

**Anti-pornography feminism: An attack on pornography or just an attack on men? A corpus linguistic critical discourse analysis investigation of the ideology of misandry in a speech by the anti-pornography feminist Andrea Dworkin.**

**Christopher K Brady**

**Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics**

**Module 4 Assignment (Corpus Linguistics)**

**January 2014**

**4,469 Words (Excluding tables)**

ELAL,

College of Arts & Law

University of Birmingham

Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT

United Kingdom

### **CL/13/02**

It is claimed that corpus research can assist studies of ideology in discourse. Give a demonstration of how this might be the case, pointing out the advantages and disadvantages of corpora to this kind of study. You may either (i) take an ideologically significant text and show how a corpus study can back up or challenge judgements made about it, for example by revealing hidden meanings, or (ii) investigate the discourses surrounding particular groups of people – e.g., relatively powerful / powerless groups of people. As data, you could use the Press part of the BNC, the Bank of English, or Press data from COCA, or some other corpus of news texts. For this assignment, consulting Baker (2006) *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis* would be particularly useful.

# Table of Contents

Title

Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Background.....	6
2.1 Anti-pornography Feminism (APF).....	6
2.2 Corpus Methodology.....	8
2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	9
3. Analysis.....	10
3.1 The Text.....	10
3.2 Lexical Reiteration: Frequency and Keywords Tests.....	10
3.2.1 Frequency Test.....	10
3.2.2 Keywords Test.....	13
3.3 Concordance, Collocation, Lexical Patterning and Semantic Prosody: A Short Corpus Study Using 3 of Van Dijk's Proposed Categories of an Ideological Group Self-Schema (1995).....	15
3.3.1 Identity/Membership.....	15
3.3.2 Tasks/Activities.....	20
3.3.3 Resources.....	23
3.3.4 Summary of Analysis.....	25

4. Discussion.....	26
4.1 Advantages of Using Corpus Analysis to Assist the Study of Ideology in Discourse.....	26
4.2 Disadvantages of Using Corpus Analysis to Assist the Study of Ideology in Discourse.....	27
5. Conclusion.....	29
References.....	31
Appendices.....	34
Appendix I. Speech Transcript.....	34
Appendix II. Stop List.....	47
Appendix III. Top 100 Keywords List .....	51

## 1. Introduction

Corpus linguistics has, to date, mostly been applied in studies of language teaching, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. (Morrish and Saunston 2007) However, its application within the discipline of discourse analysis known as *critical discourse analysis* (CDA) has been less commonplace. As Baker puts it, “this is still a cross-disciplinary field which is somewhat under-subscribed, and appears to be subject to some resistance.” (2006: 6)

In this paper I intend to demonstrate how the application of corpus research can aid a CDA approach into the study of ideology in discourse whilst also showing how certain judgements made about a group can be supported by such research. In order to do this a corpus analysis will be carried out using the Open American National Corpus (OANC) (Ide and Suderman, 2007) and a text taken from a speech by Andrea Dworkin (1985), an exemplary proponent of what is known as *anti-pornography feminism*. Following the analysis, a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of having chosen to adopt a corpus linguistics analysis to aid in this particular study of ideology will take place. The CDA framework that will be used throughout the analysis is taken from Van Dijk’s essay *Discourse semantics and ideology* (1995).

## 2. Background

### 2.1 Anti-pornography Feminism (APF)

Anti-pornography feminists believe that “pornography is the theory, rape the practice.” (Morgan 1977, cited in Echols 1983: 46) They see pornography as being “the scourge which leads inexorably to violence against women” (Echols 1983: 46) and hence, as far as men are concerned, “sexuality and violence are inextricably linked and find their cultural expression in pornography.” (Echols 1983: 47) As McElroy puts it, pornography is “redefined as an *act* of violence, in and of itself. It is the sexual subordination of women, by which their victimization is eroticized and perpetuated. It is the main way patriarchy subordinates women.” (1995: 30)

However, not all feminists agree or identify with this position. Whilst there is a wide range of criticisms levelled at the anti-pornography feminists, many of those criticisms are actually centred on the way that women and men are represented. Meyer states that women are viewed as “acted upon rather than acting; as objects of male will rather than subjects able to challenge or change cultural norms.” (Meyer [Year unknown], cited in Strossen 1993: 1151) Duggan et al, meanwhile, criticise some of the themes of APF including, inter alia, the fact that: “men are raving beasts; that women are victims, not sexual actors; that men inflict ‘it’ on women.” (1985, cited in Strossen 1993: 1147)

Further criticisms come from Wolf. (1993, cited in Cole 1999: 75) Paraphrasing Wolf, Cole lists a number of characteristics of what Wolf calls *victim feminism* including “the rejection of overt power” (Cole 1999: 75), an accusation that victim feminism is “suspicious...of money” (Ibid.), an essentialist position that regards women as “inherently better than men” (Ibid.) and a claim that victim feminism “projects aggression, competitiveness, and violence onto ‘men’ or ‘patriarchy.’” (Wolf 1993, cited in Cole 1999: 75) Hoff Summers sums up the situation well by saying that now feminism “means male-bashing, it means being a victim, and it means being bitter and angry.” (1994, cited in Cole 1999: 74)

In section 3 of this paper a demonstration will take place showing how the validity of some of these claims and judgements can be tested as part of an investigation into ideology in discourse. The investigation will consist of a short corpus analysis of a speech by Andrea Dworkin (1985), a key proponent of *anti-pornography feminism*, with the aim being to show how corpus research can assist the study of ideology in discourse. The investigation will seek to find an answer to the following question:

Is the Anti-pornography feminism stance on pornography just a front for what is really an attack on men and patriarchal institutions as a whole?

## 2.2 Corpus Methodology

Corpus research allows us to go beyond simple human intuition through revealing lexical reiteration and patterning across a whole text and thus it offers many potential benefits to a study into ideology. As Hunston states: “corpora are a very useful tool...because they identify repetitions, and can be used to identify implicit meaning.” (2002: 123) A number of corpus processes will be employed to help answer the question set in this investigation:

- Frequency and keywords tests show the frequency and saliency of particular words in a text in comparison to a reference corpus and hence will be used to help select which words from the Dworkin text (1985) will be chosen for further analysis.
- Collocation analysis, a statistical measure of co-occurrence between words, offers a precise way of ascertaining which words the selected words are associated with. Thus both the choice of concordance search as well as the way in which the results from that search are sorted will be informed by the results of collocation analyses.
- The Concordance lines produced as a result of the concordance searches will be used to study the way the selected words occur naturally within the text. Patterns in the use of language involving the selected words will be investigated by way of the sort function, which alphabetically arranges the concordance lines according to the words that fall either side of the search term.
- Cases of *semantic prosody*, where a word is seen to be regularly occurring within the proximity of a particular semantic class of other words and when our interpretation of its meaning might be modified in subtle ways by this association, will also be investigated through close analysis of the concordance lines.

## 2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

In CDA, ideology is seen “as an important means of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations” (Weiss and Wodak 2003: 14) whilst discourse “can be seen as carrying ideology.” (Sunderland 2004: 6)

The CDA framework that will be used in this essay to explore ideology in the discourse of Dworkin (1985) is taken from Van Dijk’s essay *Discourse semantics and ideology*. (1995) In this essay, Van Dijk posits the existence of a “group self-schema” (1995: 249) that consists of six categories detailing the way the ideology of any given group is formed and propagated. Three of these categories will be used in this essay and are as follows:

- **Identity/Membership:** “Who belongs to the group and who does not, who is admitted to the group, and who is not?”
- **Tasks/Activities:** “What do ‘we’ typically do? What is expected of us? What is the role or task of our group?”
- **Resources:** “All groups survive or reproduce themselves if and only if they have access to scarce social resources. Specific groups may thus have or be defined by their (preferential) access to specific material or symbolic resources.”

(Van Dijk, 1995: 249/250)

Throughout the analysis I will study the way that selected words in the Dworkin text *behave* (especially with respects to patterns of agency, choice of predicates, clause type, collocation and semantic prosody), all the time looking for evidence as to how Dworkin’s language use satisfies the criteria for the three categories outlined above vis-à-vis the development of an underlying ideology of misandry in the text. (1985)

### **3. Analysis**

#### **3.1 The Text**

The text chosen for analysis in this paper is a transcript of a keynote speech delivered by the anti-pornography feminist Andrea Dworkin to an audience at the January 1985 Pornography Awareness conference at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, USA. (1985) The speech<sup>1</sup> consists of 1,239 word types and 6,906 word tokens in total. The spoken component of the *OANC* (a corpus consisting entirely of American English) was chosen as the reference corpus for the keywords test. (Ide and Suderman, 2007) This corpus of spoken data consists of 30,478 word types and 3,285,739 word tokens in total. For the collocation and concordance analyses the entire *OANC* (Ibid.) was used, serving as a benchmark for the investigation of lexical and grammatical patterns and semantic prosody occurring within the speech text. The entire *OANC* (Ibid.) consists of 190,460 word types and 14,755,363 word tokens. The concordance program that was used throughout this investigation was *Antconc 3.2.4m*. (Anthony, 2011)

#### **3.2 Lexical Reiteration: Frequency and Keywords Tests**

##### **3.2.1 Frequency Test**

The first step taken in this corpus analysis was to conduct a basic frequency test on the text of the speech. Given the high frequency with which a number of the grammatical (closed-class) words were appearing it was decided that a stop-list<sup>2</sup> incorporating a range of these grammatical closed-class words should be applied. Table 3.2.1 on page 11 shows the results of the frequency test for word types occurring at least 10 times in the speech text, treating all data as lowercase.

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the speech in its entirety can be found in Appendix I.

<sup>2</sup> The full list of words on this stop-list can be found in Appendix II.

Rank	Word Type	Freq.
1	it	154
2	women	113
3	pornography	107
4	you	89
5	we	85
6	they	63
7	what	58
8	i	55
9	who	43
10	there	40
11	people	39
12	not	38
13	now	34
14	them	33
15	law	31
16	our	30
17	sexual	29
18	country	28
19	first	27
20	their	27
21	rights	25
22	all	24
23	her	23
24	amendment	22
25	want	22
26	say	21
27	right	20
28	speech	19
29	part	18
30	sex	18
31	she	18
32	used	18
33	woman	18
34	also	17
35	means	17
36	see	17
37	men	16
38	very	16
39	more	15
40	civil	14
41	get	14
42	rape	14

Rank	Word Type	Freq.
43	society	14
44	us	14
45	which	14
46	one	13
47	something	13
48	made	12
49	me	12
50	millions	12
51	money	12
52	public	12
53	some	12
54	things	12
55	why	12
56	any	11
57	how	11
58	no	11
59	pleasure	11
60	subordination	11
61	use	11
62	going	10
63	home	10
64	hurt	10
65	know	10
66	lot	10
67	make	10
68	political	10
69	way	10

**Table 3.2.1** Table showing all word types occurring at least ten times in the Andrea Dworkin speech text, ranked according to frequency. (1985)

The next step involved attempting to group the words from this list into loose sets. The following semantic and word class sets, based on those words occurring at least ten times in the speech, were devised (see Table 3.2.2):

Sex and Sexuality	pornography (107), sexual (29), sex (18), rape (14)
Justice	law (31), rights (25), amendment (22), civil (14), political (10)
Society and Nationhood	people (39), country (28), speech (19), society (14), public (12), money (12), subordination (11), home (10)
Gender	women (113), woman, (18), men (16)
Experience (Positive)	pleasure (11)
Experience (Negative)	hurt (10)
Semantically Nonspecific Words	things (12)
Pronouns	it (154), you (89), we (85), they (63), what (58), i (55), who (43), them (33), she (18), us (14), me (12)
Adverbs	there (40), not (38), now (34), also (17), why (12), how (11)
Possessive Adjectives	our (30), their (27), her (23)
Numbers (Ordinal/Cardinal)	first (27), one (13), millions (12)
Verbs	want (22), say (21), see (17), get (14), know (10)
Words Belonging to Multiple Word Classes	all (24), right (20), part (18), used (18), means (17), very (16), more (15), which (14), something (13), made (12), some (12), any (11), no (11), use (11), going (10), lot (10), make (10), way (10)

**Table 3.2.2** Table showing semantic and word class sets derived from the frequency test results in Table 3.2.1 and the words apportioned to them. (The frequency of the words is shown in brackets).

Among the semantic sets there is, unsurprisingly (given the subject of the speech), a focus on sexuality and gender as well as an early indication that these topics are connected in some way to politics, law making and the wider society. However, at this stage it is only an indication. To gain a more accurate insight into the salient themes of the text a keywords test was conducted.

### 3.2.2 Keywords Test

In order to conduct the keywords test, the speech text (Dworkin, 1985) was compared to the spoken component of the *OANC* (Open American National Corpus). (Ide and Suderman, 2007) All data was treated as lowercase and the log likelihood statistical measure was used. Table 3.2.3 shows the top 25 keywords.<sup>3</sup>

Rank	Keyword	Freq. (In Dworkin Speech)	Freq. (In Spoken Component of OANC Reference Corpus)	Keyness
1	<b>pornography</b>	107	1	1429.01
2	<b>women</b>	113	837	829.967
3	<b>sexual</b>	29	16	331.843
4	<b>amendment</b>	22	9	258.819
5	<b>rights</b>	25	154	192.142
6	<b>law</b>	31	592	172.25
7	<b>sex</b>	18	42	169.101
8	<b>speech</b>	19	85	157.074
9	subordination	11	0	148.075
10	rape	14	43	125.01
11	who	43	3856	114.899
12	<b>country</b>	28	1219	111.87
13	means	17	277	99.594
14	millions	12	56	98.294
15	<b>woman</b>	18	405	94.397
16	civil	14	137	91.94
17	pleasure	11	62	86.334
18	raped	9	19	86.033
19	exploitation	7	2	84.699
20	equality	8	9	84.204
21	inequality	6	0	80.768
22	obscenity	6	0	80.768
23	pimps	6	0	80.768
24	<b>men</b>	16	414	79.655
25	first	27	2262	75.418

**Table 3.2.3** Table showing the top 25 keywords ranked according to keyness and showing their frequencies in both the Dworkin speech text (1985) and the spoken component of the *OANC*. (Ide and Suderman, 2007) (Words highlighted in bold type are the three most frequent words in the first four semantic categories of Table 3.2.2)

<sup>3</sup> A list of the top 100 keywords can be found in Appendix III.

Here we can see that a number of the most frequently occurring word types also occur prominently on the keywords list. In fact, the top three most frequent word types from each of the first four semantic sets devised in Table 3.2.2 are also present in Table 3.2.3 (highlighted in bold type), except for one. The word type *people*, though scoring highly on the frequency list (ranking at 11<sup>th</sup> with a frequency of 39), is absent from the top 25 keywords list.

As a result of both their high frequency and their saliency, calculated using frequency and keywords tests, these 11 word types could have been justifiably selected for further analysis. However, due to the limitations of this paper the number of word types selected for further analysis had to be small. Thus this paper presents the findings of just 4 keywords: *men*, *women*, *pornography* and *speech*.

### 3.3 Concordance, Collocation, Lexical Patterning and Semantic Prosody: A Short Corpus Study Using 3 of Van Dijk’s Proposed Categories of an Ideological Group Self-Schema (1995)

#### 3.3.1 Identity/Membership

“Who belongs to the group and who does not, who is admitted to the group, and who is not?” (Van Dijk, 1995: 249)

<b>Anti-Pornography Feminism</b>
<b>In-group: Women</b>
<b>Out-group: Men</b>

#### Men

In Dworkin’s speech (1985) men are consistently described only in relation to what they do, not what or who they are. This is evidenced by the fact that a concordance search for *men are* in the speech revealed no hits. A search for *men* with the results sorted three to the right however reveals the predicates that are used with *men*:

Semantic Classification	Example From Text	Grammatical Pattern
What men do	1.) <b>men</b> BUY 8 billion dollars a year worth of inequality	<b>N V n</b>
	2.) those <b>men</b> READ pornography	<b>N V n</b>
	3.) <b>men</b> ROAMING this country simply KILLING woman after woman	<b>N V n Adv V n</b>
	4.) white <b>men</b> , some of whom OWNED slaves, many more of whom OWNED women	<b>N some of whom V n many more of whom V n</b>
	5.) those <b>men</b> TAKE PICTURES OF women	<b>N V n</b>

**Table 3.3.1** Table showing selected results from Dworkin text (1985) for search term *men*, sorted three to the right.

The predicates in all of the examples in table 3.3.1 are negative. Men, in short, don't *do* anything good.

An advanced search for *they* with the context word set as *men* revealed yet more characterisations of men in terms of the negative things *they* do, especially to the in-group, (which is in object position denoted by *us* and *her*):

Semantic Classification	Example From Text	Grammatical Pattern
What men (they) do	1.) some other <b>men</b> COME ALONG and <b>they</b> RAPE her	<b>N V</b> and <b>they V</b> her
	2.) what <b>men</b> THINK OF us and what <b>they</b> in fact WANT TO DO to us.	what <b>N V</b> us and what <b>they</b> in fact <b>V</b> to us
	3.) what <b>they</b> DO to us	what <b>they V</b> to us
	4.) <b>men</b> PAY and <b>they</b> WATCH and HAVE a good time	<b>N V</b> and <b>they V</b> and <b>V n</b>

**Table 3.3.2** Table showing selected results from Dworkin text (1985) for advanced search term *they* with the context word set as *men* and the parameter set at 8L-0.

Van Dijk states that: “If a social group is consistently described as being the responsible agent of negative action...we may assume that...(it) adds to the negative portrayal of such a group, and therefore has an ideological basis.” (1995: 261) The results from our corpus search in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 certainly show how this is the case in Dworkin’s speech (1985) regarding the out-group *men*, whilst they also show how evidence derived from corpus analytical processes can be used to support certain claims, such as the one made by Duggan et al. that “men are raving beasts; that men inflict ‘it’ on women.” (1985, cited in Strossen 1993: 1147) (See Section 2.1)

With regards to the in-group, Van Dijk goes on to say that: “The converse may be true for Us...when our negative actions are being de-emphasized by assigning Us to a more passive, less responsible role – as something that *happens* to us, or as something we are forced to do by others or the circumstances.” (1995: 261) We will now

investigate how this might be construed through the language of Dworkin’s speech (1985) vis-à-vis her representation of the in-group *women*.

## Women

Given the absence of hits for *men are* I decided to find out what the results would be for *women are*. Table 3.3.3 shows a selection of the results from this enquiry:

Semantic Classification	Example From Text	Grammatical Pattern
Evaluation of Women	1.) <b>women</b> ARE really <b>being forced into</b> sex	N V really V n
	2.) <b>women</b> ARE <b>urinated on</b> and <b>defecated on</b>	N V and V
	3.) <b>women</b> ARE simply <b>tortured</b>	N V simply V
	4.) <b>women</b> ARE poor	N V Adj.
	5.) <b>women</b> ARE <b>raped</b>	N V
	6.) <b>women</b> ARE <b>raped</b> by pimps	N V prep. n
	7.) <b>women</b> ARE <b>oppressed</b>	N V

**Table 3.3.3** Table showing selected results from Dworkin text (1985) for search term *women are*.

In examples 1,2,3,5,6 and 7 women are presented as Goals (in Functional Grammar terms) in passive sentence constructions. (Halliday and Matthiesen, 2004)

The absence of Actors in all but example 6 of these clauses not only helps to bring the focus onto what is done *to* women (in Table 3.3.3 highlighted in red), in particular supporting Meyer’s judgement about APF concerning women being “acted upon rather than acting” (Meyer [Year unknown], cited in Strossen 1993: 1151) (See Section 2.1), but also works ideologically by implying (through Agentless passive constructions) that those absent Actors (Agents) are men, hence automatically assigning them responsibility for the negative actions perpetrated against women.

The women in these examples (in Table 3.3.3), meanwhile, exist purely as instruments that Dworkin (1985) uses to further her negative characterisation of men.

Given that so far we have seen women playing a passive role, I decided to investigate how they might play a more active role in the speech. With this in mind, I chose to investigate ownership in relation to women. The search *women's* in the Dworkin text (1985) yielded the following results:

Semantic Classification	Example From Text	Grammatical Pattern
What women own	1.) (This is what's supposed to be...) <b>women's</b> natural sexuality	N's Adj. n
	2.) (the display of...) <b>women's</b> bodies	N's n
	3.) <b>women's</b> pain	N's n
	4.) <b>women's</b> oppression	N's n
	5.) <b>women's</b> rights	N's n

**Table 3.3.4** Table showing selected results from Dworkin text (1985) for search term *women's*.

Examples 1, 3, 4 and 5 are all abstract nouns, whilst example 2 hardly constitutes ownership. Not one of these examples indicates material possession and in most of these cases what women do possess is negative. The same search in the reference corpus revealed a more positive set of examples, such as the 25 hits of the empowering term *women's rights*, which only appeared once in the Dworkin speech (1985). In the reference corpus there were also 16 hits of *women's roles*, whilst in the Dworkin text (1985) there were none.

Further investigation in the reference corpus revealed that out of 10 hits featuring *roles of women*, 4 hits involved the *changing roles of women*. Hence, *roles* and *women*, in the reference corpus at least, appears to have a positive semantic prosody involved with change. The fact that *roles* does not even occur with *women* in the Dworkin speech (1985) is unsurprising. As we have seen, Dworkin (1985) tends not to present women as active participants in control of material possessions.

In Dworkin's speech (1985) it is important that men are presented as being responsible for negative actions whilst women are presented as being helpless recipients of those actions, for this sets up an important distinction between men and women upon which the group's ideology of misandry is founded.

### 3.3.2 Tasks/Activities

“What do ‘we’ typically do? What is expected of us? What is the role or task of our group?” (Van Dijk, 1995: 249)

**Anti-Pornography Feminism**  
**Raising awareness in relation to pornography and sexual violence.**  
**Engaging in action against pornography and sexual violence relating to women.**

#### Pornography

A collocation analysis (3L-3R/T-Score) for the term *pornography* in the Dworkin speech (1985) revealed that the top three collocates were *used*, *women* and *use*. The same collocation analysis in the reference corpus revealed that these three words did not collocate at all with *pornography*. As a consequence of these collocation results I chose to conduct concordance searches for combinations of *pornography* with the verb *use*. A concordance search in the speech text (Dworkin, 1985) for the term *pornography is used* yielded the following results:

Semantic Classification	Example From Text	Grammatical Pattern
The uses of pornography	1.) <b>pornography</b> IS USED against women in prostitution by clients.	<b>N V</b> against n by n
	2.) <b>pornography</b> IS USED as a textbook for rape by rapists. <b>It</b> IS USED in gang rape. <b>It</b> IS USED in marital rape.	<b>N V</b> as a n for n by n/ <b>N V</b> in Adj. n/ <b>N V</b> in Adj. n
	3.) <b>pornography</b> IS USED in job harassment.	<b>N V</b> in Adj. n
	4.) <b>pornography</b> IS USED to keep them in prostitution as well as to get them into it.	<b>N V</b> them in n as well as <b>V</b> them into n.
	5.) <b>pornography</b> IS USED to create compliance and terror in the home.	<b>N V</b> n and n in n
	6.) <b>pornography</b> IS USED to create fear and vulnerability on the streets of this country.	<b>N V</b> n and n on n

**Table 3.3.5** Table showing selected results from Dworkin text (1985) for search term *pornography is used*.

In these examples pornography is explicitly characterised in relation to how it is used, who uses it and what it is used for. However, a subtler less explicit characterisation of pornography also exists. The situations it is used in all subtly relate to certain *institutions* of society. In examples 1 and 4 *prostitution* and *clients* relate to a world of financial transactions whilst in example 2 *textbook* relates to education and *marital* relates to marriage. Example 3 concerns the world of work (*job harassment*) whilst examples 5 and 6 bring to mind the family (*in the home*) and the neighbourhood (*on the streets*).

These institutions of finance, education and marriage etc. are all arguably instruments of a patriarchal system that oppresses women and has done for a long time. The hidden ideological message here seems to be that the real use of pornography is to ensure that the inequalities that have thus far characterised these institutions are maintained. Thus the group's attempt to define itself on the grounds of acting against pornography appears to be a smokescreen for a definition that is instead grounded on the need to act against patriarchy itself.

Further examples of how this might be the case can be seen in the following example in Table 3.3.6, connecting the use of pornography to inequality (*harassment*) in the institution of education:

Semantic Classification	Example From Text
Uses of Pornography	We are seeing <b>pornography used</b> as a form of harassment in EDUCATION

**Table 3.3.6** Table showing result from Dworkin text (1985) for search term *pornography used*.

The examples in Table 3.3.7 (below), meanwhile, feature more institutions that have oppressed women, this time positioned as Actor in Material Process Clauses where *pornography* is the Goal, meaning they are made responsible for its use.

Semantic Classification	Example From Text	Grammatical Pattern
Institutional users of pornography	1.) <b>Some armies</b> USE <b>pornography</b>	<b>N V N</b>
	2.) <b>Medical schools</b> USE <b>pornography</b>	<b>N V N</b>

**Table 3.3.7** Table showing results from Dworkin text (1985) for search term *use pornography*.

### 3.3.3 Resources

“All groups survive or reproduce themselves if and only if they have access to scarce social resources. Specific groups may thus have or be defined by their (preferential) access to specific material or symbolic resources.” (Van Dijk, 1995: 250)

#### **Anti-Pornography Feminists**

**Defined by (the lack of)...**

- **Women’s rights to fair representation, especially in relation to female sexuality.**

#### **Speech**

One of the primary tenets of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States is freedom of speech and it is precisely this tenet that prevents Dworkin from getting a controversial law passed concerning pornography.

Dworkin’s response to this is to characterise speech as being a particular resource that the present (male) system denies women access to. (1985) Through doing this, freedom of speech can be reformulated, in Dworkin’s terms, as protection of men’s rights at the expense of those of women. (1985)

One way in which Dworkin (1985) is able to characterise *speech* is through commodification. By treating *speech* as if it were an expensive product in a marketplace, Dworkin (1985) is able to re-present it as being part of the very same capitalist system that encourages the exploitation of women via pornography. It is precisely this commodification of speech that enables it to be connected to a system of capitalist power, a system in Dworkin’s ideology that is chiefly patriarchal.

An advanced search for *speech* with the context word set as *money* (10L-10R) revealed the following results, shown in Table 3.3.8, in the wider discursive context in which they appear:

Semantic Classification	Example From Text
Evaluation of speech in terms of money	1.) And the people who don't have <b>money to buy speech</b> can drop dead and do and do.
	2.) People in this society who have power, have speech. <b>Speech costs money.</b>
	3.) "I have first amendment <b>rights to speech but I'm poor</b> . Would you <b>give me some money so I could exercise them?</b> "

**Table 3.3.8** Table showing all results from Dworkin text (1985) following advanced search for *speech* with the context word set as *money* (10L-10R).

Given that it is the protection of freedom of speech that prevents Dworkin from getting her law on pornography passed, it is perhaps unsurprising that Dworkin (1985) chooses to present it as a commodity. The commodification of speech ensures that freedom of speech (and by extension the Constitution that defends it) is not only ideologically repackaged as being a preferential resource in a male system of power and exploitation, but also that the entire constitutional system is debased in the process. As Wolf pointed out, victim feminism (APF) engages in “the rejection of overt power” (Cole 1999: 75) and is “suspicious...of money.” (1993, cited in Cole 1999: 75) It would seem we now know why.

### 3.3.4 Summary of Analysis

The kind of approach undertaken in this short study, incorporating a corpus analysis within a CDA framework, has shown how ideology could be profitably investigated through using a corpus. As a result of analysing Dworkin's speech (1985), looking for examples in her language use that pertained to three of Van Dijk's categories (1995), we found evidence to support the view that:

- Men were presented as being responsible for negative acts to women whilst women were presented as agentless victims of those negative acts.
- Pornography was presented in relation to institutions of a patriarchal system, revealing the group's real desire to engage in action against patriarchy itself, not just pornography.
- Dworkin's (1985) commodification of speech enabled the U.S. Constitution's defence of freedom of speech to be re-presented as the defence of a capitalist system of power that favours those who have money, in other words (in Dworkin's view) - men.

The evidence presented here in this analysis suggests that the APF stance on pornography is indeed just a front for what is actually an attack on men and patriarchy. Likewise, evidence found in the corpus analysis also shows how the criteria for 3 of Van Dijk's categories of an ideological group self-schema were realised through Dworkin's language use (1985), hence highlighting the benefits of incorporating corpus analysis into a CDA study of ideology.

However, in spite of the obvious benefits of having used corpus analysis to aid in this particular study, there were drawbacks too. These pros and cons will be discussed in section 4.

## **4. Discussion**

### **4.1 Advantages of Using Corpus Analysis to Assist the Study of Ideology in Discourse**

There are a number of advantages to be gained from using corpus research in studies of ideology. Corpus research was found to be beneficial to my own short study of ideology in the Dworkin text (1985) in the following ways:

- 1.) Whilst conducting a frequency test didn't reveal any specific ideological meanings, it nevertheless provided a good starting point for the investigation by enabling semantic groups to be formed out of the most frequent words. The ability to rank all the words in the speech by their frequency thus allowed for an initial overview of the text as a whole.
- 2.) Using a keywords test near the beginning of this investigation meant that the decision governing which words would be chosen for further analysis was made using statistical tests run by a computer algorithm. As a consequence, the scope of my analysis was based on statistically significant findings, ensuring researcher bias for this stage of the analysis was reduced.
- 3.) The use of the sort function in the concordance analysis tool allowed certain patterns of co-occurrence between words to be observed. Being able to observe these patterns and then look for them in a reference corpus enabled underlying discourses to be revealed.
- 4.) Collocation tests proved to be a useful starting point for concordance analysis, providing an indication as to the kind of lexical patterns or phrases the search word might occur in. Throughout the investigation, collocation test results informed my choice of concordance search.

## 4.2 Disadvantages of Using Corpus Analysis to Assist the Study of Ideology in Discourse

Certain problems and limitations were encountered through using corpus analysis to study ideology in the Dworkin text. (1985) The use of corpus research in this area was found to be problematic in the following ways:

1.) Borsley and Ingham (2002, cited in Baker, 2006) point out the difficulty of drawing any conclusions about language when, for example, certain words or phrases etc. do not appear in a corpus. On a number of occasions in this study it was difficult to draw any conclusions about the usage of a certain word or phrase in the Dworkin text (1985) because there were little or no instances of that word or phrase in the reference corpus with which to compare it to.

2.) Mynatt et al (1977, cited in Baker, 2006) showed how researchers often look for evidence that will support their claims whilst ignoring other examples that might discount them. (Confirmation bias) Corpus research methods offer a number of opportunities where this kind of researcher bias can creep in. At every stage of this analysis decisions had to be made that, had they been made differently, could have radically altered the outcome of the study. Often the sheer range of results made available by the concordancer program necessitated some degree of selectivity. Likewise, the space restrictions necessarily imposed upon this study meant selectivity had to come into play. The problem with selectivity in any study is that it encourages researcher bias.

3.) Concordance analysis is another aspect of corpus linguistics methodology where researcher bias can occur. The choice of concordance data to study and the way in which that concordance data is interpreted is open to contestation and subject to much researcher bias. Though the data in this study did appear to support the points I was making, it is hard to know whether another researcher conducting this study would interpret the data in the same way. Hence, any conclusions I have made about the

way ideology is manifested in the language of Dworkin's speech (1985) are highly open to debate.

4.) Due to the difficulty of transcribing large amounts of speech, spoken components of corpora tend to be much smaller. Whilst I was able to use the spoken component of the *OANC* (Ide and Suderman, 2007) as a reference corpus in the keywords analysis, when it came to using it to investigate the language patterns that I had found in the Dworkin speech (1985), it proved most inadequate. Most of the patterns and many of the words that were present in the Dworkin speech (1985) were simply absent in the spoken component of the *OANC*. (Ide and Suderman, 2007) Consequently, for the investigation of language patterns, the entire corpus had to be used as a reference corpus. This constituted a somewhat unsatisfactory solution to the issue as spoken discourse and written discourse differ markedly.

5.) Analysing the language used in a transcribed speech tells only half the story. The language in the speech presented for analysis is abstracted from the context in which it originally occurred. Any results drawn do not take into account intonation, kinesics or paralinguistic features. Given that Dworkin is characterised as being an "expert[s] at the art of arousal and manipulation" it might well be assumed that some of these features, absent from my analysis, play a significant part in the construction of her ideological viewpoint. (Segal, 1998: 56)

## 5. Conclusion

This paper set out to demonstrate how corpus analysis could aid an investigation into ideology in discourse. A critical discourse analysis approach was hence chosen, with Van Dijk's model for the construction of an ideological "group self-schema" acting as a framework for the analysis. (1995: 249) The corpus analysis, which used statistically significant keywords as a basis, sought to find patterns in the language that Dworkin used that might signal the ways in which an ideology of misandry might be manifested in the discourse of her speech. (1985)

The lexical and phraseological evidence provided by the corpus analysis that was conducted in this short investigation revealed the differing ways in which Dworkin (1985) presented men and women, with men being responsible agents of negative actions against women whilst women were presented as passive recipients of those actions. Further evidence found in the analysis of Dworkin's language (1985) helped to reveal that she was associating the use of pornography with institutions of patriarchy and that she was conceptualising speech as a product that was available to men, but not women. As the analysis progressed it became clear that Dworkin (1985) was propounding a view of a patriarchal system whose continued survival ensured the exploitation of women, to say nothing of the survival of the group itself. Thus, in the summary of the analysis in section 3.3.4 it was concluded that Dworkin (1985) was indeed promulgating an ideology of misandry.

However, whilst these insights appear to support my own claim as well as the claims made by a number of other feminists, a note of caution was raised concerning the potential for researcher bias associated with the interpretation of corpus data and concordance lines. Notwithstanding, the investigation was successful in that it revealed the ways in which Van Dijk's proposed criteria for the construction of an ideological "group self-schema" (1995: 249) could be shown, by corpus processes, as being construed through Dworkin's language choices (1985), helping to reveal the hidden ideology of misandry in Dworkin's speech. (1985)

Overall, then, the investigation revealed some interesting insights into the workings of ideology in discourse and proved that corpus analysis, in spite of its shortcomings, has much to offer a CDA approach.

## References

Anthony, L. (2011) Antconc (Version 3.2.4m) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/>

Baker, P. (2006) **Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis**. London: Continuum.

Borsley, R.D. and Ingham, R. (2002) Grow your own linguistics? On some applied linguistics' views of the subject. **Lingua Franca**, 112, 1-6.

Cole, A.M. (1999) "There Are No Victims in This Class": On Female Suffering and Anti-"Victim Feminism". **NWSA Journal**, 11/1, 72-96.

Duggan et al. (1985) "False Promises: Feminist Antipornography Legislation in the U.S.". In Burstyn, V. (ed.) **Women Against Censorship**. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre pp.142-143, 151.

Dworkin, A. (1985) **Keynote speech at the January 1985 Pornography Awareness conference at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina**. [online]. The Estate of Andrea Dworkin. <http://www.andreadworkin.com/transcripts/duke.html> [Accessed December 12th 2013]

Echols, A. (1983) Cultural Feminism: Feminist Capitalism and the Anti-Pornography Movement. **Social Text**, 7, 34-53.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C. (2004) **An Introduction To Functional Grammar**. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Hodder Arnold.

Hoff Sommers, C. (1994) **Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women**. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hunston, S. (2002) **Corpora in Applied Linguistics**. Cambridge: UP.

Ide, N. and Suderman, K. (2007). **The Open American National Corpus (OANC)**.  
<http://www.AmericanNationalCorpus.org/OANC>.

McElroy, W. (1995) **XXX: A Woman's Right To Pornography**. New York: St Martin's Press.

Meyer, C. (Year unknown) **Sex, Censorship, and Women's Liberation**. 13-14. n.25  
(Unpublished manuscript on file with the Virginia Law Review Association).

Morgan, R. (1977) **Going Too Far: The Personal Chronicle of a Feminist**. New York: Random House.

Morrish, L. and Saunston, H. (2007) **New Perspectives on Language and Sexual Identity**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mynatt et al. (1977) Confirmation bias in a simulated research environment: an experimental study of scientific inference. **Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology**, 29, 85-95.

Segal, L. (1998) Only the Literal: The Contradictions of Anti-pornography Feminism. **Sexualities**, 1/41, 43-62.

Strossen, N. (1993) A Feminist Critique of "the" Feminist Critique of Pornography. **Virginia Law Review**, 79/5, 1099-1190.

Sunderland, J. (2004) **Gendered Discourses**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1995) Discourse Semantics and Ideology. **Discourse & Society**, 6/2, 243-289.

Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2003) **Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan pp.1-32.

Wolf, N. (1993) **Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How it Will Change the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**. New York: Random House.

## **Appendix I - Andrea Dworkin. Keynote speech at the January 1985**

**Pornography Awareness conference at Duke University, Durham, North**

**Carolina.** . <http://www.andreadworkin.com/transcripts/duke.html>

Thank you, thank you very much. Unfortunately, also featured in Penthouse, Hustler, and Playboy. I want to tell you first something about the range of pornography that exists in this country. What is being made right now. What is being made; what is being shown; what is being bought.

The first thing is that there are millions upon millions upon millions of pictures every year of women shown with our legs spread and our legs splayed; shown as what is called "beaver, pussy, bunny"--those are *our* genitals. The genitals are trussed up. Sometimes they are glued open. Sometimes they're tied from behind, so that they stand up. They are made up so that ... they jump out at you from the page; it is almost as if they're 3-D. This is what's supposed to be women's *natural* sexuality.

In our class--the class I taught with Catharine MacKinnon on pornography at the University of Minnesota Law School--one of our students came up with an idea. She thought it would be very interesting to have a "Porn Freeze." Just simply, "Okay, you guys, you've got millions and millions and millions and millions and millions and millions of pictures of women with legs open. Let's set a date and from that point on you don't make any more." Well, we knew that this violated the basic constitutional protections of citizens of this country.

Then somebody had the audacity to suggest a build down--*one picture a year torn up*. We also knew that that violated the basic constitutional protections of our country.

Understand the magnitude of what we are talking about. The essential problem in here is: why? I can't answer that question--but why? Why isn't a million enough? Why aren't 2 million enough? Why aren't 5 million enough? Why aren't 10 million enough? Why are there never enough pictures of women with our legs spread and our genitals exposed?

There are also every year in this country millions upon millions upon millions of pictures made of women in postures of submission and access. And the access is to our vaginas, to our anuses, and to our throats. And what the pictures show is a willingness to be penetrated by that anomalous viewer, an invitation to all male citizens to penetrate. Lesbian scenes in pornography are very much a part of this display of women's bodies, so that whenever you see scenes of lesbians, the fact of the matter is what you are being shown are two women engaging in foreplay in such a way that parts of their body are available to a male for penetration.

The pornography that's being made in this country right now is primarily--as pornography has always classically been--about forced sex. It's about rape. It's about pain. It's about humiliation.

There are two scenarios on which virtually all pornography is based. And that is in one, there is a woman who is going through the course of her life doing something or other; it helps if she is a little bit upscale, because there is a hell of a lot more pleasure in bringing her down. And somewhere in the course of her life somebody grabs her. A man grabs her and he rapes her and maybe some other men come along and they rape her and maybe some women help out raping her and they tie her up and they hurt her and they put things up her vagina. And somewhere in the course of this, she discovers that she is having a wonderful time and she starts asking to be hurt more and to be brutalized more.

And in the second scenario, she already knows that she likes being hurt. And so the whole first part is just skipped and we start out with a woman who is saying "Hurt me, do this to me, I like it" with a big smile on her face.

A lot of pornography, film pornography, photographic pornography, is real rapes. Women are really being forced into sex that they don't want to have. And in addition, rapes that are filmed--women not in pornography, women in real life who are raped and the rapes are filmed--those films are also on the pornography market, now, in this country.

Pornography being made now uses women to be penetrated by animals and by objects. The animals are most often dogs, snakelike things, snakes, eels. The objects are dildos, sometimes spiked, but also knives--common household objects: knives, telephones, so-called pistol hairdryers.

In the pornography being made now in this country, women are urinated on and defecated on. Women and girls are used interchangeably, so that women, adult women--that means legally over the age of whatever the legal age is--are dressed to look like five- or six-year-old girls, surrounded by toys, put in a child's bedroom, presented for anal penetration.

There is also a whole group of pornography magazines that show women--usually blond women, because blond is objectified to be childlike--with shaved pubeses.

Pornography is a major vehicle for sexualizing racism in this country right now. Pornography presents racial hatred as sexual delight. And every injustice that people have historically suffered is used as a form of sexual pleasure for them--for the victims of the injustice! So that we have books about black women called *Plantation of Pain* in which slavery is an institution of sexual pleasure for the black women who are slaves. We have in pornography consistently the skin of black women being sexualized--so that it's treated as if it's a sexual organ; it's treated as if it's genitals--and all of the sexual hatred, all of the humiliation, all of the pain is directed against the skin of the black woman.

The pornography that uses Asian women that is being sold in this country right now is the most brutal pornography on the market. It begins with women hanging from trees, hanging in doorways, being strung up in all sorts of ways. It comes from an international trade in Asian women. The brothels in this country are filled with Asian women who have been sold into them. They don't exist as recognizable human beings

in the pornography. They have never in their lives existed as anything other than commodities to be sold to create this kind of sexual pleasure.

Pornography is also a major vehicle of anti-Semitism. And there is a lot of concentration camp pornography. "I was a Gestapo sex slave." It says: "I woke up one morning and I walked to Auschwitz and I knocked on the door and I asked please could I come in. And Herr Himmler, who was busy with somebody else, made some room for me on the table, and he said, 'Little Jewish girl, now I'm going to do this and this and this and this to you.' " And all the atrocities that happened at Auschwitz and in other camps are then presented as the will, the desire, and the pleasure of the Jewish woman.

The pornography that is being created right now presents the humiliation of woman as sexual pleasure for women.

It uses disabilities of women as a sexual turn-on; women without legs, as a sexual fetish. The maiming of women is frequently the way women with disabilities are presented. It ties in with the pornography that is being created and enjoyed in this country right now in which women are simply tortured. Torture: that thing that we recognize when it happens to real people--men in prisons--happens to women in the United States to create entertainment.

Pornography that is being created and enjoyed right now also includes murder. Snuff films *are* being made. Snuff films *were* being made. They do exist. They do end with the disemboweling of a woman, and a man having an orgasm over her disembowelment.

Now that is just what is in the pornography. What is the range of abuse associated with the pornography?--because, see, what is in the pornography isn't enough. We don't have a case if we say what is in the pornography, because "So what?"--that is the posture of this country on the reality of what I have just described. So now, separate from what is in the pornography, what is the abuse? Well, first of all, it should be obvious, but apparently it isn't: all of the above is the abuse because it is happening to real women--the women in the pornography. This is really being done--dare I say it to *people*? no, not to people--to *women*. Scientifically of the same species!

The women in pornography: why are they there? Did a child say at the age of three, "Mommy, when I grow up what I want more than anything in the world is to be hung like a piece of meat by Bob Guccione in New York City!?" You have to believe that to look at these slides and say the women are there because they want to be.

Now we have learned a lot about who the women in pornography are. And that is because a lot of the women who ... have been in pornography and have escaped are part of the feminist anti-pornography movement. And a lot of the information comes from them. There have also been studies done. And the studies show that 70 to 75 percent of the women in the sex industry are incest victims; that they run away from home; that they get picked up by pimps; that they get used in pornography and prostitution; that the pornography is used to keep them in prostitution as well as to get them into it.

Another reason women are in pornography is that women are poor. Poverty is a real thing. The women in pornography for the most part are not women who said: "Will I be a neurosurgeon or will I be in snuff?" Those were not their choices; they are the poor and dispossessed of this society.

Women are also in pornography because women are raped. Women are raped by pimps getting them into prostitution and pornography. And women who are raped--increasingly, the rapes are being photographed. Rape crisis centers have given us this information over a period of the last eight years. The photographs of the rapes are on the commercial pornography market. They are protected speech. The position of the ACLU is that you can get the rapist for the rape but you cannot touch the photograph. Think of the woman's life.

Pornography is used against women in prostitution by clients. There's a tremendous amount of information that prostitution has become incredibly more brutal and dangerous for women who are in it, because johns come and they want to do what they see in the pornography.

Pornography is used as a textbook for rape by rapists. It is used in gang rape. It is used in marital rape--such that battered women's centers are seeing women who have been tied up by their husbands and raped by animals, raped by dogs: a kind of sadistic brutalization that comes directly out of the pornography.

There is, for instance, an increase in this country in the incidences of throat rape since the distribution of *Deep Throat*, but also throat rape is a major theme in pornography. Now, we are not talking about women having oral sex with men. We are talking about deep thrusting into the throat and women showing up in emergency rooms: some of them dead.

Pornography is used in job harassment--especially women who are working in nontraditional fields but also working-class women: waitresses and so on. Their environments are made poison with the pornography, which frequently goes hand in hand with actual physical assault as a form of intimidation to get them off the job.

We are seeing pornography used as a form of harassment in education. Pornography is used to create compliance and terror in the home. I remind you that it is a fact that the home is the most dangerous place in this country for a woman--that a woman is more likely to be beaten in her home, raped in her home, or killed in her home than anyplace else. And it is more likely that the person who does those things to her is going to be somebody who lives in that home with her than anyone else.

Pornography is used to create fear and vulnerability on the streets of this country, so that there are neighborhoods that women who don't live there won't go into, and the women who do live in those neighborhoods--usually poor and working-class neighborhoods, frequently black neighborhoods--the quality of their lives is turned into a nightmare of sexual harassment and sexual threat by the men who come to their neighborhoods to get the pornography and to get the women that the pornography promises them.

Pornography is a central part in the serial murder phenomenon. We are pleased that the FBI has discovered it at last; they estimate that there are thousands of men roaming this country simply killing woman after woman after woman after woman. Those men take pictures of the women; those men read pornography. Ted Bundy has talked about the role of pornography in the reasons that he committed the murders that he did; the ways he stalked women; the ways in which he thought about women. The pornography is found in the homes of the murderers. Pornography is associated with [Charles] Manson; it is associated with the Son of Sam killer; it is associated with Richard Speck.

The reality now for women in this country is that if you film any act of humiliation or torture and if the victim is a woman, the act is sex and the film is both entertainment and protected speech.

But the social question remains: Is pornography harmful? See, because all of that can be true, and there's still this social question, because we are talking about women. All of these things are being done to women. So we say, well, look at the picture, see the picture, see the woman, see her hanging from a meat hook. See, that is a woman: she is a human being, and she is hanging from a meat hook. See, that's the harm. And people say: "That's not harm--she's there because she wants to be." Well, it is harm, actually, even if she is there because she wants to be. Do you know that there are laws in this country that say that you can't consent to violence against you? These are the little nuances of civilization. But her picture isn't proof that pornography causes harm.

I will tell you what the proof is that the society accepts in a descending order of importance. The society says: "Show us that pornography impacts on men, and we will consider that perhaps pornography causes harm." And thus the experimental research that you heard about here earlier today becomes a crucial part of our poor, pathetic efforts to prove that something bad is happening here. Because experimental scientists take a bunch of college men who are normal--and that means that they're less hostile in fact than is normal; they are tested for it--and show them pornography and see if it has any effect on them. And if it has an effect on them, it has an effect. See, then, it is socially real. It means something. We have to perhaps consider doing something about it.

We are very lucky because there is an effect on 18- to 22-year-old boys--who haven't quite grown up yet and reached imperviousness to women's pain--that is measurable. And as a result we can point to a body of research and say: See, there's an effect. And we do because we have to.

There are social studies. In social studies you take a population of live people and you ask them what happened to them. And there are ways of doing it that the society recognizes as being objective. We have social studies that show that about 10 percent of women in the population have at one time or another been forced or had pressure put on them to do acts that they did not want to do because of their husband's or lover's use of pornography, including anal intercourse, branding--I mean acts like that.

We have social studies evidence about the use of pornography in medical schools to desensitize future doctors to what is called sex but to what is the abuse of women,

because they encounter it a lot. And they're not supposed to be judgmental. And the reason that medical schools use pornography to desensitize them is that it works.

We have--and now we are getting lower on the scale of important evidence--clinical evidence. That means people who are psychologists or therapists who talk to victims. Now, it is because of their proximity with the people who have been hurt that their evidence isn't worth as much. Nevertheless, in Minneapolis--which has a whole lot of therapists per capita--they came out to talk about the use of pornography against victims of sexual abuse and the use of pornography by sex offenders and in fact asked the city council: why hasn't anyone ever asked us this before? It was pervasive; pornography was found as a causal agent in all kinds of sex abuse--admittedly so by offenders who said that they used pornography to determine what their crimes were going to be.

Now, at the very bottom of the proof are the women to whom it happens. The reason that the feminist movement is never quite in sync with this society is that that for us is the top of the proof, not the bottom of the proof. Nevertheless, the testimony of women, the women who have been victimized, is staggering. And what it shows is that in all the situations where women experience battery, rape, incest, being forced into prostitution, in the testimony of the women to whom it's happened--there are massive numbers of them, and the pornography was right at the center of what happened to them, and they have never been able to tell anyone because they've been ridiculed to death. Remember what it was like to get people to try to understand that rape was a real thing that wasn't fun. Well, it's very hard again to get people to understand it. But try being a woman who has been consistently abused over a period of time because of the pornography that her husband uses, and try to get anybody to believe you.

Another piece of proof is that some armies use pornography to increase aggression in their troops. The British Army used it in the Falklands. They used it because it works. I call this empirical evidence. And they use it in Ireland. In Ireland, Irish women report that they are taken off the streets in the last couple of years by the British occupying army and urinated on and then let go. Other acts like that--forms of harassment that they have never experienced before. In Ireland and in other places, when people do these things to people, they have political reasons. In this country, it's fun.

Pornography is an entertainment industry: 8 billion dollars a year worth. Three to four times the number of McDonald's restaurants--that's how many adult bookstores there are in this country. Now, political people on the left are supposed to recognize money as having some political importance. Theoretically, when a small group of profiteers is making a fortune off of the exploitation of a whole lot of powerless people, that's supposed to be a political issue. So why isn't it a political issue even in those terms when we are talking about a trade in women?

There are two reasons for that: the first reason is that this trade in women is supposed to be an expression of *our* natures. This isn't an issue of a bunch of pimps making money off of our exploitation; this is us realizing our dreams.

The second reason is that if you are going to talk about money and its impact on the subordination of women, you are also going to have to talk about sex as exploitation. And if there is one thing political people in this country don't want to do, it's to talk about that. Because the way in which women are oppressed has to do with the nexus of sex and money and the ways in which our bodies are bartered and sold. We are controlled through money and through sex, and the subordination of women is achieved through money and through sex.

Now, people have said since the writing of the Minneapolis law, suddenly, that they don't know what *subordination* means. They just for the life of them can't figure out what that word means. And that's a real, you know, big word suddenly. The direct translation is: putting down. It's not good statutory language, but that's what it means. What it consists of as a dynamic, I think, is, basically, it has four parts. The first part is that there is a hierarchy. Somebody is on top and somebody is on the bottom. For women this is a very intimate reality. We know who is on top and who is on the bottom. We don't need to be political science majors to understand what hierarchy is, because it is a visceral, intimate, sexual reality: it is both private and public.

The second element of subordination is objectification, and that is when you take a person and you make them less than human. You turn them into a thing. And that *hurts* them. That's not alright! That robs them of a human status both in private and in public.

The third element of subordination is submission, because if you take somebody and you put them at the bottom of a hierarchy and you turn them into an object, you better believe that their survival depends on taking orders. And oppressed people are known not only for complying but anticipating orders, because to the extent that you anticipate what is going to be demanded of you, you are safer. The smarter you are in knowing what the person on top wants, the better chance you have of surviving if you don't have any real power.

The fourth element of subordination is violence. That means the overt violence. You know: I punch you; I hit you; I stick something up an orifice of yours. That's violence. When you have a society in which violence against a class of people is *normal*, then you already have hierarchy and objectification and submission in place.

Now, the thing that makes women's oppression distinctive--because we can isolate all these elements in relation, for instance, to racism, to racist pogroms, to racist social organizations; they are very much the elements of racist subordination in a racist society--but what is unique to the situation of women is that the vehicle of subordination is sex. That is what drives everybody crazy, and that is what everybody is freaked out about.

And what we're saying is that pornography in particular sexualizes these elements of subordination: it makes them into sexual things for whole vast numbers of men who are the dominant class. It takes hierarchy and it turns it into a sexual pleasure. It turns it into part of people's sexual desire. That means, then, that the imposing of hierarchy becomes in and of itself an act that is full of sexual meaning. It's sexually dynamic; people want to do it. They want to do it because it gives them sexual pleasure. And

pornography is what makes it sexual. It is the material means of making it sexual. Pornography in its total impact sexualizes inequality. What that means is that the inequality of women becomes sexually necessary. It becomes essential to sexual desire and to how sexual pleasure is actually experienced by vast numbers of people. Pornography functions in this society as a private terrorism. That is one way it functions in people's homes, where a man's home is his castle. His castle.

Now, the function of obscenity law--and I want you to think about how smart obscenity law has been in serving to keep women suppressed from seeking our rights--a function of obscenity law is to keep pornography private, to keep it out of the public domain so that women and children can't see it. So that we don't see where all the nerves of male sexual supremacy come together. So that we don't see what men think of us and what they in fact want to do to us. So that what they do do to us we experience as being entirely private, entirely personal. No matter how many other women on the block are experiencing marital rape, we don't know that we are not responsible for it. And obscenity law, as a right-wing strategy to keep women unequal in society, is very smart. It has kept pornography from us. That's what it is intended to do.

Now, in our society, pornography has also become a form of public terrorism. We walk down the street and we avert our eyes: there are stores we do not go into. The stores that we do go into, we know we are second-class citizens.

The right warned the left not to make pornography public. The right is very smart about power. The right said, "You don't show that stuff to women and children. You don't let them see that."

Obscenity law only impacts on pornography at the point when it becomes public. Obscenity laws are criminal laws. That means the police deal with whatever the state is going to say is obscene. That means it has to be public before the police can deal with it. You can use it in your own home against your own wife. You can use it against prostitutes. You can do whatever the hell you want with it as long as you don't make the mistake that the left made in making pornography public. Because what happened is that we saw it. And we started understanding something about how all those acts of sexual abuse came together. About what their meaning was. About how they're not accidents. How they're not just personal aberrations; they are political; they are part of a plan.

The boys on the left counted on the saturation of society with pornography to create a sufficient degree of public terrorism that we would be afraid to do anything about what they're doing to us. The public saturation of the society with pornography is designed to create social subordination and social silence of women on the sexual-political issues of sexual oppression.

The so-called speech of women in pornography is silence--and splayed legs are silence. Being beaver and pussy and bunny and pets and cunts--that is an operational definition of silence. "Hurt me, and give it to me harder, and hurt me more " is silence. And those who think that it is speech have never heard a woman's voice, not once, not ever.

And even the screams of the women tortured are silence--and men pay and they watch and have a good time. But no one hears a human scream. That is what it means to be born female. No one hears a human scream.

Now, I will tell you what censorship is. Censorship is when one half of humanity is censored out of self-determined speech: the political process, the arts, the sciences, philosophy, theology, the state legislature, you name it. And laws are understood and applied to further the exploitation of those people who have been silenced. That silence is guarded and guaranteed by force, and it is state policy.

Some people say, "Well, it may be true that women aren't in all those places, but we can't draw any conclusions from that about women not having rights of speech, because we have something called the first amendment."

The first amendment was written by a bunch of men. White men, some of whom owned slaves, many more of whom owned women; and it is first, it is fundamental in this system that excluded women and black people for so long and still. It is first because there were no two things more connected when the first amendment was written than literacy and property. People who owned property were the literate people in this country, and it was their rights that were being protected. The first amendment was never used to challenge slavery. There were laws throughout the slave-owning South against teaching slaves to read and write. That was state policy. Nobody ever tried to use it. "Okay," you say, "of course not."

Segregation--the first amendment was never used to challenge segregation. Segregation was about reading and writing, literacy, speaking, freedom of association, even freedom of religion: right to have access to churches.

The first amendment protects the interests of those who have power. People in this society who have power have speech. Speech costs money....

And the first amendment doesn't entitle anyone to access to freedom of speech. Not anyone. You don't go to the government and say: "I have first amendment rights to speech but I'm poor. Would you give me some money so I could exercise them?" The government will tell you to drop dead. Nobody gives you money. The first amendment does not say that you have an affirmative right to learn to read and write--so that huge numbers of people in this country can be kept illiterate. Doesn't violate their first amendment rights at all, not as the first amendment is understood. Certainly not as it is understood by the people who defend pornographers.

The politics of the first amendment has been that them that's got shall get. And the people who don't have money to buy speech can drop dead and do and do. The first amendment is not an equality law. And there is no body of legal reality in this country that says that people have rights of access.

The way the first amendment is being used is to empower pimps. Pornographers are pimps: they sell women.

And what we are being sold is that pimps are symbols of freedom and that we protect our freedom when we protect the freedom of a pimp.

There is a civil liberties arithmetic of rights which gives me a dizzying case of math anxiety from which I may not ever recover.

[Applause] We are supposed to believe that the more speech that *they* have, the more speech *we* have. But their speech is our subservience. Their speech is our inequality. Their speech is our exploitation and our pain and our injury. And in fact, our bodies are their language. We are their words. We are their sentences. They can't exercise their rights of speech unless we don't have rights at all.

Now, why pornography is a civil rights issue is that pornography is absolutely antagonistic to the equality of women. That it sexualizes inequality and makes it necessary, sexually necessary, to people. That it turns women into subhuman creatures. That it is the systematic exploitation of a group of people because of a condition of birth. That it is the suppression of women through sexual exploitation and abuse, so that we have no means to achieve civil equality.

I say that the first amendment is fundamental to this system. It is. I want you to remember that civil rights law is not fundamental to this system. And I want you to remember that, in fact, it is 20 years old, and it is stuck onto this system of law with spit and a prayer, and anybody blows too hard and it is gone. We can't say, "Well, Madison wrote the first amendment. We stand on the brilliance of the founding fathers." It is not true. It's not true. We don't even know that they would think we have any right to equality at all.

I want to remind you the reason that sex discrimination is even a part of the Civil Rights Law of 1964 is a racist southern senator, when he saw that the legislation was going to pass, amended it to include sex discrimination as the greatest insult he could think of to the idea of civil rights and civil equality between blacks and whites. "What is that like?" he said; "It is like the idea that men and women are equal. Ha ha ha. Look, you fools." And the Senate was humiliated to be ridiculed in that way, but they passed the civil rights law with his amendment because they couldn't get rid of his amendment. And that is the only reason we have any standing at all in this system of law.

Now, last night I heard some discussion in which some feminists were talking about how laws never change anything. I want to say that that upset me a lot. I haven't thought of a nice way to say this, so I will just say it outright: Laws changed something here. Laws changed the American system of apartheid in this state. And I don't want to hear from feminists in North Carolina that laws cannot ever make a difference.

[Applause]

Now, the civil rights law that Catharine MacKinnon and I drafted is an amendment to the Minneapolis Human Rights Ordinance that is modeled on the 1964 federal civil rights statute. What it does are these things:

It defines pornography as a form of sex discrimination, as "the graphic sexually explicit subordination of women in pictures or words" that also includes one or more of a whole series of characteristics, many of which you saw here today. It ranges from women being dehumanized by being presented as objects, things, or commodities; through women being raped and showing pleasure in rape; through women being presented as humiliated and humiliation as an act of sex; through the dismemberment and maiming of women, the use of women as body parts, the torture of women.

It covers the actual pornography industry as it exists in this country. That is what the definition is. It is concrete. It is clear. It is specific.

It has four parts. That means there are four things that are actionable under this law. Now, let me tell you first: this is a civil law. It is not a criminal law. No police can make arrests. Not under this law. If somebody arrests you and they tell you it has to do with this law, they're lying. It doesn't have to do with this law, aside from the fact that this law isn't in operation anywhere right now. There is no possibility for police to make an arrest under this law. It is a civil action brought by a person who claims to have been hurt by pornography.

The injuries of pornography under the law are these:

The first one is trafficking, and what that means is that people who make, sell, exhibit, or distribute pornography are trafficking in discrimination against women. It rests on what is the most controversial part of all this: that pornography creates sexual abuse and sexual discrimination and as such it injures all women.

The second part of the law under which somebody can bring a suit is that any person who has been coerced into pornography can bring a suit and get the pornography off the goddamn market. It would no longer be protected speech. It would be part of the rape that happened to her, part of the damage that has been done to her. And she could also get money damages.

The third part of the law is called forcing pornography on a person. It says that if you force pornography on a person in their home, in their place of business, in their place of education, or in public, you are violating their civil rights. You can't do it. And they can sue you for doing it. They can't, under this part of the law, sue the pornographers; but they can sue an institution, for instance, that allows pornography to be forced on people as a part of its institutional life.

The fourth part of the law is assault or injury, physical injury, due to a specific piece of pornography. There are women who are raped by a man who holds up a picture and says: "Do this, bitch. Open your mouth this much, bitch Do it this way"; who reads the pornography to learn how to tie the knots. Anybody to whom that has happened can sue under this law and they can sue the pornographers, too.

I will tell you what is wrong with this law. What it does is that it puts the burden on the victim: that she has to sue, she has to pay for it, she has to bear the indignity of public exposure, and she in most cases has to sue organized crime.

I have been told that this law is protectionist. I would like to know how. There is a special standard of trivialization for anything that has to do with women's rights. We're not supposed to actually be able to change anything. We are allowed to say bad things are being done to us and we don't like them. We are allowed to deplore how bad those things are. We are allowed to feel pain. We are allowed to cry. We are allowed to feel angry. Goddammit, we are not allowed to change it!

Now, this law is a modest, meek, almost feminine effort. It is so polite. It says: "You boys, you make your pornography. We recognize your rights." It says, "You do what you want. The people you hurt are going to sue you after you hurt them." Now, that's not good enough, but it's something. It's something.

[Now, I've been hearing since I got down here some stuff about the Equal Rights Amendment hasn't even passed. Why are we messing around with this? This is an alliance with the right. I want to say that we've been accused of being allied with the right not because of this legislation but since the very beginning of feminist work against pornography-- the first demonstration in 1970; everything we've ever done including our demonstrations against *Snuff*; every thing, every time. We don't have any of the benefits of this alliance. We don't have money. We don't have power. We don't have any of it.

In New York State, where I live, a liberal state, the Equal Rights Amendment was voted down: we don't have a state Equal Rights Amendment.

The point that I want to make to you is that in a country where men buy 8 billion dollars a year worth of inequality and it's orgasmic, it's time for feminists to understand that there is a deep commitment to inequality in this country. The way that you change it is that you fight the institutions that are putting the pleasure into putting women down. People are constantly trying to sidetrack us and railroad us by suggesting that something else is more important. We are always concerned about the rights of all kinds of other people and so we always listen.

The reality is that if we don't fight the pornography industry and beat them, I want to tell you that our struggle for equality is a very big and very terrible joke. I also want to say that no country can protect torture as speech and flock to see it as entertainment and talk about civil liberties to me. I do not agree to find the definition of my rights and my freedoms in any such arrangement of power. If there is a right to equality, pornography not only violates it; it actively destroys it by destroying women, by destroying our ability to function in a society that even recognizes us as human beings. Now, either we stand up and something moves to accommodate our full equality or we stand up and everything breaks by staying right where it is. Frankly, I am prepared for either eventuality. And the one thing that I know for certain is that either way everything stays the same unless we are the ones who stand up!

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

I will answer questions later at the panel. Thank you very much. Thank you very

much and thank you for the honor that you've given me.

[Applause]

## Appendix II – Stoplist

Aboard  
About  
Above  
Across  
After  
Against  
Along  
Alongside  
Amid  
Amidst  
Among  
Amongst  
Anti  
Around  
As  
Astride  
At  
Atop  
Bar  
Barring  
Before  
Behind  
Below  
Beneath  
Beside  
Besides  
Between  
Beyond  
But  
By  
Circa  
Concerning  
Considering  
Counting  
Cum  
Despite  
Down  
During  
Except  
Excepting  
Excluding  
Following  
For  
From  
Given

Gone  
In  
Including  
Inside  
Into  
Less  
Like  
Minus  
Near  
Notwithstanding  
Of  
Off  
On  
Onto  
Opposite  
Outside  
Over  
Past  
Pending  
Per  
Plus  
Pro  
Re  
Regarding  
Respecting  
Round  
Save  
Saving  
Since  
Than  
Through  
Thru  
Throughout  
Till  
To  
Touching  
Toward  
Towards  
Under  
Underneath  
Unlike  
Until  
Up  
Upon  
Versus  
Via  
With  
Within  
Without

Worth  
The  
An  
A  
This  
That  
Those  
These  
May  
Might  
Could  
Can  
Must  
Should  
Will  
Would  
Shall  
For  
And  
Nor  
But  
Or  
Yet  
So  
After  
Although  
As  
Because  
Before  
If  
Lest  
Once  
Since  
Than  
That  
Though  
Till  
Unless  
Until  
When  
Whenever  
Where  
Wherever  
While  
Both  
Either  
Neither  
Whether  
Aren

Couldn  
Didn  
Doesn  
Don  
Hadn  
Hasn  
Haven  
Isn  
Mightn  
Mustn  
Shan  
Shouldn  
Weren  
Won  
Wouldn  
T  
D  
Ll  
S  
M  
Ve  
Re  
Have  
Had  
Having  
Has  
Do  
Did  
Done  
Doing  
Does  
Be  
Was  
Were  
Been  
Being  
Am  
Are  
Is  
every

## Appendix III – Top 100 Keywords List

Rank	Keyword	Freq. (In Dworkin Speech)	Freq. (In Spoken Component of OANC Reference Corpus)	Keyness
1	<b>pornography</b>	107	1	1429.01
2	<b>women</b>	113	837	829.967
3	<b>sexual</b>	29	16	331.843
4	<b>amendment</b>	22	9	258.819
5	<b>rights</b>	25	154	192.142
6	<b>law</b>	31	592	172.25
7	<b>sex</b>	18	42	169.101
8	<b>speech</b>	19	85	157.074
9	subordination	11	0	148.075
10	rape	14	43	125.01
11	who	43	3856	114.899
12	<b>country</b>	28	1219	111.87
13	means	17	277	99.594
14	millions	12	56	98.294
15	<b>woman</b>	18	405	94.397
16	civil	14	137	91.94
17	pleasure	11	62	86.334
18	raped	9	19	86.033
19	exploitation	7	2	84.699
20	equality	8	9	84.204
21	inequality	6	0	80.768
22	obscenity	6	0	80.768
23	pimps	6	0	80.768
24	<b>men</b>	16	414	79.655
25	first	27	2262	75.418
26	sue	8	27	70.127
27	hierarchy	6	3	69.318
28	society	14	376	68.707
29	prostitution	6	4	67.317
30	humiliation	5	0	67.307
31	rapes	6	5	65.622
32	abuse	9	74	64.353
33	political	10	174	57.336
34	genitals	4	0	53.845
35	pornographers	4	0	53.845
36	silence	7	50	51.886
37	hurt	10	239	51.294
38	proof	6	26	49.945
39	racist	5	9	49.079
40	our	30	5077	47.915
41	part	18	1639	47.609

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Keyword</b>	<b>Freq. (In Dworkin Speech)</b>	<b>Freq. (In Spoken Component of OANC Reference Corpus)</b>	<b>Keyness</b>
42	what	58	16721	47.48
43	discrimination	5	11	47.458
44	laws	9	200	47.411
45	human	8	135	46.335
46	studies	6	41	44.966
47	<b>people</b>	39	8923	44.377
48	harm	5	16	44.292
49	snuff	4	3	44.292
50	reality	6	48	43.209
51	public	12	655	42.889
52	legs	6	54	41.887
53	harassment	4	5	41.492
54	create	6	57	41.278
55	whom	5	23	41.085
56	objects	4	6	40.399
57	applause	3	0	40.384
58	feminists	3	0	40.384
59	sexualizes	3	0	40.384
60	submission	3	0	40.384
61	their	27	4944	39.774
62	pictures	7	126	39.683
63	her	23	3622	39.39
64	social	9	332	38.761
65	sexually	4	8	38.588
66	now	34	7881	38.048
67	torture	4	9	37.819
68	freedom	6	78	37.725
69	presented	5	34	37.517
70	we	85	33719	37.412
71	neighborhoods	5	36	36.987
72	want	22	3621	36.114
73	pain	6	90	36.095
74	also	17	2116	35.743
75	used	18	2459	35.03
76	feminist	3	2	33.659
77	acts	4	19	32.637
78	throat	4	24	30.936
79	segregation	3	4	30.833
80	evidence	5	73	30.336
81	violence	5	76	29.953

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Keyword</b>	<b>Freq. (In Dworkin Speech)</b>	<b>Freq. (In Spoken Component of OANC Reference Corpus)</b>	<b>Keyness</b>
82	slaves	3	5	29.811
83	victims	4	28	29.799
84	say	21	4158	28.408
85	protected	4	34	28.353
86	allowed	6	183	27.998
87	access	5	96	27.731
88	associated	4	37	27.719
89	shown	4	40	27.133
90	becomes	5	103	27.061
91	forced	5	104	26.969
92	anal	2	0	26.923
93	auschwitz	2	0	26.923
94	desensitize	2	0	26.923
95	humiliated	2	0	26.923
96	impacts	2	0	26.923
97	mackinnon	2	0	26.923
98	maiming	2	0	26.923
99	objectification	2	0	26.923
100	penetrated	2	0	26.923