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Constitutionally protected speech that is Clearly sexual abuse is discriminating and

unconstitutional, therefore, must be restricted speech. Catherine A. MacKinnon, in her book

?Only Words? gives persuading evidence that pornography subordinates women as a group

through sexual abuse. She says ?Protecting pornography means protecting sexual abuse as

speech, at the same time that both pornography and it?s protection have deprived women of

speech, especially speech against pornography (MacKinnon, 9). MacKinnon argues this bye

explaining defamation and discrimination, racial and sexual harassment, and equality and

speech.

Women are sexually abused for the making of pornography. Torture, rape, hot wax

dripping over nipples, and murdering women are the tools to produce a product of evil.

Literature is the description of these crimes against humanity (emphasized) and cameras are

proof of these crimes.

On the assumption that words have only a referential relation to reality, pornography

is defended as only words-even when it is pictures women had to directly used to

make, even when the means of writing are women?s bodies, even when a women is

destroyed in order to say it or show it or because it was said or shown.

(MacKinnon, 12)

However, assuming words are only a partial relation to reality would mean we would have to

reconsider what reality is. Our wedding vows such as ?I do? would be meaningless and a jury

could never return a verdict that is only partial to reality. These words are ?treated as the

institutions and practices they constitute, rather than as expressions of the idea they embody?

(Mackinnon, 13) Therefore, if these words of pornography are only words, don?t they

institutionalize rape? Since pornography is rape on women.

Pornography is protected by the First Amendment as free speech, but why? Because

the pornographic materials are construed as ideas, and the First Amendment protects ideas.

Pornography is commonly brushed of as some product of fantasy for those who buy it. But

what about the women who were tortured to make it. Also it is brushed off as simulated.

This means that the pain and hurt the women are feeling is just acting. Put a little music and

a smile here and there to cover up the pain, and you are portraying to and giving pure pleasure

for those who buy the product. Just like fantasizing a death, how do you simulate a death?

But discarding pornography as a representation is the most frequent excuse. But how can a

murder be justified on terms of representation? (MacKinnon, 27,28)

. When one fantasizes about murdering another person, this is premeditation of

murder. If he were to express this idea, he would be heard as expressing a threat and

penalized. For the obvious reason, publications that are ?how to? guides on murdering people

are not protected speech. I believe Pornography is the catalyst for premeditation of rape.

Pornography flicks are ?how to? guides for rape. So why are they legal? His idea is

protected, and further more is his threat of ?I?m gonna \*censored\* her?, because both are seen as

fantasy, but why isn?t murder seen as fantasy? Murder is the loss of ones life, but so is

pornography when women have been killed to produce it. Pornography is proven to be

addicted. When somebody is addicted to premeditating rape, it?s only a matter of time before

his addiction of premeditation becomes a solid plan.

Sexual or racial harassment has been suggested to only be made illegal if only directed

at an individual and not a group. ?The idea seems to be that injury to one person is legally

actionalble, but the same injury to thousands of people is protected speech?. (MacKinnon, 51)

This would be disparate impact which involves ?employment practices that are facially

neutral in their treatment of different groups, but that, in fact, fall more harshly on one group

than another and cannot be justified by business necessity.? (Lindgren & Taub,167)

Pornography is disparate impact on women, because of the sexual abuse, and ironically the

disparate impact seems to be the business necessity. Under Title Seven?s disparate impact

treatment concept, pornography is illegal. ( I just have to prove it now) Also, is there not

reasonable ?harm? (Wolgast, 432, Fem Juris) for a women to visit a place where men are

watching a porno and premeditating her rape? Is she not infringed on her First Amendment

right to congregate with equal respect. The idea of pornography (pre meditated rape) does not

allow her respect. It does not allow respect for women as a whole, living among men as a

whole, who have the idea in their mind. Two groups, men and women, one who is

premeditating rape against the other because of a purchased product, pornography, the

catalyst to rape.

Pornography clearly resembles the theory of Dominance. The important difference

between men and women is that women get \*censored\*ed and men ?\*censored\* women? (MacKinnon,

499. Fem Juris) socially and constitutionally. This in turn renders them incapable of an

individual self. When protected dehumanizing speech (pornography) is ramped in the

market, subordination of women occurs. The more violent speech gets, it seems that more

protected it becomes. The more pornography expands, the more protected it becomes.

Therefore, the more pornography is produced, the more unequal women become, and there

speech is less heard and reduced to ?Only words?. (MacKinnon) Women are then left to

remain silent.

If true equality between male and female persons is to be achieved, we cannot ignore

the threat to equality resulting from exposure to audiences of certain types of violent

and degrading material.

(Mackinnon, 101)
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