

Father Inire's photo album

The Urth list — 2 messages, 2 voices, 08 Sep 1998

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/1100>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Dan Parmenter — 08 Sep 1998, 10:30

From: "William H. Ansley" <wansley at warwick.net>

Mantis>> Happily, Inire seems to be just enamoured by little exultantesses, and there
Mantis>> is no evidence of his actually molesting them. Boy, wouldn't that be an Mantis>>
embarrassment to the reign of the Autarch Severian.

I certainly hope no one reading this list thinks that Charles Lutwidge
Dodgson (Lewis Carroll) molested any children. He didn't. He also wasn't a
child pornographer - mantis was joking (I hope).

I guess it depends on how you define "pornography". Dodgson definitely took pictures of naked
little girls. This is not a controversial assertion as far as I know, and this is what Mantis was
talking about.

D

William H. Ansley — 09 Sep 1998, 00:01 · follows Dan Parmenter

Dan Parmenter <dan at lec.com> wrote:
From: "William H. Ansley" <wansley at warwick.net>

Mantis>> Happily, Inire seems to be just enamoured by little
exultantesses, and there
Mantis>> is no evidence of his actually molesting them. Boy, wouldn't that
be an
Mantis>> embarrassment to the reign of the Autarch Severian.

I certainly hope no one reading this list thinks that Charles Lutwidge
Dodgson (Lewis Carroll) molested any children. He didn't. He also wasn't a
child pornographer - mantis was joking (I hope).

I guess it depends on how you define "pornography". Dodgson
definitely took pictures of naked little girls. This is not a
controversial assertion as far as I know, and this is what Mantis was
talking about.

Yup, I guess it does. I didn't write "Lewis Carroll wasn't a child pornographer despite the fact
that he took pictures of naked little girls," not because I wasn't aware of that he took pictures of
naked little girls (as well as clothed ones) but because I assumed that the people who read this
list would know this fact.

Despite the fact that this hobby probably indicates a major kink in Charles Lutwidge Dodgson's
personality and sexuality (he never married nor had any kind of sexual relationship, as far as
anyone knows), the fact remains that the Victorian fashion at the time to idealize small children
as completely pure and innocent beings made it easy to present his photographs as Art.
Dodgson never put his nude photographs on public display, was very selective in who he let
view them, never published them and requested that all the nude photographs be destroyed

after his death, which they were.

Dodgson always asked permission of parents before he photographed their daughters in the nude (although he might play word games if the parents didn't directly tell him not to) and he never photographed a little girl in the nude who was at all unwilling that he do so.

I think the above statements disqualify Dodgson as a child pornographer. While I certainly don't find this aspect of Dodgson's artistic endeavors to be particularly appealing, I object to seeing him branded as something he was not.

If my arguments seem unconvincing, well, everyone is entitled to their own opinion. This discussion thread is by now completely off topic and I have no intention of contributing any more messages to it.

William Ansley