

A Personal Encounter with Purity Culture

Evangelical Christian Schooling in Aotearoa New Zealand

Olivia Stanley, University of Auckland

Abstract

In this article, I employ an autoethnographic lens to look at the evangelical Christian purity movement, which I experienced within my high school and church in Aotearoa/New Zealand. To frame my discussion, I focus on two best-selling books by evangelical Christian writer Dannah Gresh: *Secret Keeper: The Delicate Power of Modesty* (2002) and also *And the Bride Wore White: Seven Secrets to Sexual Purity* (2012). Both of these books were reverentially passed around my school and church circles as though they were sacred scripture. My analysis of Gresh's writing and evangelical purity culture does not arrive without an agenda, but comes with a plea to end abstinence-only sex education and purity teachings.

Key Words

Abstinence, Christianity, evangelicalism, gender, modesty, purity, sex education, virginity.

Introduction

In the early 1990s and 2000s, there was a particularly potent, purity-based evangelical Zeitgeist that stormed America and swept overseas to Aotearoa New Zealand.¹ What washed up on our shores were the adopted principles of abstinence, the virtues of feminine virginity and the morality of marriage—a minefield of values that many evangelical Christians here embraced. Embedded in this mania, we buried our heads in the sand and accepted it without question. I say “we,” as I employ an autoethnographic lens in this article to look within the evangelical purity movement. What follows are my own stories, and I am present in them as a privileged, Pākehā,² middle-class, tertiary-level educated, self-identifying woman, who benefits from the current heteronormative order.

From 2005 to 2015, I attended a private, evangelical Christian school in Aotearoa New Zealand. My sister and female cousin, alongside a few

¹ This article also appears in *Women's Studies Journal Aotearoa* (Stanley 2020). It is reproduced here with the permission of the *WSJ* editors.

² The term Pākehā carries diverse meanings for different communities and is used to signify both political, cultural, and ethnic identities. Here, I use it to refer to inhabitants of Aotearoa New Zealand who are of European descent.

friends who shared the same schooling, were also interpellated into a similar system. Among ourselves, we retrospectively called our Christian education “cultish,” as our school engendered a feedback loop between church fellowship and everyday indoctrination in the classroom. Since leaving school and going to university, I have been able to begin hoisting my head out of the evangelical sandbank. In writing this article, I do not intend to critique the entirety of Christian culture rather, my aim is to point to its most fundamentalist fringes of evangelicalism. I have many happy memories of being situated within a strong church community and schooling, yet I also recognize its more pernicious side. To frame my discussion, I draw on two best-selling, evangelical books by Dannah Gresh: *Secret Keeper: The Delicate Power of Modesty* (2002), as well as *And the Bride Wore White: Seven Secrets to Sexual Purity* (2012). These books (the first aimed at middle-schooler, tween-age girls, the latter at high-school teenagers and young adult women) were reverentially passed around my school and church circles as though they were sacred scripture. My analysis of Gresh’s work does not arrive without an agenda, but comes with a plea to end the dangerous impact of abstinence-only sex education and purity teachings. As pastor Nadia Bolz-Weber emphatically argues, “We should not be more loyal to an idea, a doctrine, or an interpretation of a Bible verse than we are to *people*” (2020, 5; emphasis original). The church should not be permitted to hurt people.

‘Born-again’: Evangelical Christianity and the Feminized Church

The evangelical church is an evolving subculture, or counterculture, but its most stubborn message has always been that of sexual purity (Klein 2018; Moslener 2015). The main threads of purity culture can be traced through the following themes: waiting until marriage is God’s original design for sex; your body is God’s temple, so don’t desecrate it with sexual sin; lust is a ceaseless battle; men are pursuers and women are passive; pursuing purity is not just about virginity but about righteousness and holiness too; and true heterosexual love is like Christ’s love for his feminized church. Essential to comprehending this Christian subculture is the notion of being “born-again” through the spiritual rebirth of accepting Jesus Christ as your saviour. Karen Armstrong refers to the work of theologian Normal Powell Williams, who suggested that such “twice-born” Christians “tend to adopt theologies which are fundamentalist and literal ... [and] are unable to come to terms peacefully with their sexual lives prior to conversion” (Armstrong 1987, 30). For born-again Christians, sex is always tainted by sin and shameful desires.

Born-again Christianity also relies on flashy alter-calls, religious fervour, and impassioned personal testimonies. This was very evident within the churches I attended during my teens, and consequently, I always felt isolated there. I had been born into my faith—it seems I inherited it from my parents along with my genes. My father used to be a pastor and my mother

was a children's minister.³ I never felt as though I needed to be born-again—to fall on the floor crying and shaking, or fling my hands toward the ceiling, overcome with the Holy Spirit.⁴ Such expressions, or possessions, of the “Holy Spirit” can be linked back to Pentecostal and charismatic influences. As religious historian Kate Bowler suggests, “Pentecostals ... alone [have] required an involuntary ecstatic utterance as a credential for ordination and full participation in the community” (2013, ch. 1). Bowler also adds that young church congregants are “encouraged” by the spirit (and their pastors) to dance under the flashing lights, sometimes amidst smoke machines, as if they were in a “night club” (2013, ch. 4). What I have learned since leaving my church is that I was situated within a similarly fundamentalist, evangelical environment that was imbued with Pentecostal and charismatic elements.

Fundamentalist, evangelical churches are characterized by their devotion to biblical literalism, capitalism, counterculturalism, individualism, and, most regrettably, sexual conservatism. This is an establishment that “caters to the tastes, comforts and concerns of middle-class conservatives” (Moslener 2015, 11). And the apostle Paul, the founder of the first churches, is the evangelical's greatest hero. Although the New Testament epistles of Titus, 1 and 2 Timothy, Ephesians, and Colossians were likely written decades after Paul's death by successors assuming his name (Armstrong 1987, 15-16), many of these epistles are still considered crucial texts for evangelicals. It is within their pages that we find teachings on women's modesty and subordination, sexual abstinence, and the church as Christ's “bride.” This feminization of the church occurred alongside its evolution from an egalitarian movement to an institution steeped in gender hierarchy. As Armstrong explains:

Paul had seen the Church and Christ as an inseparable unit; each Christian had a special function in the Church: just as each member of the human body has a special function and are all dependent on one another, no function or gift in the Church is superior to any other ... Because they are Christ they cannot be separated from him in any way at all. By the time Ephesians [5:21-32] was written, the Church is seen as separate from Christ: the Institutional Church is emerging to stand between Christ and the individual Christian and will subordinate some members of the Church to others – clergy over laity, celibate over married people, men over women. This is fundamentally opposed to Paul's egalitarianism. (1987, 261)

Lost were the gender-blind cries of believers being “neither male nor female in Christ” (Gal. 3:28), and instead, a feminized Church became subordinated

³ My mother was herself raised by a Brethren woman. The Brethren have four central doctrines: non-creedalism (New Testament is the central creed), pacifism (my great-grandfather was a contentious objector in WWI), simplistic (no drinking, smoking, dancing, secular schooling, etc.) and believer's baptism.

⁴ These types of behaviour (crying, shaking, falling and frantic prayer) were very common in this church and were perceived as evidence of your faith

to a masculinized Christ (Col. 1:18; 3:18). The egalitarian teachings of Jesus and Paul were replaced by a hierarchy of a masculine God over a feminine church, men over women, and masters over slaves. I believe that it is in the literal and un-contextualized interpretations of these passages that we can locate the rotten roots of fundamentalist evangelical purity discourses.⁵ These discourses are embedded in a deep-seated misogyny that fundamentally distrusts egalitarianism. As a young, curious teenager attempting to cultivate my spirituality alongside my sexuality, purity discourses dictated what could be discussed and questioned in church – as well as what had to be left unsaid. Sexuality was a stifled conversation. The Bible, being read literally to its own detriment, was used as a weapon.

Secret Keepers and Purity in My New Zealand Christian School

Of course, sexuality was not only taboo in church, but in my Christian school too. The intermediate years heralded the exciting era of Christian camps, mufti-days, graduation from children’s church, and admittance into youth group where the big kids gathered. This was a time marked by a sharp increase in sex-segregated purity panels (no doubt coinciding with girls’ coming of age) as well as “relationship evenings”⁶ where “daddy-daughter dates” were encouraged. Girls’ spaghetti-strap singlets were banned, purity rings became popular and we began passing around modesty manuals, such as those penned by Gresh. We also had our first sex-education classes, which could more accurately be described as abstinence-only classes. Abstinence-only sex education is marked by a sexual conservatism that forbids premarital sex, same-sex attraction,⁷ pornography, masturbation, and even sexual thoughts and fantasies. To learn the mechanics of our maturing bodies, we were sent to the science department and given a graphic glimpse into the taboos of boys’ wet dreams and girls’ periods. This was accompanied by a video of a man and a woman sitting under a white sheet, bolt upright in bed, clasping hands like ghostly lovers. This, laughed our male science teacher, was sex.

In New Zealand schools, sex-education programmes “have been uneven to say the least ... [due to] an increasingly neoliberal approach to education, which allows schools to choose curricula” (Fitzpatrick 2018, 601). Our semi-private school capitalized on this neoliberal discretion to enforce a

⁵ After conversing with my parents about this research, I discovered that Ephesians 5:21-32 was part of the passage my father chose to write about in the final paper of his Bachelor of Theology degree. He argued that these verses do *not* justify a woman’s submission. This was a radical thought in a conservative, late-twentieth-century Christian university, and he was ridiculed by his peers. The apple doesn’t fall far from the tree.

⁶ Relationship evenings were after-school events where pupils and their parents gathered to talk about purity. These meetings were sex-segregated too, and could include *either* mothers *or* fathers accompanied by *either* their sons *or* their daughters.

⁷ Having a non-heteronormative sexuality is virtually non-existent to evangelicals, who envisage only a temporary perversion of ‘same-sex attraction’ which you can be cured of.

decidedly conservative curriculum. Schools, like churches, are institutions with an immense amount of power. As Louisa Allen asserts, they are “sites for the production of sexual identities” (2007, 221), yet they are already “heteronormative spaces” (Allen 2017, 101). Therefore, New Zealand schools are nationally reproducing “default” heteronormative identities, “othering” and excluding a broad spectrum of sexualities (Allen 2017, 101). According to Allen, New Zealand schools smother sexual identities even further by investing in “a particular sort of student that is ‘ideally’ non-sexual” (2007, 222).

This construction of “non-sexual” students is gendered further within evangelical Christian contexts, whereby men are regarded as inherently sexual pursuers while women are naturally the moral pillars of a non-sexual purity and passivity. The New Zealand nation as a whole has inherited a pioneering “muscular Christianity” from the “Motherland” of Britain, which upholds ideals of “manliness, morality, health and patriotism” (Moslener 2015, 22). This muscular Christian ideal of manhood depends on an equally ideal womanhood—the Angel of the House (Armstrong 1987, 32; Bronfen 1992, 218). Such gender complementarianism serves to preserve “social stability,” with the presence of “female piety” preventing “the vices of uncontrolled masculinity” (Moslener 2015, 27). The construction of man’s uncontrollable, bestial and debasing lust reaches right back to the early Church Fathers, namely Saint Augustine (a “born-again” Christian himself), whose theory of concupiscence has corrupted western theology ever since. Concupiscence is sex reimagined as a “raging and irrational force” that gets in the way of God (Armstrong 1987, 32). Thus, sexuality becomes a hurdle to men’s spirituality as they “attempt to assert mastery over their baser selves” (Moslener 2015, 25). A leaflet published in 1888 by the New Zealand Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) argued that women should be allowed to vote because they “are less accessible than most men to most of the debasing influences” (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2017). Pākehā women’s presence as political actors in the Aotearoa New Zealand public sphere was predicated on first de-sexualising themselves. It is no coincidence that first-wave feminism “coincided with the earliest purity movement” (Moslener 2015, 16). WCTUs in both the United States and Aotearoa New Zealand invoked these “antagonistic” Victorian “gender ideologies” of uncontrolled masculinity and angelic purity (Moslener 2015, 7).

This rhetoric of man’s irrepressible lust seems an odd bedfellow for purity discourses, yet they lie hand in hand. And they are directly imported alongside colonialism. The WCTU was not only coded for gender, but also for colour. Purity discourses coincided with nationalistic discourses that “capitalized on racialized and sexualized fears of national decline and asserted a causal relationship between sexual immorality, Anglo-Saxon decline, and national decay” (Moslener 2015, 8). It is no coincidence that purity culture is mostly embraced by white, middle-class, conservative Christians—the majority of the demographic make-up of my old school.

Throughout the history of evangelical purity culture, purity has never simply been a matter of social and sexual hygiene, but it preserved the idealized “white race.” Thus, the “purpose of sex [wa]s simply procreation” (Valenti 2009, 43), and marriage was championed as a state-sponsored system that ensured white, Christian, conservative hegemony and contained men’s uncontrollable lusts. The threads of racism, colonialism, and sexism are inextricably intertwined. When white women are rendered as good, clean, and pure, all other women are by default rendered “dirty” and damaged (Valenti, 2009, p. 45).

Overemphasising men’s lust while denying women’s sexual presence set a precedent wherein sexuality was a problem. It still is. As Allen notes regarding abstinence-only sex education, students learn to see their sexuality as “a problem to be managed rather than a positive part of youthful identity” (2005, 390). The “missing discourse of desire” is evident not only in Christian schools, but in schools across Aotearoa New Zealand (Allen 2013, 295). And if desire is missing, then girls’ desires are entirely lost. White, Christian, female desires don’t exist—they are starved of oxygen high up on a pedestal that “protect[s] our innocence and insure[s] our purity” while also separating us from the possibility of our own pleasure (Webster 1985, 386). Anyone (or, more accurately, any woman) who falls off this pedestal is radically excluded from this realization of Christianity.

Evangelical Christian modesty manuals are one of the many ways that girls’ desires are reined in and rendered invisible in the classroom. Gresh’s *Secret Keeper: The Delicate Power of Modesty* (2002) is one such manual that is presented in a tone of benign “guys and gals” Pennsylvanian charm for tween and teenage girls.⁸ Gresh rode the tide of the abstinence movement in America, which included abstinence-only sex education that has received a total of US\$2 billion in US federal funding since 1981 (Klein 2018, Introduction). This funding coincided with the advent of the individualistic, countercultural, evangelical megachurch that “resemble[d] corporate headquarters” (Moslener 2015, 10), and throughout the 1990s, there was a shift from chastity being a young person’s “private choice” to it becoming a political declaration, with evangelical groups such as True Love Waits and Silver Ring Thing reaching millions of young people with their purity and abstinence teachings (Moslener 2015, 3, 110). Throughout this period, the commodification and fetishization of female virginity remained persistent, combining with these other elements to create a highly-orchestrated tidal wave of fear and moral outrage. The revitalization of the virginity movement, or “the purity myth” as Jessica Valenti calls it, had “conservatives and evangelical Christians at the helm,” whipping up a sensationalist moral panic of “girls gone wild” (2009, 23). And as churches became increasingly focused on capitalism and profit, girls became re-commodified within a Christian context.

⁸ *Secret Keeper* was rebranded in 2019 to *True Girl*, after the name came under fire. See Gresh (2019) for further details.

Gresh herself continuously employs advertising theory as evidence of boys having been “created” to be “visually stimulated” and girls’ bodies being created to contain sexual capital (2002, 34, 42). She describes meeting a girl who feels she possesses “power” when men are drawn to look at her, yet paradoxically hates the persistence of their gaze (2002, 10). Gresh informs the girl that this is evidence of her feminine “allure,” a euphemistic term for the pervasive and misogynistic male gaze (2002, 11). Gresh goes on to explain that:

Modesty is the source of this delicate yet formidable power, making it a power in and of itself. It’s delicate because it can be so innocently given away without your even knowing it. It’s formidable ... because once you’ve mastered it, no man will be given access to the full secrets behind your allure until you so desire. (2002, p. 11)

Gresh repeatedly talks about the “secrets” that lie behind a girl’s “allure,” which she insists are the “most powerful part” of girl’s “beauty” (2002, 24). While she never explicitly explains what these “secrets” are, it becomes clear that this is a euphemism for a girl’s virginity. Gresh employs ambiguity as an insurance policy against claims of virginity fetishization. In interviews and blogposts, she has stated that purity is not a synonym for virginity (Gresh 2014b; see also Wyngaard 2019). Yet throughout *Secret Keeper*, she expresses her belief that God made girls with a gift which can only be “given” once. This is a conditional gift, a conditional beauty, it is for one man only (“one man” is often italicized, underlined, or both in the book). Confusingly, Gresh also claims that girls must keep this gift a secret and that they are also “worthy of every glance you receive ... The masterpiece is applauded with many glances” (2002, 20).

As young girls, we therefore learn that we are rewarded by the male gaze. In a commodified body economy, glances are as good as gold. But too much of this currency and you have begun to “prostitut[e] [your]self visually” (Gresh 2002, 55). Gresh reminds girls that “immodesty ... [is a] cheap thrill that requires no investments on [a guy’s] part ... Modesty protects the true secrets of your body for one man, requiring him to invest in your life in order to one day enjoy your allure. It invites a guy to earn your virtue” (2002, 46). Notice again the commodified rhetoric: cheap thrills, investments, inviting and earning virtue. Emotions have become economic in this capitalist minefield of losses, gains, gifts, investments, earnings, trusts, risks, rewards, and profits, creating what Armstrong describes as a “cult of female dependency” (1987, 281). The evangelical response to alarmist cries of hypersexualization has therefore been to reinforce the capitalist commodification of teenage girls by fetishizing virginity. Valenti notes with irony that “virginity worship” is the same as sexualization, and “raunch culture” exists because of the repressed, religious right (2009, 70, 95). Or, as Breanne Fahs (2010, 116) puts it, repression fosters obsession. Similarly, Allen notes that discourses of girls’ desire are “limited” to provocative, promiscuous and commodified depictions, which cause girls to internalise misogyny through modesty self-surveillance and the incessant navel-gazing

of encouraged narcissism (2013, 296). As objects of desire, they cannot be sexual subjects (Allen, 2017, 297-298).

Thus, rather than equipping girls to discover their own real desires, they are stifled by virginity fetishization and a patriarchal “perpetual girlhood” (Valenti 2009, 30). Contemporary evangelical purity culture preserves perpetual girlhood into adulthood, fostering a generational learned helplessness of feminine weakness, naïveté, and ignorance. Girls are taught that preparing for autonomous adulthood is undesirable (Valenti 2009, 65). And although preparation for adulthood is a school’s institutional role, abstinence-only sex education functions to further generate perpetual girlhood. Schools become secondary, “substitute” parents that determine what its “child” is allowed to know (Allen 2007, 228). For Christian girls, this is doubly devastating, as the church creates a patriarchal theology that aligns God with their “earthy fathers,”⁹ and schools perpetuate a state-sanctioned paternalism that determines what girls can, or cannot, know. Girls therefore have three substitute parents: God, the state, and schools.

Stumbling Blocks and Victim Blame

While Gresh insists to girls that they are rewarded by the male gaze, she also reminds them that they may cause their “Christian brothers to stumble” if they wear too-revealing clothes and thereby topple a guy’s innocent glance into one of grievous lust (2002, 36-37). The phrase “stumbling block” is repeatedly deployed by evangelical Christians to chastise girls for being tempting *things* that boys and men can trip over (Klein 2018, Introduction). This power, “so innocently given away without your even knowing it” (Gresh 2002, 24), typifies the world order envisioned by the early Church Father Tertullian (another “born-again” Christian). In his third-century treatise *On Female Dress*, Tertullian emphatically connects female appearance with the original sin of Eve (Genesis 3), with the result that “each woman is completely responsible for destroying men ... [because of] something as apparently unimportant as women’s clothes” (Armstrong 1987, 55). Tertullian lectures women that “as soon as man has lusted after your beauty, he has in his mind already committed the sin which his lust was imagining and he perished because of this, and you have been made the sword that destroys him” (*On Female Dress*, II, ii; cited in Armstrong 1987, 55). Another founding Church Father, the fourth-century Jerome, shared a number of Tertullian’s anxieties about women’s sexuality and was so sexually repressed himself that he even feared women walking around: “As you walk along your shiny black shoes by their creaking give an invitation to young men” (Letter cxvii; cited in Armstrong 1987, 59).

⁹ “Earthy fathers” was a saying used in my church to separate one’s biological father from one’s “heavenly father”/God. This was incredibly isolating for young people who were adopted, whose fathers had left them or who had lost their fathers.

These third- and fourth-century fears of the destructive lust that women can inspire remain alive and well in contemporary purity discourse. Sixteen hundred years later, Gresh tells her teen girl readers that a skirt with a slit “invites” boys to “finish the picture” and fill in the gaps by imagining the rest of her body—this, insists Gresh, is “simple visual science” (2002, 43). And “[i]f a guy sees a girl walking around in tight clothes ... well, she might as well hang a noose around the neck of his spiritual life” (Gresh 2002, 44). Girls, it seems, are causing guys to commit spiritual suicide, luring them unwittingly into a cycle of helplessness that is driven by uncontrollable male sexual lust. And all because girls’ immodest clothes (and by association, girls’ bodies) are nothing less than a source of “sin” (Gresh 2002, 39).

The biblical verse of Matt. 5:28 is often cited as evidence of this helplessness men are goaded into; in the words of Jesus, “I say to you that everyone who so much as looks at a woman with lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Amplified Bible). Yet does this verse really mean that girls and women are “stumbling blocks” for men, and must therefore constantly police their appearance? According to Armstrong:

Jesus was not making a particular issue of lust here, but was illustrating his admirable religious insight that mere external conformity to a set of rules is not enough for the truly religious man. It is the attitude in his heart that counts, not a meticulous performance of burdensome commandments. Tertullian twists this potentially liberating idea into a truly frightening view of the moral world. (1987, p. 55)

For centuries, then, modesty has been envisioned as obedience to God, in a gendered regime where unruly bodies are reined in through disciplining girls’ dress and deterring their desires. Christian girls are constructed as bodies that must be brought under control to guard good, Christian boys, and to barricade themselves against the invasion of bad, non-Christian boys. In turn, good, Christian boys must fortify their minds against foreign invasions of lust incited by immodestly dressed girls. Lust thus becomes a battle—it is not natural. Girls’ only option is to assume responsibility for men’s sexual purity by practicing modesty (Moslener 2009, 108).

Moreover, this purity discourse perpetuates various myths about sexual violence that scaffold rape culture. It is bad, unsaved boys who rape, not good, Christian boys. But girls—beware! You might cause your Christian brothers to stumble, turning them into bad boys. So if you get raped, it’s probably your fault. Gresh warns her teen girl readers that:

Altering the course of ... lust once aroused is very difficult for a guy. I’m not saying that a guy has no responsibility to control his own arousal ... But sometimes a girl can attract the wrong kind of guy with what she wears. I don’t even mean a really, really bad guy. You could just attract a really, really nice guy whose moral standard has been suddenly and terribly weakened. (2002, 35)

Make no mistake, this is victim blaming at its worst. Girls are blamed for attracting bad guys or weakening good ones. If a girl wears any clothes that might cause her Christian brothers to stumble, she is effectively responsible for what boys see and how they behave. Women's clothing can talk, it can actually ask for it. So, as my school said, no spaghetti straps.

Years after publishing *Secret Keeper*, Gresh clarified in a blogpost that guys are not “off the hook” when it comes to rape. Rather, a non-Christian woman who has not been taught modesty should be safe around saved men: she should “find herself PROTECTED by a godly man” (Gresh 2016; capitals original). But benevolent sexism is still sexism. The necessity of patriarchal protection implies that women are weak and passive. In the battle of lust, Gresh declares that “modesty is the first line of defence for your purity” (2002, 49). Because guys just can't help themselves, girls!

Abstinence-only sex education similarly advocates that purity is always a “choice” and modesty is effective risk-management against sexual assault. This instantly shames and stigmatizes victims of sexual abuse, assault, and rape, insinuating that they have not made the “right” choices. Yet the high rates of sexual violence in our society prove that rape has nothing to do with purity (Valenti 2009, 108). This, however, does not stop evangelical purity proponents from repeatedly peddling similar discourses as Gresh's which exonerate perpetrators of rape and, instead, blame their victims. As Kathryn Klement and Brad Sagarin demonstrate in their study of evangelical Christian self-help books for women, these books consistently set “higher standards of conduct for girls (...dressing modestly, not flirting) than for boys (...boys are visual creatures, they can't help it)” (2017, 218). According to Heather Hendershot, the construction of teenage boys as “out of control” creates:

a body that can only be controlled/cured by a spiritual commitment to chastity ... fundamentalist chastity discourse may inadvertently encourage boys to be sexually violent and girls to see submission to sexual violence as natural ... Crudely put, when all bodily control is lost, boys give in to their urge to rape and girls give in to their urge to submit to rape ... It sometimes seems that rape per se does not exist for fundamentalists. Instead, boys ‘lose control’ or ‘force themselves’ on girls. (2002, 92; cited in Fahs 2010, 121)

Fundamentalist gender complementarianism, although claiming gender *difference*, encourages gendered *dominance*. And, as I suggested above, it also encourages rape culture. Men's “ethics are safe from criticism” as sex is simply too risky for women, while women are left with an “ethics of passivity” (Valenti 2009, 25, 109).

Abstinence Angst ... Until Marriage, That Is

As us girls grew older, we were allowed to read Gresh's “racier” adult book, *And the Bride Wore White: Seven Secrets to Sexual Purity* (2012). *Secret*

Keeper had ended with a “love note” from Jesus: ‘I am enthralled by your beauty. Oh, how I love you ... how precious your body is to me. Will you honour me with it? Will you love me back?’ (2002, 68). The only boyfriend Gresh had allowed us was Jesus, who was imposed on us as a possessive, stalkerish boyfriend always imploring us to love him. At my school, if a boy and a girl were standing close together, we would shout “Make room for Jesus!” at them. Naturally, we thought we were hilarious.

Of course, Jesus has been a girl’s first boyfriend for centuries. The first purity rings were emblems worn by the saintly virgins—such as Catherine of Siena, Teresa of Avila and Catherine de Ricci—as evidence of their consecration and marriage to Christ (Armstrong 1987, 152). But as we graduated from *Secret Keeper* to *And the Bride Wore White*, we also graduated from Jesus-as-boyfriend to husband training. Jesus became the jilted lover, because the ideology of marriage is integral to the evangelical Christian worldview. Through marriage, every home can be envisioned as a little bastion of God’s heavenly kingdom. This idea emerged with the WCTU, which sought premarital purity as a “social salvation” from venereal disease, drunkenness, and other moral depravities (Moslener 2015, 4, 18, 30, 44).

In over a hundred years since the WCTU’s campaigns, Christian conservatives haven’t changed their tune. Gresh contends that the “only no-risk method of protection against HPV [human papillomavirus] is abstinence ... a woman who is not sexually active will never acquire HPV” (2012, ch. 2). Gresh’s assertions here essentially shame victims of sexual assault and rape, who could contract HPV or another sexually-transmitted infection (STI) from their rapist. She also articulates an oft-cited conservative belief that the HPV vaccine makes girls promiscuous, which, as Valenti notes, has as much validity as the following statement: “If you give a kid a tetanus shot, she’ll want to jab rusty nails in her feet” (2009, 71). At my school, the trip to the nurse’s office to get the (funded) “slut” vaccine was considered a walk of shame; only one girl was “promiscuous” enough (or, more accurately, brave enough) to take it. She was never able to shake off the stigma. Some parents thought it wiser to pay for their daughters to get the vaccine from their GP, thereby sparing them the shame. But I wonder if some girls never received the vaccine because their parents couldn’t afford to get it privately, or because they too were influenced by the miasma of stigma and shame that surrounded it. Purity culture, it appears, would rather risk girls getting cancer than promote safer sexual activity (Valenti 2009, 71).

Mind you, for Gresh, there is no such thing as “safe, sexual activity.” Satan is the sole author of “safe-sex,” she writes, because it is “one of the most dangerous activities that exist” (2012, ch. 2). Alongside a shopping-list of STIs, Gresh cites that condoms only work “50 percent of the time” (2012, ch. 2). With a distinct tone of fear-mongering, she equates premarital sex with teenage pregnancies, cancer, loneliness and suicide; premarital sex is even equated with death (2012, ch. 5). This is part of the price of impurity: “Giving your body away might someday need to be paid for in the form of

pregnancy, AIDS or some other STDs” (Gresh 2012, ch. 5). Again, the sexual economy resurfaces, only this time the stakes are costlier.

Gresh’s questionable statistics should come as no surprise. Various studies have shown that “over 80 percent of abstinence programs contain false or misleading information about sex and reproductive health” (Valenti, 2009, p. 218). Fear-mongering, false information, and shame-tactics has ensured that:

[a] generation of young [people]... has been indoctrinated not only with messages about how wrong, dirty, and immoral premarital sex is, but also with subjective, and often false, information: that contraception is ineffective (and sometimes dangerous); that abortion is wrong; that any sexual activity outside of marriage is likely to make you diseased, poor, depressed, and suicidal. (Valenti 2009, 102)

Jason Bivins’ analysis of late-twentieth-century evangelicalism found that it is a “religion of fear” (2008; cited in Moslener 2015, 9), while historian Angela Lahr contends that evangelicals emerge in ages of anxiety (2007; cited in Moslener 2015, 9). Evangelical movements feed on fear to survive. They are sustained by the current craze, whether that be the threat of war, sexual liberation, feminism, LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and more) rights, or BIPOC (black, indigenous, and people of colour) rights. Nothing feeds the fire of fear more than ignorance; hence, “misinformation is just the tip of the abstinence iceberg” (Valenti 2009, 105).

Abstinence-only sex education has a whole host of other failings too. Studies have found that middle-schoolers who received abstinence-only education were “just as likely” to have sex as teenagers who hadn’t (Valenti 2009, 119). The only difference between these two groups is that one is misinformed. Teenagers who have had abstinence-only education, or have pledged their purity, are less likely to use condoms and more likely to have anal or oral sex to preserve their “technical” virginity (Valenti 2009, 120; Fahs, 2010, pp. 117, 125). Anal and oral sex were known within the Christian circles I inhabited as “loopholes,” while using a condom only confirmed you had “planned” to be promiscuous, it didn’t “just happen.” Chastity and purity pledges only delay the first experience of vaginal intercourse by up to eighteen months for primarily white, fifteen-to-seventeen-year-olds, making pledges virtually ineffective for older teenagers and minorities (Fahs 2010, 124). Gresh is very proud of this eighteen-month delay, claiming that it is “good” (2014a), even though it only works for a small demographic, something she omits to mention. And as Linda Klein argues, abstinence-only sex education does not meaningfully delay sex, but it does increase sexual shame (2018, Introduction). According to Klein, the abstinence rhetoric of purity culture is:

traumatising many girls and maturing women haunted by sexual and gender-based anxiety, fear, and physical experiences [such as vaginismus] that ... mimic the symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder. Based on our nightmares, panic attacks, and paranoia, one

might think that my childhood friends and I had been to war. And in fact, we had. We went to war with ... our own bodies, and our own sexual natures. (2018, Introduction)

Similar to Linda Klein, ex-evangelical Jamie Lee Finch (2019) experienced a distinctly religious dimension of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), called Religious Trauma Syndrome (RTS). RTS often accompanies other disorders, including anxiety, eating disorders, sexual dysfunction, depression, and substance abuse (Finch 2019, "Trauma and PTSD"). Abstinence-only sex education *does* achieve something, then: lasting trauma and distress. It also guarantees students' sexual repression and "securing their conformity to conservative and religious mores" (Allen 2011, 105). "Danger and fear" are two of the key tools that abstinence-only educators use (Allen 2011, 47), and purity-based education pushes girls in particular to experience more anxiety, more risk, more shame, and less pleasure.

Prosperity, Pleasure, And Procreation

The purity movement also propagates what Katelyn Beatly (2019) refers to as the "sexual prosperity gospel." The sexual prosperity gospel is "Evangelical purity culture's [own] brand of sexual repression," as Finch calls it (2019, "Conclusion"). It is primarily a legalistic bargain that a purity-pledging young person makes with God: as a reward for premarital chastity, God will grant "a good Christian spouse, great sex and perpetual marital fulfilment" (Beatly 2019). In other words, a pure, premarital state makes a perfect marriage union. Hence, sexual purity, with its "promises of marital bliss and sexual ecstasy, is a most compelling metaphor for the Christian faith and the promise of eternal salvation" (Moslener 2015, 14). Sexual prosperity sprang naturally out of the larger, legalistic prosperity gospel which advocates spiritual abundance, and which reinterprets the self-replicating nature of white, heteronormative, middle-to-upper-class privilege as a God-granted "miracle." According to Bowler's comprehensive study of American Christianity, the prosperity gospel is an "orientation," not a cut-and-dry "cattle brand" (2013, "Appendix B").

Gresh affirms the sexual prosperity gospel using some more highly dubious statistics, noting that Christian wives who "wait" until their wedding night experience greater sexual satisfaction and have a "distinct 'oneness' with their husbands" (2012, ch. 14). The sexual satisfaction found within marriage is not, it appears, about orgasms or pleasure, but the "smirking" knowledge that "your relationship is more 'complete' than other people's *because* you waited" (Valenti 2009, 44; emphasis original). This marriage contract, or bargaining chip with God, has a distinct and conditional clause: "*If you wait, then* it will be a blast" (Gresh, 2012, ch. 14; emphasis original). Bewilderingly, Gresh also reassures readers who have already been sexually active that they can renew their purity, just as the

biblical prostitute Rahab renewed hers,¹⁰ implying that premarital sex is practically prostitution. Excessive sexual pleasure is ever-present, warns Gresh, lurking about like Satan to lure girls in with lies about sex (2012, ch. 2). Thus, equipping young Christians with safe-sex practices only encourages them to spiral into a heathenistic hedonism.

With a cultural legacy of inherited neuroses around sex (Armstrong 1987), it's no surprise that Christianity devised a binary order of heavenly purity that stood in opposition to an underworld of pleasure. Men, with their uncontrollable lusts, are afforded pleasure, while women are depicted as "such emotional creatures" (Klement and Sagarin 2017, 207) who are incapable of separating sex from emotion. Women who choose to be sexually active outside of marriage are thus portrayed as being "broken in some way; they've disconnected from their emotions, and are acting like men" (Klement and Sagarin 2017, 215). Gresh blames the feminist movement for perverting the "natural" gender regime and "now we have girls pursuing guys... sexually! ...It's out of control!" (2012, ch. 3). Girls have gone wild!

I cannot claim to know what went on in the boys' sex education talks at my school, as discussions about sex were strictly segregated. But it was both assumed and frowned upon that boys had been masturbating since middle-school. Masturbation was made into a masculine word. And so, it seemed, was pleasure. Women could seek pleasure solely in marriage, where husbands could dictate desires to their wives, creating in them an "extreme sexual dependency" (Armstrong 1987, 247). Valenti argues that this over-dependency and underrepresentation of female pleasure is a "surefire way to ensure not that young women won't have sex, but rather that they'll have it without pleasure ... Pleasure is widely dismissed, if not denounced, in the virginity movement" (2009, 43). Unless of course, it is procreational. Gresh reminds her female readers that sex is "fun!" and is also "for making babies!" (2012, ch. 14). Pleasure and procreation, it appears, go hand in hand for women.

We Christian girls had learnt from *Secret Keeper* that we could be an accidental temptress, and this is reinforced in *And the Bride Wore White*. As well as being likened to Rahab, girls are also invited to see themselves as Eve—the first fallen woman and archetypal temptress (Genesis 3). Eve is equated with all women in *And the Bride Wore White*. Like Eve, our sins are forgiven but never forgotten. Like Eve, we must "accept the consequences" of procuring the forbidden fruit (Gresh, 2012, ch. 15). Only our "fruit" is our sexuality. Gresh frames girls' and women's sexualities as a source of sin and evil. None other than Satan himself "looks at your sexuality much like he did Eve's Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil" (Gresh 2012, ch. 2). Gresh uses a possessive apostrophe to highlight that it is *Eve's* tree, not Adam's,

¹⁰ Rahab was a Canaanite prostitute who protected Israelite spies in the Old Testament book of Joshua. She supported Israelite claims to Canaanite land and was spared when God's chosen people conquered her home city, Jericho. In biblical interpretive traditions, she is considered a reformed 'harlot' who had faith in the true God. Rahab is also mentioned in Jesus' genealogy in the New Testament gospel of Matthew (Matt. 1:5).

thereby placing the blame and culpability for the sin of sexual knowledge squarely on *her* shoulders. Gresh further explains that, as Satan tempts Eve to “just” touch the forbidden fruit, “just touching” sex includes oral sex, sexting, and posting “provocative profile pictures” on social media (2012, ch. 3). God, insists Gresh, says “No!” to these things, “and you can too. No debating. No touching. Just ‘No!’”; even “emotional fantasy” is off the table (2012, ch. 3).

Through discourses such as these, women have been “trained not to cultivate the self but to suppress it” and sacrifice it; sacrifice has been the sole “mission” of women throughout history (Armstrong 1987, 207), including the sacrifice of their sexuality. The marriage bed is anticipated as a “sacrificial alter where the woman suffers the sexual attentions of her husband” (Armstrong 1987, 77). Or, as Gresh puts it, the site where the hymen is broken and bleeds, in “most” cases at least (2012, ch. 13). Drawing on misinformation about the hymen that has long been medically disproven, Gresh constructs the marriage sacrificial alter as the last remaining “blood covenant sacrifice God still asks that we practice today ... your sexuality” (2012, ch. 13). Evident here are evangelical hangovers from Puritan covenant theology, combined with the Calvinist “distrust of pleasure” (Armstrong 1987, 55). What happens in the marriage bed, insists Gresh, is between “you, your husband and God” (2012, ch. 13). God becomes the second “guy” in the room, just as he was the guy-in-the-sky who filled the “hole in your heart,” according to a female group leader in my church. Gresh reminds girls that the first man to fill this “guy-shaped hole” in their heart is their father (2012, ch. 12). The psychoanalytic allusions are glaringly obvious, particularly when we also consider those daddy/daughter dates so well-loved in evangelical Christian circles (thankfully, my own father never subjected me to such an evening, he thought the events were “disgusting”). Fathers are made the “*literal* gatekeepers for ... their daughters’ sexualities” (Fahs 2010, 35; emphasis original). There are so many gatekeepers, though: protective fathers, the patriarchal God, paternalistic schooling, and a girl’s own learned helplessness. All these aspects colour premarital sex as “perpetually perilous” and “pleasure-less” (Allen 2011, 105). As Allen has noted about abstinence-only sex education, students who consider their own sexuality as inherently “wrong” are set up for failure (2007, 222). We cannot expect generations of young people to be “fine” after such an education (Valenti 2009, 119).

The Poster Girl

In 2012, I made my diary debut. Only each entry began with “Dear Lord” rather than “Dear Diary,” thanks to my church and school inspiring daily, devotional reflections. Evidently, all my hard work penning my tween angst paid off, as at the end of the year I won the “Christian Character” award at prize-giving—ironically, a much-coveted award. In hindsight, it is hard to pin down precisely what I thought of purity culture, being so embedded in it

at the time. But the few entries in my various diary volumes that specifically mention purity were all in direct relation to one person: Cassidy.¹¹

Cassidy was in my sister's year group (five years older than me); she was my small-group leader at church,¹² and was dating Lewis, the church heartthrob. When I was thirteen, I wrote in my diary that "I am learning at the moment (through relationship evenings and [Cassidy's] small groups) that we have to find our beauty and identity in you, God—and to stay pure." I look back on such a cringe entry and laugh, as even then, purity was an elusive afterthought. When I was fourteen, I wrote an entry on Cassidy, who had once again spoken about purity at church. She was the one who told me that God alone could fill the "guy-shaped hole in [my] heart." Women, as I would grow to learn, were created to be incomplete without men, and vice versa. Cassidy often gave talks about her dogged-eared and underlined favourite book, *And the Bride Wore White*, which she carted around alongside her Bible. She was the poster-girl of born-again Christianity. She had converted from Catholicism and was a born-again virgin. Her testimony was a tour de force from sexual sin to regret, then onto redemption and renewed purity. Cassidy came to my school to speak to the middle-school girls on a panel about purity. She was also propped up on her penitent pedestal at school-run "relationship evenings" and made an appearance at almost every event. She was showcased in both the church and school as an example of how we can be "cleansed" of any sin. Even Cassidy, even her worst sexual sin, could be forgiven, it appeared.

At church there was a complicated politics around purity. Women like Cassidy were unable to share their previous sexual experiences, which would be tainted with shame, but *were* required to spout about purity. Behind closed doors and in shady church corners, Cassidy might be whispered about as the one who "strayed," but her past indiscretions lent her a certain mystique by virtue of being the only young woman (that I knew of) in our church friendship circle who had sexual knowledge and experience. Yet this was a double-edged sword, as these experiences were also frowned upon by her peer group, who, in their superiority, were still considered "pure." Cassidy was expected to confess to her boyfriend that she had engaged in premarital sex, although he may have already heard about it through church and community gossip. As Samantha Pugsley notes,¹³ gossip can be the "lifeblood" of a church (2014), and gossip was as good as currency in my church, with sex-talk being of the utmost premium. While girls were the gossips, boys were the gatekeepers of sexual knowledge: they were the masturbating majority, who made sexual jokes at the girls' blushing expense. A distinctly gendered knowledge gap was therefore maintained: girls were rendered the "blissfully" ignorant, pure gatekeepers of sex. Those

¹¹ All the names I mention in this section have been changed to protect people's privacy.

¹² A small-group leader shepherds a group of younger, same-sex mentees in a church, stimulating discussion and leading prayer.

¹³ Samantha Pugsley is the author of the notorious article, 'I waited until my wedding night to lose my virginity and I wish I hadn't,' which stirred up controversy in my church.

girls (like Cassidy) who had sexually experimented held this premium on knowledge, but were condemned for their previous promiscuity and impurity. Born-again virginity made all past sexual experiences sinful. At that time, in our eyes, there was no positive premarital sex; marriage was the lone island of pleasure. To many newly-married Christian couples, though, this was far from the reality they encountered. “Doing the deed” had been demonized for so many years, how were they supposed to reconcile the rhetoric of sexual shame with their newfound marital status? How, as Bolz-Weber (2020, 4) asks, can Christians suddenly flip a “switch” in their brains and bodies from shame and sin to joy and pleasure? This complicated system of sex that I learned through church and school gossip permeated almost my entire socialisation. I was part of a church, a Christian school, a youth group, a church camp, and a worship band. All, aside from one paramount place of refuge (my parents), pointed to purity.¹⁴

Concluding Thoughts

Best-selling book *And the Bride Wore White* was first published in 1999. Dannah Gresh holds in the 2012 updated edition that she has helped at least 250,000 young women (2012, “Acknowledgments”). Yet I have no doubt that this book is *not* helpful, but is, instead, chillingly harmful and spiritually abusive. It frames purity culture as the bedfellow of rape culture, wrapping it up in the rhetoric of girls’ spiritual and cultural empowerment. Purity is sold as a radical, political, and countercultural choice. Yet purity teachings and abstinence-only sex education do not create choices—they are detrimentally damaging and ineffective, as has been well-demonstrated by educationalists (Allen 2011, 139). The purity movement, spearheaded by authors like Gresh, put forward a fundamentalist Christian regime that “splinter[s]” its subjects sexually and spiritually (Allen 2007, 231). We cannot let anyone carry around a splintered self any longer. We must teach effective and safer-sex education and equip young people to become independent, decision-making adults. To echo the words of Sharon Thompson (1985, 376), teenage girls are not enjoying too much, too soon. Rather, they have been afforded too little pleasure, too few options, and all too late.

References

- Allen, Louisa. 2007. “Denying the Sexual Subject: Schools’ Regulation of Student Sexuality.” *British Educational Research Journal* 33 (2): 221-234.
- Allen, Louisa. 2011. *Young People and Sexuality Education: Rethinking Key Debates*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

¹⁴ My parents told me that it was better to have premarital sex than to get married just to have sex. Marriage, they told me, was a huge commitment and not for the faint-hearted.

- Allen, Louisa. 2013. "Girls' Portraits of Desire: Picturing a Missing Discourse." *Gender and Education* 25 (3): 295-310.
- Allen, Louisa. 2005. "Say Everything': Exploring Young People's Suggestions for Improving Sexuality Education." *Sex Education* 5 (4): 389-404.
- Allen, Louisa. 2017. *Schooling Sexual Cultures: Visual Research and Sexuality Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Armstrong, Karen. 1987. *The Gospel According to Woman: Christianity's Creation of the Sex War in the West*. London: Pan Books.
- Beatly, Katelyn. 2019. "Joshua Harris and the Sexual Prosperity Gospel." *Religion News Service*, 26 July.
www.religionnews.com/2019/07/26/joshua-harris-and-the-sexual-prosperity-gospel/.
- Bivins, Jason. 2008. *Religion of Fear: The Politics of Horror in Conservative Evangelicalism* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bolz-Weber, Nadia. (2020). *Shameless: A Case for Not Feeling Bad about Feeling Good (About Sex)*. Convergent Books.
- Bowler, Kate. (2013). *Blessed: A History of the American Prosperity Gospel*. Oxford University Press, 2013. Kindle Edition.
- Bronfen, Elisabeth. 1992. *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fahs, Breanne. 2010. "Daddy's Little Girls: On the Perils of Chastity Clubs, Purity Balls and Ritualised Abstinence." *Frontiers* 31 (3): 116-142.
- Fitzpatrick, Katie. "Sexuality Education in New Zealand: A Policy for Social Justice?" *Education* 18 (5): 601-609.
- Gresh, Dannah. *Secret Keeper: The Delicate Power of Modesty*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2002.
- Gresh, Dannah. 2012. *And the Bride Wore White: Seven Secrets to Sexual Purity*. Chicago: Moody Publishers. Kindle Edition.
- Gresh, Dannah. 2014a. "Is Purity an Idol in Christian Circles?" *Dannah Gresh Pure Freedom Ministries*, 22 January.
www.dannahgresh.com/2-sexual-myth-purity-is-an-idol/.
- Gresh, Dannah. "Should We Stop Using the Word 'Purity'?" *Dannah Gresh Pure Freedom Ministries*, December 30 2014b.
www.dannahgresh.com/should-i-stop-using-the-word-purity/.
- Gresh, Dannah. 2014c. "#3 Sexual Myth: 'Teaching Modesty Promotes Rape Culture'." *Dannah Gresh Pure Freedom Ministries*, 28 January.
www.dannahgresh.com/3-sexual-myth-teaching-modesty-promotes-rape-culture/.
-

- Gresh, Dannah. 2016. "Modesty Myth #3: Guys are off the Hook." *Dannah Gresh Pure Freedom Ministries*, 24 January.
www.dannahgresh.com/modesty-myth-3-guys-are-off-the-hook/.
- Gresh, Dannah. 2019. "Why I'm Changing the Name of Secret Keeper Girl." *Dannah Gresh Pure Freedom Ministries*, 31 January.
www.dannahgresh.com/were-changing-our-name-introducing-true-girl/.
- Hendershot, Heather. 2002. "Virgins for Jesus: The Gender Politics of Therapeutic Christian Fundamentalist Media." In *Hop on Pop: The Politics and Pleasures of Popular Culture*, edited by Henry Jenkins, Tara McPherson, and Jane Shattuc, 88-105. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Klein, Linda K. 2018. *Pure: Inside the Evangelical Movement that Shaped a Generation of Young Women and How I Broke Free*. Atria Books. Kindle Edition.
- Klement, Kathryn R., and Brad J. Sagarin. 2017. "Nobody Wants to Date a Whore: Rape-Supportive Messages in Women-Directed Christian Dating Books." *Sexuality and Culture* 21: 205-23.
- Angela Lahr. 2007. *Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares: The Cold War Origins of Political Evangelicalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage. 2017. "Ten Reasons Why the Women of New Zealand Should Vote." *NZ History*, 17 May.
<https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/ten-reasons-for-vote>.
- Moslener, Sara. 2015. *Virgin Nation: Sexual Purity and American Adolescence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pugsley, Samantha. 2014. "I Waited Until My Wedding Night to Lose My Virginity and I Wish I Hadn't." *Thought Catalogue*, 11 August.
<https://thoughtcatalog.com/samantha-pugsley/2014/08/i-waited-until-my-wedding-night-to-lose-my-virginity-and-i-wish-i-hadnt/>.
- Stanley, Olivia. 2020. "A Personal Encounter with Purity Culture: Evangelical Christian Schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand." *Women's Studies Journal Aotearoa* 34 (1-2): 116-129.
- Thompson, Sharon. 1985. "Search for Tomorrow: On Feminism and the Reconstruction of Teen Romance." In *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, edited by Carol S. Vance, 350-384. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Valenti, Jessica. 2009. *The Purity Myth: How America's Obsession with Virginity is Hurting Young Women*. California: Seal Press.
- Van Der Wyngaard, Jessica. 2019. *I Survived I Kissed Dating Goodbye. Director's Cut*. Film. DOCSology, 31 August.
www.youtube.com/watch?v=ybYTkkQJw_M.

Webster, Paula. 1985. "The Forbidden: Eroticism and Taboo." In *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, edited by Carol S. Vance, 385-98. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License.