

**Human Events**<sup>TM</sup>.com

Headquarters of the Conservative Underground



## Playboy's Historical Hate Rape

by [Judith Reisman](#)

06/24/2009

Playboy's recent online "So Right, It's Wrong" campaign to "hate rape" ten conservative women, providing a gallery with their names, photos and videos has received some rightful condemnation. However, few people realize that "hate rape" mirth is in keeping with Playboy's long history of marketing the sexual assault of women and children.

Many liberals and conservatives were stunned both by Playboy's call to rape the ten ladies in its online issue and by AOL's loyal censorship of those who criticized its 'rape your enemy treatise.'

After Playboy dumped its cowardly tract, inevitably, thousands of Playboy-trained users defended its rape campaign as "edgy" "speech."

In fact, Playboy's website brags that such 'edgy' erototoxins are busily arousing 10 million Americans plus "partners in more than 50 countries throughout Europe, Latin America and Asia...in 200 countries and territories," thus growing the demand side of the global sex traffic.

Playboy is statically documented as long *supporting* the sex traffic and the rape of women and children as a class -- albeit usually absent specific names.

For example, the November 1971 Playboy (redacted) image of a naked sleeping child urged dads to do what? "BABY DOLL: It's easy to feel paternalistic to the cuddly type above. Naturally, she digs forceful father figures, so come on strong, Big Daddy!"

Historically all females, liberal or conservative, are treated with the mandarin slavery mentality of contempt and sexual violence by Playboy and its erototoxic satellites.

Scientific research commonly finds sex and drugs co-morbid addictions. As principal investigator for the U.S. Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention study, *Images of Children, Crime & Violence in Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler* (Grant No. 84-JN-AX-K007, 1989), my research team documented Playboy's strategic seduction of vulnerable consumers into both addictions.

In 1987, psychiatrist Dr. Linnea Smith and I reported on "Sports, Children, Drugs, Crime and Violence in Playboy Magazine" to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

Youngsters trust publications that profile sports heroes. Collegiate football players appear in the '50s and college basketball players since November 1977 in Playboy's "All-American Team."

Playboy merged sports, sex, and mirthful rape since 1954, adding illicit drugs in 1968. In the late '60s, visual drug scenes appeared, with 28% involving juveniles as glamorous and harmless.

In 1970, the Playboy Foundation bankrolled NORML, the National Organization for the Repeal of Marijuana Laws (later "Reform"), and lobbied for legalization of cocaine.

In 1975, market researchers found over 6 million children raised in Playboy homes, many of those who today can laugh at the hate rape crusade. (How many of these are parents whose daughters send naked photos of themselves across the Internet?)

With Playboy marketing prostitution, selling the Phototron (commonly used to grow marijuana indoors) was a logical extension of its interests.

In 1979 psychologist, Aaron Hass (*Teenage Sexuality*) said almost all children trusted Playboy for reliable sex advice, values, and mores. Our early studies found just over 30% of Playboy images were "child magnets." These were commonly sexualized cartoons and illustrations with special child appeal, (i.e., Santa Claus, Cowboys and Indians, coloring books) like the colorful "Feds 'N Heads" (May 1971) druggie board game.

*Playboy's* August 1984 "Official Boy Scout Handbook" awarded a "Water Safety" badge for scouts who had Johnnie Walker straight. Cocaine smoking scouts got a "Free-Basing" badge.

In our study of 373 *Playboy* issues, there were 3,045 child images (children under age 18), an average of 8.2 images per issue, 158 (5%) linked to drugs or alcohol; 52% of these were drug and 48% alcohol related.

This is a quick contextual sketch of Playboy's recent "hate rape" movement as based on a systematic use of cartoons to condition the viewer, to see the mirth in sexualized children, even raped children in photographs.

Playboy falsely states that they never portrayed children in sex scenes with adults. Fully 415 (14%) of our 3,045 *Playboy* child images found children in a happy or neutral sex scene with adults. For example, an officer lethargically observes Dorothy's three friends skip off after apparently having raped her. "That's them officer!" (March 1978, p. 231). This was typical of 21% (646) images linking children with nudity and 14% (424) with genital acts.

No *Playboy* child sex abuse scene ever showed the child as harmed. *Playboy* displayed adult-child sex via its fold out biography and in "Sex in Cinema" featuring oral and

incestuous activity.

In sum, Playboy's drugs and child sex rapes are part of a larger context of prostitution propaganda, often in a sadomasochistic or ritual, virgin sacrifice context. Playboy laughs at gang rape, incestuous abuse, juvenile prostitution, necrophilia, and sadomasochism.

Hence, Playboy commonly depicts men and boys as impotent, as "too small," and as rapists. Most children were between six and eleven years of age -- the most common age group for actual incestuous abuse and general child maltreatment. Based on case histories, sex offender and survivor testimonies, child pornography, child prostitution, and sex rings research, and onsite crime evidence, Playboy has long been used to sexually entrap children.

To do this, Playboy, like all erototoxins, is at war with real men. Liberal Playboy icon Dr. Bernie Zilbergeld wonders why Playboy sexually ridicules men in their cartoons.

"Humor is the basic source of education ... and sexual humor boasts all the old crap and all the old fears. It counts. Sex is loaded with anxiety, even for ten-year-olds. Cartoons that poke fun at impotence or other male inadequacies would outweigh any supportive things said in the advice column" (Thomas Weyr, *Reaching For Paradise*, 1978, p. 218).

As in the Playboy "mirthful" cartoon above of a man who sexually assaults a woman in the elevator, men who are ridiculed as impotent, too small, or deformed are at high risk of proving their virility by finding mirth in what they will call "edgy....hate rape" speech and actions.

Cowards are historically dangerous to the weak and vulnerable.

---

*Dr. Reisman is a former principal investigator for the U.S. Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Her last book was Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences—The Red Queen and the Grand Scheme. She runs [drjudithreisman.com](http://drjudithreisman.com).*

---

Reader Comments: (40)

[Report Abusive Post](#) You forgot their 'funniest' cartoon- Chester the Molester.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 03:17 AM

**Big Daddy G**, What's it to ya?

[Report Abusive Post](#) Big Daddy, Chester the Molester was a staple of Hustler, not Playboy. Eventually, there was so much outrage that Hustler changed the name of the cartoon simply to "Chester."

But having said that, I have ALWAYS HATED PLAYBOY. And NOT because I object to dirty pictures. I like looking at pictures of naked women as much as any other man. I object to Playboy because it makes me feel inadequate.

Because Playboy tries to sell an image of who is the ideal man? According to Playboy, it is a man who has his way with women. He is young, more or less, handsome, well-attired. He has a good job and a lot of disposable income. He wears only cool clothes, has only cool automobiles, uses only cool cosmetics, has only the latest in cool toys and electronic gadgets.

With all of these things going for him, he can talk any woman he wants into bed.

And finally, The Playboy Man has to think a certain way -- or he can't be a real Playboy Man. the real Playboy has to be politically "progressive." He has to support liberal causes, because he has to prove his concern for everybody, because everybody knows that women aren't attracted to men who aren't sensitive and caring about suffering.

You can't be a Playboy if you're not a liberal. Ronald Reagan fans need never apply.

I am very few of the above things -- particularly progressive. I could never live up to this Playboy ideal. And Playboy always made me feel like, if I couldn't live up to their ideal image, I was therefore inferior; I was lacking an essential something.

**BLEEP PLAYBOY!**

A couple of years ago, I enrolled in a subscription to Sirius satellite radio, and the Sirius worker asked me if I wanted a free subscription to Playboy radio. I told him no, and he repeated, but it's free, and I told him HELL NO; the service was worth more to me withOUT Playboy.

Why would I want something that makes me feel bad about myself?

By the way, has anybody noticed that as female political pundits go, the hot ones seem to be CONSERVATIVE?

I mean, I like Susan Estrich, even if she is a liberal, bu c'mon -- put her next to Ann Coulter, and there's no contest at all! And Helen Thomas -- please, somebody, gimme a spoon; the faster I vomit, the better.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 03:47 AM

**James A. Nollet**, Milkowice, POLAND

[Report Abusive Post](#)

"Many liberals and conservatives were stunned both by Playboy's call to rape the ten ladies in its online issue"

Why? Why are they stunned? Are they really that stupid?

The only possible reason for anyone being "stunned" is because they were not taking at face value everything Playboy has stood for since its inception.

Why on earth do you think that decent people (who get laughed at on a daily basis by the

smirking intellectuals who occupy our public conversation) have, since FOREVER, prevented their children and teens from seeing or having such trash in their possession?

For 50 years at least, we've been mocked, laughed at, satirized and joked about on late night TV. And then we get this kind of "Oh, I'm so shocked!" from these people.

We have "character training" in the public schools, because the character that was taught by Godly, churchgoing Americans has been laughed out of the public square.

It's the word "continuum". That describes what this is. Just a continuum, and more to follow. So get over "being shocked" or you're going to wear yourselves out.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 08:40 AM

**Meryl,**

[Report Abusive Post](#)No doubt, Satan looks fondly upon Hugh Hefner as he regards Hefner's great contributions in leading America from morality.

How many sexual perverts have first lusted over pictures of perverted fathers in bedrooms of young girls, before sneaking into households at night to nab innocents?

Mind is creative. The Christian mind nurtures healthy thinking; anti-God minds do just the opposite.

The wickedness Playboy has put into the world is horribly, overwhelming; not a joking matter. Pandora's Box is open; the worst of thoughts continue to escape into the world. Who can close it, but Jesus Christ who is waiting in the wings?

Jun 24, 2009 @ 09:18 AM

**square root,** In

[Report Abusive Post](#)it wasn't "hate rape," it was "hate f\*\*k" It's still offensive, but it's not advocating violence. There's a big difference between a consensual act between two people who hate each other very much, and rape.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 09:57 AM

**Dan**

[Report Abusive Post](#)Buck: "In a fair world, Ann Coulter would have Susan Estrich's body (and lose the Adam's apple, but that's another story)."

Wow! it only took until the 3rd post for this devolve into exactly the thing that is wrong in this issue: rating women we don't know.

Of course, we all knew we could count on Buck. Can the profanity be far behind?

Jun 24, 2009 @ 10:00 AM

**Harlequin,** Pittsburgh, PA

[Report Abusive Post](#)Meryl: "For 50 years at least, we've been mocked, laughed at, satirized and joked about on late night TV."

Yeah, but something about being laughed at by a fool that makes it completely

ineffective :-)

Meryl: "And then we get this kind of "Oh, I'm so shocked!" from these people."

Oh I know. Consequences to them are always such a surprise.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 10:02 AM

**Harlequin**, Pittsburgh, PA

[Report Abusive Post](#)Dan,

Even if we accepted your symantics it's still very wierd. I don't see a whole lot of difference in the terminology, however.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 10:12 AM

**Harlequin**, Pittsburgh, PA

[Report Abusive Post](#)it wasn't "hate rape," it was "hate f\*\*k"

Dan, thank you very much for our Darwin Award moment of the day. You know very well that the connotation of the article was very much the former. But, like the rest of the elitist liberals, you can decry the lesser of the offenses all while snickering about those Conservative women deserving the greater of the offenses.

Keep it up liberals, America is really getting a (un)healthy dose of the ugliness that is the foundation of liberalism.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 10:38 AM

**trotter**, Katy, TX

[Report Abusive Post](#)Oh Puhleeze!!! Your trotting out this same old horse, now I know your going to pull the old "Media influence" argument on me but only mental defective freaks who are messed up in the first place would rape or kill somebody because he/she saw it on TV. Puritans butt out. It seems to me that you all preach about keeping government out of this and that, but when it comes to the bedroom...oh boy, like peeping tom perverts you can't help but want to watch the action while condemning. Listen I don't trust government in any area I don't like it when its in my wallet or in my pants for that matter. Anybody who does shill research for the government whether it be "global warming" or "sex" research earns my distrust. Now I don't think children should be photographed in explicit manner but if adults want to look at other adults nude let them. I've heard all the moralizing arguments about Playboy destroying lives, making the sky fall etc. I for one think porn is utterly boring and stupid but it is a freedom issue. I've researched some claims in this article and they seem to me a bit overblown. If your a real conservative like me you'll butt out and start blaming the person who commits heinous acts not the "dirty magazine" or "bad movie" he/she watched. Them and they alone are responsible for their actions.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 11:04 AM

**Rich**, Eugene OR

[Report Abusive Post](#)Rich:

When you are done ranting, can you point out where anyone has mentioned government involvement? As a TRUE Conservative, I believe that cultural change can only come from the efforts of citizens, not the government. In addition, I don't consider citizens

demanding decency and minimal standards in the public venues to be "puritan" or intruding on the bedroom.

BTW, why is it so hard for apologists of filth and smut to distinguish between that which is happening in an actual bedroom and that which is being spewed openly into the public arena?

Jun 24, 2009 @ 11:11 AM

**trotter**, Katy, TX

[Report Abusive Post](#) Hugh Heffner is a vile venom spewing reptile lower than a snake in a wagon rut. Could you imagine if some conservative had wrote this about liberals all the major birdcage lingers would have this on their front pages

Jun 24, 2009 @ 11:24 AM

**Flu-Bird**, Etna, CA USA

[Report Abusive Post](#) This is a hate crime. PB even defined the act in those terms "Hate Rape" or "Hate F#\*k" Maybe we need some kind of legislation to protect the victims of a crime like this, when someone is targeted for violence in a speech or publication and the idea is acted on by a listener. Wait this legislation was proposed by our perverted congress but instead of protecting us from child pornographers and pedophiles they are the ones protected. This world is lost.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 12:39 PM

**JB**, Socialist Seattle

[Report Abusive Post](#) As a democrat, I would take a hummer from that gal that replaces Rush on Fridays. I can't remember her name.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 01:08 PM

**The Happy Democrat**, Hyde Park, NY

[Report Abusive Post](#) Did anyone think to mention that it's the Conservative women who have guns?

Go ahead, try it, boys.

Result: Several dead Liberal bully-boys.

Win/win

Maybe it's really a Conservative conspiracy

Jun 24, 2009 @ 01:10 PM

**thegunslinger**, California

[Report Abusive Post](#) "Cowards are historically dangerous to the weak and vulnerable."

Like all worthless liberals, especially their Magic Negro, having to stand up to the thugs of the world by calling them on the murder of their citizens merely seeking a little thing called "freedom" is the job for someone else, like conservatives. It's a real icky kind of thing for the Coward Cult.

But boy, do worthless liberals get all erotic and salivate at the prospect of shoving a stiletto into the skull of a fetus and sucking its brains out. Heck, even if that fetus makes

it out of the canal breathing, how orgasmic they always feel knowing that death is imminent, in a filthy medical waste basket. This is better than licking an ice cream cone.

Yep, to cowards (that would be all worthless liberal Democrats) running from someone their own size is not nearly as much fun as crushing to cranium of a baby.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 01:23 PM

**Telescoping You**, Red America

[Report Abusive Post](#) GREAT POST, TROTTER!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Jun 24, 2009 @ 01:25 PM

**Harlequin**, Pittsburgh, PA

[Report Abusive Post](#) It's been decades since I read playboy, so I can't speak to what they publish these days, but I remember looking at (note my avoidance of the word "reading") Playboy during the exact time-frame that most of the references in this piece cite.

I don't recall ANY such things as are described here. I'm sure I could have messed a few, but such a preponderance of kiddie-porn would not only have caught my eye (and made me never look at that magazine again) but, one imagines, would have made the publication a pariah to the general public.

The hate-speech against conservative women was indeed odious, but I greatly hope that Dr. Reisman isn't leading a mis-directed child-porn crusade against Playboy merely as payback.

Just as PETA is completely jeopardizing its own credibility (and thus imperiling genuinely abused and neglected animals) with its preposterous campaign of chastising President Obama for killing a fly, this piece, if genuinely misleading, could do more harm than good.

If I'm wrong, I'm sorry, but my own memories directly contradict the assertions in this piece.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 01:58 PM

**Cormac**, NJ

[Report Abusive Post](#) Meryl,

Very well stated!

Dan,

How many times do people who hate each other engage in physical contact as described? How often is it consensual? And do you think the 10 ladies mentioned in the Playboy article would agree to such a thing? Not likely.

Jun 24, 2009 @ 02:45 PM

**Bill**, California

[Report Abusive Post](#) Hey Happy Democrat,

Why don't you leave this website and give yourself a happy "hummer".

Jun 24, 2009 @ 02:50 PM

**Bill**, California