

To the Editor,

I am writing to request that you discontinue accepting advertising money from www.bendricks.com.

It is possible that *The Nation's* staff did not realize that it provided classified advertising to an online escort service selling "complete erotic vacations with private introductions to friendly beautiful women." I will give you the benefit of the doubt.

It is also possible that your staff fully knew that Bendricks International Men's Club sells weeklong Costa Rica and Thailand vacation packages, featuring "companions, pleasurable massage service, female escort service, and adult entertainment in the privacy of your hotel suite," for prices ranging from about \$1700 to \$3000. The website features photos of clothed and unclothed prostitutes, described as "sweet, friendly and particularly adept at expressing their distinct erotic sex appeal" (if they are Thai) and "vibrant young adult women who enjoy exuding an aura of sexual vibrancy and beauty" (if they are Costa Rican). The site also mentions the exciting prospect of finding "a beautiful Tica considering marriage to the right man" or "beautiful Thai-Asian Women...who you might even consider for a girlfriend or wife." But if your assigned prostitute grows tiresome, Bendricks suggests, feel free to "change companions daily."

I have reviewed your advertising policy guidelines, and anticipate that you will revert directly to your standard "free speech trumps all" stance on this one.

If so, I must inquire why a magazine that week after week reports on the troubles of everyone from non-unionized Wal-Mart workers to unwed gays cannot forego a handful of advertising dollars in the name of third-world prostitutes servicing wealthy American men.

In other words, in a battle between the free speech rights of pornographers and pimps, and the women they exploit and abuse, why do the women always lose?

Sincerely,
AntiPorn Activist Network