



F.A. Hayek, Ronald Reagan, Christopher Hitchens, Thomas Szasz, and Timothy Leary: Buy and download Reason's first e-book today!

**reason**

45 YEARS OF Reason Magazine Interviews VOL. 1

Click [here](#) to login.

Follow

Like 69k

- HOME
- REASON24/7
- REASONTV
- HIT & RUN
- MAGAZINE
- POLL
- SUBSCRIBE
- DONATE
- SHOP
- SEARCH
- Politics
- Policy
- Economics
- Civil Liberties
- Culture
- Science/Tech
- War on Drugs
- More

# The War on Sex Workers

An unholy alliance of feminists, cops, and conservatives hurts women in the name of defending their rights.

Melissa Gira Grant from the February 2013 issue

Like 31 3 Tweet 9 Share

SHARE PRINT

On August 30, a 19-year-old woman in Ann Arbor, Michigan, was arrested after a prospective client called 911 on her. He claimed she raised her fee for services after their initial online contact. The cops took her away in handcuffs.

## RELATED ARTICLES

**"The idea that you could openly sell things that help women achieve orgasm is pretty new."**

Amanda Winkler | 11.28.12

**Matt Welch Joins a Panel on MSNBC to Discuss What's Driving 2012's Election**

10.15.12

**"Go Topless Day": What We Saw at the 5th Annual Protest**

Joshua Swain | 9.01.12

- WOMEN
- FEMINISM
- PROSTITUTION
- SEX OFFENDER REGISTRY
- ACTIVISM
- POLICE
- CONSERVATIVES

There's nothing particularly unusual about this story, which initially appeared on AnnArbor.com. It's one of dozens you can find every day in police blotters and local newspapers around the country, often accompanied by mug shots. No women's rights organization compiles comprehensive data on how many people are arrested, tried, convicted, and incarcerated for prostitution-related charges. But their names and photos are lodged in search engines in perpetuity, no matter the outcome of their cases.

The consequences of such arrests can be life shattering. In Louisiana some women arrested for prostitution have been charged under a 200-year-old statute prohibiting "crimes against nature." Those charged—disproportionately black women and transgender women—end up on the state sex-offender registry. In Texas a third prostitution arrest counts as an automatic felony. Women's prisons are so overloaded that the state is rethinking the law to cut costs. In Chicago police post mug shots of all those arrested for solicitation online, a shaming campaign intended to target men who buy sex. But researchers at DePaul University found that 10 percent of the photos are of trans women who were wrongly gendered as men by cops and arrested as "johns." A prostitution charge will haunt these women throughout the interlocking bureaucracies of their lives: filling out job applications, signing kids up for day care, renting apartments, qualifying for loans, requesting passports or visas.

Not all people who do sex work are women, but women disproportionately suffer the stigma, discrimination, and violence against sex workers. The result is a war on women that is nearly imperceptible, unless you are involved in the sex trade yourself. This war is spearheaded and defended largely by other women: a coalition of feminists,

Reason In Your Inbox!

Sign up box with SIGN UP button

### Obama Ceremonially Sworn-In for Second Term

1.21.13 11:59 am


### Canadian Said To Coordinate Algeria Attack in Which 37 Hostages Died

1.21.13 11:32 am

### Rapper Lupe Fiasco Criticizes Obama at Pre-Inauguration Concert

1.21.13 10:55 am

VIEW MORE »



## TOP STORIES

Featured Most Visited Most Commented



**The War on Sex Workers**  
1.21.13 1:30 pm



**The Myth of Free Medicaid Money**  
1.21.13 12:00 pm

conservatives, and even some human rights activists who subject sex workers to poverty, violence, and imprisonment—all in the name of defending women’s rights.

### Off Craigslist and Onto the Streets

A woman dressed from head to toe in khaki was trying to corral the few dozen people who showed up to picket in front of the New York offices of *The Village Voice*. Her eyes shaded from the blazing June sun by a safari-style brimmed hat, Norma Ramos pointed toward the entrance of the venerable alternative weekly with one hand, gripping a hand-printed placard in the other. It read, in deliberately uneven letters: “The TRUTH behind backpage.com: \$2 MILLION PER MONTH by hosting sex trafficking ads.”

Ramos is the executive director of the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW). According to promotional copy from the speaker’s bureau that represents her, Ramos is at the forefront of “one of the most ignored and tragic social justice issues that affects our world.” She takes credit (with some exaggeration) for shutting down Craigslist’s “Erotic Services” listings, where anyone with an email address used to be able to post an ad offering sexual services to anyone with an Internet connection. After the demise of Erotic Services, which followed years of lobbying by law enforcement agencies and the National Association of Attorneys General, many sex workers opted for Craigslist’s main competitor, Backpage.com, which saw a tremendous spike in new sex work ads. (The site, once owned by Village Voice Media, was recently split from the alt-weekly side of the business, partly due to the controversy over its content.)

Ramos’ Craigslist fight, like the Backpage campaign that followed, drove up the cost of doing business for some sex workers. After opponents used the media and congressional hearings to dubiously link Craigslist to violence and exploitation in the sex trade, Craigslist began charging \$5 per post for its Erotic Services ads, arguing that credit card numbers would help police locate advertisers who had been victimized. For sex workers who could not afford the fees, the next best choice was to take on the additional physical and legal risks of soliciting on the streets. All the buzz threw a spotlight on both sites, giving cops an excuse to step up stings that put Craigslist and Backpage advertisers in jail. Now Ramos is agitating for an encore.

Two months before the demonstration outside the *Voice*, feminist icon Gloria Steinem held court in the brothels of India as part of a humanitarian junket sponsored by the NoVo Foundation, one of the largest private women’s charities in the United States. NoVo’s money is Warren Buffett’s money: \$1 billion, transferred by the second wealthiest American to his son Peter, who chairs the effort along with his wife, Jennifer. Steinem accompanied Peter and Jennifer Buffett on a tour of Sonagachi, Calcutta’s biggest red light district. Steinem came away from her visit with an astounding proposal: What would really benefit the women who worked there—whom she described to the Calcutta Telegraph as “prostituted,” characterizing their condition as “slavery”—would be to end sexual health services and peer education programs in brothels, programs that have been recognized by the United States Agency for International Development as best-practices HIV/AIDS interventions. Steinem described the women leading those health and education programs as “traffickers” and those who support them “the trafficking lobby.”

How have we arrived at this point, that in the name of “protecting” women, or even ensuring their “rights,” feminists are eager to take away their jobs and health care? Ramos, Steinem, and their allies deliberately conflate sex work and what they now call “sex trafficking” for their own reasons, not to advance the rights of sex workers. The result is—or should be—an international scandal.

### How Sex Work Became “Sexual Exploitation”

Feminist fights over prostitution and pornography are old news. But anti–sex work feminism has come a long way from the magazine store picket lines of the 1970s and the campus anti-porn



### MLK’s Contested Yet Universal Blueprint for Freedom

1.21.13 9:00 am



### Obama Inaugural Rewind: Rhetoric vs Reality

1.21.13 5:00 am



### The War on Pot: Not a Safe Bet

1.21.13 7:00 am

Melissa Gira Grant on the War on Sex Workers

1.21.13 1:30 pm

A. Barton Hinkle on the Myth of Free Medicaid Money

1.21.13 12:00 pm

Lupe Fiasco Causes One, Calls Out Obama at Pre-Inaugural Concert

Nick Gillespie | 1.21.13 11:08 am

[READ MORE POSTS »](#)

## TRENDING

2 days ago

[The FDA’s Pathetic Food Safety Proposal - Reason.com](#)

3 days ago

[Feds Hounded ‘Net Activist Aaron Swartz, Says EFF’s Parker Higgins](#)

2 days ago

[The Relief Disaster - Reason.com](#)

1 day ago

[No More Corporate Welfare - Reason.com](#)

19 hours ago

[The Bank of England’s Flawed Approach to Monetary Policy - Reason.com](#)

revivals of the 1990s. “Pornography is the theory, and rape is the practice,” wrote feminist author and activist Robin Morgan in 1980. She is still around today, hosting a radio show on D.C.’s 1580 AM for the Women’s Media Center. “Prostitution is paid rape,” claims Melissa Farley, who has been fighting against sex workers since the 1990s and now produces reports for anti-prostitution organizations such as Demand Abolition. While these women once focused on ending sexual “objectification” in magazines and red light districts, today they are waging a global war that pits one class of women against another.

One architect of this shift is attorney Jessica Neuwirth, a founder of the women’s rights organization Equality Now. In a 2008 interview with Barnard College sociologist Elizabeth Bernstein, Neuwirth described the change as a move away from “an earlier wave of consciousness about exploitation that took both pornography and prostitution almost together as a kind of commercial sexual exploitation of women.” The rewrite was necessary, Bernstein explained in the journal *Theory and Society*, because the outright prohibition of porn and prostitution was not popular, putting feminists at odds with liberal allies such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). “They got battered down by ACLU types,” Neuwirth told Bernstein. “By re-situating these issues in terms of the ‘traffic in women’ overseas and as a violation of international commitments to women’s human rights,” Bernstein explained, “they were able to wage the same sexual battles unopposed.”

These battles were now being fought in the name of combating “sexual exploitation,” “sex trafficking,” and “sex slavery.” The activism has shifted to the realm of international law. In 2000 anti-sex work feminists attempted to push their redefinition of sex work into the U.N. Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children. Norma Ramos and her allies wanted the protocol, which is intended to formally define trafficking across U.N. programs and to promote collaboration among U.N. member states in order to protect the rights of people who are trafficked, to define all prostitution as “trafficking.” According to the Paulo Longo Research Initiative scholar Jo Doezema’s 2010 book *Sex Slaves and Discourse Masters*, sex workers were supported by the U.N. special rapporteur on violence against women, who rejected the prostitution/trafficking equivalence. Sex workers also opposed the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women’s substitute proposal, which described commercial sex as “sexual exploitation.”

CATW went on a media offensive, seeking to discredit their opponents, even enlisting Sen. Jesse Helms to the cause. It worked. The protocol was approved and is now signed by 117 countries, defining sex for pay as “sexual exploitation.” The protocol has given feminists legal and moral cover to target sex work under the banner of fighting trafficking.

“People have been very successful in using this term sexual exploitation in pushing legislation,” says Ann Jordan, former director of the Program on Human Trafficking and Forced Labor at American University’s Washington College of Law and an attorney who has defended the rights of trafficked persons. “Many of the people they talk to never ask them what they mean by it.” But while sex work opponents have been successful in passing laws against “sexual exploitation,” Jordan says, “they are not enforceable because no one knows what this means.”

On the domestic front, anti-sex work activists scored one of their biggest wins with the 2005 reauthorization of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA). TVPA earmarked \$50 million for law enforcement agencies to “develop and execute programs targeted at reducing male demand and to investigate and prosecute buyers of commercial sex acts.” Although ostensibly aimed at supporting victims of forced labor, TVPA provides money for efforts to discourage men from hiring sex workers, including quasi-legal and legal activities such as escorting, pornography, stripping, and phone sex, as well as for investigating the people they attempt to hire. Although nearly all prostitution-related law in the United States is made at the state or municipal level, redefining prostitution as trafficking provides a rationale for federal action

## REASONTV: FEATURED VIDEOS



Obama Inaugural Rewind: Rhetoric vs Reality  
Meredith Bragg



3D Printing and the Future of Shopping: Shapeways CEO Peter Weijmarshausen  
Nick Gillespie  
Amanda Winkler



Nassim Taleb Talks Antifragile, Libertarianism, and Capitalism's Genius for Failure  
Nick Gillespie  
Jim Epstein

[VIEW ALL »](#)

advertisement

against the sex trade.



Meanwhile, legislators in many states have responded to the demands of feminist activists by boosting penalties for prostitution-related offenses and prioritizing enforcement. “Think about it,” Jordan says. “If you are a politician on the state or national level, and someone comes to you and says, ‘There are these horrible men who are holding these innocent little virgins, and all you need to do is put money into law enforcement,’ you will want to act. Stepping up vice enforcement allows legislators to avoid the far more complicated steps necessary to support people who have been trafficked or to meaningfully address immigration and labor policies that drive people to migrate illegally or accept dubious work offers when few legal options are available. Tackling problems such as those, Jordan says, “doesn’t allow you to go around and say you are ‘saving sex slaves.’” The prohibitionist approach means “you don’t actually have to deal with the people at the edges of society.”

What happens when people in the sex trade—the people these laws supposedly are meant to protect—push back? Anti-trafficking activists often respond by denying their existence. At the June anti-Backpage protest, I watched Norma Ramos’ staff distribute fliers to passers-by cautioning them against the very term sex work, a phrase that “completely masks the physical, psychological, and sexual violence inflicted on prostituted persons,” although they had to acknowledge “it is a term that women in prostitution themselves use and prefer.”

If this semantic debate seems a bit arcane for placards and fliers, the purpose was revealed 15 feet further down the sidewalk, where members of the Sex Workers Outreach Project New York (SWOP-NYC), a volunteer-based, grassroots group dedicated to improving the lives of sex workers, held a quiet counter-protest. SWOP members—current and former sex workers among them—greeted New Yorkers on their way through Greenwich Village with smiles and fliers, inviting them to throw their support behind the people who had real expertise on the sex industry. That day the police repeatedly instructed SWOP members to stay half a block away from Ramos’ people. They made no such demands of Ramos.

#### Feminists, Cops, and Conservatives

An article in the August issue of Marie Claire follows Andrea Powell, executive director of Free Aware Inspired Restored (FAIR) Girls, as she trolls Backpage for classified sex ads she suspects were placed by or for minors: “Putting in an earbud and picking up her pink-and-black Kate Spade-encased iPhone to dial a local police officer, Powell says urgently, ‘We have to report her now.’” But when the cops set up a sting operation against the advertiser, the story continues, “she said she was in fact an adult—and didn’t want help from the police or anyone else.”

Some activists view calling the cops to “rescue” people from the sex trade as the model of a successful human rights intervention. They don’t count their victories by the number of people they help; they count them by arrests.

These tactics are part of a rise in what Elizabeth Bernstein calls “carceral feminism”; Harvard law professor Janet Halley calls it “governance feminism.” Feminists once offered a powerful critique of the criminal justice system, but that argument has faded as they have found power within it. Not surprisingly, they have found conservative allies along the way.

In redefining sex work as an issue of bad men doing bad things to enslaved young women, anti-prostitution activists have recast themselves as liberators instead of scolds, while simultaneously making their message more attractive to the social conservatives who have at times distrusted them. The conservative Heritage Foundation has taken up the cause of “fighting sex trafficking,” though mostly as a way to beat up on the Obama administration and the United Nations for not adopting even more punitive policy. The Protect Innocence Initiative, a partnership between the

anti-prostitution Shared Hope International and the American Center for Law & Justice (the right's answer to the ACLU), gave a presentation at the Values Voters Summit in Washington last September touting the 40 bills it has persuaded state legislators to introduce since December 2011. The title: "Can You Protect Your Children From the Commercial Sex Industry?" Shared Hope International's director, former Rep. Linda Smith (R-Wash.), explained to the Values Voters audience that they should "put this issue in its proper position" alongside the anti-abortion cause.

Donna M. Hughes, a professor of women's studies at the University of Rhode Island, who praised George W. Bush for "put[ting] the fight against the global sex trade on par with the campaign for democracy in Iraq and the war on terrorism," is another conservative-friendly voice in the anti-sex work chorus. Hughes banged her own curious "women's rights" drum in support of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in a 2004 Washington Post op-ed, co-written with second-wave feminist Phyllis Chesler, in which the duo criticized feminists for not seeing that conservatives "could be better allies on some issues than the liberal left has been."

Sex workers bear the brunt of this coalition's preference for using law enforcement to protect women's rights. Increased penalties for "sex trafficking," supported by such groups as the National Organization for Women New York (NOW-NYC) and the Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation (CAASE) have led to high-profile sting operations, such as a January 2012 bust in New York snaring a reported "200 johns" and seized many of their vehicles prior to arraignment. But demanding cops protect women by "going after the johns" doesn't exempt sex workers from arrest. A 2012 examination of prostitution-related felonies in Chicago conducted by the Chicago Reporter revealed that of 1,266 convictions during the past four years, 97 percent of the charges were made against sex workers, with a 68 percent increase between 2008 and 2011. This is during the same years that CAASE lobbied for the Illinois Safe Children Act, meant to end the arrest of who the bill describes as "prostituted persons" and to instead target "traffickers" and buyers through wiretaps and stings. Since the Act's passage in 2010, only three buyers have been charged with a felony. These feminist-supported, headline-grabbing stunts subject young women to the humiliation of jail, legal procedures, and tracking through various law enforcement databases, sometimes for the rest of their lives.

"It's fascinating that women who claim to be feminists" are so willing to use the law in this way, says Ann Jordan. Supporting anti-prostitution enforcement requires them to call in the muscle of "all these institutions that have oppressed women forever," she notes. "But they are willing to use the law to coerce a particular kind of behavior from women."

As a staff attorney at the Sex Workers Project at the Urban Justice Center, Melissa Broudo deals with the aftermath of crackdowns like the one in New York last winter. Broudo is one of the few lawyers who works to vacate the sentences of people who have been trafficked and who have been convicted of prostitution charges. "The hardest piece I've dealt with," Broudo says, "is trying to represent individuals who don't fit the model. They aren't a 12-year-old girl, or whatever the portrayal is. Men can be trafficked. Trans women and trans men can be trafficked, and are trafficked. Older women can be trafficked. I have clients who fall within all different categories, but they [don't match the conventional] picture of trafficking."

Oversimplified portrayals of trafficking can have devastating consequences for those who are trafficked. "When I am vacating prior convictions for survivors," say Broudo, "I view it as a legal hurdle if it's someone who isn't a cisgender [nontransgender] female minor at the time. And it shouldn't be that way." Broudo concedes that "you need people to understand that trafficking exists." But she adds that "awareness isn't enough, and awareness campaigns can have negative consequences. When somebody like [*New York Times* columnist] Nicholas Kristof writes an article about shutting down Backpage or applauding law enforcement efforts, it creates this picture that the answer is criminalization and punishment, and then people think we need to

arrest more people, and that's incredibly detrimental. And unfortunately, when there is more money and a mandate for arrests, that will often result in sex workers who may or may not have been forced into sex work being arrested."

Sex-worker activists have long voiced this concern, not to protect the sex industry (as anti-prostitution campaigners claim) but to protect themselves from the violence of arrest and the violence that results from widespread social stigma and discrimination. Defenders of sex workers' rights want to stop those arrests, while the feminists who should be their natural allies are pushing for more.

#### 'Sack of Bones on Gilgo Beach'

Between 2010 and 2011, the remains of 10 people, many identified as sex workers, were found on Long Island's Gilgo Beach. New York sex workers, including SWOP members, responded by reaching out to the families of the victims, attending vigils, and providing support to one another. Networks such as these are strong among sex workers, who cannot rely on cops, courts, or other institutions most people can turn to in times of crisis.

NOW-NYC's response to these murders, still unsolved, came in a letter from its president, Sonia Ossorio, to the *New York Daily News*. Against the backdrop of NOW's campaign to increase stings and raids in the sex trade, Ossorio complained that the paper was out of bounds for running a column questioning the public good in keeping prostitution illegal. She closed her letter by invoking the murdered women who "ended up as sacks of bones on Gilgo Beach." For Ossorio, these women's deaths are a justification for prohibition rather than a wake-up call to the dangers that prohibition creates.

It is not sex work that exposes sex workers to violence; it is our willingness to abandon sex workers to violence in an attempt to control their behavior. Prohibition makes prostitution more dangerous than it would otherwise be by pushing it underground and stripping sex workers of legal protection. The fight over that policy is about more than just strains between generations of feminism. It is about an unholy marriage of feminism with the conservatism and police power that many feminists claim to stand against.

Advocates for sex workers are making some headway in calling that alliance to account. In 2011, for the first time, sex-worker activists participated in the U.N. Universal Periodic Review of Human Rights (UPR), a review of all member states' human rights records conducted each four years. It was also the first year that the U.S. government's record on human rights was up for U.N. review.

Activist Darby Hickey, a transgender woman who has been involved in the sex trade and is currently an analyst at the Best Practices Policy Project, which defends sex worker rights, participated in the U.N. evaluation. Its findings reinforced what sex workers have been reporting for decades: American sex workers are vulnerable to discrimination and violence not simply because of their work but because of the ways institutions exclude and harm them. The United States signed on to UPR recommendations that "no one should face violence or discrimination in access to public services based on sexual orientation or their status as a person in prostitution."

"Now we'll see what they do with that," Hickey says, "and what steps they take to address violence from law enforcement and systemic violence." When it comes to criminalization and the prison system, Hickey says, "there's a general recognition that we're going in the wrong direction, but around prostitution it's going in the opposite direction, where people are saying, 'Arrest more people; increase penalties.'□" Just as the war on drugs is in many ways a war on black people, Hickey says, the war on prostitution is a war on sex workers.

If we are going to call attacks on reproductive and sexual rights a "war on women," then let's talk

about a war on women that has actual prisoners and a body count. It's a war on the women engaged in sex work, waged by women who will not hesitate to use their opponents' corpses as political props but refuse to listen to them while they are still alive and still here to fight.

---

SHARE | PRINT

---

**[Full Military Records](#)**

[Militaryrecords.us.org](http://Militaryrecords.us.org)

1) Enter Any Name & Search It! 2) Military Records Instantly



AdChoices

[VIEW COMMENTS \(82\)](#) | [LEAVE A COMMENT](#)

*Editor's Note: We invite comments and request that they be civil and on-topic. We do not moderate or assume any responsibility for comments, which are owned by the readers who post them. Comments do not represent the views of Reason.com or Reason Foundation. We reserve the right to delete any comment for any reason at any time.*

---

**SparkY** | 1.21.13 @ 1:36PM | #

*If we are going to call attacks on **reproductive and sexual rights** a "war on women,"*

There really needs to be a new term for this. The ability to have sex and make babies is not a "right."

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Virginian** | 1.21.13 @ 1:37PM | #

But the ability to control when and where and how and with whom most certainly is.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 1:48PM | #

*But the ability to control when and where and how and with whom and with whose money **most certainly is.***

FIFY

Not a right anymore, after critical fix.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Virginian** | 1.21.13 @ 1:59PM | #

Eh, you might as well command the tide to recede at this point. Telling people the government shouldn't be paying for the Pill means YOU HATE TEH WOMENZZZZZZ RIGHTSSS!!!!

War's over. We lost. When saying people should pay for their own shit is an unpopular position, it's basically over.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**SparkY** | 1.21.13 @ 2:00PM | #

You pretty much just nailed the heart of why it shouldn't be called reproductive rights.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Cytotoxic](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:06PM](#) | <#>

The war is never over. We've won some MJ legalization and some state-level victories against the worst excesses. Gun rights are more solid than they have been in a long time.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[wareagle](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:41PM](#) | <#>

*War's over. We lost.*

Nope. Not waving my flag. I don't care if it is unpopular or not, telling people to pay for their own shit is the morally right thing to do. And I'll keep doing it no matter how many statist shitheads insist otherwise.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Hyperion](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:55PM](#) | <#>

I'm not waving a flag either, but I am staring reality square in the face.

We have lost, as far as change by voting is concerned. The freeshitters and low information liberals outnumber us. It will only get worse.

State level revolt is the only thing that can save us.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[\\$parkY](#) | [1.21.13 @ 1:57PM](#) | <#>

I agree, but "reproductive rights" is the wrong terminology to convey that.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[tarran](#) | [1.21.13 @ 1:39PM](#) | <#>

I disagree: the ability to have sex is much like the ability to speak, or tap a keyboard with your fingers.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[\\$parkY](#) | [1.21.13 @ 1:56PM](#) | <#>

If you're referring, in a roundabout way, to the First Amendment, it doesn't grant the right to speak. It grants the right to speak freely. Anybody can speak, the FA prevents (in theory) people from being punished for what they say.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[entropy](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:28PM](#) | <#>

Wikipedia:

*While the United States Constitution's First Amendment identifies the rights to assemble and to petition the government, the text of the First Amendment does not make specific mention of a right to association. Nevertheless, the United States Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama that the freedom of association is an essential part of the Freedom of Speech because, in many cases, people can engage in effective speech only when they join with others.*

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[\\$parkY](#) | 1.21.13 @ 2:32PM | #

Interesting, but I'm not sure how it applies.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[entropy](#) | 1.21.13 @ 2:45PM | #

So the ability to have sex is much like the ability to speak freely. Basically sex is speech, which requires associations to be spoken.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[\\$parkY](#) | 1.21.13 @ 3:01PM | #

First, I would fix this:

So the ability to have sex is ~~much~~ exactly like the ability to speak ~~freely~~.

If (speech=sex) then (free speech=free sex).

I still maintain that calling it "reproductive rights" is wrong. Naming it that has allowed the people who coined the term to setup the discourse in a manner that can only be advantageous to them. If you want to let people get away with politicizing sex (I know, too late) then there's nothing to do but weep as it gets twisted to fit whatever argument somebody wants to make.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Anonymous Coward](#) | 1.21.13 @ 1:48PM | #

Can one person's "rights" really be exercised at another person's expense (are "reproductive rights" actual rights when some of the parties demanding those rights also demand that they be funded out of the public treasury)?

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[nicole](#) | 1.21.13 @ 1:54PM | #

Yes. That's like saying you don't have a right to life just because some people want to live on welfare.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Anonymous Coward](#) | 1.21.13 @ 2:00PM | #

Not at all. It's more like saying "I have a right to free speech, therefore I should be given a radio station." Or I have a right to be secure in my property and effects (I know, the 4th Amendment is dead letter but for the sake of argument), so Uncle Sam should build a vault under my house for me to put them in.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[nicole](#) | 1.21.13 @ 2:07PM | #

Sorry I misread your question. I meant to say that these were still *rights* even though other people do want someone else to pay for them. So reproductive rights are still rights regardless of the paid-for BC bullshit, just as free speech is still a right regardless of people who want internet access for free and shit like that.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Anonymous Coward](#) | 1.21.13 @ 2:21PM | #

I agree with all of that.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Zeb** | 1.21.13 @ 2:08PM | #

But none of that makes free speech any less of an actual right. And forcing employers to pay for birth control doesn't make using birth control if you so choose any less of a right.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Francisco d Anconia** | 1.21.13 @ 2:08PM | #

Can one person's "rights" really be exercised at another person's expense (are "reproductive rights" actual rights when some of the parties demanding those rights also demand that they be funded out of the public treasury)?

Yes

/T o n y

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**entropy** | 1.21.13 @ 2:17PM | #

Freedom of Association.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**entropy** | 1.21.13 @ 2:19PM | #

It's got nothing to do with reproduction. I don't think anyone has reproductive rights. That's almost like "income rights" or "financial rights" or something. You don't have a right to a specific end result.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Guy Laguy** | 1.21.13 @ 1:36PM | #

First they came for the sex workers, but I didn't speak up because I wasn't a sex worker.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 1:50PM | #

Sex-bots.

War of the sexes, terminated.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**nicole** | 1.21.13 @ 1:53PM | #

*"Prostitution is paid rape," claims Melissa Farley*

Am I the only one who wonders whether "paid rape" wouldn't involve paying the *rapist*?

Fucking retarded.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**SparkY** | 1.21.13 @ 1:59PM | #

A woman voluntarily giving sex in exchange for a payment is totally the same as being

raped by a guy who then throws some money on her.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:00PM | #

Just another misandrist feminazi that deserves no more than to be relegated to the dust bin of one of the dumbest periods in history. In fact, I don't believe we can survive much more stupid.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**wareagle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:44PM | #

clearly, you underestimate the public's tolerance for and ability to strive to new levels of stupid.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:57PM | #

No, I don't underestimate that at all. I just don't think we will survive it as a prosperous and free society.

Both our freedom and prosperity are slipping away right before our eyes, and the ones who caused it, think the cure is to double down on stupid.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Virginian** | 1.21.13 @ 2:01PM | #

Is it sexist to say that there is no more idiotic "ism" than feminism?

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Zeb** | 1.21.13 @ 2:02PM | #

That would make more sense.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dagny T.** | 1.21.13 @ 2:03PM | #

By their retarded logic, we are all "paid slaves" of our employers. Buying groceries is "paid theft." Nothing is voluntary, everything is exploitation, everyone is a victim.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**nicole** | 1.21.13 @ 2:08PM | #

I believe they call that "wage slaves" ;)

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dagny T.** | 1.21.13 @ 2:11PM | #

I have never heard that said sincerely, though. It is always at least partially tongue-in-cheek. This stupid cunt actually thinks that prostitution is a "form of" rape, because "rape" to these people now means any fucking that is unapproved.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Warty** | 1.21.13 @ 2:13PM | #

*stupid cunt*

Look at you, with your false consciousness and your Stockholm Syndrome, using the language of your oppressors.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**nicole** | 1.21.13 @ 2:15PM | #

Ask (or not), and **ye shall receive**.

Actually I think the most interesting thing about calling this rape is, as always, the implicit connection to consent--why can prostitution *not* be consensual? Now, think about why consent is impossible in this case (as in so many others, where rape and "feminists" are concerned), but why it *is* possible WRT to the state...

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dagny T.** | 1.21.13 @ 2:21PM | #

I think there's a reasonable debate that reasonable people can have about consent, but that's not the debate the feminists are interested in having.

As far as I am concerned, if a person is physically able to walk, run, or crawl out of the room and chooses not to do so, whatever happens after that may not be pretty but it sure as fuck isn't rape.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**nicole** | 1.21.13 @ 2:32PM | #

No, they're not interested in having it, and they're not interested in applying their own ideas to most other things.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Jordan** | 1.21.13 @ 2:09PM | #

They probably believe that. Especially the part with respect to employers.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**entropy** | 1.21.13 @ 2:22PM | #

Yeah, but what's your point?

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**nicole** | 1.21.13 @ 2:09PM | #

I should also note I find this particularly hilarious since we were just recently having a discussion about whether rapists should be allowed to just offer some kind of payoff to their victim, and whether the victim should then be able to stop criminal prosecution.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Lyle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:03PM | #

Legalize paid for sex!

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**\$park¥** | 1.21.13 @ 2:06PM | #

It's the only way some people will get it.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

---

**Lyle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:52PM | #

I wouldn't know. ;)

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Zeb** | 1.21.13 @ 2:05PM | #

The "All prostitution is sex slavery/human trafficking" people are awful. There are people who are actually forced into prostitution and pretending that all people who do sex for money are in the same situation can only be making it worse for those who have actually been forced into sexual slavery.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dagny T.** | 1.21.13 @ 2:08PM | #

They *want* more people to be victims. The more people are real or as-defined-by-Newspeak "victims," the better. They are beyond ghoulis.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**OldMexican** | 1.21.13 @ 2:18PM | #

Re: Zeb,

The "All prostitution is sex slavery/human trafficking" people are awful.

Not to mention *creepy*. In one of Stossel's shows, he invited ex-prosecutor Wendy Murphy who reiterated that prostitution is forbidden in order to "protect" women from a life of exploitation, even when confronted by Stossel's very valid point that many women CHOSE to become prostitutes. She would have none of that, saying that most women would never choose such a profession (a contention presumably based on her ability to read minds) and so they should be protected from such decisions. My skin just curled by the thought that this woman used to prosecute people.

Another display of pure creepiness was when Stossel invited Lis Wiehl to talk about the same subject, and the Petunia Pig-like blonde just weaseled her way out of a coherent argument for prohibition by saying "well, it's policy!"

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dr. Frankenstein** | 1.21.13 @ 2:30PM | #

She did provide a good example of the real meaning of begging the question.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**wareagle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:47PM | #

didn't Stossel also have one of the girls from a Nevada brothel saying it was nobody's damn business if she had sex with others for money?

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:06PM | #

*everyone is a victim*, who is not a white male

All of this fixin is becoming a full time job around here...

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dagny T.** | 1.21.13 @ 2:16PM | #

I don't know, Hype, I am sure the mantle of loserdom could easily be extended to include white males, on any number of grievances. Plenty of the Occupy whining was done by just such a demographic. The Oppression (Special) Olympics is a fast growing sport for damn near everyone from what I can see.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:22PM | #

I recall that back during the height of the OWS movement, speakers saying things like 'minorities and women speak first, white males to the back of the line'. I actually recall some even saying that they didn't want white men in the movement at all, especially older white males. So we have all sorts of racism and sexism going on in the movement, and no one seemed to notice it, except those outside of the movement.

Those males are not exactly what I would call men, or they wouldn't put up with such bullshit just in order that they might get lucky with some greasy hair OWS slut.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:28PM | #

But I get your point. Some of the older white males around where I live, are some of the most self-righteous, whiney ass, I'm a victim, people on the planet.

I remember after hurricane Irene, the power was out for several days. I was driving around trying to find a gas station that had working pumps, like a lot of other folks.

I stopped at one because I saw someone inside and tried the pumps, to no avail.

But this old guy, probably in his 60s, comes up to me, with sour face and went off on a tirade about how all of this was the fault of capitalists like BGE who don't care about people, only about their profits.

I politely pointed out that BGE was not making money while the electric was off and that they had crews, including from out of state, working 24/7 to restore power, and that I think they cared.

He didn't like that at all, scowled at me, and went off in a huff, mumbling something about damn capitalist. That's when I saw the Obama - Biden 2008 sticker on his car.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Dagny T.** | 1.21.13 @ 2:43PM | #

We are seeing the rise of the professional loser class. Pretty soon, simply defining oneself as a non-victim will be considered a form of oppression.

Seeing an Obama '08 sticker is a sure sign of someone who has doubled down on loserdom.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**wareagle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:49PM | #

*the professional loser class*

I like that and will be using it. It's a nice replacement to congregants in the church of the aggrieved and the offended.

+1 winner in your life.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**OldMexican** | 1.21.13 @ 2:09PM | #

These battles were now being fought in the name of combating "sexual exploitation," "sex trafficking," and "sex slavery."

The above can only mean that the puritanical Statists have run out of politically-correct excuses to keep victimizing women that way and are now resorting to pure *sophistry*. Previously, the State victimized female sex workers in the name of public health and morality; now they victimize them in order to "save" them from a fate presumably worse than being incarcerated and stigmatized for life.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:14PM | #

*The above can only mean that the puritanical Statists have run out of politically-correct excuses to keep victimizing*

No so fast.

**The ultimate minority**

They can only pray that they won't be smarter than the average low information voter...

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Fladnag the Yarg** | 1.21.13 @ 2:14PM | #

Sex for money is way cheaper than sex for "love".

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Hyperion** | 1.21.13 @ 2:17PM | #

Especially if the latter involves marriage.

Which is why I still cannot figure out the gays desire to be legally married.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**OldMexican** | 1.21.13 @ 2:22PM | #

Re: Fladhag the Yarg,

Sex for money is way cheaper than sex for "love".

Not to mention that sex for cash is a totally voluntary transaction whereas as a married guy I'm *expected* to perform... at ANY time... no matter how late or how much I just want some shut-eye...

So if anybody else tells me that marriage is like institutionalized prostitution, I am going to punch that person in the fucking face for not knowing what he or she speaks.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**H. Reardon** | 1.21.13 @ 2:51PM | #

OM - you are truly oppressed.

I wish I had your problem. My wife gets to have it whenever she want's. My problem is that she rarely wants it.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**H. Reardon** | 1.21.13 @ 2:53PM | #

Please ignore that stray apostrophe. Who in the hell left the door open?

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**RandomJackass** | 1.21.13 @ 2:19PM | #

"It's fascinating that women who claim to be feminists [...] are willing to use the law to coerce a particular kind of behavior from women."

Is it really? It's actually commonplace for illiberal "progressives" to use the law to coerce individual behavior.

From mandating that we all pay into misguided "insurance" schemes to mandating when and where we can exercise our rights to free speech, self defense, and private property, or even to regulating the size of beverage cups, nobody should be surprised. It's not at all fascinating - it's disturbing to see it happening again and again in a supposedly free country.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Suthenboy** | 1.21.13 @ 2:41PM | #

The whole 'free country/ supposedly free country' canard should be dropped. I have done it many times myself, but the last time I did I thought " WTF Suthenboy, someone is going to call you on this".

Does anyone here really believe this is a free country, or even supposed to be one? That it has any chance of becoming one?

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Randian** | 1.21.13 @ 2:42PM | #

Me myself, I'm a bit tired of the eschaton/Cassandra levels of handwringing that go on in certain libertarian communities.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Liberty** | 1.21.13 @ 2:51PM | #

It's a freer country than Sweden or Hati. We aren't committing "hate crimes" by saying what we do. The problem with the "I'm so oppressed this is worse than Hitler" rants are that they prevent people from taking action to defend our last few freedoms.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**wareagle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:53PM | #

yes, it is supposed to be free and, yes, when weighed against much of the world, it still is. Doesn't mean we are without forces who wish to change that, but the US is not

Somalia just yet.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Randian** | 1.21.13 @ 2:40PM | #

One place where the argument gets confused and conflated is the "impression" into prostitution versus the alleged enlightened pro who gets thousands of dollars an hour to be in Vegas.

As libertarians, we have a bit of an issue when a 14-year-old girl is basically raised in a shitty neighborhood and is more or less effectively sold to the crack-dealer or madam down the street to be turned out starting at the age of legal consent, and works as a pro because that's all she ever has known.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**AlmightyJB** | 1.21.13 @ 2:50PM | #

And if prostitution was legal and out in the open we could be using our limited resources to stop actual human trafficking instead of the voluntary adult exchange of money and services.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**AlmightyJB** | 1.21.13 @ 2:55PM | #

With legal and open prostitution you could also make sure those women had the ability to seek help with outside groups to discuss getting them out of that life if they so choose.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Randian** | 1.21.13 @ 2:56PM | #

I think that most of the world's prostitutes are closer to the "not voluntary" side than the voluntary one, unfortunately.

I should say that I don't disagree with you, but what is and is not voluntary is a sticky wicket on certain issues.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**wareagle** | 1.21.13 @ 2:54PM | #

I would hope that having "an issue" with the 14-year is not confined to libertarians; that as human beings, we would have a problem with that.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

**Randian** | 1.21.13 @ 2:57PM | #

The issue, to be a little more clear, is that (a) we relatively speaking want parents to be able to raise their children how we wish and (b) want the State to leave people who are "of age" alone with their choices so long as they aren't harming others.

On a psychological level, I have a hard time saying that a pro who has been doing it since she was 16 because she's hooked on crank is doing it "voluntarily" and with full and robust consent.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Liberty](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:43PM](#) | <#>

I think these women have the liberty to live their lifestyle, to sell themselves. But they aren't "sex workers." They're hoers. And trannies should be treated as men, that's what they are, biologically. And I really don't see why we should have sympathy for these women. Last year I paid tens of thousands in taxes to support their food stamps. Let's talk about that.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Dagny T.](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:50PM](#) | <#>

I actually agree with you. Just because it should be legal doesn't mean we have to impart some kind of dignity on it. And probably, if the movement to legalize whoring just fucking left it at that and didn't try to cram a lot of PC terminology and free shit down our throats, it would be a lot more palatable. Society is going to continue to judge whores as whores, and that is fine.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[AlmightyJB](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:46PM](#) | <#>

Even if you think drugs and prostitution are terrible things, it should be blatantly obvious that the statist "cures" are far worse then the "disease".

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Suthenboy](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:59PM](#) | <#>

"... it should be blatantly obvious....statist "cures" are far worse...".

It is. However, making things better is not the goal of the statist.

Using arguments of reason, logic and fact is pointless against prohibitionists because their opposition is not based on reason, logic or fact. In the same way you will never get anywhere arguing with a statist by pointing out that their proposed solutions are worse than the status quo.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Liberty](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:49PM](#) | <#>

Feminists hate competition. If there is prostitution, maybe men wouldn't put up with their crap. But at the same time I could see their point. It IS exploitation. These women are not enlightened rational actors providing a service in a wonderful capitalist paradise. They are poor, drug addicted, disease ridden women. We should condemn them whenever the subject comes up even as we argue for their rights, especially when they reproduce and raise their children up to live in that lifestyle. They are why I gave money to Project Prevention.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[wareagle](#) | [1.21.13 @ 2:58PM](#) | <#>

many a large city is full of attractive, smart women who are highly-paid escorts. In practical terms, they are still whores, prostitutes, or whatever basic term you choose.

I fail to see how they are exploited. They appear to understand capitalism perfectly well. Doesn't mean I want my daughters doing it, but free will means NOT doing something, too.

[log in](#) or [register](#) to reply

---

[Zair](#) | [1.21.13 @ 3:03PM](#) | <#>

They are poor, drug addicted, disease ridden women