting, winning by a narrow margin.²²

It was this unthinkable turn of events that finally galvanized frustrated anti-censorship feminists in England to form Feminists Against Censorship (FAC).²³ Within months FAC produced its first leaflet²⁴ and managed

15. See *The Primarolo Bill*, in *BAD GIRLS AND DIRTY PICTURES*, *supra* note 13, at 41 (describing the introduction of an anti-pornography bill, drafted by the Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom and supported by the Campaign Against Pornography & Censorship, into the House of Commons by Labour Party Member of Parliament Dawn Primarolo).

16. See MARK LILLY, *THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES: THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS 1-10, 150-51* (1984) (describing the founding of the NCCL and its current situation).

17. See generally AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, BRIEFING PAPER NO. 1, *GUARDIAN OF LIBERTY: AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION 1* (1993). "The American Civil Liberties Union is the nation's foremost advocate of individual rights—litigating, legislating and educating the public on a broad array of issues affecting individual freedom in the United States." *Id.*

18. See LILLY, *supra* note 16, at 42.

19. See ROSEMARIE TONG, *FEMINIST THOUGHT* 116-20 (1989) (explaining Andrea Dworkin's and Catharine A. MacKinnon's view that pornography is a civil rights issue, best confronted with anti-discrimination law); see also *Introduction* to ANDREA DWORKIN, *PORNOGRAPHY: MEN POSSESSING WOMEN* at xxviii-xxxiv (1989).

20. See *Chronology of Anti-Pornography Initiatives in the UK*, in *PORNOGRAPHY: WOMEN, VIOLENCE & CIVIL LIBERTIES* 593 app. (Catherine Itzin ed., 1992).

21. See Nettie Pollard, *The Modern Pornography Debates*, 14 *TOLLEY'S J. MEDIA L. & PRAC.* 134, 134 (1993).

22. *Id.*

23. See *Preface* to *BAD GIRLS AND DIRTY PICTURES*, *supra* note 13, at vii; *FEMINISTS AGAINST CENSORSHIP, PORNOGRAPHY AND FEMINISM: THE CASE AGAINST CENSORSHIP* 14 (Gillian Rodgeron & Elizabeth Wilson eds., 1991).

to get attacked in the local feminist press.²⁵ Public appearances, usually met with vociferous objection, quickly schooled us in public speaking and, by the 1990 annual general meeting of NCCL, FAC was able to turn back the tide of anti-pornography support. Our real victory, however, came in 1991 when our resolutions won overwhelming support from NCCL's members, and when a FAC representative was elected to the executive committee.²⁶ FAC has had further victories since, and now has three members serving on the executive committee.

II. NO SEX PLEASE, WE'RE . . . WOMEN?

In the fight over pornography, the issue of violence against women is often used to support censorship rather than to address the evils of violence and sexism.²⁷ Women do have genuine concerns about the production of sexual materials: in television, film, and written material, there has been a history of androcentrism, insensitivity to women's views, misrepresentation of women's attitudes and tastes, stereotyping, and just plain sexism.²⁸ But television and general-release film have usually been

24. See FEMINISTS AGAINST CENSORSHIP, ASK YOURSELF . . . DO YOU REALLY WANT MORE CENSORSHIP? (1989).

25. See *Watch This Space*, EVERYWOMAN (Eng.), Jan. 1990, at 5 (accusing FAC of being overwhelmingly influenced by Americans and asserting that it "could be more accurately named Anti-Feminists for the Pornography Industry").

26. See Pollard, *supra* note 21, at 134. The resolution read:

This AGM instructs the EC [Executive Committee] to actively campaign against sexual censorship, including attempts by the authorities to suppress such materials as gay men's publications, comics, material produced by women, sex education material, and of other media which discuss sexual politics. In view of the increasing harassment of publishers, distributors, and members of the public, a concerted effort on behalf of freedom of expression and the right to read and view is essential. As no organization is better placed than Liberty to take on this growing affront to fundamental rights, this AGM accordingly instructs the EC to attach the highest priority to public campaign in defense of these crucial civil liberties.

Resolutions Carried by the AGM, LIBERTY (National Council for Civil Liberties, London, Eng.), July 1991 (on file with the *New York Law School Law Review*).

27. See Nadine Strossen, *A Feminist Critique of "The" Feminist Critique of Pornography*, 79 VA. L. REV. 1099, 1154-59 (1993) (arguing that by focussing on the evils of pornography, both anti-pornography feminists and the political right transform the discussion about women's equality into a debate on censorship, thereby obscuring the broader social issues of discrimination and violence against women).

28. See, e.g., Barbara B. Stern, *Feminist Literary Criticism and the Deconstruction of Ads: A Postmodern View of Advertising and Consumer Responses*, 19 J. CONSUMER RES., Mar. 1993, at 556, 558 (analyzing the advertising industry's widespread use of

produced with the idea that women will view these materials, making it relatively easy for women to spot and analyze sexist content and, in turn, demand that participation be fully invited. Similarly, a wide range of publications have been open to the lens of public examination by women, and ultimately women have become visible—and often highly regarded—participants in journalism and the literary field.²⁹

In the case of pornography, however, it was always assumed that women would have no interest, and *should* have no interest. Surely, no genre ever made women feel more excluded. Our resentments about exclusion should surprise no one. Because women were not meant to see pornography, we could have no comment on it, no quarrel with its sexism, and, thus, no criticism of its internal values. Indeed, it was the one area where it was unthinkable for women to demand participation in order to bring about change.

Could this be why so many feminists have automatically taken the position that pornography should be banned rather than reformed in the same way women have been reforming other genres and media? Have we simply accepted the assumption that women cannot participate as consumers and creators of pornography? Have we decided that if we can't play, then the boys can't play either? Does this sense of exclusion make it easy for us to believe that sexual fantasies that men have while reading pornography are really about something much nastier than sex?

The idea that women are excluded—and should be excluded—from sexual discourse is an old one.³⁰ Although this idea has become considerably weakened in the last few decades,³¹ it still exerts influence on the argument over the presence of sexual materials in society. Assumptions abound that the very nature of sexual desire makes it an unpalatable subject for recreational consumption by women and children. To many people, sex remains a dark and unsavoury aspect of our existence, too sordid and bestial to be appreciated by any but the most equally bestial members of our society—men.

what are considered to be traditionally male-oriented values).

29. *See generally* DAVID H. HOSLEY & GAYLE K. YAMADA, *HARD NEWS: WOMEN IN BROADCAST JOURNALISM* (1987) (noting the many accomplishments of women in both broadcast and literary journalism).

30. *See generally* BEATRICE FAUST, *WOMEN, SEX AND PORNOGRAPHY: A CONTROVERSIAL AND UNIQUE STUDY 3-11* (1980) (noting the historic discomfort of women when discussing the issue of women's participation in and consumption of pornography, and the recent tendency of an increasing number of feminists to overcome this discomfort and participate in the debate).

31. *See id.*

III. NO HELP FROM THE DADDY STATE

Censorship is not the answer to the question of sexual violence. For that, we must look further into the much more compelling research that suggests such violence is a direct result of sexual repression and family relationships.³² Much as the moral right might like us to believe that licentiousness is our greatest threat, it seems clear that the most conservative attitudes about sex lead inexorably to a society that accepts and sometimes encourages rape and domestic violence.

An earlier wave of feminism that advocated sexual purity was successful in suppressing sexual expression, but without reducing violence against women. Rape myths were as widely accepted as ever, and the language of blaming women was elevated to a science. Modern feminism came into existence in large part as a reaction against precisely those values that had been promoted by social-purity feminists (most people forget the second half of the British suffragists' slogan: "Votes for women and chastity for men").³³ By the late 1960s, it was abundantly clear that the double standards condemning the pursuit of sexual pleasure by women had become an intolerable burden.

As poor economic conditions and social alienation increase, crime rates in Britain continue to rise.³⁴ The government, however, can hardly admit that its policies provided a foundation for these rises in criminal and violent activities. Under the circumstances, it is far more politically expedient to jump on the censorship bandwagon and condemn television and pornography than it is to halt the Conservative Party's own destructive and socially alienating programs. In both Britain and America, conservative politicians gratefully latch on to drives for laws that empower government's control of what can be seen and said in the name of making society safer. But laws like these do nothing for women, or our homes and families. Whether "citizens" of America or "subjects of the Crown," we foolishly hand over our freedom to question those in power and receive nothing in return.

32. See King, *supra* note 13, at 73. See also R. EMERSON DOBASH & RUSSELL P. DOBASH, *WOMEN, VIOLENCE AND SOCIAL CHANGE*, 267-70 (1992) (examining research showing that most violence against women occurs within intimate heterosexual relationships, and that much of this violence includes sexual assaults by husbands on wives, which historically have been ignored, if not winked at, by a patriarchal society).

33. See BARBARA CASTLE, SYLVIA AND CHRISTABEL PANKHURST 122-23 (1987).

34. See, e.g., *The Britain Audit*, *supra* note 6, at 56 (reporting that the overall crime rate in Great Britain has been increasing, with the most rapid rise (starting in 1980) coinciding with general government cuts in spending in all areas except criminal justice, where government spending has increased).

The costs associated with law enforcement's choice of which criminals should be pursued is another matter receiving little attention in these discussions. Although most police experts admit that beat patrolling is probably the best safeguard against neighborhood criminal activity,³⁵ increased anti-vice campaigns remove more and more potential patrol officers from their beats and involve them in high-profile and relatively safe porn seizures, gay bar sweeps, and party raids. Chasing "perverts" and pornographers is far less dangerous than addressing serious criminal activity or domestic violence. Men who will beat up strangers or batter their wives are as likely to attack police officers, but homosexuals and porn traders are seldom so prone to resistance and violence. Because breaking up "vice rings" also often results in flashy media coverage for officers involved, pursuing the sex industry can be highly rewarding without entailing the dangers of facing truly violent offenders or the frustrations of dealing with house breakings that cannot be solved. In addition, high-level governmental appointees may seem to be accomplishing a great deal whenever one of these stories hits the papers—without ever making a dent in the kind of crime from which desperate victims are begging for relief.

In other words, too much energy is directed *away* from dealing with the very crimes which these new laws claim to solve. Moreover, the repressive and anti-sexual nature of the campaigns makes it that much harder to address the real causes of sexual violence, as well as sexism in general.

IV. FRIGHTENED AND IGNORANT—YOU CALL THIS "PROTECTION"?

Because the campaigns to suppress sexual material contain so much "anti-filth" and anti-sex propaganda, it becomes almost impossible to address vital issues such as sex education, disease prevention, and contraception for the young. Fifty years of experience in examining the causes of sexual violence and the costs of early pregnancy for young women have made it abundantly clear that to improve the position of

35. See generally Joseph A. Gambardello & Bob Liff, *Crime Rate Drops; Cop on Beat Touted as Reason*, *NEWSDAY*, July 29, 1992, at 19 (reporting that an increase in the number of "beat" cops, or "community policing," is believed to have caused New York City's crime rate to drop); Aaron Zitner, *Back to the Beat—and Basics For These Cops*, *BOSTON GLOBE*, Aug. 18, 1991, *NW Wkly.*, at 1 (discussing community policing as the reason for safer neighborhoods and decreased crime in the city of Lawrence, Massachusetts). But see Glenn F. Bunting, *Police-Community Plan: Rumbblings Among Success Stories; Shortfall in Staffing Hinders Effectiveness*, *L.A. TIMES*, Nov. 24, 1985, San Diego ed., Part 2, at 1 (reporting that the effectiveness of San Diego's experimental community policing program, implemented in 1975, has been questioned by both city residents and police officers).

women in society we need a broadscale educational campaign directed at teaching sexual rights and responsibilities, as well as the simple facts, to young people.

More than two decades of modern feminist activity, despite the successes, has largely failed to change the environment in which children learn myths and lies about sex and gender because our programmes have been kept firmly aimed at adults. Young people may see sexy images in advertising, but informationally their situation has not improved much. And for all the rhetoric we hear about protecting children from exploitation, hardly a soul bothers to mention children's rights or empowerment. It seems likely that children who know about sex, and understand that their bodies belong to them, are far more likely to be able to resist abuse. Such young people seem to be less prone to later sexual violence and to dangerous, unprotected sex, as long as protective measures are available to them.³⁶ Yet in spite of the evidence indicating that these programmes can actually reduce the likelihood of harm to children and women in society, we have expended little energy trying to bring information and help to young people.

Puritanism and over-protectiveness have made it impossible to enact programmes that would help arm children against abuse, early pregnancy, and disease. It is still possible to raise children in such a shell of ignorance and guilt about sex that the children later explode into horrifying acts of sexual violence. The right-wing answer to problems related to sex and reproduction always has been further repression.³⁷ We can see how well that has worked. The anti-pornography campaigns have actually increased the fear of exposing children to anything with sexual content. In fact, the level of fearfulness has become overwhelming: one gets the impression that a woman cannot walk out of her house without being sexually assaulted, and that allowing any male to be in the unsupervised presence of her child will expose that child to sexual abuse. The moral right could not have designed a better programme to keep women trapped in their homes.

36. See, e.g., Sara Ruddick, *Procreative Choice for Adolescent Women*, in *THE POLITICS OF PREGNANCY: ADOLESCENT SEXUALITY AND PUBLIC POLICY* 126, 134-35 (Annette Lawson & Deborah L. Rhode eds., 1993); see also Claire Brindis, *Antecedents and Consequences*, *supra* at 257, 275 (noting that where health clinics are located on high school campuses, teenage pregnancies have dropped by 30%).

37. See generally U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, ATTORNEY GEN.'S COMM'N ON PORNOGRAPHY, FINAL REPORT 45, 78-79 (July 1986) [hereinafter FINAL REPORT] (asserting that restrictions should be placed on pornography because it contributes to teenage pregnancy and abortion); Carole S. Vance, *The Meese Commission on the Road*, *NATION*, Aug. 2/9, 1986, at 65 (discussing the Reagan Administration's Attorney General's Commission on Pornography as part of a right-wing moral agenda "that links sexuality and its surrogate, sexual images, with harm to women and death").

Wide-scale social panic has proved to be an enormous obstruction to even the most moderate discussion of giving children enough information to recognize potential dangers and avoid them before they happen. We must, however, get the facts to children early to arm them against the misinformation they will pick up in the atmosphere, in traditional ways, regardless of the law.

V. ANTI-PORN IS ANTI-WOMAN

The sexual double standard was once a priority issue for females.³⁸ Even during the 1960s, it was obvious that we needed sexual autonomy and a self-defined sexuality if ever we were going to have freedom as human beings in society.³⁹ It was simply not possible to endure the pressures of a culture that defined us in terms of our sexual partnerships but also refused us the opportunity to understand and experiment with our own sexual repertoire and needs.

One of the feminine role's greatest demands is to keep the lid on sex outside the marital relationship. Aside from a few carefully aimed methods of enticing a prospective partner into marriage, it was principally women's job to control men's hair-trigger sexuality by keeping thoughts of sex out of mind. Desire was a male trait, while allure was a female trait; the job of keeping both under wraps fell strictly on women because it was understood that men were not capable of controlling themselves. Rape was the result of a woman's failure to keep allure down to a minimum: she'd let the tiger out of his cage. It was said that women who were raped must have been "sending out signals"—good girls did not get raped. Women who got raped deserved it because they had committed the ultimate social crime: they had aroused thoughts of sexuality in men. Such behaviour was so unforgivable that even the most violent and bruising gang-rape was entirely justified.

The assumption that male misbehaviour results solely from female misbehaviour has been with us so long that we hardly question it. Even decades of anti-rape activism seem to mean nothing once the mere suggestion is made that, thanks to those women who take off their clothes in front of a camera, men just can't control themselves. Is it too much to

38. See KATE MILLETT, *SEXUAL POLITICS* 63, 206-09 (1970) (discussing the sexual double standard as a concern of feminists in the Victorian era and throughout the first half of the twentieth century, and the backlash created by attempts to do away with it).

39. See generally SARA EVANS, *PERSONAL POLITICS: THE ROOTS OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND THE NEW LEFT* 212-16 (1979) (explaining that the feminist movement was created, in part, because women in radical movements of the 1960s realized that the new sexual freedom was primarily based on male notions of sexuality).

ask feminists to realize that this is nonsense; that most men do indeed control themselves; that neither women in miniskirts nor women in minimal underwear "provoke" rape? It should be obvious that the "porn causes rape" argument is nothing but a slightly more sophisticated version of blaming (highly stigmatized, largely powerless) women for the anti-social behaviour of a minority of men.

Rather than saying that a woman in a miniskirt invited her own rape, we now pretend that other women incited the rapist. A common argument against pornography asserts that porn "misrepresents" women by portraying us as being willing to participate in sex for the sheer pleasure of it.⁴⁰ The underlying presumption is that we can *not* participate in sex for the sheer pleasure of it, which leads only to the conclusion that any woman who appears to do so is harming other women.

This view of female sexuality is thoroughly evil and manifestly anti-woman. Feminists should know by now that although many women enjoy sex very much, doing it for love alone, without lust, often proves to be a tedious, degrading, and painful event. It is shameful that self-proclaimed "anti-sexist" men and "feminists" run around maintaining that women are not competent to make free choices to participate in sexual activities or pornography because we are too "brainwashed" to understand how oppressed we are. Discouraging women from sexual exploration has been vital in making us feel we have to tolerate bad sex; we are entitled to find out what we want without being told what we are not supposed to like by the church, our mothers, or our "sisters."

Have we already forgotten the misery of being expected to satisfy the needs of husbands and society because our own sexual desires were not meaningful? Why, then, should we settle for a new "feminist" instruction to ignore our own sexual curiosity and go back to our old "feminine" job of suppressing sexual thoughts in men? If women are to achieve any kind of freedom from oppression, it must mean that each of us owns her own body—not just her womb, but her sexuality as well. This necessarily must include the right to park our naked bodies in front of cameras if we choose. We are not just tools with which society can build itself to its own ends: In the same way that we have argued that we do not owe unwanted pregnancies to the state or free sex to rapists, neither do we owe our sexual behaviour to society, to abstract ideals of "the family," nor to the most vocal members of the current feminist movement.

40. See generally FINAL REPORT, *supra* note 37, at 35-36, 82-83, 99, 339 (discussing the alleged harm inherent in pornography because it represents sex as a purely pleasurable experience unconnected to love, affection, or commitment); Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Not a Moral Issue*, 2 YALE L. & POL'Y REV. 321, 326 (1984) (arguing that pornography presents a male view of female pleasure and desire).

Anti-pornography feminism is no substitute for our original analysis of economic arrangements, repression, and the family. Nor can censorship stand in for positive programmes to improve the position of women and ameliorate problems of social violence. This essentially anti-sexual approach to sexual media is ultimately anti-woman. It once again blames individual women for making personal choices said to harm the family and other women, rather than encouraging much-needed examination of larger social forces that cause violence and oppression.