

WHAT FEMINISTS CAN LEARN FROM THE LESBIAN SEX RADICALS

Margaret Nichols

Nothing I wouldn't do for the woman I sleep with
When nobody satisfy me the way she do.
kiss her in public places
win the lottery
take her in the ass
in a train lavatory . . .
sell my car
tie her to the bed post and
spank her
lie to my mother
let her watch me fuck my other lover . . .
buy her cocaine
show her the pleasure in danger . . .
to keep her wanting me . . .

In women's groups, the political clones, the Dworkinities, see my studded belt and withdraw. I am obviously a sex pervert, and good, real true lesbians are not sex perverts. They are high priestesses of feminism, conjuring up the "wimmin's" revolution. As I understand it, after the wimmin's revolution, sex will consist of wimmin holding hands, taking their shirts off and dancing in a circle. Then we will all fall asleep at exactly the same moment. If we didn't all fall asleep, something else might happen—something male-identified, cojoclicity, pornographic, noisy, and undignified. Something like an orgasm.²

Contemporary lesbian culture has bred some interesting developments in the area of sexuality. "Mainstream" lesbian feminist culture (the primarily white, middle-class lesbian culture that grew out of the feminist movement of the seventies) has tended to celebrate traditional female attributes of sexuality—gentleness, egalitarianism, sensuality (as opposed to genital focus), tenderness and other not necessarily orgasmic aspects of sex. At the same time other lesbians have explored domains of sex previously believed to be outside the bounds of "normal" female sexuality: rough sex, dirty sex, "promiscuous" sex, s/m sex.

The sex radicals have been much maligned and sharply attacked within the lesbian/bisexual women's community. This stands in sharp contrast to the way sexual exploration was received by the gay male community before AIDS. Between Stonewall and AIDS, gay men elevated sexual expansion to the status of a political mandate, seeing it as central to the expression of male homosexuality. The very same behaviors, practiced by lesbian sex radicals, have been censored,

denounced and excoriated by the mainstream lesbian-feminist community.³

The contemporary lesbian community has created an atmosphere in which some women have begun to experiment with a sexuality that defies the constraints of gender role, transcending and separating sex from gender. Feminists who oppose the sex radicals argue that they have, by virtue of their socialization in a patriarchal society, been brainwashed and are perpetuating and/or mimicking oppressive sexuality. But these critics ignore the fact that sex between women cannot possibly carry the same power differential as sex between a man and a woman. The lesbian sex radical movement has developed (with no corresponding movement developing in the heterosexual feminist world) precisely because lesbians are freer of patriarchal sex roles.

I want to emphasize that while I polarize two extremes of lesbian sexuality for this analysis, I am not saying that lesbian sex radicals have a better or truer form of sexuality than anyone else. In sex, pluralism is critical. True sexuality is diverse sexuality. We need to celebrate diversity, especially in the realm of sex. Our culture as a whole polarizes female sexuality, praising the Madonna and damning the Whore. I applaud a movement which challenges that, pushing at the boundaries, redefining female and lesbian sexuality. The lesbian sex radicals say: if it gives pleasure and is consensual, do it.

Many feminists and sexologists agree that contemporary female sexuality is repressed, rather than being a natural expression of women's sexual potential. This is fundamental. If current female sexuality is repressed, it makes sense to encourage efforts to uncover sexual desire. If current female sexuality is natural, it's better not to tamper with the order of the universe.

We know from Masters and Johnson⁴ that women's physiological capacity for sexual arousal and orgasm is as great or greater than men's. Anthropological research, especially by feminists, shows that in many cultures women are as sexual or more sexual than men, and that attributes we take to be indisputably male, such as sexual aggression, are relative. Rubin reports that in New Guinea "men's fear of sex is so extreme that rape appears to be feared by men rather than women. Women run after the men, who flee from them, women are the sexual aggressors, and it is bridegrooms who are reluctant."⁵

We know that the sexual behavior of women in contemporary Western culture has not matched their biological potential. What accounts for this discrepancy between potential and behavior? Many feminists, including myself, believe that sexuality is socially con-

structured and misogyny is principally responsible for repressing and distorting female sexuality.

Feminist Construction of Female Sexuality, or After the Revolution, How Will Women Do It?

While most feminists would agree on the cultural factors which constitute misogyny, there has been and continues to be much less agreement about the "true" nature of female sexuality. In a culture free of male dominance, what kind of sexuality would women want, practice or experience?

Within the contemporary women's movement, two answers have emerged. One has been characterized by Echols and others as the cultural feminist line. Andrea Dworkin, Susan Brownmiller, Mary Daly and Adrienne Rich are the best known representatives of this position.⁶ The cultural feminist position on sex approaches biological determinism: they appear to believe that male sexuality is essentially by its nature, violent and destructive, and that female sexuality is essentially gentle, pacifist and life-preserving. Cultural feminists see male and female sexuality as polar opposites. While they acknowledge that women's sexual freedom has been hampered by misogyny, they contend that such characteristics as gentleness, etc. are "natural" to women, rather than the result of repression.

Some of the consequences of this thinking are obvious. Heterosexual sex verges on being oppressive to women under any circumstances. Pornography is solely an expression of male objectification of women. Diffuse, non-genitally-oriented, sensual behavior in the context of a loving relationship is the only natural sexual behavior for women. Other forms of sexuality must then be male-identified. As Gayle Rubin points out, the cultural feminist view of sex is very similar to the Western/Puritan/Victorian sexual ethic, with the exception of the exalted status of lesbianism.⁷ Rubin describes a "sex hierarchy" of socially condoned sex as defined by society at large. The inner circle includes sex that is married, heterosexual, monogamous, pro-creative, free, coupled, in a relationship, same generation, at home, no pornography, bodies only and vanilla. The outer circle includes sex that is homosexual, promiscuous, non-procreative, for money, alone or in groups, casual, cross-generational, in public places, with manufactured objects or s/m. Rubin maintains that the cultural feminists unwittingly promote most of the sexual values and taboos held by the most conservative elements of our society.

The alternative to the cultural feminist view, espoused by feminists

such as Ann Snitow, Carole Vance, Gayle Rubin and many others, is that, while we must take seriously the effects of misogyny, the connection between it and female sexuality is not obvious. That is, while we know some things about how women have been sexually oppressed and repressed, we have little idea of what a free female sexuality would be.⁸ This point of view does not assume that current stereotypical female expression is natural to women; nor that, come the revolution, women will eschew pornography, domination/submission fantasies or casual sex. It assumes, rather, that we don't know what is natural to women, or even if such a concept makes sense. Thus we must carefully examine all of women's (and men's) expressions of sexuality in a value-free atmosphere. This strain of feminist thought emphasizes the importance of sexual pluralism and of listening to what women say they want and do sexually.

I tend to take a more cautious position on what is and is not natural to women. Feminists tend to assume both that sexuality is socially constructed and that gender and gender relations are responsible for that construction. But what if gender is not as critical as we assume? What if sexism determines some of the content but not much of the structure and function of sexuality? Take the example of rape, and remember Rubin's New Guinea tribe. Feminists assume that rape is an expression of men's power over women. Rubin shows that gender can be reversed in this relation. Maybe we need to drop gender out of the picture and focus instead on how sex and aggression work together. Feminists tend to assume that any association of power and sex is negative (based on the assumption that power is always held by men), but there are alternative ways of seeing this issue.

We must assume that men and women exhibit polarized and exaggerated forms of sexuality and that these extremes each contain functional and nonfunctional attributes. Our task is to dissect and analyze these polarizations. But we also need to see how much of sexuality is constructed separate from male/female dynamics. As Rubin says:

It is essential to separate gender and sexuality analytically to more accurately reflect their separate existence. This goes against the grain of much contemporary feminist thought, which treats sexuality as a derivation of gender. . . . Feminist conceptual tools were developed to detect and analyze gender-based hierarchies. To the extent that these overlap with erotic stratifications, feminist theory has some explanatory power. But as issues become less those of gender and more those of sexuality, feminist analysis becomes irrelevant and often misleading. (Rubin, 1984, p. 309)

The Lesbian Sex Radicals: Who Are Those Women and What Are They Doing, Anyway?

Pat Califia describes the origins of the lesbian/bisexual sex radical movement in the mid-seventies as an offshoot of lesbian feminist activity.¹⁰ In response to pressures for sexual conformity, lesbians who did or wanted to do s/m organized groups to provide support for "politically incorrect" sex. Many sex radicals are experimenting not only with s/m sex, but with various forms of bisexual sex, multiple sexual relationships, sex with more than one partner at a time, casual or anonymous sex, butch-femme roles and other types of gender-bending and with all sorts of sexual toys, enhancers, costumes, symbols and paraphernalia enlisted in pursuit of pleasure. Sex radicals are also creating a lesbian erotica: pornographic audio and video tapes, photographs and movies, erotic stories, novels, poetry and essays in magazines, newsletters and books.

What are these women doing that goes against the grain of contemporary feminist culture, indeed against the grain of the culture at large? In an era in which our society as a whole seems to be growing more conservative, lesbian sex radicals are valorizing recreational sex, non-monogamy and group sex. Further, they are going beyond accepted feminist analyses of sex. While mainstream feminists are still decrying "women as sex objects," the sex radicals are redefining the meaning of the term. "Sex object" originally referred to several things: men viewing women only as potential sex partners; ignoring women's choices about participating in sex; and imposing narrow standards of beauty on all women. Over the years, feminists began to apply the term more loosely. I have heard lesbians complain that their partners are viewing them as sex objects when they comment on what nice breasts they have.

Sex radicals also destroy the idea of "natural" sexuality. Our culture holds that certain uses of certain body parts are sexually acceptable. The lesbian sex radicals eroticize all parts of the body, find a wide range of activities sexual in particular contexts and recognize no boundaries on accessories. A razor is an erotic tool for shaving a partner's pubic hair in a sexual ritual; a foot is an erogenous zone if a lover is kissing it; a spanking is a sexual act if administered with proper panache during a state of heightened sexual arousal.

What do these women have to teach us? Very concretely, they can teach us new ways to achieve pleasure. This alone may be worth espousing and protecting. The sex radicals also deliver a very important message to women, who have been taught their sexual desires

are evil, sick or unfeminist by the culture at large and their own movement. Sex radicals also expand our knowledge of what women do and don't like sexually, given a setting of freedom and permission. Last, sex radicals, interacting sexually without the confounding variable of heterosexual dynamics, can perhaps begin to teach us something about the deep structure of human sexuality. To look at this last issue, I want to examine in some detail two aspects of sex radical activity: s/m and gender-bending.

Power Dynamics and Sex: Playing with S/M

More than once an olive skinned nun pulled her skirts up for me; later bribed me with a wild orange palm leaf; thought its color was a miracle awesome as the resurrection; whispered it was the palm leaf of Mary Magdalene, laughed; side to side, stroked her unfrocked breasts and shoulders with it; tied my wrist to hers with it and took my forgiveness.¹¹

A major focus of the lesbian sex radical movement has been sadomasochistic sexual practices. As Rubin points out, s/m is on the farthest fringes of the social outer limits of sexuality. Although sadomasochism is a statistically unusual activity, it is by no means rare. Hunt's 1974 survey showed nearly 5% of respondents acknowledging s/m sexual activity;¹² the *Gay Report* indicates that 37% of gay men and 15% of lesbians had some experience with sadomasochistic practices.¹³ Yet even within the field of sexuality s/m is rarely acknowledged and when mentioned, is typically described as abnormal.

The lesbian sex radicals (and, for that matter, most gay male s/m practitioners) define s/m sex quite differently from the mainstream. The majority of s/m practitioners define the essential elements in s/m as domination and submission, not pain:

sadomasochism is... an erotic ritual that involves acting out fantasies in which one partner is sexually dominant and the other partner is sexually submissive. This ritual is preceded by a negotiation process that enables participants to select their roles, state their limits, and specify some of the activities that will take place. The basic dynamic of sexual sadomasochism is an eroticized, consensual exchange of power—not violence or pain.¹⁴

And one might say that the ritual itself is an essential element, serving the same complex functions of drama, reverence and catharsis as do rituals in spiritual or religious contexts. Sadomasochism is physically safe and probably no more or less psychologically safe than other types of sexual expression. Its practitioners are not "addicted" to

s/m. While there are individuals for whom s/m sex can be addictive or self-destructive, these problems are no more or less common than abuses of, say, alcohol, recreational drugs or food. Anything pleasurable can and will be abused by some people. Sex is no exception, and s/m sex is no exception.

Let us first deal with the issue of physical pain; while it is less pivotal than dominance/submission, it is easier to explain. The pain administered/received during an s/m "scene" (a prearranged s/m sexual encounter) is not experienced as pain because of heightened levels of arousal and probably also because pain thresholds tend to rise for experienced s/m participants. People who like pain during sex do not enjoy pain at other times, and in fact the same stimuli that might be enjoyable at a time of high sexual arousal might be noxious when arousal is still low. When painful stimuli—spanking, slapping, whipping, nipple clamps, etc.—are administered to an already aroused person, the pain serves to heighten arousal, prolong the "plateau" (preorgasm) phase of sex and make the orgasm more intense. Some kinds of pain can also make the skin affected much more sensitive.

Why does pain have this effect? There is a complex interaction between different arousal states such as fear, anger, sex and pain. Think about horror movies; sometimes we seek fear for pleasure's sake. We might similarly seek pain. Tripp posits a "barrier" principle of sexuality, hypothesizing that sexual arousal is produced by overcoming barriers, whether of romantic love (the unattainable, distant or forbidden lover) or physical pain.¹⁵ The anthropologists Ford and Beach note that:

societies in which intercourse is regularly associated with biting, scratching or hair pulling prove inevitably to be the ones in which children and adolescents are allowed a great deal of sexual freedom. Furthermore, if the cultural stereotype of satisfactory intercourse includes a considerable amount of moderately painful interaction, it also represents the woman as an active, vigorous participant in all things sexual.¹⁶

Larry Mass speculates on a biological link between pain and pleasure via endorphins, the opiate-like substance released in the brain in response to stress or noxious or painful stimuli.¹⁷ Whether any of these theories turn out to be right, they get away from the frameworks of sickness/health and political correctness/incorrecness to speculate about the essence of sexuality.

Dominance/submission is a more complex issue than the question of pain. A striking feature of much s/m, especially lesbian s/m, is the theme of trust and love. In a typical s/m story, the bottom (also called masochist or submissive) gives herself in complete trust and surrender

to the top (sadist, dominant) who administers pain, bondage or punishment lovingly, respectfully and with much appreciation for the courage of her partner. Is this theme sexist? Certainly if we assume the top is male and the bottom female, it can look sexist. But the theme can be gendered in many ways, depending on the gender of the actors and on whether they see the theme as symbolic of peer love relationships or of childhood age-discrepant relationships. The ambiguity of s/m themes and their multiply-determined origins make s/m sex in some ways the most genderless of all sex.

Parent/child and teacher/student s/m themes seem to show no particular patterns of gender. Mommy/little girl is as likely to emerge as Daddy/little girl. The connection between child/parent themes and s/m is especially clear in one of the most typical experiences of the bottom:

Why would anyone want to be dominated, given the risks? Because it is a healing process. As a top, I find the old wounds and unappressed hunger I nourish, I cleanse and close the wounds, I devise and meet out appropriate punishments for old, irrational sins. I tip the bottom up, I see her as she is, and I forgive her and turn her on and make her come, despite her unworthiness or self-hatred or fear.¹⁸

Gender is not the most important issue here. Think of Cheryl Clarke's poem "palm leaf of Mary Magdalene," part of which introduced this section. The hints of bondage and submission are in a lesbian context, and the connection between childhood and s/m is clear. The lesbian context shows that lesbian s/m is not simply a gender-rearranged version of patriarchal heterosexual themes.

Indeed, Califia sees s/m on a political level and connects it to what she interprets as the sexual underpinnings of political/social power, as explained in the following passage:

This may be why S&M is so threatening to the established order, and why it is so heavily penalized and persecuted. S&M roles are not related to gender or sexual orientation or race or class.... Our political system cannot digest the concept of power unconnected to privilege. S&M recognizes the erotic underpinnings of our systems, and seeks to reclaim them.¹⁹

While Califia is undoubtedly correct about a relationship between eroticism and political power, it is probably incorrect that s/m roles are not related to gender or sexual orientation or class. It is more correct to say that the relationships between s/m themes and these variables of power are complex and not systematic.

For s/m participants, power is experienced as fluid, not static. It can be granted, denied, exchanged and then reclaimed. This picture of power is totally unlike the rigid and static notion of power held in our culture as a whole.

This brings us to another level: the fluidity and complexity of power differentials in s/m. Most people do not always hold top or bottom roles, but switch between them. More interestingly, s/m roles rarely match real relationship and real-world roles. Most important is the interdependency of top and bottom:

While it is true that S&M involves dominance and submission, it is seldom clear whether the sadist controls the slave, or the masochist controls the master . . . viewing S&M merely as a power relationship between two participants still misses one of its central characteristics. This is the ultimate unity of sadism and masochism. Rather than taking these to be polar extremes . . . [see them] as elements of the same erotic attitude.²⁰

The notion of power in an s/m exchange goes against the grain of much contemporary feminist thinking, which is based on a victim/perpetrator model. This may be why many feminists find s/m hard to understand. S/m shows a type of power relationship in which the power of the dominator derives from the consent of the dominated and in which the participants are ultimately equal. This is part of the eroticism of s/m. It is also a way of seeing power that is very different from the hierarchical constructs in which even feminists have been trained.

Gender-Bending Sex

Not surprisingly, the lesbian sex radical movement has been a haven for those who experiment with sex roles and for women who play with the boundaries of sexual orientation. One of the ways the sex radicals have rebelled against the feminist concept of woman-identified woman is by bringing back butch-femme roles. Joan Nestle has been particularly eloquent in her defense of herself as a femme and of the history of butch-femme in lesbian culture:

A butch lesbian wearing men's clothes in the 1950's was not a man wearing men's clothes; she was a woman who created an original style to signal to other women what she was capable of doing—taking erotic responsibility. In the feminist decades, the fem is the lesbian who poses this problem of misinterpreted choice in the deepest way. If we dress to please ourselves and the other women to whom we want to announce our desire, we are called traitors by many of our own community, because we seem to be wearing the clothes of the enemy. Make-up, high heels, skirts, revealing clothes, even certain ways of holding the body are read as capitulation to patriarchal control of women's bodies. An accurate critique, if a woman feels uncomfortable or forced to present herself this way, but this is not what I am doing when I feel sexually powerful and want to share it with other women. Fems are women who have made choices, but we need to be able to read between the cultural lines to appreciate their strength. Lesbians should be mistress of discrepancies, knowing that resistance lies in the change of context.²¹

Nestle's analysis of butch-femme lesbian culture opposes that cur-

rently espoused by the movement, sociologists, etc., who say that butches and femmes of the fifties were only mimicking heterosexual culture, out of self-hatred and identification with the aggressor. Nestle's analysis of how an oppressed group can seize the symbols of political repression and turn them on their heads is reminiscent of the way the meaning of words like "nigger," "fag" and "dyke" were turned around by minority groups.

The existence and apparent erotic importance of butch-femme to lesbians raises further questions about the nature of sexual attraction. Try to disengage butch-femme, think of butch-femme as polarized aspects of personality, like being outgoing or shy. Imagine that our culture, and most others, have tended to assign these aspects to the opposite sexes, but that they actually have little to do with biological gender. If gender is divorced from biology, there could be more than two genders. If we consider the interaction of biology with these different aspects of personality, we can identify people not only by their physical gender but by their psychological gender as well. This could turn out to be a better basis for explaining erotic attraction than our current concept of sexual orientation, which relies only on biological gender.

Indeed, Newton and Walton have proposed a new schema for defining an individual's sexual preference that includes sexual orientation but goes beyond it. They also have a concept they call erotic identity (how one imagines oneself as an erotic object). Erotic identity is most typically modeled along gender lines but need not be. Erotic identity is more complex: it contains subcategories and refinements of the two-gender system. Newton and Walton distinguish erotic identity from erotic role, which corresponds most closely to active/passive or top/bottom and can be fluid or static.²²

Sex radicals are experimenting in other ways with new views of gender. One of them is by their acceptance of bisexuality. This comes partly from their political commitment to support all types of "deviant" sexuality. It also comes from seeing bisexuality as a type of gender-bending. At least, bisexuality sees gender as drastically less important than it is for either homosexuality or heterosexuality. For some women, gender is less important than s/m identity; for others it is less important than some other aspect of personality. Still others are attracted only to butches or only to femmes—but they can be male or female butches or male or female femmes.

Gay male culture, at least before the ascendancy of the "clone," provided numerous examples of gender-bending: the drag queen, the men who will only have sex with men dressed as women, the

weight-lifter with a diamond stud in his ear. The lesbian sex radicals celebrate the same kind of gender-bending in women. The lesbian who fistfucks a gay man, the lesbian who straps on a dildo under a pair of jeans and slips a condom on it to screw her female partner, the lesbian who wears garter belt and stockings in order to dominate her lover, are all playing with our concepts of gender.

Conclusion

We need to celebrate the diversity of women's sexuality—whether it be gentle or wild and voracious, whether it be unified, easy to understand, complex or contradictory. We cannot do that until we stop passing judgments on each other's likes, dislikes, activities and desires.

The lesbian sex radical movement has the potential to be enormously liberating. Although it is difficult to assess the impact this movement is having on women's sexuality in general, I suspect there is beginning to be a ripple effect, at least within the lesbian community. Many lesbians have now been exposed to the movement and have had opportunities to hear diverse sexual experiences presented in a positive light. Recently I have begun to conduct sexuality workshops for lesbian and bisexual women in which I show lesbian-made video porn and other erotica and ask women to speak about their own sexuality. Two of the most common responses to the videos are "It validated what I already like to do but felt ashamed of" and "It gave me ideas of things to do that I never thought of before." If the sex radical movement can do these two things—alleviate sexual guilt and help create new modes of sexual pleasure—it will be of invaluable service to women.

On a more theoretical level, the example of lesbian sex radicals can teach us much about female sexuality. For instance, I have been told by both gay men and lesbians involved in s/m that women approach s/m differently than do men, with more concern for safety and consentuality, especially the subtleties of emotional safety and the ability to give true consent. If this is so, then perhaps women have a unique contribution to make in the area of sex: the development of a humanistic, rather than a moralistic ethic of sex.

Finally, their example can help us get past the constraints of gender. They can teach us how to step beyond simplistic renderings of sexuality, such as the essentialist/biological view, the patriarchal view, the pathology model and yes, the feminist model of sexuality. In short, they can show us meaning in previously unfamiliar and maligned acts and ways of negotiating sexuality.

NOTES

- ¹ Cheryl Clarke, *Living as a Lesbian* (Ithaca, NY: Firebrand Books, 1986), 56.
- ² Pat Califia, "A Secret Side of Lesbian Sexuality," in S and M: *Studies in Sodomasochism*, ed. Thomas Weinberg and G. W. Levi Kamel (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1983), 131.
- ³ Margaret Nichols, "Lesbian Sexuality: Issues and Emerging Theory," in *Lesbian Psychologies*, ed. Boston Women and Psychology Collective (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
- ⁴ William Masters and Virginia Johnson, *Human Sexual Response* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966).
- ⁵ Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 166n.
- ⁶ Alice Echols, "The Taming of the Id: Feminist Sexual Politics, 1968-83," in *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, ed. Carole Vance (Boston: Routledge & Keagan Paul, 1984).
- ⁷ Gayle Rubin, "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*.
- ⁸ Carol Vance, "Pleasure and Danger: Toward a Politics of Sexuality," in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*.
- ⁹ Rubin, "Thinking Sex," 309.
- ¹⁰ Califia, "Lesbian Sexuality."
- ¹¹ Clarke, *Living as a Lesbian*, 28.
- ¹² Morton Hunt, *Sexual Behaviours in the 1970's* (Chicago: Playboy Press, 1974).
- ¹³ Karla Jay and Allen Young, *The Gay Report* (New York: Summit Press, 1979).
- ¹⁴ Califia, "Lesbian Sexuality," 130.
- ¹⁵ C. A. Tripp, *The Homosexual Matrix* (New York: New American Library, 1975).
- ¹⁶ Celian Ford and Frank Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior* (New York: Harper & Row, 1951).
- ¹⁷ Larry Mass, "Coming to Grips with Sodomasochism," in Weinberg and Levi Kamel, *Studies in Sodomasochism*.
- ¹⁸ Califia, "Lesbian Sexuality," 131.
- ¹⁹ Califia, "Lesbian Sexuality," 132.
- ²⁰ Califia, "Lesbian Sexuality," 132.
- ²¹ Joan Nestle, "The Fem Question," in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*.
- ²² Esther Newton and Shirley Walton, "The Misunderstanding: Towards a More Precise Sexual Vocabulary," in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*.