

The Society for Promotion of Community Standards Inc.  
P.O. Box 13-683 Johnsonville  
<http://www.spcs.org.nz> spcs.org@gmail.com

**SUBMISSION TO:**  
**THE OFFICE OF FILM AND LITERATURE CLASSIFICATION**

17 October 2005

**RE: CLASSIFICATION OF**  
**CRITIC: Issue 23, 19 September 2005**  
**Editor Ms Holly Walker**

[CRITIC is owned by Planet Media Dunedin Ltd a wholly owned subsidiary of the Otago University Student Association]

**Summary: The Society submits that the publication *Critic* (Issue 23, 19 September 2005) should be classified “objectionable.” Its contents fall within s. 3(2)(b); s. 3(3)(a); s. 3(3)(c) and 3(3)(d) of The Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act (1993) [henceforth referred to as “the Act”].**

**Explanation:** The articles from *Critic* - “Diary of a Drug Rapist” (pp. 24-26) and “Max Hardcore” (pp. 20-22) - are the main focus of the Society’s submission.

S. 3(2)(b): The publication is “objectionable” because it “tends to promote or support or promotes and supports ... the use of violence or coercion to compel any person to participate in, or submit to, sexual conduct.” It offers a how-to-do recipe for serial drug rapists and would-be drug rapists, assisting them on means of avoiding detection, maximising their pleasure and gains from sexually violating and raping women (e.g. recommending specific drugs helpful for committing anal rape) and degrading the woman’s partner and the effective targeting of Christian women.

The Office of Film and Literature Classification (henceforth referred to as OFLC) has classified a number of documents “objectionable” on the basis that they encourage and promote criminal activity (see Appendix I). Rape and sexual violation are both “sexual crimes” and are dealt with under the Crimes Act 1961 Part 7 “Crimes Against Religion Morality and Public Welfare.” Amendments to the Act that came into force in May 2005 make it very clear that sexual violation (vaginal or anal) constitute “rape” when either is committed against a person who cannot offer resistance to the activity. The Act states:

S. 128A. Allowing sexual activity does not amount to consent in some circumstances

S. 128A (1) A person does not consent to sexual activity just because he or she does not protest or offer physical resistance to the activity.

S. 128A (3) A person does not consent to sexual activity if the activity occurs while he or she is asleep or unconscious.

S. 128 (A)(4) A person does not consent to sexual activity if the activity occurs while he or she is so affected by alcohol or some other drug that he or she cannot consent or refuse to consent to the activity.

S. 128B (1) “Every one who commits sexual violation is liable [liable on conviction on indictment] to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 20 years.”

A drugged woman is unable to offer resistance to sexual violation or rape and such degrading acts committed against her are acts of sexual violence. They are immoral acts (“Crimes Against Religion Morality” s. 7 of the Crimes Act 1961) that degrade, demean and dehumanise the victim and impose a life sentence on her.

The *Critic* (Issue 23) publication is also objectionable applying s. 3(3) of the Act.

Consideration of “the extent and degree to which, and the manner in which, the publication... describes, depicts, or otherwise deals with the following matters, leads the Society to conclude that it is “objectionable”:

3(3)(a)(i) Acts of torture, the infliction of serious physical harm, or acts of significant cruelty:

3(3) (a) (ii) Sexual violence or sexual coercion, or violence or coercion in association with sexual conduct:

3(3) (a) (iii) Other sexual or physical conduct of a degrading or dehumanising or demeaning nature:

3(3) (a)(v) Physical conduct in which sexual satisfaction is derived from inflicting or suffering cruelty or pain:

3(3) (c) Degrades or dehumanises or demeans any person:

3 (3)(d) Promotes or encourages criminal acts or acts of terrorism:

Treatment of women (a “class” as defined in the Human Rights Act: based on gender)

3(3)(e) Represents (whether directly or by implication) that members of any particular class of the public are inherently inferior to other members of the public by reason of any characteristic of members of that class, being a characteristic that is a prohibited ground of discrimination specified in section 21(1) of the Human Rights Act 1993.

A formal complaint from SPCS over the breach of s. 121(1) of the Act by the publisher of *Critic* (Issue 23) has been made by the SPCS to the Censorship Compliance, Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington. The use of a R18 (red sticker) ‘restriction label’ on the front cover of the magazine and its message breaches the law. Only the Film and Video Labelling Body can issue authorised labels for use of restricted publications and any action on the part of a publisher to subvert the integrity of this system is a serious offence under the Act.

Note 1: All material highlighted (underlined in bold font) is quoted directly from *Critic* (Issue 23, 19 September 2005). The Society's commentary and comments follow on from quoted passages.

Note 2: **“The 1993 Act clearly prohibits any work endorsing sexual violence, paedophilia, bestiality, urophilia and coprophilia”** (*Critic*, p. 27) [Emphasis added]

Note 3: *Critic* Issue 23, 19 Sept 2005 is available on line. The article entitled “Diary of a drug rapist” is the only part of the publication that cannot be accessed. *Critic* has chosen to block access to this article – probably in response to the submission of the publication to the Chief Censor's Office for classification, by the Office of the Commissioner of Police

Abbreviations: In this submission The Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act (1993) is referred to throughout as “the Act”. The Office of Film and Literature Classification, headed by Chief Censor, Mr Bill Hastings and his deputy, Ms Nicola McCully, is referred to as the OFLC.

**Detailed Analysis of Critic (Issue 23).** *All bold text underlined is direct quotation*

**Editorial [by Ms Holly Walker]** [p. 3]

**Read this first!**

**I want you to know before you read on that parts of this issue of Critic are so offensive they make me feel physically sick. Consider yourself warned.**

This admission by Ms Holly Walker, editor of *Critic*, that she found parts of the publication (in particular “Diary of a drug rapist” and “Max Hardcore: the most offensive man in porn”) “so offensive” to the point of making her “feel physically sick”; shows that the nation-wide public outrage over this publication is understandable. It raises the obvious question:

Why would any educated editor make a conscious effort to publish material that she/he knew would grossly offend many people, including rape victims and those seeking to rehabilitate and care for such victims - material that the Society submits, is unquestionably “objectionable”?

It is noteworthy that the Office of the Commissioner of the NZ Police has seen fit to submit the *Critic* publication for classification, highlighting serious concerns over the drug rape article.

The Society has witnessed the detrimental effects of offensive and gratuitous material promoting vaginal and anal rape and necrophilia on the minds of nine members of the Film and Literature Board of Review who regularly have the difficult task of reviewing hardcore porn/graphic violence literature and films like *Baise-Moi* and *Irreversible*. The *Critic* (p. 28) describes Board members, who are paid to classify such material, as “pillars of the community”.

One example should suffice. While making its oral submission on the film *Bully* to the Board at the Department of Internal Affairs in Wellington in August 2002, SPCS executive members present (as well as members of the media) witnessed the reaction of the president of the Board, Ms Claudia Elliott, to its straight forward account of one of the gratuitous rape scenes in the film. (The Board had just viewed the film prior to the presentation). Ms Elliott was violently sick in

the meeting room during a description of a rape scene. This forced a closedown of the meeting for about 20 minutes so the room could be cleaned before proceedings could be resumed. The Board members naturally tried to downplay the unfortunate spectacle suggesting that there was no link between the physical reaction of the president to the description of the film content. The Chief Censor's Office and Board members regularly attempt to downplay the effects "objectionable" content on the minds of readers and viewers, despite being presented with documented evidence of its detrimental impact on viewers.

*Critic* notes on page 28 in reference to the Board: "**we can only observe the liberality of their judgements**". The Board cleared the film *Bully* for screening in NZ public theatres by supporting the R18 classification imposed earlier by the OFLC. The Society received reports of a number of groups of people having to leave screenings of *Bully* at the Rialto in Wellington because members of their group became physically sick during the film in direct response to exposure to its objectionable content (rape scenes). Similar reports have been well documented in the media relating to public screenings of films such as *Irreversible* and *Baise-Moi* which both feature graphic and gratuitous depictions of the rape of a woman. And yet the Chief Censor Bill Hastings and his deputy (both hold statutory positions) and every one of the nine members of the Board have seen fit to allow adults to watch these films for the purpose of "entertainment" in mainstream NZ cinemas.

The Society wishes to stress that while the content matter of a publication like *Critic* may offend people and possibly even cause them to be physically sick in extreme cases, this is not the critical issue that censors must consider when deciding whether a publication is "objectionable".

The "deeming provisions" under s. 3(2) of the Act do not require censors to determine the degree to which a publication offends people, or the extent to which it might be considered in bad taste or whether it makes people physically sick. Some squeamish people feel sick at the sight of blood (human or animal blood), cockroaches, people living in crowded slum conditions with poor sanitation etc. Of course, documenting such reactions does not constitute a legal basis for ruling a publication "objectionable".

Under s. 3(2)(b) of the Act, if a publication "promotes or supports or tends to promote or support ...The use of violence or coercion to compel any person to participate in, or submit to, sexual conduct"; then the censorship authority must classify it "objectionable".

The Society submits that the publication *Critic* (Issue 23, Sept 19, 2005) contains content – "A diary of a drug rapist" - that falls within s. 3(2)(b) of the Act and therefore the publication is "objectionable". Other content matter ("Max hardcore...") falls within s. 3 (a)(ii) ["Other sexual or physical conduct of a degrading or dehumanising or demeaning nature" and s. 3. (c) ["Degrades or dehumanises or demeans any person"]].

**...I think the arguments for using an issue of Critic to test the boundaries of taste are strong and defensible.**

*Critic* editor Ms Holly Walker has failed to understand that her right and/or that of her colleagues to test "the boundaries of taste" by publishing this issue of *Critic*, is not the issue here. She refuses to acknowledge that the issue raised by this publication, the one that has caused the Society and the Office of the Commissioner of Police to both submit *Critic* to the OFLC for classification, is its "objectionable" content. The determination of what constitutes

“objectionable” content does not involve taking up a straw poll, running a public jury on people’s personal tastes concerning the printed media, or setting new boundary lines in law to accommodate the likes of Holly Walker’s views. It involves the censorship “experts” applying a legal test in the first instance to the publication following its submission in accord with the Act.

The OFLC has a statutory duty to address the questions:

1. Does this publication come within s. 3(2) of the Act?
2. Specifically: Does it promote or support OR tend to promote or support “The use of violence or coercion to compel any person to participate in, or submit to, sexual conduct”?

**By offending you, I hope this issue of Critic challenges you to think about what offends you, and why, and to confront some of the decidedly unpalatable images, acts and attitudes which, despite their high level of offensiveness, are pretty all-pervasive in our society, particularly since the advent of the internet, and to think about what kind of society we live in that produces them.**

This threadbare and inane series of excuses from Ms Holly Walker for knowingly and deliberately offending readers serves as no justification for publishing “objectionable” content. There is no defence in law for publishing “objectionable” content. Ms Walker has no grounds for claiming that she was unaware that the content may be legally constituted as “objectionable”.

It is a specious argument that suggests that just because the internet contains a “high level of offensiveness” then *Critic* is justified in publishing “objectionable” content (note Walker refuses to acknowledge a distinction between “objectionable” content and offensive content that is not “objectionable”). Images traded via the internet and downloaded internet site material are publications regularly being classified “objectionable” by the OFLC.

If Ms Walker’s argument is to be accepted as a justification for publishing “objectionable” content, then s. 3(2) and s. 3(3) of the Act are irrelevant. If the law is not to be enforced on these matters, then why not just give publishers free reign to publish material promoting and supporting every activity listed under s. 3(2) of the Act, including paedophilia, bestiality, rape etc? Parliament has spoken clearly on this matter. The relevant statutes prove that the will of parliament is that all material that promotes or supports or tends to promote or support s. 3(2) activities, should be classified “objectionable” and consequently the publication containing such material must be banned.

It is a specious argument that seeks to justify “objectionable” content on the grounds that it serves the public good in provoking people to consider just where the boundary lines should be drawn. The lines have been drawn. The problem is that the Chief Censor, Mr Bill Hastings, and the Board of Review have demonstrated, in the Society’s opinion, an unwillingness to apply the law in a number of test cases. Publications such as *Baise-Moi* and *Visitor Q* are good examples. However, the Society applauds the Chief Censor where he and his officials have applied the law correctly (e.g. Jim Peron’s paedophile manual *Unbound* Vol. 1 No. 4 [1987]; and computer games *Postal 2* and *Manhunt* – all classified “objectionable”).

**I had a similar dilemma this week over the article that appears on page 24, entitled “Diary of a drug rapist”. This purports to be the real-life experience of a drink-spiker in Dunedin,**

**complete with misogynist internal dialogue, graphic sexual content, and generally offensive and shocking undertones. It's not real, of course...**

Ms Holly Walker appears to believe that because an account is not “a real-life experience” (i.e. it actually happened in “real” space-time), then somehow this diminishes the chance that it could be classified “objectionable”. However, content matter does not have to reflect an actual “real-life experience” to be classified “objectionable”. Sexual perverts regularly fantasise about raping women and/or children. If their fantasies, once committed to writing or film, are published and are judged by censors to tend to promote the activity, then they are considered legally “objectionable”.

**... and is objectively no worse than Brett Easton Ellis's “classic” novel American Psycho, but that doesn't detract from the fact that it's a horrible and horrifying read.**

Again Ms Walker misses the point. Whether or not a publication is “horrible” or a “horrifying read” is irrelevant to the censor's task of dealing with s. 3(2). While it is true that “horror” is one of the jurisdictional “gateway” issues listed in s. 3(1) that a publication must pass through allowing censors to consider restriction issues, Walker is referring here to a level of horror that may breach the censorship boundaries. Critic must be classified on its own content, without reference to *American Psycho*.

**So why include it? Well, I hope it shocks people into taking care when leaving drinks unattended.**

So why not have the next issue of *Critic* explore the most successful strategies used by serial paedophiles to abuse children and avoid detection? So why not sexually stimulate students with raunchy depictions of bestiality so they will be so shocked at their positive reactions, that they would feel guilt-ridden about their response (this could be ‘educational’)? So why not depict graphic scenes of necrophilia obtained from the internet or from films like *Visitor Q*, just to shock students into realising how depraved internet and film content has become? So why not publish nude pictures of *Critic* staff obtained from hidden video cameras in the Student Union toilets so that students will realise how easily it is for their private lives to be invaded by Big Brother? So why not publish explicit and “objectionable” close-up content from the anal rape scene from “Baise-Moi” to highlight why the country needs a new Chief Censor, deputy and Board of Review?

**While it's offensive, it's also informative, and it certainly draws the reader's attention to what to look out for to combat this sinister but growing trend.**

Just because a publication is informative and provides some insight into what to avoid, this does not provide a defence in law for publishing and disseminating “objectionable content”. A well written article on the dangers of drug rape by a compassionate and informed female police officer in conjunction with social workers and medical staff, would avoid any hint of “objectionable” content and yet fully inform, warn and stimulate thinking students. The Society would recommend *Critic* publishes an apology to all Rape Crisis groups and victims of rape for its extreme level of insensitivity in publishing this article and for the offence it has caused. It would appear that *Critic* staff have not bothered to consult with any professional in the field of rape crisis prior to publishing this offensive article (Dunedin rape crisis have publicly criticised

*Critic* over the article). Ms Walker has committed a very serious error of judgement for which she and her editorial staff should be held accountable (as well as the publisher Planet Media Ltd).

**And while I can't speak with authority on this subject, I also think it is probably a fairly accurate portrayal of the state of mind of somebody who would engage in such behaviour. It's not pretty, but it really happens, and that's the scary thing.**

An article that is “objectionable” cannot be defended on the dubious ground that it “probably [gives] a fairly accurate portrayal of the state of mind” of a drug-rapist. There are many who can speak with authority on the subject of drug rape – victims, their counsellors and police psychologists, to name a few. We believe they would all be sickened by the drug rape article.

**...I know this issue is offensive. I'm offended by it (and not just the drink-spiking article – another feature about porn producer Max Hardcore is also pretty tough going), and I expect most of you will be, too.**

On the one hand Walker admits here that she knows that the material is offensive (it even offended her!) and then apologises on national television to a woman (a rape victim) who was offended by the article, that she did not *intend* for the article to be offend her. *The next day Ms Walker spoke on public radio declaring that she was unrepentant about her actions and would publish the article again if she had half the chance to do it again.*

**I've lost sleep over what my friends, family and superiors will think of it.**

Clearly the editor knew in her conscience that there were matters of “community standards” and the censorship laws to consider. To describe the article on hardcore porn, as “tough going” is a code word used by extreme liberals who are in a state of denial that the content is “objectionable”. The same type of nebulous phrase (“It's pretty 'out there' !” ) was used by Chief Censor Bill Hastings to describe the content matter in the brutal rape film *Baise-Moi* when he discussed it with Steven Gray on Radio 95 bFM. (Wednesday 12.16 p.m., 27 March 2002). After having reached the conclusion that it was “objectionable” and should be banned, following his first viewing, months before the radio interview; some six months later he changed his mind (after listening to public opinion), and cleared the film for adult viewing at film festivals.

**But I decided that if I did make an offensive issue, I wanted to make sure it really did challenge people into considering their assumptions and confronting the nastiness of what really goes on out there. I think it's safe to say that this issue does that. Good luck getting through it.**

This same misguided reasoning could be used to try and justify “objectionable” material that is claimed to confront paedophilia, bestiality or necrophilia. An editor's claimed “intent” in publishing “objectionable” content is irrelevant to the task of censors applying s. 3(2). The fact that Holly Walker may not have known, or claims that she did not know, that the content matter might be “objectionable”; is no defence in law for publishing such material. The whole “intent” of *Critic* Issue 23 is to deliberately offend readers using obscenity, lurid and morally putrid sexual content, racist and degrading content, gratuitous descriptions of sexual abuse fantasy etc; to “test the boundaries of taste” so that the reader “thinks about what offends” them. Any perceived merit in the publication, like the issue of its “intent” can have no bearing on the application of s. 3(2).

## Diary of a drug rapist [pp. 24-26]

### No means no, but if they can't talk, they can't turn you down. By P. Bateman.

This comment, given the context of the article, promotes the view that pursuing sex with those women who cannot talk - drugged victims, mentally handicapped, the mute and even the dead (necrophilia) – has real advantages. The rapist submits that the opportunity for forced sex is increased if a victim is chosen who cannot “turn you down”. Sadly, this is a real “turn-on” to some dysfunctional sexual perverts.

### Warning: content definitely will offend. Just remember as you gag and throw the magazine down that this happens with reasonable frequency at your local. You might want to watch out for that.

It is not the fact this article is offensive per se, that makes it “objectionable”, it is the fact that it has the *effect* of promoting and supporting sexual violence (drug-rape against women) by providing a “how-to-do” one-sided account of drug rape activities, presented as conquests: and this makes it “objectionable”. The finding that it is “objectionable” cannot be negated by the claim that the *intention* of the writer of the article was not to offend, but rather to inform women of potential dangers (“You might want to watch out for that”). The intention of the writer does not come into the equation when making judgements on “objectionable” content.

*Critic* could have produced an article that fully informed women on the dangers of drug rapists without serving to promote and support the activity of sexual violence/coercion and demean, degrade and dehumanise women.

### Rohypnol (flunitrazepam)

References to Miss N as a “**loud-mouthed slapper**”, “**tasteless slag**” and “**trollip**” [sic] and her friends as “**a troupe of scantily-clad sluts**”, sets the misogynist and sexist tone of this instructional aid for a would-be drug rapist.

“... Miss N's friend – Miss A (the subject of another night's [drug rape] experiment)... I could probably have taken her [Miss N] home myself without much effort, but I had four roofies in my pocket and it would've been a shame to waste them, ... I slipped two tablets in and let them dissolve while Miss N was in the toilet.”

The tone supports the view that drug-raping women is a worthy “**experiment**”. To not make use of extra “**roofies**” would be a shame – constituting “**waste**”.

The detailed guidance given to would-be drug rapists must constitute promotion of the activity. There is no justification for providing this level of detail on the means to most effectively administer the drug to set a woman up to be raped.

**Sex with a passed-out person has its advantages and its problems. It means there's a lot of lifting (especially with a heifer like this one), and you don't have any help locating the right holes.**



The promotion of sexual abuse (vaginal and anal rape) against a drugged female victim is evidenced by the total focus of the criminal on his self-gratification in terms of “**advantages**” he sees in this type of sex, compared with sex with a conscious woman. The description is demeaning degrading and dehumanising to women. The woman is referred to as a “**heifer**” (a mere animal) with mere orifices (“**holes**”), ready for his use in committing acts of sexual violation (including sodomy). (This is the same mindset of those who promote hardcore porn). The “**problems**” the rapist highlights (having to lift the “**heifer**”) do not address the negative aspects of rape from the victim’s perspective. It is a totally one-sided, self-absorbed perspective.

**That said, passed out women don’t demand foreplay or want to talk about their feelings afterwards, or complain that you don’t wear a condom (although I always do, since I don’t want my semen to be traced after the fact).**

The promotion of the advantages of sex with a drugged woman is expounded without any reference to the negative impact on the victim. It panders to the dysfunctional male perverts with little interest in a normal sexual relationship with a woman within a committed relationship (involving concern for a woman’s feelings, mutual respect, sensitivity etc.), thereby encouraging rapists (including potential rapists) to sexually abuse woman. This statement promotes criminal activity by instructing the rapist/abuser to wear a condom in order to avoid forensic detection.

**Obviously, I do all this at her place – who wants to cook the bitch breakfast the next morning (“Sorry I raped you! I made waffles”).**

This treats rape as a joke. It is also intended to be grossly offensive. Women are portrayed as offensive “bitches” deserving to be raped. Many rapists commit their crimes against women in the context of home invasion and aggravated robbery. When sexual violation occurs at the woman’s home (a location she is entitled to consider safe and secure), it alienates the woman from her own personal domain and imposes on her a life-sentence: she may never feel safe in her home again. The plan of attack on the victim (demeaningly referred to as a “**bitch**”) outlined by *Critic* promotes the idea that rapists should deliberately seek to commit their offences at the women’s home. This is an outrage in that it serves as a “how-to” guides to would-be rapists.

**I always leave as soon as possible after I’ve got my rocks off, since I want to avoid interfering flatmates (or parents if she’s younger).**

This may well be argued as merely conveying the mindset of a well-organised rapist and helping women realise what they are up against. However, to argue this is ludicrous. Everyone knows that criminals leave the scene of the crime as soon as possible to avoid detection. The statement is consistent with the instructional tone of the “how-to-be a drug rapist” article.

**In this case, I was in by two and out by three: a solid hour’s work (although that bitch could have made things easier by clipping the hedge down there, it was overgrown).**

Holding his victim (“**the bitch**”) to account for impeding his getaway (by having not cut “the overgrown hedge *down* there”) is an offensive and critical reference to her pubic hair and her carelessness in not having had it trimmed. To refer to the sexual violation as “a solid hour’s work” is degrading and offensive to rape victims.

**GHB (gamma hydroxybutane):**

**Miss D was always going to be a tough nut to crack, not because she has enough brains to keep her legs together, but because she has a boyfriend. And she's a Christian. I just love a challenge.**

Under the present editor, Ms Holly Walker, *Critic* has published a lot of mindless anti-Christian vitriol. It is not surprising that the writer has chosen a *Christian* woman as a subject of his “how-to” drug rape guidelines. Drug-raping *Christian* girls is described as a “challenge” especially if they have Christian boyfriends. This woman’s boyfriend is portrayed as “**the blandest person you’ll ever meet**” in contrast to the rapist who is “real man” because he can “**clean out [Miss D’s] caramel pie**” (i.e. rape a virgin). The boyfriend is no doubt referred to by the title “Master” to emphasise the writer’s view that he is less than a real man like him. This mindless demeaning of Christians is standard fare for *Critic*.

**I decided that I would be that man** [the “real man” proven by my ability to drug rape Miss D] **and GHB was the drug for the job.**

This statement glorifies drug raping. It promotes the view that a man can prove himself to be “**a real man**” by drug raping a woman, especially a *Christian* one with a *Christian* boyfriend.

**... and GHB was the drug for the job. Since it works best when combined with alcohol, I decided I should invite Miss D and Master B out for a few drinks. As Christians, D and B aren't too good at handling the booze, so they didn't recognise the effects of GHB.**

Here the writer promotes the use of a particular drug for use on Christian women, based on the reasoning that most Christians are so immature that they cannot handle alcohol. So specific is this advice that details of what type of alcohol to administer it with is given (“**comes in small dropper-bottles**” or in “**powder**” form. Because of its “**salty taste, it's best to use it with a strong red wine or with straight spirits. I decided to invest in a bottle of nasty Australian Shraz**”).

The article assists the would-be drug rapist understand all the signs that would indicate that the drug is taking effect and when it is most appropriate to administer the next dose.

**Master B spewed all over the back seat... I got them both inside and lying on Miss D's (single) bed. Both of them were passed out .... I decided to roll him [Miss D's boyfriend] onto the floor and do [rape] his girlfriend in front of him. That way, when she woke up, I figured she'd think it was him (and since she was supposed to be "saving herself for marriage", I guessed it would add some excitement to their relationship).**

The sickness of the mind of the writer is so evident here. The drug raping of a Christian woman with high moral standards (the rapist has good cause to believe she is indeed a virgin) is presented as some sort of triumph over the ‘repressed moral mindset’ of a person who sincerely believes in the Christian virtue of restricting sexual intercourse until after marriage. The putrid, depraved and vile mindset of the rapist is conveyed in a sneering tone that tends to promote the sexual abuse of the Christian woman. The rapist who describes Master B as “**the blandest person you’ll ever meet**”, thinks that he needs some “**excitement**” added to his relationship

with Miss D. He fantasises that the impact of raping her while she is passed out on drugs, will create real “excitement” for her.

The account of raping a Christian woman while her boyfriend is sedated beside her and the setting up the scene so he takes the blame for the abuse, is presented as an instructional guide.

**“Because GHB is supposed to reflex the muscles and reduce the gag reflex, I toyed with the idea of using Master B’s mouth as well, but it was still crusty with vomit, so I stuck to his girlfriend.”**

The promotion of and support for the use of GHB in drug rape use is undeniable. The promotion of the sexual violence (rape) against women using drugs is undeniable. The use of GHB to relax the anal sphincter muscle is implied in this statement. It is implied that the rapist gloats that he managed to sodomise the woman.

Promiscuous homosexual men regularly use drugs to relax the a-s muscle (N.B. not all homosexuals are promiscuous). Sniffing poppers (amyl nitrite, isobutyl nitrite, butyl nitrite) relaxes the anal sphincter muscles, allowing anal sex to take place more easily. As poppers dilate blood vessels, many men find that they lose their erection when sniffing them. Hence when sodomising a woman they have to act fast (as in the film *Irreversible*).

The Chief Censor and his deputy are well aware of these facts. In the OFLC decision that cleared the rape film *Irreversible* for public screening in NZ cinemas, details of the depiction of a drug-crazed anal rape of a woman by a promiscuous homosexual – eight minutes in duration - is given. The OFLC notes that he was sniffing drugs (amyl nitrite is suggested) while he is sodomising the woman. Homosexual men on good salaries who are into the clubbing scene and multiple partners would know all about the types of drugs that effect s-a relaxation.

GHB (gamma-hydroxybutyrate) has recently become popular on the club scene, with users reporting an alcohol-like high with potent positive sexual effects. However, its possession and use recently became illegal after a series of deaths were associated with its use.

GHB affects the release of dopamine in the brain, causing effects ranging from relaxation to deep sleep, and coma. The drug also lowers blood pressure and can cause breathing difficulties.

A case has been reported in which levels of GHB were increased to life-threatening levels when taken along with a protease inhibitor. A man who was taking ritonavir and saquinavir became deeply unconscious after taking a half-teaspoon of GHB. Doctors believe that the ritonavir and saquinavir slowed down the metabolism of GHB and caused a near-fatal reaction.

Source: <http://www.aidsmap.com/en/docs/0D8FD9DD-BCA8-46C2-8B0C-B31AB6EA82A6.asp#4335c5dd-8845-4181-aac0-b894ef4c76f9>

GHB is very dangerous drug and can be fatal when mixed with alcohol or other drugs. Users can lose consciousness, as it's hard to know what strength the dose is. Too many hits can cause sickness, stiff muscles, fits and collapse. No one knows what GHB could do to you 20 years down the line. Because GHB can really knock you out it's been linked to drug assisted sexual assault. And because it's almost tasteless it's easily slipped in a drink. In a Home Office report in June 2000, 123 victims of drug-assisted assaults were questioned and 70% of the rapists were known to the victim. One in five could not remember the assault but 70% felt physically unable

to resist. In Britain GHB is a Class C drug - illegal to have, give away or sell. Possession can get you up to two years in jail. Supplying someone else can get you up to fourteen years. [source: Metropolitan Police June 2000] <http://www.outinlondon.com/drugs/ghb.htm>

**“GHB is one of my favourite drugs: it’s reliable and because it relaxes the recipient, it makes them much easier to handle than rohypnol. It can cause respiratory problems and even death in large doses, though, so I administer it slowly. There’s nothing like fucking a cadaver to ruin your evening. It doesn’t take very long: only about 3 to 6 hours (unless it’s combined with large doses of alcohol, in which case it can last much longer), so I always want to get in, get out, and make a clean getaway as fast as possible. On the plus side, it doesn’t remain in the system for very long, and is difficult to trace. It’s certainly relatively cheap, and I have friends in the right places, so I can buy it direct from the manufacturer. All in all, it makes for a good night out.”**

The “**reliable**” nature of GHB - its desirable physical effects on the victim - is applauded. This is promotion of a drug for the purposes of anal and vaginal rape. It’s relative cheapness is applauded. This is also promotion of a drug to support criminal activity: rape. The “**plus side**” of the drug is emphasised: “**it doesn’t remain in the system for very long, and is difficult to trace**” (allowing for avoidance of forensic detection). This also constitutes a promotion of a drug for rape activity. GHB is promoted as the means by which “**a good night out**” can be achieved by a rapist.

The drug rape article demeans and degrades women, referring to them as “slappers,” “sluts,” “bitches” and “heiffers” etc. It singles out a *Christian* woman and her *Christian* boyfriend. This is significant given that *Critic* regularly degrades *Christian* women. For example it publishes regular attacks on a *Christian* woman and mother of four (name known to the editor of *Critic* and the Society). It makes degrading references to her weight, calls her a sow in heat, and makes sexually tinged comments about her being a slapper and promiscuous. She is singled out because she is a *Christian*. *Critic* Issue 24 contained yet another letter attacking the woman using demeaning sexual innuendo.

### **Special K (ketamine).**

The application of “**an animal tranquilliser would be perfect for an enormous sweaty beast like Miss A**”. This content dehumanises, demeans and degrades women. The calculations provided to would-be rapists concerning appropriate dosages for given body masses, show that this article serves to promote the activity of date rape. There is no justification for giving such information. It has the effect of promoting the activity of date rape. “**Special K clearly worked a treat and I will definitely be using it again in the future. Because it is widely used in veterinary practice, it’s not hard to get hold of.**” Here the promotion of drug-rape extends to directing would-be rapists to an actual source where Special K can be obtained easily. From observing the responses of Miss A to ingesting Special K, the writer states:

**“.. I learned a very important lesson about using these drugs: not to use them in a context where people will be surprised by someone acting disorientated and sleepy. Also, I won’t try and drug people too early in the evening – I’ll wait until other patrons are drunk and inattentive. I got greedy, and tried to drug Miss A too soon.”**

These helpful instructions to would-be rapists are further proof that the effect of the publication is to promote and support drug rape. While it is important that women think carefully about how a drug rapist could operate, this could be achieved without providing a how-to-do manual for rapists. The effect of the article is to demean, degrade and dehumanise women rape victims and assist would-be rapists in the best way to carry out this criminal activity. It is grossly and deliberately offensive.

The article fails to outline any of the serious risks of using ketamine. Because you don't feel any pain when you're on ketamine, you're in danger of injuring yourself badly and having no idea you've done it. Big doses can cause severe breathing difficulties and even heart failure. Ketamine is very dangerous when it's mixed with other drugs or even alcohol. It can cause panic attacks, depression and in large doses can exaggerate pre-existing mental health problems such as schizophrenia. If high enough doses are taken, the anaesthetic effect can result in death from inhaling vomit. Street ketamine is often sold in tablet form as an alternative to ecstasy, or comes as a white crystalline powder for smoking or snorting

[Source: <http://www.outinlondon.com/drugs/ketamine.htm>]

Any content that promotes and supports or tends to promote and support this drug as an aid to raping a woman is “objectionable”.

### **Alcohol**

**“Contrary to popular belief, you don’t always need to knock a bitch out cold to get a piece of minge. Often, it is enough merely to get them to the point where they’re so confused they don’t know what’s happening to them.... Merely plying them with alcohol until they are incontinent is not necessarily the cheaper option ... the last thing you want when you lie down on a girl is for her to spout Kristov from both ends. Nevertheless, alcohol is less legally problematic than the other drugs described here ...I’m always prepared to deliver a sharp smack to the face if she gets frisky.”**

Legitimising violence in the context of sexual activity is part of the rapist’s activity. Nothing in the article touches on the negative, traumatising effect of drug rape on a woman.

### **The article is, of course, a work of fiction.**

To the question of whether the publication is “objectionable” under the Act, it is not relevant that the article is claimed to be a “work of fiction”. The Japanese film *Puni Poemi*, imported for private viewing by a local anima aficionado, was classified “objectionable” and yet it was a complete work of fiction. Three-year-old heroines of the film are depicted as being raped by evil space robots. On appeal the Film and Literature Board of Review upheld the ruling.

In the classification by the Board of Review of the book *The Seventh Acolyte Reader* as “objectionable under s. 3(2)(a) of the Act; it “was not persuaded by the argument that works of fiction cannot be brought within the ambit of the statute” advanced by legal counsel for Applicant, GAM Moonen. Following referral of the matter back to the Board by the Court of Appeal, the Board in this case “considered that it [the book] [tended to] promote and support – the exploitation of children, or young persons, or both for sexual purposes” [s.3(2)(a)] in the ordinary sense of those terms, because of the fact that the stories in the book treated sexual

activity between men and boys as normal and pleasurable.” [Quoted from “Summary or Reasons For Decision” OFLC *List of Decisions* January 2003 (OFLC Ref. No. 1518)].

The use of drugs by rapists (drink spiking etc.) and their general effects on victims are facts generally understood by university students due to the number of high profile drug rape convictions reported in the media. Such reports emphasise the adverse consequences or effect of such crimes on the victims and serve to alert women to the dangers of leaving unattended drinks in public bars etc.

However, the *Critic* presents drug rape in a gratuitous and offensive manner that serves as a do-it-yourself manual for would-be rapists: listing suitable and effective drugs and providing details on how to best use them as well as how to best degrade, demean and dehumanise women. (Important note: "suitable and effective" at one level - "dangerous, even deadly" at another. If the welfare of students was indeed paramount in the editor's mind, the fictional rapist would have explicitly made mention that these drugs were very dangerous. Or the editor herself could have.).

## **Max Hardcore: the most offensive man in porn** [pp. 20-22]

**Interviewed by Bill, introduction by Holly Walker** [editor]

This article provides Max’s hardcore porn website address (Max must be very grateful to Holly that thousands of Otago University students can now access his porn site and download challenging material). Walker quotes directly from the website in her introduction:

**“Max shoots classy broads who think ... until they get their throats and asses reamed by Max!” and “Max turns ordinary teens and mother’s [sic] alike into piss and cum splattered sluts before your eyes .....eyes”.**

Critic editor Ms Holly Walker comments:

**“Misogyny is a clear theme – erotica is not. Indeed it is hard to believe that anyone could find the violent and gruesome acts he portrays as arousing. ... [Max] does unspeakable and painful things with a medical speculum and camera. In all his films, the discomfort and humiliation experienced by the actresses is writ large on their faces.”**

*Critic* is given away free at the university and can easily find its way into the hands of children. Walker provides no coherent or rational reason why this promoter of hardcore porn and his site material is featured in *Critic*.

**“Why feature him in *Critic*? Perhaps to highlight a disturbing misogynistic trend in pornography. Perhaps to highlight a worrying aspect of the human psyche which finds such material exciting. Perhaps to alert readers to the alarming level of highly offensive material readily available on the internet (as if you didn’t know already) or to raise questions about the sort of society we live in that has given rise to such material... Perhaps, as Hardcore himself would contend, simply to profile a man providing people with what they want to see. One thing is certain: he sure is offensive.** [italics for emphasis]

Here she shoots herself in both feet - if the “highly offensive material” is already known to readers, why the article? Furthermore, by prefacing each ‘explanation’ for why she published the

article with the word “perhaps”, she treats the question concerning intent in a frivolous manner. She creates a mere illusion of serious intent. The reality is that Max’s views and the gratuitous account of his hardcore porn business is presented to deliberately offend the reader.

However, the issue is whether the material is “objectionable” as defined in the FVPC Act 1993.

Consider the passage:

**Max: ... Okay, I had one girl a long time ago ..... Still fist-fucking can be a dangerous thing to do, so at the beginning of every video, I say. Don’t try these stunts at home.**

Only a naïve person would believe that the depiction of such degrading, demeaning and dehumanising sex acts do not serve to normalise and promote such activities among the aficionados of “extreme sex” and those looking for new forms sexual perversion (“experimentation”). “Humiliation and degradation [of women] come standard” is the caption to the photo reproduced on page 22 of *Critic*.

**Critic question: Do you ever look down at a girl, her asshole gaping, piss and cum and spit on her face, make-up smeared and think “Hang-on, what the fuck am I doing here?” [p. 22]**

“**Never**” says Max, in answer to the question. “**I believe in my mission in life. Along with entertaining people, my job is to show what is possible, and what I, along with my girls are capable and willing to do to please an audience**”.

The deliberately offensive and degrading content central to Max’s hard core porn is regularly approved for adult viewing by New Zealand’s Chief Censor, Mr Bill Hastings. Literally hundreds of titles featuring girls with “gaping orifices”, faces covered and smeared in “cum” etc, participating in “degrading, demeaning and dehumanising sex acts” (“**ass-reaming**” “blowjobs” etc) are cleared for adult viewing each year by Hasting’s Office (e.g. R18 *Matador Series* titles marketed by NZ hard-core porn promoter Steve Crow via his company Vixen Direct Ltd). Many of the “porn stars” featured exhibit all the trademark emotional responses seen in victims of sexual abuse.

The SPCS has highlighted to the OFLC, among other things, the use of extreme close-ups of women’s anuses as demeaning, and the portrayal of women as merely a collection of orifices as degrading. In submissions to the OFLC it noted:

“The director [of the video] splayed a women’s anus to the close view of the camera while placing a finger in her vagina and forced the vaginal wall so that it appeared to exit the anus”. (Quoted from *North South* “The People vs Steve Crow” June 2003, p. 85)

Here the SPCS was quoting the OFLC’s own classification of the R18 film.

**Critic: Do you have any words of wisdom for a guy trying to convince his girlfriend to try anal?**

**Max: I would try the truth. Start by saying, “You don’t want to get pregnant, do you?” If that doesn’t work, you can try b, c, and d. Explain that a lot of pussy fucking causes problems like yeast infections and nasty discharges. Anal sex has no problems. And most**

**girls really enjoy it once they get used to it. The secret is to start out slow. Get plenty of lube worked into the ass with a finger, get plenty on your rod, and push it in slowly, and let the girl adjust to it. I've yet to see a girl who couldn't do it. And liked it, when she put her mind to it. If all else fails, tell them you'll take them shopping and to dinner.**

The nature of this question might suggest to some that *Critic* has an agenda beyond just offending readers: the normalisation and promotion of anal sex: the promotion of sodomy, a degrading sexual act which is unnatural and has huge associated health risks. Why else would a question like this be put to Max? *Critic* itself refers to a “sodomitical agenda” (*Critic* p. 28).

“Max Hardcore...” is a deliberately provocative article that has the effect of demeaning, degrading and dehumanising women. The interviewer’s questions are sick and the article is highly “objectionable” under s. 3(3). *Critic* asks Max:

**“Surely girls have got to vomit while you throat them? What’s it like to have someone vomit on your cock?”**

To which Max replies:

**“It can of course happen when a girl gets repeatedly throat-fucked. I may even work it into the story sometimes, with lines like, “Is this how the supermodels stay skinny mister?” It doesn’t bother me at all. It means that we’ve reached higher ground and can see further than ever before. It means the girl is giving it her all, and I appreciate that.**

Of course Chief Censor Bill Hastings who has already reached the “higher ground” and “can see further than ever before”, has little problem clearing this sort of moral filth for adult cinema viewing. The same can be said for the ‘enlightened’ nine experts on the Film and Literature Board of Review. In the film *Baise-Moi* (lit. transl. “Fuck Me”) a woman, Manu, vomits all over a man’s erect penis in the middle of a “blow-job”. A man is stamped to death by a woman wearing high heel shoes, merely because he wanted to use a condom while having paid-sex. Naked men engaged in explicit sex (including “blow jobs”) have their brains blown out in a sex club by the heroines of the film. A brutal act of sodomy is filmed for four minutes in a most voyeuristic manner at close range and from every angle. The Chief Censor says its not porn, its “hardcore”.

Max completes the interview by saying:

**“I was the first one, and perfecter of the gaping bung hole, showing for the first time to the world, the beauty of a girl’s cavernous asspipe. And we here at the Max Hardcore Institute of Finer Filth, are always working on new and imaginative ways of creating mayhem on the sets. So you haven’t seen the last of my creations.**

The Chief Censor’s Office is viewed by many New Zealanders as directly responsible for allowing the legal dissemination of moral filth. Some view it as working tirelessly trying to create new and imaginative ways of defending the public exhibition of explicit and gratuitous scenes of brutal rape (*Baise-Moi* and *Irreversible*) sexual violation of a child, vaginal and anal violations of women using garden implements (*Anatomie de L’Enfer*), necrophilia and incest (*Visitor Q*), homosexual sex acts, graphic violence combined with sex acts etc.



## **Critic's top ten people who should just fuck off** [pp. 30-31]

**Everyone knows that the only thing wrong with what Hitler did was target Jews. Because Jews, though cunty, are not that bad when compared to many other people. Why spend so much time and money killing Jews when you can instead hand-select the very worst individuals – the type of people who should just fuck off – and kill them instead? If the glorious Final Solution had been tailored to rid us of such people, rather than those who like God but not pork, morally opposing it would have been a lot more difficult. Critic can only assume that the main concern the Nazis had with this more targeted approach was narrowing down, from a world chock-filled with workaday morons, a list of those people that really, really should fuck off. So we've done it for them. We only hope that the leader of the next Reich reads Critic.**

The Society has referred this obscene statement and the blasphemous statement referring to the Virgin Mary (p. 31) to the Race Relations Office by way of a formal complaint. The Society submits that both statements are deeply offensive to Jews and Christians and to most decent-minded New Zealanders.

## **Critic's Letter of the Week** [p. 14]

*Critic* appears to consider obscenity as deserving promotion and support. A \$30 book voucher was given as a prize to the winner of "Letter of the week" whose author wrote among other things: "... **I believe that there is an Asian teen with a tight wet pussy that is just waiting for my cock and I can meet her today.**"

Obscene and degrading language like this is common place on the video/DVD titles and film posters that the Chief Censor Bill Hastings has seen fit to approve for adult public display and sale/hire via NZ retail outlets (see Appendix II).

## **Appendix I:**

The OFLC has classified a number of documents "objectionable" on the basis that they encourage and promote criminal activity (s. 3[3][d]) of the Act. Examples include:

1. *Secrets of Methamphetamine Manufacture*  
Decision registered 21/8/02; OFLC Ref. 201077
2. *The Big Book Of Buds*  
Publisher Quick American Archives  
Author Ed Rosenthal  
Decision registered 9/7/02; OFLC Ref. 200772

"The publication contains extensive information on plant varieties, articles on topics such as decriminalisation of cannabis and the history of cannabis use, and numerous high quality photographs. *Despite the book advising against illegal activity, the dominant effect of the publication as a whole is the promotion and encouragement of the criminal act of cultivating*

*and using cannabis, an offence under s9 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1975.*” [Quoted from OFLC Summary of the reasons for decision]

3. *Psilocybin Mushrooms Of The World*  
Decision registered 9/7/02 OFLC Ref. 200767
4. *Psychedelic Chemistry*  
Decision registered 31/702; OFLC Ref. 200876
5. *The Construction And Operation Of Clandestine Drug Laboratories*  
Decision registered 9/7/02; OFLC Ref. 200770
6. *Opium for the Masses*  
Decision registered 9/7/05 OFLC Ref. 200768
7. *Peyote And Other Psychoactive Cacti*  
Decision registered 9/7/05; OFLC Ref. 200771

## **Appendix II**

The following video and DVD titles are a tiny sample of the many hundreds viewed by Mr Bill Hastings, his Deputy Ms Nicola McCully and that have been cleared for adult viewing (R18) for the purpose of “entertainment”. Many of the titles are part of a series so these title names are very familiar to the OFLC censors. One title, not listed here (*Matador Series II*), was submitted by the SPCS to the Chief Censor for reclassification after it had been cleared by the OFLC for home viewing (R18) and had been on sale for two years in New Zealand. The OFLC agreed with the Society that the video contained “objectionable” content and ordered the distributor to make seven excisions. The same banned explicit sexual content involved the degrading, demeaning and dehumanising of treatment women is also found in most of the titles listed below and yet they are readily available for hire and purchase through video stores/mail order catalogues throughout New Zealand.

Examples of the hundreds of video and DVD titles cleared by Mr Hasting’s Office for R18 home entertainment in recent years. Any of these publications classified R18 by the OFLC can be legally screened in public cinemas, provided copyright laws are adhered to by the distributor.

Best Of Girls Who Suck Cock & Eat Cum #17  
Ultra Kinky #57 Cunt Craving Cuties  
Slurpee Sluts Suck Dees Nutz  
Ejaculation  
Fresh Meat #13 “Peel That Ass”  
B & Kinky Pussy in the Middle  
Fucking Filthy Housewives  
Killer Pussy #5  
True Anal Stories XV  
The Ultimate Guide To Anal Sex For Women 2  
Super Fuckers No 11  
Screw My Wife, Please!! (& Make Her Sweat)  
Rocco’s Reverse Gang Bang

The Voyeur's Favourite "Blow Jobs & Anals" #6  
Buttman's Anal Show  
Blowjob Impossible  
Up Her Ass  
Real Female Masturbation  
Stop My Ass Is On Fire  
Killer Cum Shots  
Meat Fucker  
All Star Anal Asian  
Sexual Predator  
The Voyeur's Favourite "Blow Jobs & Anals" #6  
Young as they Cum 3  
True Anal Stories  
Up and Cummers