

10-2015

Pornography and Humiliation

Rebecca Whisnant

University of Dayton, rwhisnant1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/phl_fac_pub



Part of the [History of Philosophy Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Whisnant, Rebecca, "Pornography and Humiliation" (2015). *Philosophy Faculty Publications*. Paper 87.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/phl_fac_pub/87

This News Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Philosophy at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.



Thursday, May 19, 2016

It published here is an excerpt from the Women's Front newsletter for members: "The floor is yours, sister!". All this in other words, already published in paper form.

[HOME](#)

[Articles](#)

[Reliable Tilda](#)

[Notifications](#)

[The quotation](#)

[This and that](#)

[old issues](#)



Rebecca Whisnant is an American feminist, university professor of philosophy and anti-porn activist. She has written extensively on pornography, and this is a blog post about the degradation of women in pornography. The text is based on a porn DVD, which got Rebecca Whisnant to discuss the humiliation - and of consent - role.

Sign up!

As a member of Kvinnofronten get the newsletter directly in your mailbox! Read more **HERE** !

GÄST-
skribenten:

Pornography and humiliation

ON THE COVER OF A PORN DVD kneels a young white woman dressed only in tiny panties and smiles shyly over her shoulder at the camera. Her name is Jamie, we are told. In her hand is a glass containing a milky substance. The tagline is "See hot sluts drink cum from her asshole!". The text on the back cheerfully clarifies how it works: "See her get a statement in the butt to then push it out and swallow!". The film is called "Anal Cumsumption # 4." What has happened to this woman, with Jamie? Many things, no doubt, but chief among them is that she has been humiliated. But what does that mean? In everyday conversation the term often completely interchangeable with being embarrassed. "I was so humiliated," can one say, "when my child got an outbreak in the grocery store", or "when I realized that I had spinach between the teeth during my presentation". The feeling of being publicly extradition is central to both concepts. But the core of the concept of humiliation is the dictionary definition. According to The Oxford English Dictionary is the English word to demean - "to humiliate" - defined as "pulling down or make some inconspicuous position, condition or feeling". Term's etymological root is the Latin *humilis*, which means low. The dictionary Merriam Webster agrees: "pull down to a lower position in their own or other people's eyes: to humiliate". Jamie has really degraded - in the eyes of others, at least, and probably also their own. It clarifies the The Oxford English Dictionary 'second definition of "humiliate": "to pull down or reduce a person's dignity or self-respect". This last topic is large in philosophical discussions. As **Daniel Statman** observes: "Humiliation is seen first and foremost as an injury to the victim's dignity, an injury that is often described in the

figurative language: the humiliation 'deprived' a dignity, or simply 'lost' or 'lose' it' . Avishai Margalit , who makes non-degradation of the pillars of his concept of a "decent society", defines humiliation as "any kind of behaviors or conditions that constitute a good reason for anyone to believe their self-respect injured" . IT MUST SUFFICE FOR THE MOMENT when it comes definitions. You may also believe me when I say that "Anal Cumsumption" - the example is extreme - the humiliation of women is in fact an immutable grandeur of modern mainstream pornography. Here a woman crawling on all fours, which pushed a penis in from the side of her mouth so that it extends her face and makes her look ridiculous, and everywhere she messes "I'm one of those dirty little whore" . Over 40% of the best-selling adult titles in a recent study contained 'ass to mouth' scenes, where a man removes his penis from the woman's anus and insert it directly, without cleaning it in her mouth and another woman mouth. A more complete humiliation is hard to imagine. So what? Why does this matter? It does first and foremost role of women acting in pornography. What is the consequence of such a degrading action for those that conduct extorted from? When the Abu Ghraib scandal broke out in 2004, there were many who noted that although some of the Iraqi detainees were physically injured, it was horrendous with the abuse at least as much degradation that they were subjected. Men were forced to crawl on the floor on a leash, wear panties on the head, masturbate in front of the camera, get other men to urinate in their mouths, climb naked into a pyramid, all the images could be taken, distributed and laughed at. Many torture survivors tell us that the worst was not pain without humiliation. Pain ends, but a persecuted long as the image of himself as a naked, filthy, utspretad, begging and praying, the dejected passivity and shame. **David Luban** points out actually that humiliation is central to the evil of pain itself - so it is generally and especially when the pain is caused by people and seen by others: "*acute pain in itself is demeaning because it makes our world collapse and restrict ourselves to merely prisoners in our own bodies ...*" "... when it happens in front of the spectator's experience twice as shameful and degrading " . He notes that the methods to humiliate used against war counter-terror detainees in the US "*was the 'Ego-breakdown' and 'Lönlöshet' methods - Army name for methods designed to break down the prisoners by making them feel worthless and distraught* " . It should therefore not surprise us (again according to Luban) "*a new medical study found absolutely no difference between the traumatic psychological effects of physical torture and humiliation*" . **SO IN SOME CONTEXT** , we recognize readily that it is terrible and traumatizing to be humiliated - in fact, a violation of human rights. So how is it with the humiliation of pornography? Oh, we say, that's a whole other thing, you understand ... because unlike Abu Ghraib prisoners agree the women in pornography, and that makes everything better. Look, this is the paper on which she wrote during on the dotted line, clearly grown at 19 or 21. Large girl knows what she's doing, the next topic. But it is completely wrong because it misses precisely what is so destructive of humiliation pornography. That there is consent does not do this humiliation smaller, it makes it worse - not worse altogether, but worse in a special and important way. The consent does is that it exacerbates the shame of the woman herself. Ignore the man behind the curtain: what we see on the picture or movie is not this cheap and dirty was done to her, but she did it. Pornography pretending thus to reveal some fundamental truth about her, not about someone else irregularities. Think of Jamie: no one else is in the picture to give her the glass with ejaculation or encourage her to drink it, let alone forcing her to do the. She drinks the release of his own rectum brand yourself, obviously, because that's just the kind of girl she is. And what kind of girl is that? What are we supposed to think about Jamie and all others like her, who populate this

multimiljard- "picture empire"? The women's consent - whether it is real or only apparent - leads us to search for some kind of explanation. The most obvious explanation may seem that the women will not be humiliated for real, after all, but only treated in a manner that is in keeping with their own character and will. These women demean themselves voluntarily - perhaps because they value their own dignity so low, or perhaps because they are too stupid to even realize that they insulted and humiliated. Surely they are desperate economically (in a culture that sees such desperation, especially in women, as something to meet with disdain rather than empathize and help). Choose yourself, mix and match; in the end they're just hookers, and we all know what whores deserve. We are shaken by the images from Abu Ghraib, for in them we see people who have a personal dignity they may be deprived, people unjustly "reduced". As a counterpoint, we have, for example, Jamie, that is not "lowered" - only she is under. We know this, because she does everything voluntarily. She reaches for the glass with ejaculation, she smiles, she swallows. It would degrade others demeans not her, but rather fits, and mirrors, her kind. She is not a man, she's just a woman. In discussions about pornography often claim that well-meaning people how distasteful it may be, we must accept pornography as long as it portrays "consenting adults". Thus, it is expected that mark the border of the harmful and unacceptable is the lack of consent. But my brief analysis here shows how dangerous simplified the setting is. Images of women who accept and even welcome their own humiliation and degradation are deeply destructive, not only for the women portrayed, but for women in general. Pornography presents the course as it reveals the dirty, raw truth, not of men, or capitalism, or patriarchy, but about the women - who we are and what we are for. And like all propaganda uses the individuals as representatives of the whole group. So, on an ideological level, Jamie is not only a woman, but woman. In the world of pornography, and the world that pornography has helped to create, show Jamie's voluntary humiliation that she has no dignity to lose, after all that she's just a woman.

Rebecca Whisnant

This article was previously published in English on the blog [RadfemRepost](#).

All materials, unless otherwise stated:
© Kvinnofronten



© Kvinnofronten 2006-2016