

# Porn vs. Art

by Alicia Hartman

**What is it?** Pornography.  
**Who produces it?** The Media.  
**Where can you find it?** Everywhere—magazines, movies, books, etc.  
**Why is pornography produced?** Because sex and violence sell.  
**How can the media be permitted to produce pornographic material?** The

*"They're posing for a purpose, and that purpose might be money, but no one is forcing them to pose."*

First Amendment.

What is pornography? Writings or pictures intended to arouse one's sexual desires. It is portrayed through violent sex or sexual implications.

Example: A nude woman posing, with her sexual body parts accented in red and black lace. Her body is covered with sweat. It trickles down her face and arms and comes together at her chest. It proceeds down her stomach and onto her pelvis. The beads of sweat then separate, as they flow onto each thigh and then down her legs.

A picture of a nude woman tied up with rope and chains, bound to the bed. Her legs are spread apart as a man forces her to have sexual intercourse with him. She is crying, but she is deathly afraid to scream for help, fearing he might hit her again. His touch is rough, threatening, and unmerciful. He has total control over her. She has fought back as much as she can. She is exhausted and weakness overtakes her. She succumbs to him.

Who is to blame for this pornographic material? Society? The Media? How can the media produce such material? The answer—because of the First Amendment:

"Congress shall make no law representing an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

There has always been the argument of whether pornography is a form of art or not.

Example: a statue of a nude human. Some would say that this is pornography because of the "unmoral" exposure of the human body. On the other hand it's considered "art", because it was created by an "artist". What if it was a picture of a nude human? Many would say that this is

pornography because it wasn't created by a true artist.

So how do you draw the line between pornography and art? Some say that sculptures and paintings of nude humans are "art" because they are created by a professional. Nude sculptors and paintings are not exact images of the human. On the other side, pictures and movies with nude humans are



"pornography" because an exact image of the human body is portrayed.

Fine. But what about comparing a statue of a nude man and a nude woman making love, versus a picture of a nude woman. Which of the two has a stronger sexual implication? The statue is the worse of the two evils here, because it has a stronger sexual implication.

Back to my question: how

can you make a distinction between porno and art? You can't. Everyone sees things differently, and we all have our individual opinions and ideas. What's art to me may be pornography to you and vice-versa.

Why is porno such a popular thing? Because sex and violence sell, especially when you combine the two.

There are people who say that pornography influences men to rape or sexually abuse women and children. Possibly, but there are also cases where men who physically harm women and children in sexual manners were abused themselves earlier in their lives. However, not all men who read porno magazines are going to go out and sexually molest their wife, girlfriend, or children.

I know there's someone out there saying, "but look how those poor, innocent women are victimized!" They don't look too "innocent" to me. These women are pretty and have good figures. They're posing for a purpose, and that purpose may be money, but no one is forcing them to pose. They choose to.

And why is it always women who are victims of pornography? There are porno magazines where males are pictured nude.

So what should our country do, ban porno material? If you're going to ban magazines like *Playboy* and *Playgirl*, then you better wipe those lusty love books (that women love so

much) off the shelves too.

How about adding a clause to the First Amendment? "...Freedom of the press, but nothing pornographic may be published." Freedom of the press means freedom of the press, whether it's a picture of Behrend College or a picture of a naked woman. Some may favor adding such a clause to the First Amendment, but once you give up part of your right to do something, little by little, more

*"Freedom of the press means freedom of the press, whether it's a picture of Behrend College or a picture of a naked woman."*

is taken away from you.

I for one, would like to leave the First Amendment as it is and have pornography published. No one is forcing you to look at porno material. Isn't it easier to just not buy porno magazines if you don't like them than to have to fight for a right you were guaranteed over 200 years ago?

Alicia Hartman is a first semester communications major. Her column appears every other week in *The Collegian*.

## The Media Is Doing An Accurate Job On The Campaign

by Dave Barry

As the nation enters the "home stretch" of the 1992 election race, it's time to address the question of whether we in the new media are doing an accurate, fair and responsible job of covering the bozos running for president.

I would have to say, in all objectivity, that we are. Oh, I realize that there are some critics who believe that we in the media are a bunch of childish, irresponsible snots with zero attention span and no interest in real issues. Well, let me tell you something, Mr. Media Critic: Your fly is unzipped. Ha ha! Made you look!

Seriously, I'm sick and tired of this media-bashing. I happen to be darned proud of the job that we journalists do, sometimes under very difficult circumstances. I'll give you an example from the Republican Convention:

It was the night that George Bush was to give his speech accepting the nomination, and all of us in the media knew that unless he gave The Speech of His Life, his candidacy was doomed. We had learned this the same way we learn everything, namely by

conducting a scientific poll of 549 people.

Perhaps you are saying: "Wait a minute. You can't get any kind of meaningful information by polling only 549 people."

Oh yes we can. Because this is a SCIENTIFIC poll. These are not just any old 549 people. These are, by scientific measurement, the 549 stupidest people in America who can still answer the telephone. We in the new media get all our major facts from them. That's why, as the presidential race has developed over the past two years, we've been able to inform you, with complete confidence, that: (1) George Bush was unbeatable; (2) Bill Clinton was doomed; (3) Ross Perot had a very serious chance; (4) George Bush was doomed (5) Bill Clinton was unbeatable; and (6) Ross Perot never had a chance. You do not obtain information of this consistency without the aid of science.

So anyway, when the Republican Convention was held, our polls showed that George Bush was scientifically doomed, and his only hope was to give The Speech Of His Life. Everybody in the media was saying this: A gang of leading pundits roamed the convention press center, and if they found a

journalist who had failed to use the words "The Speech Of His Life" in a news report, they'd knock this offender down, and Jack Germond would sit on him while David Broder yanked off his press credentials in a painful manner.



### Dave Barry

I was with a group of journalists who had decided to cover the President's speech from a Houston establishment named, but rarely

called, "Richard Heads' Restaurant and Bar." Our idea was that we'd find ordinary voters there, and we could gauge their reaction to the speech, using a battery-powered reaction gauge.

The problem was that this particular night turned out to be Bikers' Night at Richard Heads'. And when I say "bikers", I'm not talking about the health fanatics you see pedaling furiously around on their 10-speeds, wearing what appear to be girdles from space. I'm talking about people who ride Harley-Davidson motorcycles; large, muscular, hairy people who have individual tattoos larger than my entire body. And those are just the WOMEN.

Fortunately the bikers were basically friendly, by which I mean they did not pick us up by our small-circumference journalistic necks and use us in a game of Human Wall Darts. But they did not seem at all interested in the President's speech. You could see the President on a ceiling-mounted TV, but you couldn't hear him, because there was a very loud jukebox playing heavy-metal songs by bands with names like Ear Discharge.

We were able, however, to follow the speech, because one of us, Craig, had a cellular

phone, which he used to call a friend of his in Washington, D.C., who was watching TV.

"WHAT'S HE SAYING NOW?" Craig would shout to his friend. Then he'd turn to us and shout: IT'S SOMETHING ABOUT CAPITAL GAINS. OR MAYBE WAR WITH SPAIN."

Meanwhile, the rest of us, as trained observers, were sharing our observations on the speech. "HE HAS ONLY ONE STRIPE ON HIS TIE," somebody would observe. And somebody else would say: "I THINK HE'S MAKING THE HAND GESTURES OF HIS LIFE."

And thus, using gritty determination and advanced journalism techniques, we were able to overcome major obstacles to journalism techniques, "get the story" and report it to the American people, who were unable to watch this vital speech themselves because they had rented "Revenge of the Nerds."

And so, Mr. Media Critic, don't try to tell ME that we're not doing a heck of a job. The U.S. new media corps just so happens to be the finest corps of new media in the entire nation. And that statement is not just my opinion. It's backed up by a scientific poll.