Feminist Rhetoric of Violence Against Women and the Production of Everyday Fear

Julianne Pidduck

Throughout the mid-seventies and early eighties, North American radical feminists produced an astounding body of literature documenting an overarching system of gender domination. While the effects of the Patriarchy, as it came to be called, included systemic economic and social discrimination, its most dramatic and visible manifestation was located in a disturbing pattern of male acts of violence committed against women. For many prominent feminist theorists, statistical cases of violence, and later violence as played out in the media, offered persuasive and shocking evidence of how bad things really were in the North American genderscape.

Out of the pre-feminist obscurity where gendered violence was perceived as a random and unfortunate, but not *political* occurence, radical feminists spawned the rhetorical category of "violence against women." As Kathryn Pyne Addelson remarks, this task of "making private knowledge public," of shifting the intimate concerns of the home into public discourse, has been central to feminist activism and theory. Certainly one of the great gains of the second wave of Western feminism has been to identify formerly "personal" or "private" experiences of rape, domestic violence, and incest as ubiquitous societal problems rooted in skewed, and often violent gender relations. This political project can be traced through the

historical production and increasing circulation of the discursive category of "violence against women." This now-familiar trope has variously included crimes such as rape, incest, murder, and wife-battering. As we shall see, the rhetorical field of "violence against women" has proved remarkably absorptive of a range of other issues from systemic discrimination to representation. In fact, in much radical feminist writing, "violence" has come to signify the horrifying end-point of a constructed continuum of social injustices.

My intention here is not to dismiss this tradition, for the war of words that created an identifiable category through which to describe systemic patterns of gendered violence is indispensable in an ongoing way to any feminist project. And I realize that to critique or to qualify this category in any way is to embark on the slippery slope toward a Paglia-esque dismissal of the structural and systemic nature of oppression — or even worse, to make light of the horrors of lived experience. This is by no means my intent. But in my current research which seeks to understand the question of mediated violence, the inherited terms of debate around "violence against women" are so broad as to be politically and epistemologically imprecise. I would even go so far as to suggest that they can contribute to a general climate of fear. Given this theoretical and social impasse, I would like to begin by historicizing the feminist rhetorical category of "violence against women" and tracing its circulation in relation to broader feminist issues of politics and representation.

My attention to the effectivity of discourses may be seen as a departure from the inescapable materiality of violence. However, this work is offered in the understanding of the important relation between how we conceive of reality, and how we act to change it. As Michel Foucault insists in *L'Ordre du discours*, "*le discours n'est pas simplement ce qui traduit les luttes ou les systèmes de domination, mais ce pour quoi, ce par quoi on lutte, le pouvoir dont on cherche à s'emparer*" (Foucault, 1970:12). Rhetoric as an expressly public and political discourse can

never be understood as merely transparent, but exists "in a describable relationship with the ensemble of other practices" (Foucault 1978: 19) including activist strategies and policy-making.

The Rhetoric of Violence Against Women

Due to space limitations, the following historical account of the genesis of the rhetorical category of violence against women must be anecdotal and impressionistic. I would like to concentrate on general trends, and on the continuities and shifts in this discourse as it moves through different contexts — from the radical feminist context of early 1970s anti-violence activism, to the English North American anti-pornography movement of the 1980s, through to the Canadian policy discourses which emerged after the 1989 Polytechnique incident. My own bias as an anglophone Canadian feminist living in Montréal partly accounts for these overlapping contexts, as I try to take into account the movement through different locations.[1] The radical feminist sites which I describe originate in what may be loosely termed an anglophone North American feminist "counterpublic sphere;" for while feminist discourses around violence have certainly had some purchase in Québec, the anti-pornography lobby has not touched a chord here to the same extent as in the U.S. and English Canada. The Polytechnique discussion relates more specifically to Canadian public discourse, and draws to some extent both from francophone and anglophone responses to the incident.

In *Caught Looking*, Nan Hunter (1988) sketches out a brief chronology of feminist discourses around sexuality, media, and violence in the U.S. from 1966 until 1986.[2] For Hunter, early feminist activism around violence originated in issue-specific organizing, with mobilizations against rape and domestic violence in 1971 and 1974 respectively. Early anti-violence activism proceeded by making public specific forms of gendered violence (especially rape), and by the

establishment of grassroots feminist resources such as halfway houses, support groups, and crisis lines. This infrastructure demonstrates an ongoing feminist commitment to providing services for the victims of crimes not even recognized in broader political and juridical discourses. Part of the simultaneous and ongoing lobbying achievement of contemporary feminism has been to create public categories of crimes including sexual harassment, incest, domestic violence, and date rape. But what is also fascinating in this history is how from very early on, the grassroots anti-violence activism became inextricably linked to issues of representation.

According to Hunter's timeline, the general term "violence against women" originated in 1976 with the L.A. group "Women Against Violence Against Women" (WAVAW, a group which spawned many namesake chapters across North America, including groups in Vancouver and Toronto). Notably, this group's first action was to deface a Rolling Stones billboard ("I'm black and blue from the Rolling Stones and I love it"). This example demonstrates the early slippage between feminist anti-violence activism and an interest in mediated violence. Further, as Kirsten Marthe Lenz points out, the early history of the Take Back the Night march follows a similar trajectory. This event was originally conceived in 1977 by anti-rape activists in Pittsburgh "to dramatize women's insistence on the right to enjoy public space in safety" (Lenz, 1993: 27). The idea spread, and one year later the San Francisco march coincided with an anti-porn conference, where 5,000 women marched in protest through the city's porn district. Now, while Hunter's brief history may privilege a certain interpretation, these examples provide a clue to what I see as a larger paradigmatic shift from direct anti-violence activism to an overarching attention to an escalating feminist preoccupation with issues of representation and specifically, pornography.

Many feminists[3] have commented on the problematic conflation within anti-pornography feminism, which may be summarized in the phrase,

"Porn is the theory, rape is the practice." Within a position which situates mediated violence as indistinguishable from real violence, even the cause of it, feminist anti-violence activism became barely distinguishable from anti-pornography activism. Lynne Segal succinctly describes this collapse as follows:

> With male sexuality here seen as indistinguishable from male violence, with male violence here presented as the key to male dominance, and with pornography portrayed as the symbolic proof of the connection between the two, anti-pornography campaigning was soon to become emblematic of this strand of feminism. It redefined "pornography," once again, as material which depicts violence against women and is in itself violence against women. (Segal, 1993: 7-8)

In a circular argument where pornography becomes simultaneously cause and effect of an epidemic of violence against women, anti-pornography activists began to increasingly target pornography as a form of violence against women. Confronted by a depressingly ubiquitous yet publicly unrecognized social phenomenon of violence against women, pornography offered perhaps a more concrete evidence of widespread male sexual violence and objectification of women. Further, if pornography could be isolated as a cause of violence against women, legislated solutions proved tactically much more within the grasp of the movement than other more dispersed and complex social phenomena like poverty or cycles of family violence.

Interestingly enough, as Lenz points out, with this paradigmatic shift of focus toward representational rather than social targets, "the pornography issue 'popularized' feminism" (Lenz, 1993: 389). The anti-pornography movement was certainly the most vocal feminist activist presence within 1980s anglophone North America. For while mainstream popular opinion may not have been prepared at this juncture to recognize the oppressive and often violent nature of intimate relations between men and women, the familiar moral overtones of the pornography debates created the potential for alliances with more

traditionally-minded women, as well as conservative religious and political groups. Through the charismatic rhetoric of figures like Susan Cole (of Toronto), Andrea Dworkin and Catharine MacKinnon, and the considerable success of anti-pornography legislation, feminist anti-porn activism provided the major vehicle to bring feminist discourses of "violence against women" into the public eye.[4] Presently I will look at how this played itself out in a Canadian context with the Polytechnique Massacre, but first I will look briefly at the specifics of some of the influential American anti-pornography rhetoric as it pertains to violence.

The War Against Women and the Poetics of Fear

Andrea Dworkin, perhaps the single most famous American anti-porn feminist, recently published a collection of her essays and speeches spanning the time-frame from 1976 to 1987. Entitled *Letters from a War Zone*, the book mobilizes a recurring radical feminist metaphor, that of an escalating "gender war." Marilyn French, for example, in her 1992 *The War Against Women*, treats what she calls "individual men's physical war against women" as the inevitable escalation of a continuum of insidious and ubiquitous low-level gender conflict. For French, the metaphor of violent warfare is inseparable from parallel and interconnected political, economic, cultural, religious, health and reproductive rights wars waged by individual men and groups of men against women; this gender warfare is presented as both global and ahistorical. French's metaphor of "the war against women" is telling, as she uses the terms "war" and "discrimination" almost interchangeably.

Susan Faludi presents a related, if much more exhaustively-documented argument, in her 1991 best-seller *Backlash*, subtitled "The Undeclared War Against American Women." Faludi concentrates on wide-ranging

contemporary discourses of media, pop psychology, electoral politics, and reproductive rights rather than violence. Yet her mobilization of the war metaphor (in this case undeclared), suggests a similar coordinated (if not necessarily conspiratorial) oppressive and all-encompassing anti-feminist backlash. Although the focuses and tones of these three authors are quite distinct, they present a common premise, where the category of violence, or the war metaphor, stands in for an entire interlocking system of gender discrimination. Consider, for example, this excerpt from the title essay of Dworkin's *Letters from a War Zone.*

> It is late 1986 now, and we are losing. The war is men against women; the country is the United States. Here, a woman is beaten every eighteen seconds: by her husband or the man she lives with, not by a psychotic stranger in an alley... Woman-beating, the intimate kind, is the most commonly committed violent crime in the country, according to the FBI, not feminists. A woman is raped every three minutes... There are an estimated 16,000 new cases of father-daughter incest each year; and in the current generation of children, 38% of girls are sexually molested..
>
> We keep calling this war normal life. Everyone's ignorant; no one knows; the men don't mean it. In this war, the pimps who make pornography are the SS, an élite, sadistic, military, organized vanguard. They run an efficient and expanding system of exploitation and abuse in which women and children, as lower life forms, are brutalized. This year they will gross $10 billion (Dworkin, 1994: 308-309).

Dworkin's writings convey much more than a convincing argument. They work rhythmically and metaphorically to stir feminist audiences into rage and action. Yet when I start to unpack to the implications of this rhetoric, the dominant discursive and emotional residue is not one of productive anger and resistance, but of fear.

Dworkin's words offer perhaps one of the clearest, most extreme (and therefore most effective) examples of how much contemporary feminist rhetoric around "violence

against women" or the "war against women" evokes an apocalyptic fear-scape. To once again qualify my position, I do not contest the widespread instances of injustice, violence, or anti-feminist backlash. But I do question the political and epistemological implications of a worldview that, in its haste to make connections, can no longer differentiate between the linked but distinct orders of lived experience of violence, representation, and systemic discrimination. Dworkin's case rests on the positioning of women not as agents of their own destinies (as, without a doubt, feminist activists are), but as victims or potential victims of an escalating gender war which pollutes every aspect of their lives. By characterizing gender relations as intrinsically and uniquely violent, Dworkin and others off their audiences only the response of self-defence — a response predicated not only on critical understanding and choice, but on fear, even terror.

In *The Politics of Everyday Fear*, Brian Massumi writes of the "saturation of social space by fear." In this Foucauldian-slash-Deleuzian argument, Massumi notes that "the history of modern nation-states could be written following the regular ebb and flow of fear rippling their surface, punctuated by outbreaks of outright hysteria" (Massumi, 1993: 1993, vii). He suggests that several parallel histories could be written tracing out various "technologies of fear production" including gendering as a matter of national concern; the body as fright site from the point of view of its medicalization; horror at the body as pleasure site; a genealogy of the modern self as seen through the social technologies mounted for its defense and care; racial-ethnic or class scare campaigns, and so on. In fact, Massumi concludes this long list with the question, "What aspect of life, from the most momentous to the most trivial, has *not* become a workstation in the mass production of fear?" (Massumi, 1993: viii).

For Massumi, the "tools of the organized fear trade" are seen as essentially forces of social constraint. Yet he seeks to leave open the door for resistance and epistemic rupture in this overwhelming and multiply-articulated fear-scape.

Of course, rupture and resistance in the face of seemingly all odds are precisely what is at stake in an analysis which tries to understand the complexities of feminist discourses around violence and, in my transposed terms, fear. For the current discursive mobilization of feminist discourses around "violence against women" or the "war against women" well fits the terms of Massumi's analysis. While descriptive of certain endemic social forces, they also carry a rhetorical weight of their own, which may include the tendency to frighten feminists out of our wits.

I will now turn to a more specific local grounding of this rhetoric in the case of the 1989 Polytechnique incident. For, in Canadian terms, I believe that this event served to explode the formerly feminist-specific discussion around "violence against women" into broader public discourse.

The Polytechnique: Genealogy of a Massacre

We have recently passed the fifth anniversary of the December 6, 1989 Polytechnique Massacre – an event of momentous symbolic importance for Canadian feminism. For many Canadian and Québécoise feminists, Lépine's action embodied an increasingly violent Faludian anti-feminist backlash. Intriguingly enough, at the one-year anniversary of the massacre, the major feminist event planned at the Université de Montréal was a keynote address by none other than Andrea Dworkin. Of course, there were also a multitude of memorial services and other events organized to mark this one-year anniversary, both at the Université de Montréal and elsewhere in the city (as well as nationally and internationally). However, the Dworkin lecture stands out as the single largest feminist activist event in the city, organized at the very site of the massacre took place. Dworkin's invited presence there at this key datepoints to the broad circulation of American radical feminist discourses within Canadian and even Québécoise feminist circles. Simultaneous translation was provided for an audience of some 700 people, including

both anglophones and francophones, men and women, and feminists of all stripes from the corporate variety to the *lesbiennes radicales*.

At the university's plush main auditorium just up the hill from the Polytechnique, I clearly remember massive security forces and metal detectors at the door of Dworkin's lecture. A whispered threat of backlash perfumed the air. The crowd, in short, was primed for Dworkin's characteristically rousing speech, excerpted here.

> And those of us who are berated for being radicals have said, "That is not the way we measure progress. You see, we count the dead bodies. We count the numbers of rapes. We count the women who are being battered. We keep track of the children that are being raped by their fathers. And when those numbers start to change in a way that is meaningful, we will then talk to you about whether or not we can measure progress." [Applause]
>
> And it is my experience and I think the experience of most women that I know...that everything we achieve we are punished for achieving. Every statement we make we are punished for making. Every act toward self-determination that we make we are punished for making. Every assertion of dignity is punished socially by the great media out there. When they choose to recognize us it is through ridicule and contempt. Or by the men who are around us — who are in fact the foot soldiers in this very real war in which the violence is almost exclusively on one side.

It is difficult to recreate through bloodless ink on paper the drama of this event, but my enduring memory is of Dworkin's masterful ability to mobilize outrage, a certain siege mentality, fear. This cathartic experience was reminiscent of a fundamentalist sermon, amassing all the passion, moral outrage, and plain rage appropriate to feminist martyrs and rituals of mourning. This spirit was, perhaps, all together fitting to the occasion. But at the same time I was disturbed by a current within the speech, and the uncomfortable residue of rear and paralysis which clung to me as I left the auditorium. Dworkin once again mobilizes

the war metaphor, and with it a narrative where the lines are clearly drawn between women as victims and men as "foot soldiers in this very real war."

While incidents like the Polytechnique (and so many other daily news items) seem to substantiate such a claim, this type of argument fosters a climate which sees the gender war as eternally binary, escalating, and essentially unchanging. This worldview retains a Hegelian model of historical change, where one "epoch" may be understood as a particular paradigmatic totality (in this case, Patriarchy) which pervades all social relations; here, social change involves a complete "revolution" or *Aufhebung* which heralds the arrival of a completely new paradigm. (Matriarchy, perhaps?) The gender war and backlash metaphors follow such sweeping paradigmatic models which may have a certain rhetorical strength, but lack the nuance to account for the multiple and subtle nature of changes in gender relations across space, time, and circumstance. Patriarchy presents a violent and monolithic epochal system within which feminists may only hope to count bodies, and await their punishment. For a rhetoric which seems to revel in the worst case scenario, the Polytechnique becomes emblematic of the current and eternal state of gender relations.

Violence Against Women in Canadian Public Discourse

The events of December 6 also had strong repercussions outside of feminist circles, with a wave of soul-searching which permeated media[5] private conversations, and political discourse for a brief time. One clear memory of the post-Polytechnique media coverage finds Prime Minister Mulroney on prime-time news sporting a white ribbon and looking suitably sombre, pronouncing on the horrors of this event, and the gravity of the problem of violence against women. To the seasoned feminist, in the wake of massive government cutbacks to front-line feminist services, this

declaration rings hollow at best. Yet Mulroney's presence amidst a cacaphony of media coverage of gendered violence signals the profound effect of the Polytechnique on Canadian political discourse. If within an American context, the pornography debates made "private" knowledges of violence against women public, in Canada, Marc Lépine's actions crystallized this shift. Significantly, in the wake of the Polytechnique, the Tory government commissioned volumes of paperwork on a new topic of national concern, "violence against women."

In June, 1991, the House of Commons Sub-committee on the Status of Women issued a report entitled, significantly, the "War Against Women." (Note the borrowing of the war metaphor: strong stuff from the annals of Tory bureaucracy.) At the same time, in fine Canadian style, the government commissioned a massive "Panel on Violence Against Women."[6] Regardless of its shady reputation among feminists and possible filibustering function, this Panel marks the arrival of formerly marginal discourses about "violence against women" as an identifiable and widespread category for policy and media discussion. Consider, then, the opening paragraph from this report.

> Every day in this country women are maligned, humiliated, shunned, screamed at, pushed, kicked, punched, assaulted, beaten, raped, physically disfigured, tortured, threatened with weapons and murdered. Some women are indeed more vulnerable than others, but all women, simply by virtue of their gender, are potential victims of violence. Moreover, the violence is often directed at them by those whom they have been encouraged to trust, those whom they are taught to respect, those whom they love. Violence against women cuts across all racial, social, cultural, economic, political, and religious spectrums. While there is no question that violence may be conditioned by these factors, the fact remains that all women are at risk (Canada, 1991: 3).

Now I can hardly claim that some sort of odd body-snatching happened, and that Andrea Dworkin actually

wrote this report, duly printed in multiple copies, available to all in French and English. But you will notice the consistencies between the radical feminist position and this official government document. Curious, when you think about it. Frightening when perhaps our only basis of unity as women may be our shared status of looming potential victimhood. At the risk of simplifying the complexities of policy production, the tone and argument of this report reflects a trend where radical and liberal feminist arguments move into official channels. (The 1992 *Butler* ruling on pornography represents another example of such a shift, where feminist anti-pornography arguments put forward, notably by the Women's Legal Action Fund (LEAF) importantly influenced a shift in judicial interpretations of "obscenity" as materials degrading or harmful to women).[7] But what does it mean when what Linda Williams calls the "rhetoric of harm" of radical feminism slides into more general usage?

On one level, an optimist might argue that such a shift in government rhetoric means that violence against women is on the road to being recognized as a pressing social issue. And shrinking social expenditures aside, there is more than a grain of truth to this argument. Yet Massumi's discussion of the saturation of the social space with fear also seems to cut uncomfortably close. What kind of a social space does this report describe for Canadian women? Consider again the litany of transitive verbs listed in the first sentence: "maligned, humiliated, shunned, screamed at, pushed, kicked, punched, assaulted, beaten, raped, physically disfigured, tortured, threatened with weapons and murdered."

This description, like Dworkin's essays and speeches, functions rhetorically through hyperbole. The text arranges a series of escalating forms of abuse, careening emphatically toward violence and the seemingly inevitable end-point, murder. Once again, as in French's linear continuum from discrimination to violence, we are presented a barely distinguishable field of activities which are weighted toward the extreme. I by no means wish here

to deny that these unspeakable things happen, that they are in fact *done to women by men*. But I would like to reframe the terms of the "violence against women" as in some ways contributing to widespread fear-production processes around gendering.

Massumi differentiates between two great categories of fear. First, we have "*low-level fear*—naturalized fear, ambient fear, ineradicable atmospheric fright;" then, he cites the extreme case, the spectacle, the catastrophe: "the great symphonies of collective hysteria and national paranoia" (Massumi, 1993: viii). I would not care to argue that "violence against women" as a fear-mobilizing discourse fits exclusively into either of these categories. Rather, the tension between low-level fear and the extreme offers a conceptual tool to think through the muddled morasse of undifferentiated gendered acts and representations.

Take, for example, the case of the Polytechnique. In the aftermath, feminists battled to link Lépine's actions within a larger context, in Juteau and Laurin-Frenette's terms "*un crime contre les femmes, un crime politique, pensé, prémédité, contre des individus qui représentent une catégorie sociale ciblée*" (Juteau and Laurin-Frenette, 1990: 206). For many feminists, the tendency to describe Lépine's actions as insane deliberately clouds the link between murder and wide-spread misogyny and anti-feminist backlash. Juteau and Laurin-Frenette feel that this feminist position, which unveils the underlying meaning of Lépine's act, was silenced in the media fallout of the Polytechnique.

> *Et pourquoi nous faire taire? Parce que le geste de Lépine dévoile l'existence du système de domination entre les hommes et les femmes et parce que nos analyses en rendent visible l'horreur. Il ne faut surtout pas que la réalité remonte à la surface du discours* (Juteau and Laurin-Frenette, 1990: 211).

This article identifies an underlying "sociologie de l'horreur" as a privileged truthful account which must be salvaged from the silencing of the media and of masculinist

discourse generally. In the same way that for Dworkin the snuff film well represents the North American pornography industry, for many Québécoise and Canadian feminists, the extreme case of Lépine's act *stands in for* and is the logical conclusion of the current system of gender domination. But this analysis begs the question, which reality does Lépine's act reveal? Or, more generally, what is the relation between a spectacular mass murder like this one, and the day-to-day low level fear and violence experienced by women? What are the implications of seeing the extreme as the defining moment for gender relations? And, perhaps most importantly, how can one hope to respond once the dust has settled?

As a preliminary response to these queries, I would carefully contend that aspects of feminist rhetoric around violence against women, particularly as they begin to circulate in broader discourse, are not simply clean critical tools which cut through ambient masculinist silences and lies. (Although this is part of their function). Feminist rhetoric carries more than critical negativity, more than a righteous corrective effectivity. It carries a tangibly productive weight which may at times even amplify the fear-production process.

Clearly, within the rhetorical arena, certain arguments "take" more easily than others. As the success of certain anti-pornography and now anti-violence campaigns show, the articulation of feminism with more traditional feminine terms like morality or victimhood offer fertile ground for public persuasion, and for government-administered solutions. However, within these narratives, the essential feminist components of autonomy and female agency tend to fall by the wayside. The difficulty arises when we seek to differentiate between the dramatic and pragmatic force of certain rhetorical positions (such as feminist outrage voiced by Dworkin in the aftermath of the Polytechnique) and how we as feminists understand the world around us — *and how we inhabit it.* The danger lies, I think, in believing too literally in our own narratives. As the feminist imaginary becomes saturated with fear-producing metaphors of an

escalating "war against women" or "violence against women," we leave less and less space to imagine resistance and social change.

Notes

[1] In her influential discussion of North American feminism as a "subaltern counterpublic," Nancy Fraser describes the channels of communication of this sphere as occurring through "a variegated array of journals, bookstores, publishing companies, film and video distribution networks, lecture series, research centers, academic programs, conferences, conventions, festivals, and local meeting places" (Fraser, 1993: 14). This listing demonstrates the materiality and the range of discursive places which facilitate the circulation of feminist discourses through geographical space.

[2] Timelines offer a useful shorthand to perceived collective histories. Hunter's timeline may be usefully compared with the 10 year anniversary issue of *Ms*. Magazine's WLM timeline which notes many of the same events. Of couse, such devices function rhetorically through the process of selection and the production of linear progressions and patterns which privilege certain events. Hunter's timeline, within a strong anti-censorship position tends perhaps to simplify the progression of the anti-violence and anti-pornography movements.

[3] See, for example, Thelma McCormack's succinct summary of effects research on the link between pornography and violent behaviour. ("Making Sense of Research on Pornography," *Women Against Censorship*. Varda Burstyn, ed. Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 1985). This entire volume offers important Canadian feminist commentary on the pornography debates.

[4] For an insightful, in-depth discussion of the discursive complexities of the Canadian pornography debates, see Dany Lacombe's *Blue Politics: Pornography and the Law in the Age of Feminism*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994).

[5] For an analysis of the discursive struggle within media representations in the wake of the Polytechnique, see Marc Raboy, "Media and the Invisible Crisis of Everyday Life" (Marc Raboy and Bernard Dagenais, eds. *Media, Crisis and Democracy: Mass Communication and the Disruption of Social Order*. London: Sage Publications, 1992).

[6] One cannot mention this panel without noting its controversial status among grassroots feminists and the eventual withdrawal of the National Action Committee from the Panel on the grounds of lack of representation of diverse groups.

[7] In fact, American anti-pornography lawyer and activist Catherine MacKinnon, who taught at Osgoode Hall Law School near Toronto until the mid-eighties, was instrumental in the writing of the LEAF brief that largely formed the basis for the court's opinion. (See Jeffrey Toobin, "Annals of Law: X-Rated". *The New Yorker* October 3, 1994: 70-78.)

Works Cited

Addelson, Kathryn Pyne. 1993. "Knowers/Doers and Their Moral Problems.". *Feminist Epistemologies*. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, eds. New York: Routledge, 265-294.

Changing the Landscape: Ending Violence — Achieving Equality. 1993. (Final Report The Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, .

Dworkin, Andrea. 1994. Keynote Address, Polytechnique one-year anniversary memorial. Université de Montréal, December 7, Audio Recording.

———. 1993. *Letters from a War Zone*. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books.

Ellis, Kate, Beth Jaker, Nan D. Hunter, et. al. 1988. *Caught Looking: Feminism, Pornography & Censorship*. Seattle: The Real Comet Press

Faludi, Susan. 1991. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Doubleday.

Foucault, Michel. 1970. *L'Ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.

———. 1978. "Politics and the Study of Discourse". *Ideology and Consciousness* 3.

Fraser, Nancy. 1993. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy". Bruce Robbins, ed. *The Phantom Public Sphere*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1-32.

French, Marilyn. 1992. *The War Against Women*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Juteau, Danielle, and Nicole Laurin-Frenette. 1990. "Une sociologie de l'horreur". *Sociologie et sociétés* XXII.1: 206-211.

Lacombe, Dany. 1994. *Blue Politics: Pornography and the Law in the Age of Feminism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lenz, Kirsten Marthe. 1993. "The Popular Pleasures of Female Revenge (or Rage Bursting in a Blaze of Gunfire". *Cultural Studies* VII.3. 374-405.

Massumi, Brian, ed. 1993. *The Politics of Everyday Fear*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McCormack, Thelma. 1985. "Making Sense of Research on Pornography". Varda Burstyn, ed. *Women Against Censorship*. Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre. 181-205.

Raboy, Marc. 1992. "Media and the Invisible Crisis of Everyday Life". *Media, Crisis and Democracy: Mass Communication and the Disruption of Social Order*. Marc Raboy and Bernard Dagenais, eds. London Sage Publications.

Segal, Lynne. 1993. "Does Pornography Cause Violence? The Search for Evidence". *Dirty Looks: Women, Pornography, Power*. Pamela Church Gibson and Roma Gibson, eds. London: British Film Institute., 5-21.

Toobin, Jeffrey. 1994. "Annals of Law: X-Rated". *The New Yorker* October 3, 70-78.