Ordinance will not curb rights

The Editor

A response to Chip Dershowitz’s letter to the Tech ("Preventing a violent rapist violates rights," Oct. 19),

"Why is it "inside" that civil liberties for pornography would be part of the Human Rights Ordinance? Of course it is not inside the law for purely technical reasons.

Dershowitz is concerned that the definition of speech would be retained. Women’s speech is voiced by pornography (but then the Bill of Rights was never intended to cover women). If pornography harms women (sex, race, subordination...), then is its "speech" value more than the rights of pornography’s victims to equality that one is subject to systemic subordination, rape, torture.

Dershowitz takes part of the definitions of pornography—"women are presented as being penetrated by objects of animals, and claims that this "classifies sex. I hope, for the good of women who have had or will have sexual contact with him, that he does not define as the ordinance describes pornography. (On order to be pornographic, the material must (1) be sexually explicit and (2) include one or more of the following...)."

If you think there is no difference between pornography and obscenity, you must have a lot of tolerance for the exploitation of women, who do not have the power to stop it. Dershowitz’s letter is a reminder of why we need our rights, not to fight for them, but to stop them from being taken away.
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