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PURPOSE OF THESIS

This project is an effort to understand the philosophical underpinnings of the radical feminist movement. Pornography is the issue which will be used to provide an example for how these beliefs are expressed and acted upon by radical feminists. After investigating and explicating the views of the radical feminists, their motives and philosophies will be compared to those of John Stuart Mill. The positions of the radical feminists will also be critiqued, applying Mill's works On Liberty and The Subjection of Women.
In the Fall semester of 1992 at Ball State University, Playboy sent a photographer to interview and photograph female students. This was a somewhat controversial issue. My perception of the whole situation was one of mild disgust. Obviously this university had much more to offer than a party image, let alone a "party-babe" image. For the most part, however, I remained apathetic. My apathy soon turned to curiosity.

On the front page of the student newspaper, the Daily News, was a picture of several female students screaming violently in protest at other female students who wanted to interview with and be photographed by the magazine. One of these protesters I had briefly dated my sophomore year. I knew she was a feminist, but I had no idea she would be willing to so ardently protest something like this. One of the individuals who went to be photographed was a colleague of mine where I was employed. I knew she was a feminist, but I was rather surprised to learn she had been photographed by Playboy, bare-breasted. When I asked this colleague whether or not she was a feminist, her answer puzzled me. She said she thought she was, but that she must not be; after all it was the campus feminist organization that was berating her as she arrived at the site of the interview.
My curiosity was becoming a desire to understand what I was observing. What was a feminist? What does a feminist stand for? At the source of the issue, I saw a conflict in values. It seemed as if my former friend and her cohorts wanted to suppress the right of other individuals to express themselves in a perfectly legal fashion. After all, pornography is legal. This paper is my attempt to better understand the position held by those who were protesting with such vociferous enthusiasm last fall.

In my research, I have found that these individuals are part of a strong and vocal movement of feminists. Their views, even among feminists, are not mainstream. They are considered to be and categorized as radical feminists (with an apology to the fact that no group of persons is a vast, faceless monolith). The radical feminist position on the issue of pornography is an effective standard by which to understand their Weltanschauung. The problem that seems to be inherent in their views is that in their protest against pornography, there exists a struggle between freedom and equality. Women striving for equality, but willing to use whatever means necessary, including the limiting of certain freedoms, to achieve their equal place in society.

How to effectively judge or critique the radical feminists was a problem until I read two works by John
Stuart Mill. I read his famous *On Liberty*, as well as *The Subjection of Women*. Mill is a very respected and renowned philosopher who spent much of the nineteenth century as a reformer in England. Among his most influential ideals was that of an egalitarian state between the sexes. His *Subjection* is "unquestionably the most eloquent, the most ambitious, and at the same time among the most heartfelt pleas in the English language for the perfect equality of the sexes" (Carr, 1970, p. v). Indeed, Mill gave an eloquent voice to an infant, but burgeoning movement for equality in the West.

This paper will attempt to draw points of similarity and differences between Mill’s writings and the current beliefs held by radical feminists who feel that pornography is wrong and should be eradicated or at least censored. Do their views adhere to the blueprint for equality and liberty of individual persons that was laid out by Mill over a century ago? And ultimately, are the radical feminists best served by the perspectives they take?

Pornography is the issue which many radical feminists have begun to see as their primary litmus test for the feminist movement. Unless one is opposed to pornography,
one can not possibly be a feminist. Of course, this automatically discounts many other feminists, who do not view pornography as the problem the radical feminists do, and probably almost all liberal males. Why do radical feminists feel pornography is such an important issue; one worthy of alienating many potential allies?

Radical feminists believe that they live in a gender-dominated society. A society in which men rule. A society in which the ruling philosophy of Liberalism is used by males to suppress women (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 9).

Regardless of political ideology, all men are concerned with perpetuating patriarchal institutions and values. One such institution includes the court system, which has "established the legal formula that protects pornography. . . they have established the formula the pornographers use to protect legally the material they publish." (Dworkin, 1990, p. 34). One such patriarchal value would be the idea of a right to privacy. This has particularly manifested itself in matters of reproduction. Giving women reproductive rights was "like granting women expensive, limited, and easily revokable guest privileges at the exclusive men's club called the Constitution" (Butler, 1990, p. 117). Another such value would be liberty. One long standing criticism of the theory of liberty is that it "was a theory of
affirmative action for non-aristocratic men. . ." (Lahey, 1990, p. 200). The problem, of course, is that those non-aristocratic men were not interested in sharing their gains with women.

Thus, the radical feminists feel that all men, including more liberal thinking males, are actively involved in the suppression of women; particularly as women fight for equality. In addition, any women who support the male hierarchical establishment, are either traitors or unable to understand the error of their thinking. (Mackinnon, 1990, 10).

Of course, as the incident at Ball State will attest, there are other feminist views on the issue of pornography. Libertarian feminists feel that sexuality is "an arena of constructive struggles toward women's sexual liberation," and that it would be important to encourage the expansion of sexual freedoms (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 7). Liberal feminists believe that "the state is supposed to refrain from intervention in the private lives of individuals and from imposing moral values that threaten individual autonomy" (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 53). It is important and helpful to remember that the world of feminism is diverse and that the subject of this study is limited to the radical feminists who oppose pornography.
Pornography has become the main vehicle by which radical feminists have chosen to challenge the status of women in the United States, mainly through social and judicial protest. In pornography, they see an issue that can be addressed; and create, for women, positive change. Before further exploring their methods and philosophies in attacking pornography, I will explain how they perceive pornography and why they want to change it. This will aid in explaining why they feel it is such an important issue as well as why it is representative of both their overall philosophy and how it is representative of a male dominant hierarchy.

Lawyer Wendy Kaminer has written that "pornography is speech that legitimizes and fosters the physical abuse and sexual repression of women. . ." (Kaminer, 1980, p. 241). This definition may be considered to be a radical feminist’s definition of pornography. Their objection to pornography exists along several fronts. The content of pornography is sexist. It supports sexism and creates several other objectionable effects. Pornography also exploits women and some radical feminists think it is consumption propelled by exploitation (Soble, 1986, p. 150).

Pornography, argue radical feminists, "presents women as objects available to be acted upon by men" (Kelly, 1988,
These acts by men are often reflective of the depictions of women in pornography. If a woman is shown as enjoying rape or forced sexual activities, then men who look at that are more inclined to see the imagery as normal or acceptable. There is, claim the radical feminists, a direct link between pornography and abusive violence against women. Even if there are no violent connotations in the pornography, it treats men to look at women as objects, hindering social and communication skills that women need to exist in order to gain equality in society (Kappeler, 1986, pp. 50-52).

As women seek more equality in society there seems to be an "increase in the sale, availability, and acceptability of pornography as a patriarchal response to campaigns for women's liberation" (Kelly, 1988, p. 30). In a speech given to sympathetic ears, Dworkin stated "Now what I am asking for, pleading for, is a consistent and militant activism against those institutions and systems of exploitation that hurt women" (Dworkin, 1990, p. 137). From what does this revolutionary rhetoric derive? Probably from the fear that arises when it is noticed that the more they protest pornography, the more prevalent its presence in society (Kelly, 1988, p. 40). Is there a deep-rooted mistrust in our system? Are they merely seeking civil
rights? Or are they interested in propagating a more complete and intrusive change? By empowering women, do they seek to find a place in society, or do they seek to change the society we live in? One might suspect the answer to all these questions is in the affirmative.

Unlike many individuals in the United States who oppose pornography on grounds of its immorality, radical feminists oppose pornography not because it might be wrong or right, but because they perceive that it does damage to women and that morality is just another value that is both always changing and one way males maintain their preeminent position in society (Kappeler, 1986, p. 25). In addition, the main defenders of pornography are organizations like the ACLU and the educated, middle class "establishment" which defends pornography in an indirect fashion. Their style generally includes rhetoric involving First Amendment rights and freedom of expression (Kappeler, 1986, p. 22).

Other feminists are aversive to the radical feminist goal of suppressing pornography. Liberal feminists feel that "antipornography politics" practiced by the radicals will promote sexual repression and that this would stifle the sexual liberation of women (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 52). They also believe that freedoms and liberties have little value if individuals cannot exercise their rights.
Liberal feminists "advocate the entrance of women into mainstream society so women may compete equally with men. . ." in society (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 52).

Libertarian feminists are equally opposed to restricting pornography. They see pornography as an opportunity to advance female sexual liberation. They are also far more concerned with the evils of censorship than the potential damage to women (Soble, 1986, p. 152). Many other feminists feel that the attempts to use the state by radicals to control pornography will only weaken the position of the feminists; for the existing patriarchy will have expanded once again into the realm of civil rights (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 48). Therefore they feel that any activity which incorporates the government is self defeating and not worth the aforementioned cost.

The use of notions such as freedom of speech and the First Amendment is considered by the radical feminists to be a part of "the continuing instrumentalization and exploitation of women in order to make liberal politics pay off for men" and that men can not "imagine liberty without assuming the oppression of women. If there were not women (socially or sexually), then men could not experience that state or condition they call liberty" (Lahey, 1990, p. 199). Men are the dominant leaders of most civil rights
organizations. Henceforth, they will make choices to advocate causes that support men.

These positions have a strong tendency to polarize women against men. However, the radical feminists see it as a necessary tendency; so they might incorporate right-wing women into their camp while eliminating the presence of liberal men from their movement (Soble, 1986, p. 154). Again, this suggests that the radical feminist agenda really has very little to do with ideology, but everything to do with gender. The unification of women that they seek "threatens to become merely the female side of the war between the sexes" (Soble, 1986, p. 155). This view is bolstered in the writings of another radical feminist leader, Katherine Mackinnon. She has stated that the movement, indeed, is about "sex-based" help. Not political, social, or ideological, but gender based. (Mackinnon, 1990, p. 13).

How else then, have the radical feminists sought to fight pornography? It is true that a real disdain for pornography exists, but interestingly, they have not tried to attack pornography as being wrong, evil, or smutty, but their emphasis has "focused less on the content and meaning of pornography and more on its importance as an issue and the the strategies some feminists have suggested for
opposing it" (Kelly, 1986, p. 40). Interestingly, they have taken pornography and transformed their fight into an opportunity to further the cause of women in the United States.

Where the political movement for the ERA failed, the radicals have sought an alternative means to improve the plight of women. They found it on the frontline of their battle against pornography.

"We looked for something that could be made to work for us, something we could use. We took whatever we could get our hands on, and when it wasn’t there, we invented. We invented a sex equality law against pornography on women’s terms" (Mackinnon, 1990, p. 6).

What Mackinnon, a New York lawyer, is referring to is the landmark effort in Minneapolis by its City Council to pass an ordinance declaring that "certain kinds of pornography violate women’s civil rights" (Kappeler, 1986, p. 11). This ordinance was in fact written by Mackinnon and Dworkin. The focus of the battle against pornography was shifted "from its traditional place of obscenity and censorship to a question of civil rights: the civil rights of women" (Kappeler, 1986, p. 12).

This ordinance failed. The city’s mayor twice rejected the ordinance as being unconstitutional, suppressing freedom
of speech. Another similar ordinance in Indianapolis, also written by Mackinnon, failed in 1984. This ordinance was struck down by an appeals court, on the grounds that it violated the First Amendment (Dworkin, 1990, p. 37). That these ordinances failed is significant. The failures can only have contributed to the alienation these women feel from society; as well as perpetrated the idea that men will not allow women to use the same Constitutional privileges they have. What is also important is that valuable insight can be gleaned from these efforts in understanding how the radical feminists are seeking to change or improve the society in which they live.

Clearly, the radicals are willing to use "traditional (nonfeminist) political-legal discourses and strategies that have excluded consideration of gender" (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 111). By taking a civil rights approach to pornography, the radicals sought to give individual women "the power and ability to directly confront pornography and to initiate civil suit" (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 118). The use of civil rights is peculiar in that many radicals feel that women have none. This notion was only affirmed by the rejection of the ordinances. Because women remained powerless to take civil action against pornography, they have no "affirmative means to get access to speech for those to whom it has been
denied" (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 119). The radicals sought to use censorship as an affirmative action public policy.

Mackinnon explains this position by stating "No one who does not already have these rights (free speech, privacy) guaranteed them socially gets them legally" (Mackinnon, 1990, p. 12). They tried to buck the legal status quo because free speech as they see it only protects the male right to abuse and denigrate women and that the First Amendment only protects the speech of those who already have speech" (Mackinnon, 1990, p. 12).

However, many Liberal and moderate feminists feel that censorship of pornography will lead to a climate of repression that would stifle the women's movement. In addition, they feel the preservation of the First Amendment is imperative to protect the gains they have made (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 45). Mackinnon sharply rebukes these arguments and believes these are arguments that ultimately hurt women as they enable "... this other population of women... (to) experience its eroticism, liberation, or education at their (exploited women) expense (Mackinnon, 1991, p. 10).

Another major criticism of radical feminists by other feminists is that by employing the government to ensure more civil rights, they are only increasing state control and
being co-opted by the existing patriarchy at a cost to feminism (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 46). Overall, these critics of the radicals seem, as is supported by the Libertarian feminist position, more concerned with the danger of censorship than the dangers to women the radicals think are inherent in the existence and perpetuation of pornography.

The radical feminists emphasize the victimization of women by pornography. They advocate a political program that will attack the sources that institutionalize violence against women. They are primarily concerned with the damage they think pornography does. This leads them to support legal measures, despite the fact that the only measures they can take are through a system that is "patriarchal". They believe this risk is outweighed by female involvement in pornography; as the women in porn are subject both to patriarchy and abuse (Berger et. al., 1991, p. 48).

Do women, as the radicals suggest, truly have no power in the United States? Are they without civil rights? Is their philosophy sound? Are their methods toward change beneficial? To address these questions, I will call upon the time honored writings and philosophy of John Stuart Mill. I will use *On Liberty* and *The Subjection of Women* to
critique the positions, philosophies, and actions of the radical feminists.

"The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community against his will, is to prevent harm to others."

"The state is supposed to refrain from intervention in the private lives of individuals and from imposing moral values that threaten individual autonomy."

JOHN STUART MILL

One of the goals of the radicals, as was previously explained, seems to be a separation of the sexes. Men are not only not welcome, but are all oppressors of women. This position directly contradicts Mill's supposition that "Women cannot be expected to devote themselves to the emancipation of women until men in considerable number are prepared to join with them in the undertaking" (Mill, 1970, p. 78). Clearly Mill would not agree with the polarization of the
genders encouraged by the radicals. Mill probably would have had a difficult time envisioning himself as an oppressor of women.

If a radical feminist was to justify this position by claiming that there is still not equality, then she would be rejecting Mill’s assertion that men are needed to improve the plight of women; when, in fact, women must employ the patriarchal systems to gain what they seek. It would be difficult to argue on these grounds, because if this is still an oppressive patriarchal society, the woman’s movement is still in need of the help of men who are intimate with the system in order to change or topple that system. If a radical feminist were to argue that our society is different than his British nineteenth-century society, one could only agree. Women no longer need men in their movement because they are now already exercising rights they previously did not have.

Mill wrote that progress is the driving force in civilized history; progress dictates that change must and will continue (Mill, 1970, p. 17). When he wrote this, women had few, if any legal rights. They were absolutely subject to their husbands and could exercise almost no personal freedoms. He also felt that the progress of society should be spurred on through legislation and by any other possible
means. As a Utilitarian, he was seeking the greater good for society. To gain this greater good he advocated the notion that the means do justify the ends. One mean he found perfectly acceptable was despotism. It was "... a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end (Mill, 1975, p. 11).

The radical feminist position certainly would embrace the ideal that pornographers are "barbarians", in that they are responsible for the pornographic material circulating which many persons, including non-feminists, feel is responsible for encouraging, if not for causing reprehensible crimes against humanity. The idea of using any means necessary to put an end to pornography is apparent in their willingness to forsake rhetoric and embrace the existing system of lawmaking and courts.

However, the progress Mill spoke of is different from the progress the radicals envision. Where Mill thought in terms of voting rights, citizen rights, property rights, marriage rights, and the basic fundamental right to equality for women, the radical feminists have spoken of a desire to change, to revolutionize our present system. Mill envisioned a despotism to bring about rights inherently belonging to human beings. The radical feminists envision a
despotism of our legislatures and court system to create rights that would exclude half of the population. After all, the Minnesota ordinance did not provide for male victims of pornography. Is despotism by a government any different then the despotism of a despot?

The answer to this question may lie in how the radical feminists perceive their place in society. Mill reasoned that women without inherent rights were slaves by the law. Samuel Johnson, an early American political philosopher, once remarked that because nature has given women so much power the law was wise to restrict a woman's power. Mill agreed that women, by nature are able to assert power over men, on an individual basis by being persuasive or through authority that might be gained as a wife; but that "Her power often gives her what she has not right to, but does not enable her to assert her own rights" (Mill, 1970, p. 38). In other words he felt that women could not find freedom without legal equality (Mill, 1970, p. 41). The radical feminist still sees women as being denied legal equality, therefore the ability to exercise their own rights.

Mill describes the lack of these rights as a lack of liberty. He states

"Where liberty cannot be hoped for, and power can, power becomes the grand object of human desire—those to
whom others will not leave the undisturbed management of their own affairs, will compensate themselves, if they can, by meddling for their own purposes with the affairs of others" (Mill, 1970, p. 97).

The radical feminists certainly perceive themselves as liberty-starved in this patriarchal system. They have tried protesting, they have tried litigation, and they have tried to gain civil rights. Whether or not women are equal in this country, the reality is that the radicals do not think so. Thus, they will respond as individuals without liberty, but not, as is evident, without power to take action.

The radical feminists, as was previously explained, have been roundly criticized for their desire to restrict pornography. Liberal, Libertarian, and many other feminists argue that pornography is speech and should therefore be protected by the First Amendment. In fact, in 1983, as the battle lines were drawn in Minneapolis over the pornography ordinance, the Feminist Anti-Censorship Taskforce (FACT) was formed. FACT claimed first, that free speech for pornographers is necessary to guarantee free speech for feminists because secondly, they feared that any type of censorship law could be used by non-feminist conservatives to restrict speech they found objectionable (Kappeler, 1986, p. 29).
However, the radicals, who see women as being alienated from the Constitution's provisions for free speech, sought to gain the right to free speech on equal terms as men. They were not concerned as much with the fact that the patriarchal state will grow or get stronger as they are concerned with "finding an affirmative means to get access to speech for those to whom it has been denied" (Berger et al., 1991, p. 119). They were seeking affirmative action through "progressive censorship." This, they felt, is how they could achieve free speech and equity (Berger et al., 1991, p. 119).

Free speech, to Mill, was an aspect of liberty that needed to be carefully considered and respected. He states "There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence: and to find that limit, and maintain it against encroachment, is as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs, as protection against political despotism" (Mill, 1975, p. 6). If pornography is, as the radical position in Minnesota strongly indicated, a political issue, then Mill would likely object to its censorship or any notion of "progressive" censorship. Mill explains that his vision of a perfect society includes "an ideal public which leaves the
freedom and choice of individuals in all uncertain matters undisturbed, and only requires them to abstain from modes of conduct which universal experience has condemned" (Mill, 1975, p. 78). This ideal would probably not include the censorship of pornography; a topic on which the opinions of its merits greatly vary.

Whether or not Mill would agree that women are still lacking in equality or civil rights is a matter of opinion. Without a doubt, pornography fits the definition of an "uncertain matter." What is not a matter of opinion, or uncertain, are the guidelines Mill, who vociferously argued on the behalf of women's rights, set forth for government infringements on the rights of the individual in his treatise, On Liberty.

Mill was very interested in protecting people from government. There exists only one reason for government to infringe upon the rights of an individual. That exception is when a person is engaged in "Acts, of whatever kind, which, without justifiable cause, do harm to others...he must not make himself a nuisance to other people" (Mill, 1975, p. 53). He later states that if there is "definite damage or a risk" to the public or an individual, that it is no longer an issue of liberty, but of "morality or law" (Mill, 1975, p. 76). Is, as the radical feminists
maintain, pornography a sufficient contributor to harming
the public or individuals that the government or courts
ought to infringe upon the rights of an individual? If the
radicals were to argue, and prove, that pornography is a
social evil, then Mill might very well agree with the
necessity for censoring pornography.

However, this is a very difficult point to prove.
Obviously many feel pornography is an evil to be restricted,
while others maintain that people are responsible for their
own actions and that pornography, in and of itself, does no
harm and does not hurt anyone; therefore First Amendment
rights should not be denied. In his writing, Mill offers a
solution to this problem. A solution that, if the radicals
were to consider employing, would not involve government
action and will not offend any individual's sense of
freedom.

Mill believed that when the public interferes with
private conduct, that, as a general rule, it does so wrongly
and in the wrong place (Mill, 1975, p. 78). Nonetheless, he
also felt that

"It is one of the undisputed functions of government to
take precautions against crime (violence encouraged by
pornography) before it has been committed, as well as
to detect and punish it afterwards. The preventive
function of government, however, is far more liable to be abused to the prejudice of liberty, than the punitory function" (Mill, 1975, p. 89).

Thus, he seems to be arguing that while it may be necessary for government to act, it is best that the action be taken after the damage has been done; that is what is in the best interest of liberty. He does not, however, ignore the need for prevention of any such crime.

In The Subjection of Women, Mill wrote that societies which try to fulfill the highest ideal of the Enlightenment, equality, "have most strongly asserted the freedom of action of the individual—the liberty of each to govern his conduct by his own feelings of duty, and by such laws and social restraints as his own conscience can subscribe to" (Mill, 1970, p. 96). Where the radicals are willing to strive to control this liberty in the form of restricting pornography, Mill offers an alternative. Mill affirms the notion that all measures should be taken "in enforcing at all costs to those who endeavor to withhold fulfillment" (Mill, 1975, p. 70), the problem being, of course that a direct cause-effect link almost certainly cannot be drawn to pornography and violent crime towards women.

In this situation, Mill advocates using our individual rights "to act upon our unfavourable opinion of anyone, not
to the oppression of his individuality, but in the exercise of ours" (Mill, 1975, p. 72). The radical feminists can avoid the company of pornographers and can warn about the dangers of pornography. Furthermore, those who indulge in pornography should expect to be ostracized by society at large (Mill, 1975, p. 73). If this climate can be achieved, then pornography will eventually fade as a social influence while the rights of individuals to indulge in pornography will never be infringed upon.

This process of course, will not give women more rights. If Mill is right, they cannot gain more civil rights due to their failure to bring men into their movement. This failure may very well account for their failure to enact any legislation on behalf of their cause, be it pornography or civil rights. Furthermore, the idea that women still lack civil rights is considered by many observers to be dubious at best. One might suspect that John Stuart Mill would have been delighted to see where women stand Constitutionally and socially in this country. Finally, pornography, like any other vice, cannot be stopped. As long as the demand exists, it will be produced. This is why Mill's notion of creating a public opinion that would outcast pornography is appealing. This could be done without spending one day in court. However, it would take
time and a willingness on the part of the radical feminists to focus their efforts on pornography.

My curiosity led me to undertake this research project. In my research of the radical feminists, I have found that feminism is a very diverse field. Indeed, feminism is certainly not the monolithic movement I once envisioned. The spectrum of thought and philosophy is as wide in the arena of feminism as it is in any part of society. Today, I can easier understand how and why one feminist might argue with and even protest against another feminist.

I have also found that the actions of the radical feminists do not seem to match up with their rhetoric. First, they use patriarchal methods to gain civil rights granted by a patriarchy. Considering that some radical feminists speak of revolution, this is an interesting fact. That they can even use the patriarchy to gain civil rights is also interesting. If seems as if they are using their civil rights to gain their civil rights. Yet, they have so far failed to legally change or improve the status of women; but I doubt they will stop trying.

Second, the radicals have shown that their ultimate intent is to use whatever means necessary to improve the plight of women; the means ranging from ideological and
social discourse to grass roots politics. It seems as if they reject the Constitution and its patriarchal nature, yet they do accept the ideals of its philosophy. Thus their wholesale philosophical rejection of the patriarchal institutions turns out not to be so complete. Reality is that they must use the institutions to further their cause. This reveals a pragmatism that is not uncommon in the American ethic.

The radical feminists are an influential and articulate part of the feminist movement. They feel the Constitution has deprived them of rights that male citizens have. Even if this is the case, the amendments, particularly the Fourteenth Amendment and the judicial activism that has accompanied it since its inception, have gone a long way in alleviating, if not eradicating, social inequalities. If the radical feminists want to make a difference; to help women; to effectively fight pornography; they must fight pornography. They can succeed if they follow Mill's suggestions for taking individual and not governmental action. They must not, however, try to use the issue of pornography to make wholesale, societal changes on the status of women. Because if they do, they will fail. They will only be running in place. They will never help one women escape the violent and exploitive grip of pornography.
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