

**GENDER, NATURE AND DOMINANCE: AN ANALYSIS OF INTERCONNECTIONS
BETWEEN PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY, USING EXAMPLES OF MEAT AND
PORNOGRAPHY**

ERIKA CUDWORTH

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
School of Sociology and Social Policy

March 1998

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: ANTHROPARCHY AND HUMAN-ANIMAL RELATIONS IN GREEN THEORY	
Introduction	13
Sociology and the Environment	15
Social ecology	25
Deep ecology	30
From anthropocentrism to anthroparchy	35
Eco-feminism	36
Anthroparchy and the control of non-human animals	40
Conclusion	44
CHAPTER TWO: PATRIARCHY, SEXUALITY AND PORNOGRAPHY IN FEMINIST THEORY	
Introduction	47
Liberal feminism	52
Marxist and socialist feminism	54
Theorizing Patriarchy: Radical feminism	58
Postmodernism and gender relations	62
Structural and poststructural approaches to gender relations	67
Structures of patriarchy	76
Pornography and patriarchal sexuality	81
Conclusion	91
CHAPTER THREE: MAKING THE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN GENDER AND ECOLOGY	
Introduction	93
Gender and nature in patriarchal discourse	94
Gender and nature in the discourses of modernity	100
Patriarchy, anthroparchy and mythology	106
Discourse analysis and relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy	110
Gender, nature and the sociology of food and eating	128
Gender, nature and reproductive technology	135
Conclusion	139
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY	
Introduction	142
The framework for research	145
Carrying out the research	154
Conclusion	164

CHAPTER FIVE: THE SYMBOLIZATION OF MEAT IN POPULAR CULTURE

Introduction	165
The significance of meat as a cultural symbol.....	167
The gendering of food	168
Food preparation and the gendered division of labour	172
Meat, gender and sexuality	176
Meat, gender and domesticity	183
Gender, nature and the cooking of meat	186
Contemporary developments in the symbolization of meat	194
Conclusion	199

CHAPTER SIX: THE SYMBOLIZATION OF BODIES AND SEXUALITY IN PORNOGRAPHY

Introduction	202
Soft-core pornographies	205
Hard-core pornography	219
Lesbian S/M pornography: Califia's Sadeian women.....	224
Conclusion	233

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE MEAT INDUSTRY

Introduction	236
Slaughter	240
Butchering	253
Farming	260
Conclusion	272

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE PORNOGRAPHY INDUSTRY

Introduction	275
Publishing, distribution, and sale of pornography	279
Modeling	287
Photography	295
Conclusion	299

CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION - RELATIONS BETWEEN PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY

Theoretical frameworks	303
Systems of oppression: patriarchy and anthroparchy.....	310
Structural comparison of patriarchy and anthroparchy	313
Structural divergence of patriarchy and anthroparchy	323
The contribution to debate	325

<i>Appendix I</i> Sources for research on the meat industry	328
<i>Appendix II</i> Sources for research on the pornography industry	333
<i>Appendix III</i> Sources for research on meat culture	334
<i>Appendix IV</i> Sources for research on pornographic culture	336
<i>Bibliography</i>	337

Abstract

This thesis investigates the relationship between gender and ecology. It conceptualizes relations of difference and inequality socially constructed upon gender and nature as part of specific systems of oppression: patriarchy (male domination) and anthroparchy (human domination of the environment). It does not see these oppressions as isolated, but as relatively autonomous and interconnected. It critiques green theory as gender-blind, and feminist theory, with the exception of eco-feminism, as nature-blind. Drawing upon analyses within eco-feminism, radical feminism and other literature in sociology, it develops a dual systems approach in order to examine the relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy as one characterized both by harmony and mutual reinforcement, and by conflict and difference in terms of the forms dominance assumes and the degrees to which such forms may operate.

The thesis is substantiated via comparison of two contemporary case studies: meat and pornography, which are examined as cultural phenomena (regimes of representations), and as industries. Green theory has seen meat as 'speciesist' (discriminating against Other animals on the basis of species membership), and radical feminism has largely understood pornography as a patriarchal construction. This thesis attempts to show the problems with such approaches, and argues the specific instances of oppression of meat and pornography involve the articulation of both patriarchy and anthroparchy, although these oppressive systems operate in different forms, to different degrees, and at different levels, depending on case and context.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the relationship between gender and ecology. In so doing, it will attempt to develop a new form of 'dual systems' theory in order to account for the articulation and interaction of two systems of oppression: patriarchy (the oppression of wimmin (1) in male dominated society) and anthroparchy (a new term developed by this research, which I define as human domination of the natural environment, and specifically in the case of non-human animals, their oppression by human beings). It will be argued that patriarchy and anthroparchy are autonomous social systems, but systems which also interrelate and intersect in complex ways. In developing such a dual systems approach, the thesis will draw upon two rather different theoretical positions within sociology, and will attempt to combine a form of discursive analysis within a generally structural approach.

In order to investigate the possible connections between the two systems, two case studies are examined: pornography and meat. Pornography is seen by some feminists as an instance of the oppression of wimmin, a product of gender relations of power or more radically, patriarchy. Meat production and consumption tends to be seen by most green theorists as an instance of the oppression of animals, a product of 'speciesism' (discrimination on the basis of species membership) or more radically, 'anthropocentrism' (human centered society). This thesis questions these positions and will argue that particular phenomena such as meat and pornography may not only be seen to be produced by anthroparchy and patriarchy respectively, but as constructed through the interaction of two systems.

Much of green theory has tended to see modern western societies as 'anthropocentric' (human-centered), wherein the environment, including non-human animals, is generally conceptualized in terms of resources for human beings to use. This anthropocentrism is seen to explain and justify practices such as meat eating. Human treatment of animals has been seen as speciesist, for we discriminate against animals and treat them abusively as food and potential food on the basis that they are not human. Some feminist theory, particularly radical feminism, has seen contemporary western societies as 'patriarchal', hierarchically structured around the principle of male domination. Pornography has been seen variously as a form of cultural representation, of violence against wimmin, or of sexuality, that is patriarchal.

A particular variant of feminist theory, eco-feminism, has argued that there is a close relationship between the domination of wimmin and the domination of the natural environment. Eco-feminism has tended to argue that the domination of nature is patriarchal, an aspect of a system of male domination. Although this thesis engages with and develops certain elements of eco-feminist approaches, it does depart in certain important ways from the core of their analysis. The thesis

challenges the eco-feminist assumption that the domination of nature is patriarchal, and will argue there are too many contradictions between the ways in which animals and wimmin are treated, for this to be the case. The empirical research for this thesis, I will suggest, does not support a single system of dominance. Whilst I concur that the dominations of the environment (specifically non-human animals) and of wimmin are linked, I will argue this is the product of the relationship between two interconnecting systems, rather than the product of one overarching system of domination. It is hoped the analysis elaborated in the final and conclusive chapter of the thesis may overcome some of the criticisms of eco-feminist theories which have characterized patriarchy as an all-embracing system of domination, and the relationship between the dominations of wimmin and of 'nature' as harmonious. A dual systems approach, I will suggest, may be able to account for difference in both degree and form, of the oppressions based on gender and 'nature'.

There are three sections to the thesis. The first, encompassing chapters one to three, sketches the outline of a new dual systems approach to the analysis of social relations based around gender and 'nature'. These chapters include 'literature review', but they go beyond a critical review of relevant material, for they revise existing theories and propose new concepts and analytical frameworks. The first two chapters review green and feminist theory in order to establish an account of both the relevant systems of social relations operationalized in the thesis: anthroparchy and patriarchy. These chapters argue the case for a generally structural approach to the analysis of relations of nature and gender, although they contend that certain aspects of poststructural and postmodern theorizing may also be helpful in understanding such relations.

The third chapter examines connections already established between gender and ecology in social theory and particularly eco-feminism. In criticizing these accounts, it revises certain approaches and draws upon some of the work of Foucault (e.g. 1971, 1979) in order to develop a particular conception of 'discourse', which is elaborated with specific reference to the radical feminist theoretical framework of Daly (1979). Through the process of such elaboration, I develop a series of seven discourses which are used in the analysis of the case studies. It is proposed that these discourses might be seen as operating as part of relations of gendered or 'natured' power. For a close relationship to be suggested between patriarchy and anthroparchy, I will contend that the discourses should be seen to overlap and intermesh, i.e. they should demonstrate relations of both gendered and 'natured' domination.

The second section, constituted by chapters four to eight, attempts to investigate the possible deployment of the discourses in two empirical areas where discourses of gendered and natured relations may be seen to articulate - pornography and meat. The third section, the final and conclusive chapter, seeks to establish a dual systems approach, by drawing upon the evidence provided by the empirical research. It draws together the findings of the empirical research and

places the discursive analysis^{of} instances of meat and pornography in the context of an analysis of systems of oppression of patriarchy and anthroparchy and their constitutive and possibly interactive structures of oppressive relations. In an analysis of the structural convergence and divergence between systems of oppression, this section attempts to account for the differences between aspects of the analysis of the case studies, and to explain why patriarchy and anthroparchy may be seen to articulate in some instances and not in others.

A number of questions could initially be raised suggesting comparisons between the case studies, and the possibility meat and pornography could be seen as both gendered (patriarchally constructed) and natured (anthroparchally constructed). For example, radical feminist accounts of the content of pornography can provide no explanation as to the normative use of animal and meat metaphors to describe the wimmin depicted. Sociological accounts of food and eating see meat consumption as predominantly a male prerogative, because western households may be seen to be patriarchally structured and male heads of household disproportionately consume the most valuable protein. However, such analyses fail to account for the valuation of meat as food, nor elaborate possible connections with the construction of gender outside the context of the feminization of domestic labour. Green accounts of meat production and consumption have noted the anthropocentrism apparent in our treatment of animals, but failed to explain for example, why animals may be killed and are often predominantly eaten, by men.

The aim of this research was to investigate whether meat and pornography could be seen to be both gendered and natured, and if so, in what forms, at what levels and to what degrees. The case studies are an attempt to ascertain the potential deployment of the seven discourses developed in order to compare them. It was felt that if these could be seen to be deployed in ways which may be both gendered and natured, then a close relation between patriarchy and anthroparchy would be suggested. The project did not envisage that meat and pornography were likely to be found to be both patriarchal and anthroparchal to an equal degree. Both phenomena were seen as primarily the product of one system of oppression. In the first two chapters, meat is established via a critique of the green literature, as primarily an anthroparchal construction, and pornography, via a review of radical feminist literature, as primarily a patriarchal construction. The aim of the research, rather, was to see if meat involved the articulation of patriarchal relations in addition to anthroparchy; and if pornography involved anthroparchal relations in addition to patriarchy.

There are two chapters on each case study. They focus on different levels or aspects at which the phenomena of meat and pornography may be seen to operate: the ideological and the material. These aspects are interconnected, but certain chapters focus on particular aspects, and this focus meant the employment of different methods. The ideological level refers to the symbolic representation of notions of gender and nature. These notions are not unitary, but assume a variety

of forms. Two chapters on the symbolic representation of meat and pornography involve an investigation of the representation of gender and nature in texts of popular culture. The primary sources for this research were: literature (pornographic novels, cookery books), magazines (soft core pornographic magazines, cookery magazines, cookery articles in women's magazines), pornographic films and cookery programmes, food advertising in magazines and on television.

The material level is where oppressions assume a physical, corporeal form, often embodied in specific institutions and their associated practices. Such material practices may take the form, for example, of systematic physical violences in the processes of producing a particular phenomenon. The two chapters which focus on material aspects of meat and pornography focus upon the industries producing these 'commodities', and examine the procedures involved in such production. These chapters examine the material concretization of discourses of pornography and meat in certain practices. They investigate the operations and processes of the production of meat and pornography mainly using interviews and observation as primary source material. Interviews were carried out with people working at various stages of the production process: slaughtermen, meat inspectors, butchers, meat cutters and packers, farmers; and workers in sex shops, pornographic photographers, customs officers, and police and civilians of the Obscene Publications Department at New Scotland Yard. Particular procedures were observed: the classification of pornographies, slaughter of animals, butchering of carcasses and meat packing. In addition, analysis was undertaken of relevant literature produced by either the industries themselves, or the central or local state.

The theoretical framework adopted in this thesis underwent significant modification throughout the research process, and the empirical research and the literature review and development of the theoretical schema for the research were undertaken simultaneously. The initial conceptualization for the thesis was not a dual systems approach. It was first envisaged that comparison be made between meat and pornography in order to investigate the high level of similarities between the constitutive power relations in these cases, and to provide an empirically based eco-feminist account of patriarchal domination of both women and animals. Once the initial research began however, the extent of dissimilarity between the degree and form of power relations involved in pornography became apparent, particularly in terms of the analysis of the material aspects of the production of pornography. It was felt that the specific differences between meat and pornography necessitated a different theoretical formulation, and that a dual systems approach may be able to account for difference as well as similarity.

Feminist theory has not always accepted the idea of a system of oppressive relations implied by the idea of 'patriarchy'. I will critique forms of feminist theory (liberal, Marxist and postmodern approaches) which have either rejected a structural analysis of gender relations, or have subsumed

a structural analysis within the systemic relations of class based domination. This thesis is generally more sympathetic to radical feminist analyses which conceptualize gender relations as both systemic and structural, but I will problematize the possible reductionism in such approaches which may fail to take account of the cross-cutting presence of forms of social stratification other than gender. In order to attempt to overcome possible reductionism, this thesis engages with certain dual systems approaches to gender relations. Dual systems analysis has been used within the sociology of gender by socialist feminists undertaking research into relations between patriarchy and capitalism, usually focusing on paid employment and household production, but this research involves the possibility of patriarchal articulation with a different system - anthroparchy. This research has accepted some elements of existing dual systems approaches, such as the adoption of a structural and ontologically realist position.

Green theory has not systematically outlined human domination as a coherent system of oppression, and the sociology of the environment has tended to focus upon ecology as a form of sociological thought, or on environmental issues as social problems. Alternatively, some sociologists have sought to analyze the environment in terms of established approaches within sociology, and there is an emerging polarization between approaches which are generally structural and operationalize a realist ontology, and those which are broadly postmodern and based on a strongly relativist social constructionism. This thesis will draw upon elements of both approaches, whilst emphasizing the former. It will argue that the discipline should take 'nature' to be a fourth means of social stratification alongside those it has at least partially accepted: class, ethnicity and gender. This research therefore contributes to empirical research and theoretical debate within both ecology and feminism, and also argues for a structural and critical realist approach to the study of both the environment and of gender relations within the discipline of sociology.

Before proceeding to an outline of the contents of the chapters of the thesis, it is necessary to define some of the concepts suggested so far and operationalized within the research, namely: the concept of patriarchy and the notion of gender, and the new concepts proposed by the thesis, the concept of anthroparchy as a system of social domination, and the accompanying idea of a socially constructed 'nature'. These concepts are defined briefly here, and elaborated in the first two chapters of the thesis.

Patriarchy can be defined as a system of social relations based on gender oppression in which women are dominated and oppressed by men. The conception of patriarchy adopted in this thesis is of a system of social relations of power, composed of a number of structures which result from normative practice, and are based upon aspects of the system of oppression.

Anthroparchy is a new term developed through the research for this thesis. I use it to refer to a system of social relations in which the non-human living environment (i.e. animals, plants, land, sea and space) is dominated by human beings as a species. It also involves structures, sets of relations of power and domination, which are resultant from normative practice. I will be arguing that different aspects of the environment are differentially dominated, for whilst virtually all aspects can be seen to be subject to human control, and many to human exploitation as resources for human use, some parts of the environment (itself, I admit, a homogenizing term) may be seen to be oppressed. Many animals are 'sentient' (i.e. they are capable of experiencing pain and pleasure), and as such I will contend they may be oppressed, similarly to the ways in which we speak of the oppression of humans. In anthroparchal society, animals form an oppressed group. Human beings can be agents within systems of oppression, either on behalf of patriarchal or anthroparchal forces, or in their contestation/subversion. The environment however, can be seen to have very limited agency to contest its domination, and does not act as an agent of domination.

Gender refers to the social construction of biological difference, the social construction of the differences between men and women. Whilst feminist theorists may be divided as to the forms gender relations assume, the overwhelming majority would accept the concept of gender is a social construction, although the content of that construction may differ historically and cross-culturally.

A similar term was sought that could imply that just as contemporary relations between the sexes were not biologically based, nor are relationships between human beings and the natural environment. Green theorists have often used the term 'speciesism' to refer to human relations with other animals, but this was seen as problematic for a sociological analysis for it refers to biological not social construction. Like the term 'sex', 'species' refers to biological difference. Feminists have adopted 'gender' as a category of analysis because it assumes that relations between men and women are socially produced and structured. The term chosen to analyze relations between humans and the environment, namely other animals, was 'nature'. Whilst it must be admitted that nature can refer to biology (e.g. a behaviour 'natural' to a species, such as roosting for hens, and foraging for pigs), it is also, I would contend, a social construct. The term 'nature' refers to accepted standards of behaviour for different kinds or types (OED). This term is often misused and biology conflated with culture in order to justify culturally constructed forms of oppression for beings and organisms that have been designated 'natural'.

In this thesis, the term 'nature' is used to refer to socially constructed relations between humans and the environment. As gender refers to the cultural norms and values and the processes that construct masculinities and femininities, so nature will refer to the ideological norms and values, and the material processes through which 'humanity' and the 'environment' are constructed. Thus the 'environment' and 'nature' are to be differentiated. The former refers to particular and multi-

variate physical phenomena, which I will contend have an existence (a 'reality') which stands both within, but importantly also outside, human imagination and knowledge. 'Nature' will refer to the differential symbolization and material institutions and processes that anthroparchy constructs and which humans and animals dichotomously inhabit, i.e. to the social construction of difference between the human species and the environment. 'Humanities' and 'animalities' are conceived of as anthroparchal corollaries to patriarchal 'masculinities' and 'femininities'. Gender and nature, and their applied forms: gendered/gendering, natured/naturing, will be the terms utilized in the thesis to examine the possible presence of patriarchy and anthroparchy in the case studies of meat and pornography.

The thesis has nine chapters. The first three describe the relevant systems of oppression and develop the conceptual and theoretical framework within which they might be compared. The second four investigate the possible deployment and operationalization of such a framework in empirical research. The final chapter, the conclusion, draws the comparative empirical evidence together in an attempt to suggest the kinds of relationships that might be apparent between the two systems of oppression.

Chapter 1 looks at the 'green' literature in the form of a comprehensive range of key texts of ecology and also discusses such literature in the context of the emerging debates within the sociology of the environment. It distinguishes between the concepts of 'ecology' and 'environmentalism', arguing that 'green' perspectives are ecological (they argue human relations with the environment must be reconceptualized) rather than environmentalist (a managerial approach to the environment, requiring limited reform of human behaviour). The chapter contends that much of the emerging sociology of the environment can be seen as environmentalist rather than ecological, but that there are useful ideas within a number of approaches in the field. As such, the chapter critiques and adopts certain aspects of social constructionist and postmodern accounts, combined with an argument for a broadly structural and critical realist theoretical framework.

The two main approaches within ecological analysis are examined: social ecology (where environmental problems are seen as a consequence of structures of intra-human domination) and deep ecology (where environmental crisis is seen to be a consequence of human relations with the environment alone, and of an 'anthropocentric' world view). These perspectives appear currently antagonistic, but it will be argued a synthesis is both possible and desirable. It will be contended that a third perspective, ecological feminism or eco-feminism, may be best placed to provide such a synthesis, and that this project is a part of this development. This is because it argues that intra-human domination (patriarchy) is connected to human domination of the natural world and other animals (anthroparchy). The chapter suggests possible comparison between human domination of nature and patriarchy. In order to facilitate a dual systems analysis, the chapter develops the

concept of 'anthroparchy' as a social system of domination and oppression that may be seen to be characterized by a number of structures. Finally, the chapter reviews the green literature on the human treatment of animals and the production and cultural symbolization of meat. Via a critique of such literature as gender blind, it indicates the possibility of research on meat that could fruitfully investigate the articulation of both patriarchy and anthroparchy.

Chapter 2 reviews the feminist literature on patriarchy, sexuality, and pornography. It critiques the main theoretical approaches to the analysis of gender relations in the feminist literature, and adopts one which is generally radical feminist, but draws upon socialist feminist dual systems theory. It is argued that a radical feminist model of patriarchy must be able to account for the effects of cross-cutting systems of domination that are not gender specific (i.e. race, class, and in this case, nature). Patriarchy is seen to be composed of a number of structures, and this chapter will argue a case for a structural and systemic approach to gender relations, against poststructural and postmodern feminist analyses. It does not entirely reject the latter however, and will suggest the possibility of combining a discursive approach to gender relations within a structural framework.

The chapter outlines a number of possible structures of patriarchy, and whilst a range are acknowledged, the analytical focus for this thesis will be those of sexuality, culture and violence, and to a lesser extent, the state. It is argued structures of patriarchy overlap, but are partially autonomous, and that patriarchy cannot be reduced to one structure, such as violence or culture as some feminist approaches have suggested. The chapter examines feminist theory concerning the four structures of patriarchy seen as particularly relevant to this research, for it will be suggested in the light of the empirical research, that these structures may overlap with particular structures of anthroparchy, and in so doing, might be able to explain the forms and degrees of interrelation between these systems of oppression.

The chapter proceeds to examine the feminist literature on pornography: how it may be defined, radical feminist analysis of pornography as a structure of patriarchal culture, sexuality and violence, and the relation of the state to pornography via an examination of the censorship debate. The crux of this discussion however, is a critique of radical feminist analysis as 'nature blind', for ignoring the possibility of the articulation of anthroparchy in pornography, which, it is argued, may be seen as natured as well as gendered. In addition, such research is criticized for analysis of the ideological aspects of pornography alone, ignoring the material production of pornography. The chapter suggests research might be undertaken to investigate both material and ideological aspects of pornography, and that it should attempt to account for the operation of systems of oppression other than patriarchy.

Chapter 3 develops the connections already made by eco-feminism in particular, and social theory in general, between gender and nature. It will contend that more feminist literature seeks to make such connections than is commonly acknowledged, and the chapter draws out eco-feminist insights from a range of radical feminist theorists, in addition to evaluating the theories of those who see themselves as eco-feminists. The chapter reviews some key works of eco-feminism, analyses of the gendering and naturing of modernity and of the natured symbolic regimes of patriarchal culture. It also looks at the speculative arguments as to the origins of patriarchy in the context of human relations to the natural environment, and feminist critique of the gendering and naturing of reproduction in the light of the development of new reproductive technologies, the latter being of particular relevance to some of the empirical research for this project. It also examines the sociological literature on food and eating, which provides certain concepts that will be operationalized in the empirical research. Whilst it will be acknowledged that patriarchy and anthroparchy are distinct, it will be contended that the links between these systems of domination are strong, particularly with respect to the structures outlined in Chapter 2: violence, sexuality and culture. The chapter identifies the key weaknesses of established theories as an over concentration on gender and relegation of nature in the majority of positions, and a tendency to theorize phenomena at the level of the ideological (symbolic representation) rather than the material (physical, in terms of economic production).

Perhaps the most important function of this chapter is the development of a concept of discourse analysis through a critique of the work of Foucault. It draws upon his particular use of discourse which I will suggest can be seen to characterize much of his earlier work, and his later work on government. The chapter develops a notion of discourses as constructive and constitutive of relations of power. Discourses are conceptualized in this thesis as sets of ideas that are rooted in social practices and institutions. My use of discourse is further elaborated in relation to the work of radical feminist Daly, in analyzing certain case studies of patriarchal violences. Drawing upon Daly, and on some of the initial empirical research for the thesis, the chapter develops a series of seven discourses which it argues might be seen to be deployed in empirical cases in ways that may be seen as constitutive of gendered and/or natured relations. It is suggested that the seven discourses might be seen to be deployed in the case studies selected for the empirical research, and that where such deployment may be seen to be both gendered and natured, possible interrelation might be suggested between patriarchy and anthroparchy.

Chapter 4 discusses the methodology adopted for the empirical research undertaken to investigate the possible connections between gender and nature. It identifies the epistemological framework for the research, and the theoretical approach to be adopted, as developed through the first three chapters. It raises some of the key questions to be investigated by the research, and links such questions to the choice of empirical study. Finally, this chapter provides a detailed account of

the specific research procedures, addressing questions of access and the extent to which the data can be considered to be representative.

Chapters five to eight are based on empirical research, and examine the extent to which the seven discourses developed in chapter three can be seen to be deployed in four case studies. Chapter 5 involves the analysis of a variety of texts of food and eating in contemporary British popular culture. It investigates whether meat consumption can be seen to be natured, and whether animals might constitute absent referents in the cultural texts of meat i.e. their lives and the violences associated with them may be absent from texts, but recalled by the product of meat. It examines the ways in which meat can be seen in relation to a food hierarchy, and whether there is a cultural expectation that its chief consumer is male. It also looks at the possible sexualization of meat consumption in relation to gendering, and investigates whether meat, as a food product associated with masculinity, might be itself both feminized and sexualized. The chapter looks at the cultural expectation of food preparation, and examines the extent to which this might be linked to notions of femininities, some of which may be sexualized. Cultural texts covering different forms of meat eating and cookery are examined in order to investigate whether these forms are subject to different discourses. The representation of non meat food is also examined in order to enable explicit comparisons and contrasts with respect to gendering, natured and sexualization.

Chapter 6 focuses on pornography as a symbolic regime representing sexuality and the body, via the examination of a variety of pornographic texts in a number of forms and genres. It will investigate whether such texts might be both natured and gendered as well as inevitably (given the nature of the product) sexualized. The vast majority of both hard and soft core pornography is produced for male heterosexual consumption, and the content of such material is examined for its possible gendering in respect to feminized sexuality, and also possible natured at the level of metaphor (as the sexualized, feminized, objectified body may also be seen as animal-like). A range of texts are analyzed in order to investigate whether different genres of pornography intended for different markets are less gendered and natured, or whether the form such processes take differs. To this end, a detailed analysis of a collection of 'erotic' short stories by a lesbian sado-masochist author. Pat Califia, is undertaken.

Chapter 7 examines the meat industry, specifically the farming of animals, their slaughter, and the butchering of meat. It examines the possible ways in which the meat industry could be seen to be natured, with the animals that become meat objectified as commodities for human use, by looking at each stage of the production process. It also investigates the possible gendering of meat production by focusing on the management of animal fertility and reproduction in contemporary British farming with respect to both sexes of animal. In addition, it investigates the extent to which farm animals might be gendered via feminization, and examines to what extent farm animals might

be predominantly of one sex. Further, the chapter examines whether manipulation of reproduction, fertility and sexuality of animals might be necessary or contingent to meat production, and the extent to which this process may be gendered. It observes the slaughter and butchery of animals in order to ascertain the extent to which the latter might be feminized and sexualized by producers at both the level of metaphor, and as physical bodies. The employment culture of the meat industry is examined in terms of possible masculinization and presence of machismo (violent, aggressive, highly gender dichotomous forms of masculinity), and production is also analyzed in terms of gender segregation in the workplace.

Chapter 8 explores the pornography industry in Britain, investigating pornographic photography and modeling, and the distribution and sale of pornography. The chapter examines the production of pornography, investigating the possibility and extensiveness of gendered and sexualized processes. It investigates whether the majority of models are female, whether models might be feminized in terms of production relations in a gendered and sexualized manner, and if this possible feminization and sexualization might also be seen to be natured. We also examine the possibility of a gendered division of labour in terms of photography, publication and distribution, and the employment culture of such work in terms of possible gendering and sexualization. A key question raised by this chapter is the possibility that whilst the production of pornography might be gendered, natured may be less evident. This will be the limiting case in examining the relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy, and difference will be explained via comparison of the two systems in the final chapter.

Chapter 9, the conclusion, elaborates the theoretical connections between analyses of patriarchy and anthroparchy begun in the first three chapters, in the light of the empirical research. It will outline the theoretical basis for the analysis by discussing the different levels of theory building involved and their relationship, i.e. how the empirical data, discourses, structures and systems relate to each other. It will also draw together the arguments for a structural dual systems approach, and one which is ontologically based in critical realism. The chapter will discuss the possible relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy by outlining the structures which might compose these systems in the light of the evidence provided by the analysis of the case studies. It will also discuss the possibility of divergence between the systems, and will contend that whereas some structures may be seen to be similar, others are likely to be divergent, as systems of oppression cannot be seen as direct parallels. In undertaking such a comparison, the chapter will attempt to show how discursive and structural analyses might be combined, whilst acknowledging the tensions which might still be attendant in such a combination of approaches.

The conclusion will argue that patriarchy and anthroparchy do cross-cut each other and interconnect, but that the relationship between them is characterized by both divergence and

convergence. It will be argued that these systems can be seen to interact in different aspects of their operation, and that the forms and degrees of oppression which may be evidenced are variate and complex. This thesis conceptualizes patriarchy and anthroparchy as characterized by complex interrelationships between autonomous systems, accommodating and intertwined in certain contexts, and divergent and conflictual in others.

Notes

- (1) Throughout the thesis, the term 'wimmin' will be used to refer to women, and the singular term 'womun' for woman. This terminology has sometimes been adopted in radical feminist literature but is rarely used in academic work. I use such terminology partly because I simply prefer it (it is after all how we *say* the word), but also because I feel the meanings of the words we use have some significance, as has been argued by radical feminists such as Spender (1980) and Daly (1979, 1988). Thus I think the use of 'wimmin' may suggest an appropriate autonomy from patriarchal linguistic constructions, whereas the etymology of 'women' can arguably be seen a product of Judeo-Christian influence, with its original meaning 'from' or 'of' man recalling the creation myth of the Pentateuch. The direct derivation of the term 'women' from Old English may be seen to reflect its origins in describing the product of Adam's rib, 'wifmann' – 'wif' meaning 'wife' and 'man(n)' meaning both 'man' and 'person' (OED).

CHAPTER ONE

ANTHROPARCHY AND HUMAN-ANIMAL RELATIONS IN GREEN THEORY

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on the environment, examining the emergent work in the sociology of the environment, whilst focussing primarily on 'ecological' or 'green' social and political theory. It examines the range of green positions: social ecology (including 'eco-socialism'), deep ecology and eco-feminism, investigating the ways in which they deal with the relationship between gendered intra-human domination, patriarchy, and natured human domination of the environment, which I will call 'anthroparchy'. The chapter develops the new concept of 'anthroparchy' via a critique of various approaches in environmental sociology, and 'green' theories of human domination, and indicates ways anthroparchy may intersect with patriarchy.

In addition, the chapter develops a particular definition of 'nature'. It will argue 'nature' may usefully be conceptualized differently to the 'environment'. The 'environment' is seen as a broad category that encompasses the non-human animate world, i.e. the whole range of multifarious animal and plant species, land, seas, lakes, skies. Whilst it should be acknowledged there are incredible differences between and amongst these phenomena, they are grouped merely by biological referent: being both non-human and living (animate). In societies structured around relations of human domination, I would suggest the complex and highly diversified non-human animate lifeworld is homogenized as 'Other' to the human, and often referred to as 'nature'. I will suggest that the construction of this Other is political - that 'nature' is a socially constructed category based on power relations, and is manifest as a dichotomy between human beings and the environment as defined above. The difference between 'nature' and the 'environment' is felt to be similar to that between the social constructions of 'gender', and the biological referent of 'sex'.

The development of the concepts of anthroparchy and nature is undertaken via an examination of the three key schools of 'green' social thought: social ecology, deep ecology and eco-feminism, and informed by recent work in environmental sociology. The latter has generally sought to distance itself from green theory, which is often regarded as inflationary in the claims it makes about the degree and extensiveness of environmental problems (Hannigan, 1995, 1997), although some environmental sociologists have demonstrated closer engagement with a green political stance (Dickens, 1991; Benton, 1993). Whilst this chapter is most sympathetic to eco-feminist approaches, important insights are gleaned from the other bodies of literature examined here. This chapter will suggest eco-feminism is best placed to offer an account of both the oppression of

'nature' and intra-human oppression, in this case, gender, and various eco-feminist approaches will be analyzed in greater depth in Chapter 3.

The last section of this chapter examines the literature directly relevant to empirical research for this thesis: human relations with 'other animals'. It looks at the importance various green theorists place on the intuitive ethics of 'animism' or the case for animal 'rights', and examines the problems in establishing an ethical position with respect to human relations with the multifarious species of non-human animals. Ethical questions are raised and problematized rather than resolved in any certain fashion, although it will be suggested that a combination of a number of differing approaches might be useful. The argument put forward here draws upon social ecology in arguing for a species hierarchy in terms of biotic diversity, rather than as a justification for domination (Bookchin, 1991). It also draws upon postmodern environmental social theory in problematizing boundaries between humans and animals (Haraway, 1991), whilst drawing back from a position which homogenizes humans with other animals as suggested by some deep ecologists (Naess, 1989). It will be argued it is possible to recognize similarities between certain species of non-human animal and human beings, blurring human/animal distinctions, whilst also acknowledging a species hierarchy in terms of the appreciation of difference and diversity, rather than domination.

Second, this final section moves away from ethical considerations to review analyses of the material treatment of animals and their ideological conception in contemporary Western societies. It will be argued the treatment of animals is shaped by anthroparchy, that animals are subject to certain oppressive situations and processes that operate via specific socio-economic institutions such as the meat industry, and that such treatment is linked to the ideological symbolization of other animals. The chapter argues that as an ideological symbol articulated in Western popular culture, and as an industrially produced material commodity, meat can be seen as a key expression of human domination of non-human animals. This section critiques the green literature on meat as gender-blind however, for it assumes meat production and the cultural symbolization of meat is a product of 'speciesist' or 'anthropocentric' society alone, ignoring the cross-cutting influence of patriarchal structures and processes in the oppression of non-human animals.

Environmentalism and ecology

Before reviewing the range of social theory on the environment, it is necessary to define that which some (Dobson, 1992, pp.13-23; Porritt, 1986, p.5) assert are the two key types of theory on the environment: environmentalist and ecological. Environmentalism is often referred to within the green movement as 'light green' or 'shallow' as opposed to 'deep' (Naess, 1973), and often not seen as 'green' at all (Porritt, 1986). It is concerned with environmental conservation via a managerial or 'technocratic' (Benton, 1994, p.31) approach. It is reformist, arguing current

political, social and economic structures such as those of capitalism, are capable of adapting in order to care for the environment by for example, 'green' consumption (Elkington and Burke, 1987; Elkington and Hailes, 1988). This is distinct from the position of ecology, which asserts levels of consumption in industrial capitalist societies are a causal factor in our present environmental crisis (Irvine, 1987).

Ecologists argue our current ways of thinking and acting politically, economically and socially constitute a threat to the well-being of the planet and must undergo revolutionary change achieved by extra-parliamentary (Kelly, 1984) and/or anti-parliamentary (Tolkar, 1987) means with radical consequences for Western political systems in particular (Rozack, 1983; Bookchin, 1980, 1991; Bahro, 1986). Ecology offers a critique of industrial capitalism (Henderson, 1983; Porritt, 1986) and a vision of new forms of economic (Ekins, 1986; Schumacher, 1984) and social (Sale, 1974; Bookchin, 1980, 1991; Tolkar, 1987; Warren, 1994; Gorz, 1986; Bahro, 1986) organization. Environmentalism is a liberal theoretical position, offering an account of environmental 'problems' as a consequence of human misdemeanor, rather than analyzing human treatment of the environment as part of a social system characterized by power relations. The following section examines the contribution of sociology to the study of the environment, contending that whilst some approaches are helpful in developing the theoretical framework for this thesis, environmental sociology has been environmentalist rather than green in its perspective in that it has tended to be 'problem' orientated, and can only provide a limited understanding of power dynamics.

SOCIOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

From the late 1980 s, the social sciences have demonstrated some degree of concern for the environment. Some sociologists have acknowledged a negligence in this area (Newby, 1991, p.1). and encouraged others to challenge the 'technological determinism' characteristic of environmental research within the natural sciences. Disappointingly however, much environmental sociology is rather cautious in its approach. As Benton and Redclift (1994, p.3) have noted, the reticence of sociology to tackle human relations with the non-human lifeworld, is partly due to the history of the discipline. They argue the prevailing approaches in social theory which emerged around the turn of this century insisted on human distinctiveness from 'nature' as a means both of establishing a 'science' of society, and countering the then pervasive influence of biology in explaining social phenomena. Thus sociology has a legacy of studying human society as separate and distinct from the 'natural' environment which tends to be defined as that which is not social (Redclift and Woodgate, 1994, p.53). Benton (1991, 1994) has been one of the few sociologists to argue for the discipline to re-examine its dichotomous stance on the social and the 'natural'.

Environmental sociology tends to add the environment to the existing range of sociological concerns, examined within the confines of existing perspectives. For example, Yearley (1992, p.184) has argued sociological analyses (e.g. dependency theory and social movement theory), are readily applicable to environmental 'problems'. In addition, environmental sociology can be characterized as environmentalist rather than ecological due its marginalization of issues of power and domination via the adoption of a human-centered or 'anthropocentric' approach which concentrates on the human costs of environmental problems and human provident solutions (Barker, Johnstone, Ekins, 1994; O'Neill, 1993; Hackett, 1994). This marginalization of power is characteristic of even those texts most sympathetic to green theory (Benton, 1993, 1994). Issues of investigation in environmental sociology have included: global warming (Yearley, 1992; Barker, Johnstone, Ekins, 1994); famine as a product of human social and environmental relations (Yearley, 1992); ozone depletion (Ekins, 1992); environmental planning as part of urban sociology, and espousal of 'countryside planning' for conservation (Newby, 1980, 1988; Nicholson, 1987); consumer behaviour and environmentalism (Hackett, 1994); human welfare and environmental policy (O'Neill, 1993); and green social movements (Ekins, 1992). Most theorists discuss such issues in the context of policy-making, tending to describe environmental problems as simplified scientific 'facts' rather than socio-political constructions (Newby, 1988; Barker, Johnstone, Ekins, 1993); adhering to Yearley's conviction that 'environmental problems are problems of the natural world and accordingly demand expertise in the natural sciences' (1992, p.184).

There are others who demonstrate a more critical approach to the claims of environmental sciences and draw upon postmodernism in analyzing environmental problems. Wynne (1994, 1996) argues that we must not simply accept the definition of environmental problems by the media, scientific establishment, or environmental pressure groups, but must attempt the difficult task of comparatively evaluating both lay and 'expert' opinion. Hannigan (1997) goes further in arguing environmental 'problems' are socially constructed by individuals and institutions, and the seriousness with which the former are regarded is dependent upon the claims-making activities and abilities of the latter (1997, p.3). Hannigan argues an environmental sociology should focus on the environment as 'the site for a repertoire of definitional and contestatory activities' (1997, p.187). Thus whereas some sociologists have accepted scientific definitions of environmental problems (Newby, 1988; Yearley, 1992), others have problematized such definitions.

Whilst I would not dispute that environmental problems are (to some degree) constructed by interest groups, I concur with Benton (1994) that such a social constructionist position is 'over-socialized'. Benton acknowledges sociologists must problematize the claims of environmental interest groups (Redclift and Benton, 1994, p.10), but also rightly argues such critical awareness should not deconstruct such claims in their entirety as Hannigan's approach suggests. Benton (1994) asserts that sociologists must refrain from consistently focussing on socio-cultural aspects,

such as the rise of environmental movements, and shifts in public perception of the environment (1994, p.28). Although Benton is mindful of the interests which shape scientific research agendas, and the difficulties of an uncritical scientific reductionism, he asserts the claims of environmental science cannot be dismissed, but have some 'real' status, and may inform us of the concrete condition of the environment (1994, p.35), a position I would endorse as avoiding the reductionism both of uncritical science and extreme social constructionist relativism. Thus debates characteristic of other areas of sociological inquiry are unsurprisingly evident in the sociology of the environment. Two contentious and related debates are those between structure and agency approaches to social analysis, and between the supposedly mutually exclusive postmodern/poststructural approaches and modernist/structural approaches. These debates are examined here with reference to the development of the concepts of 'anthroparchy' and 'nature'.

Structure, agency and anthroparchy

An important area of sociological dispute is that between approaches which prioritize conscious human agency, and those focussing on social-structural conditions for and constraints upon human action, such as those of Hannigan and Benton respectively. Hannigan (1995, 1997) stresses the importance of human agency in terms of framing the boundaries of the environmental debate, seeing the environment as a socially constructed and culturally specific series of 'narratives' having no existence outside human consciousness. Benton (1993, 1994) argues for a 'realist' and structural approach which is able to account for the material as well as the ideological aspects of human relations with the environment. Benton contends we cannot exclusively examine human relations with the environment at a symbolic or ideological level (i.e. as regimes of belief and ideas), and that it is a form of sociological reductionism which transmutes 'nature' into symbolic representations alone (1994, p.31). Benton, like Newby (1991, p.2), contends we can distinguish between the symbolic representation or ideological manifestation of the environment and the materiality of the environment. For relativist constructionists like Hannigan (1995), such a position is implausible, for we cannot get outside the symbolic order of cultural narratives on the environment in order to study the relation of the ideological representation of the environment to any concrete form the environment may assume (see also Lash et al., 1996). Benton is critical of the nature/culture dualism in sociology which has valorized the social and marginalized the non-human world (1994, p.45), but is staunchly opposed to the kind of approach suggested by Hannigan, which in dissolving the nature/culture dualism, sees the environment as existing only within the bounds of human ideas.

Benton argues 'objective' conditions exist with respect to the environment which has a material existence (1994, p.31). Lash et al. (1996) contend such epistemological realism is dangerous, for it leads to the adoption of 'positivistic, disembedded, technological' analysis (p.1) which ignores the

social construction of the environment, and results in hyperbolic environmentalist claims (Maguire, 1996). However, I feel a critical and reflective realism is necessary in avoiding the relativist slippage of postmodern accounts which deconstruct the environment to the extent that any conception of human power over the non-human animate life-world is lost. I would endorse Benton's understanding of the intertwining of the ideological representation of the environment and the latter's concrete, physical 'reality'. Benton contends dominant ways of conceptualizing the environment (e.g. as a resource) have 'real' effect, and such ideas concretize themselves in practices and institutions. This is perhaps one of the defining characteristics of a realist position - that the world exists independently of our knowledge of it - there 'is' an environment 'out there'. Although realist social scientists would accept human knowledge of that world is fallible and ideologically biased, they also feel knowledge may be checked empirically and with a necessarily critical eye (Sayer, 1992, pp.5-6). Thus realism, according to Sayer, is not completely at odds with interpretive traditions in sociology, but combines the idea of empirical evaluation of knowledge claims with the interpretive understanding of texts, actions and institutions (1992, p.6). Sayer acknowledges the significance of the researcher's frame of reference, but argues although texts, actions and institutions are 'concept-dependent', they exist regardless of our interpretations.

For realists, the world tends to be conceptualized as differentiated and stratified, and composed of objects, including social structures which have powers and capabilities which may or may not produce regularities (Sayer, 1992, pp.3-5; Archer, 1996, pp.694-6). Benton (1994) suggests that humans mediate relations with the environment in specific structural contexts, and that social relationships toward the environment should be thought of as specific sets of concrete ('real') social practices which operate in a context of mutual dependence with a 'real' environment. For Benton, environment and society are partially autonomous, the environment can be theorized as belonging to the social, but also exists as a series of 'complex orders' or structures which enable and constrain human activity (1994, p.49). Bhaskarian philosophy can be seen to inform Benton's position here. Bhaskar (1979) conceives what he calls 'nature' (and I would term the environment) and human society as partially autonomous. Both the social and the natural have a 'real' existence, and are characterized by structures, concretized sets of relationships and institutions (Sayer, 1992, p.92). Neither humans nor non-human animals exist outside structures, which are a priori: 'A tribesman implies a tribe, the cashing of a cheque a banking system' (Bhaskar, 1979, p.28). Bhaskar argues there is an analytical distinction between human agency and social structure, and that the latter is a priori, although he concedes that human agency produces/reproduces, modifies and alters social structure (1979, pp.34-5). As Sayer (1992) has contended, structures have 'emergent powers', i.e. powers which cannot be reduced to the individuals which live within them (p.119), and exist whether or not they are being exercised or suffered (p.105). Thus for realists, structure and agency are separate but interrelated phenomena, and just as the world has a reality

separable from human experience, so do structures. Structures 'exist' and have real effects, they are not 'merely heuristic devices for ordering observations' (Sayer, 1992, p.87).

Giddens (1979, 1984) has sought to develop a position outside what he sees as a deadlock in the structure/agency debate, by suggesting agency and structure are interrelated to such a degree they may not be properly distinguished. He refers to the relationship of human action to structure as 'duality of structure', wherein structure has two faces, being both 'medium and outcome of the reproduction of practices' (Giddens, 1979, p.5). Giddens effectively conflates structure/agency in his idea of 'structuration', where he argues human agents are reflexively knowing about the societies they inhabit, and constitute/produce and reproduce structures by their action (1979, ch.2). Some environmental sociologists have been attracted to Giddens' position. For example, Redclift and Woodgate (1994, p.54) argue the environment can be thought of as a structure which enables and constrains human agency, but they do not actually employ Giddens' conception, for they constantly speak of structure and agency as separate and interrelated. Mouzelis (1997, pp.116-7) argues Giddens himself fails to operationalize his own position, speaking of structure and agency as separate albeit in the guise of different terminology, distinguishing 'institutional analysis' from 'analysis in terms of strategic conduct' (Giddens, 1984, p.288).

Structuration has been most devastatingly critiqued by Archer (1995, 1996) who argues conflation does not achieve its aim of linking structure and agency, but has the effect of 'sinking one into the other' with the result that the links and interplays are lost. She contends structure and agency are separate phenomena, which relate in various ways, and relations between them are spatially and temporally dynamic (1995, p.65). She argues structures and agents belong to different strata of social reality, and Giddens is reductionist for 'compacting' the two denies that structure and agency both interrelate and exhibit independence (1996, pp.688-9). Mouzelis (1995) points out there are historical variations in the structure/agency relation, and in certain circumstances, either structure or agency may take precedence in analysis due to the nature of the subject matter (1991, 1997, p.116). This latter point is of importance in analyzing human relations with the environment.

Giddens assumes that as structure/agency are conflated, they must be co-present, whilst seeming to stress the significance of agency in structuring society (1979, p.7, 67). I would suggest his position is thoroughly anthropocentric (human-centered), for he assumes agency is human, and the structures it reflexively creates are intra-human. In this empirical research (see Chapter 7), it is suggested that co-presence is problematic. I would argue animals in a human dominated society are unable to impact upon the structures by which their lives are delimited. Where agency is present for example in meat production, humans as slaughtermen, farmers and butchers reproduce structures through the exercise of their properties and power relations. Where the lives of 'meat' animals in Britain are concerned, it will be argued, there is little or no agency of which we can

genuinely speak – ‘co-presence’ is not tenable. I feel Redclift and Woodgate (1994) actually argue a position similar to that of Bhaskar (1979), Archer (1995, 1996) and Mouzelis (1991, 1995), and supported by environmental sociologists such as Benton (1993, 1994), that structure and agency are interrelated, and that structures have a significant role in shaping (but not determining) agency (1).

Collier (1994) contends realism makes possible both a greater understanding of, and a greater respect for, non-human life by avoiding: ‘the epistemic fallacy which reduces nature to our cognitive appreciation of it’ (p.149). He suggests postmodern and poststructural theorizing may be problematic in conflating the environment with the ideological, and suggests it is thoroughly ‘anthropocentric’ (1994, p.261) in its insistence on an approach which prioritizes human agency and culture. Bhaskar, like Benton, sees both society and nature as separate but interactive and interdependent, and as composed of structures. For Bhaskar, nature and society have different kinds of structures, for humans are reflexive in relation to structures whereas animals are not (1979, p.38). thus natural structures exist independently of, and without reference to, that which they encompass, e.g. non-human animals. Whilst I accept Bhaskar’s defence of the ‘reality’ of the environment, and the significance of structures in shaping such ‘reality’, I concur with Collier (1994, p.242) and Benton (1981, p.17) that Bhaskar is too keen to draw distinctions between humans and the environment. Collier asserts differentiation within the animate non-human world is intense, and that in the cases of certain non-human animals, there is a greater case for similarity than distinctiveness from humans; and Benton (1994) is careful to argue in terms of both human distinctiveness and similarities with certain social species (pp.41-2), precluding the criticism of naturalistic reductionism.

Whilst sympathetic to the realist contentions that the environment has an objective reality from human consciousness, and is shaped by structures, I depart from certain aspects of the realist position as articulated above. First, I am less certain than Bhaskar that the structures which shape the environment and human society are utterly dissimilar. In arguing for the recognition of difference and diversity with respect to the environment, I will suggest certain species of animal may be subject to similar structures as those to which affect humans. Second, I would argue that the way in which the environment is structured is best analyzed in terms of social rather than natural scientific configurations (as undertaken by Bhaskar, 1978; and Benton, 1991, 1994). For example, in Western societies, human industrialization, and the management of animal reproduction in agriculture, are key structures which shape the non-human animate world. Third, in any discussion of agency in environmental sociology, human agency alone is discussed. This, in my view, is likely to be because agency on the part of the non-human animate world is limited or absent, however the question of agency needs discussion, even if only to debate the reasons for its relative absence. Finally, structural approaches to the environment are far more cautious than those considering intra-human stratification, and most retreat from an analysis of institutionalized human

domination, and argue in terms of human misconduct (O'Neill, 1993). In an uncritical adoption of 'humanistic values' (Redclift and Benton, 1994), human-providence shapes analysis in environmental sociology where the 'good' of the environment becomes a component of human well-being (O'Neill, 1993). Whilst some research argues in terms of human control (Vogler and Imber, 1995), it does not investigate the possibility of human domination as systemic. I would suggest that environmental abuses are systematic, widescale social phenomena that can be seen as symptomatic of a society structured in terms of human dominance. The review of green theory in this chapter attempts to capture possible dynamics of power in the structuring of the non-human animate world in terms of systemic domination. It will indicate the possibility of combining the insights of a structural and realist perspective, with the analysis of human relations of power over the environment as identified by various perspectives in green theory, developing the concept of a system of human domination of the environment – anthroparchy.

Modernity, postmodernity and 'nature'

'Once upon a time, on a little farm, there lived a boy named Jack....One day, Jack's mother told him to take the family cow into town and sell it. Never mind the gallons of milk they had stolen from her!...On his way to town, Jack met an old magic vegetarian, who warned Jack of the dangers of eating beef and dairy products. 'Oh I'm not going to eat this cow' said Jack, 'I'm going to sell her'. 'But by doing that, you'll just perpetuate the cultural myths of beef, ignoring the negative impact of the cattle industry on our ecology, and the health and social problems that arise from meat consumption....I'll offer to trade your cow for these three magic beans which have as much protein as the entire cow, but none of the fat or sodium.' (Finn Garner, 1994, 'Jack and the Beanstalk', *Politically Correct Bedtime Stories*)

'...feminists across the cultural field of difference should contest to tell stories and to set the historical conditions for imagining plots.' (Haraway, 1991, p.107)

The debate on the relationship between structure and agency is closely related to (although not co-terminus with) that on modernism/postmodernism. 'Postmodernism' itself can mean a variety of things, from architectural style to a method of literary criticism. In terms of sociological theory, it has meant both a form of theorizing, and a conceptualization of society itself as characterized by fragmentation and uncertainty, in which the 'grand narratives' (Lyotard, 1984; Lash, 1990) of the era of modernism, such as progress and rationality, along with overarching theories of contestation, such as those of capitalism and patriarchy are deconstructed. Just as contemporary society is to be seen as characterized by diversity and fragmentation, so social theory must reflect this condition and refrain from constructing falsely universalizing grand theoretical schema which are seen as incapable of catching the complexities of social life. As Lash and Urry (1994, p.257) have observed, postmodernism 'proclaims the end of certainty', both in life and in theory. Postmodern approaches in sociology have thus turned away from concern with large-scale social processes, and tended to focus on a micro-sociology of subjective life, language and meaning, and cultural process. Whereas the majority of social and deep ecologists have rejected postmodern theorizing

(Bookchin, 1991), some environmental sociologists (Hannigan, 1997) and eco-feminists (Haraway, 1991) have been attracted to such a perspective.

It has been suggested that the 'postmodern condition' may take us into a more environmentally benign 'post-industrial' future (Hannigan, 1997, p.183), with information technologies constructing new patterns of consumption, relationships to work, and refiguring human relations with the environment (Haraway, 1991, ch.8). In addition, postmodern approaches with their stress on language, meaning and cultural relativism, may deconstruct falsely universalizing conceptions such as 'nature'. Haraway has argued that new 'cybernetic' technology and the social forms it generates, are problematizing and refiguring the boundaries between humans, animals and machines (1991, p.165). We are becoming chimeras, or 'cyborgs', hybrid entities of human, animal and machine (pp.150-1). This destabilization of boundaries is a means to transform our identities by illuminating the false 'unitary' constructions of oppressions of gender, race and class, as well as to suggest new ways of relating to the non-human animate and inanimate environment (p.170,172). Hannigan (1997) is more sceptical of the environmental potential of new technologies in a society which is not yet postmodern. He is most sympathetic to theoretical approaches which lie on the cusp of the distinction between modernism/postmodernism, such as those of Giddens (1990, 1991) and Beck (1992) who conceive our current situation as late or high modernity.

Beck (1992) argues we have moved from an industrial society focussed on the distribution of wealth, to a new paradigm: a 'risk' society or 'risk distributing' society, wherein the risks or hazards produced by modernization, such as pollution, must be minimized, prevented or channelled. Hannigan (1997) argues environmental risks are a key feature of high modernity, and contestation of environmental threats problematizes our idea of the environment, and induces a postmodern sensibility of a contingent and erratic world (p.185). This is arguably a realist rather than a postmodern position however, and Beck (1992 (1986)) has been criticized for an uncritical acceptance that environmental risks are 'real' (Bauman, 1991). Beck (1996) has attempted to challenge such critique in his notion of a contemporary society of 'uninsurable' risk, but still seems to accept ecologists claims of environmental problems, going so far as to argue 'we now and in future are living in the hazardous age of creeping catastrophe' (Beck, 1996, p.40).

Hannigan draws upon Beck, but rejects his realism, for like Haraway (1991), he sees the environment as a social construct rather than a certain reality. If it 'exists' at all, it does so in the form of 'narratives' or, as Haraway more honestly describes them, 'stories' (1991, p.1), which are diverse, contestatory and culturally and historically specific or relative. Haraway (1991, p.185) argues all forms of knowledge are stories, and has written about research on monkeys in the natural sciences as a series of stories which define the 'natural' (Haraway, 1989). As suggested above however, I am unconvinced that the environment has no objective reality, and have concurred with

Benton (1993, 1994) that the environment has a 'real' existence. This does not imply Haraway's position is to be entirely rejected, and insights from both the postmodern feminism of Haraway, and the realism of Benton are helpful in understanding relations between humans and the environment. I concur with Haraway that 'nature' is ideological, and conceptions of 'nature' are political and usually negative, and have been applied to humans as a means of oppression, for example, via the 'naturalization' of 'race' (Haraway, 1989; 1991, ch.1). This said, Haraway goes too far in arguing that the social world is constructed and recast via narrative alone, and I would endorse Benton's conception that material, corporeal phenomena and process exist in interrelation with the ideological. Haraway is too optimistic concerning the ability of narratives to change from 'stories' of oppression to politically correct stories of liberation, for changes in human ideas take place in interrelation with the material. As Redclift and Woodgate (1994) note, changes in attitudes and cultural variations of 'nature' take place interwoven with material changes in society, and are facilitated or restricted by the latter.

In advocating a realist approach, Sayer argues narrative approaches have an excessive sensitivity to detailed descriptive accounts at the expense of analysis, and reify the context of knowledge so that no evaluation of events, process and institutions and their theorization can actually take place (1992, pp.260-261). This is an apt criticism of approaches which overly emphasize the context of knowledge (e.g. Wynne, 1996 with respect to environmental science), and is certainly apposite for Haraway (1989, 1991) who goes as far as to suggest all knowledge is a series of competing stories which may be evaluated in terms of their political implications, rather than the strength of their analysis (in particular, Haraway, 1991, ch.5). Postmodern approaches are useful in indicating that our ideas about 'nature' are profoundly social and political. However, the non-human animal world exists in a concrete sense, and not only in human imaginings as narrative, and to assert the latter constitutes what Bhaskar (1979) calls 'superidealism' and Benton (1994) 'hyper-idealism'.

I would suggest it might be useful to distinguish the 'environment' from 'nature', concepts which are conflated throughout the literature in both environmental sociology and green theory. The environment refers to a wide range of actual physical entities that are loosely grouped by being animate (living) but not human. 'Nature' is socially constructed, and refers to the ideas and beliefs about the environment, and the sets of relationships between humans and the environment. This distinction is particularly important when considering the position of non-human animals in a human dominated society. Tester has adopted a position similar to Haraway (1991), positing 'reality' as a series of narratives in which animals are not real but exist only as human ideas:

'A fish is only a fish if it is socially classified as one, and that classification is only concerned with fish to the extent that scaly things living in the sea help society define itself. After all, the very word 'fish' is a product of the imposition of socially produced categories on nature....animals are...a blank paper which can be inscribed with any message, any symbolic meaning, that the social wishes.' (Tester, 1991, p.46)

Benton finds this approach unworthy of any serious critique, and merely labels it 'entertaining' (1994, p.45). As he has noted elsewhere (1993) however, this denial of any 'reality' effectively excludes environmental issues from sociological investigation. Tester (1991) analyzes animal rights as a series of changing 'discourses', and whilst such discourses about animals should be seen to be culturally and historically specific, narratives about animals conceptualize what Bhaskar would call 'the intransitive object' (1979, p.11). For Bhaskar, human knowledge can change, but the objects of knowledge are separable from the knowledge about them, and may stay the same. One of the problems inherent in Tester's approach is that he implies that if narratives change, then so does reality. As Collier has remarked, if Tester's argument were to be accepted then we would have found: 'a wonderfully cheap way of solving two problems of maritime ecology at a stroke: we could reclassify lumps of untreated sewage as 'fish'' (Collier, 1994, p.89). Such a relativist approach is problematic in relation to understanding the human domination of other animals, for it is unable to account for a material reality which it effectively denies.

I find Tester's use of 'discourse' here rather unhelpful, for it has a limited reference to power relations. Tester is referring, I feel, to ideas and beliefs which are not the same as discourses. I elaborate my ideas about 'discourse' in the discussion of Foucault in Chapter 3, but suffice it to say here, I see discourses as interrelated sets of ideas that are concretized in specific institutions, practices and processes. The notion of discourse deployed in this thesis has a strong sense of concretization, the embedding of symbolic regimes in 'real' institutions and practices. Thus a discourse is not simply a story, it has a 'real' existence (see Sayer, 1992, p.88). I find Haraway's position similarly problematic. She suggests all theories are stories (1991, p.82) which we can evaluate by the politics they imply (p.187) rather than by any standard of theoretical sophistication or empirical accuracy. Thus feminists should contest male supremacist stories which they don't 'like' (1991, p.107). This seems to be a relativism of extremes, but is also rather contradictory, for only a few pages earlier, Haraway claims with reference to scientific studies of monkeys, that she 'cannot tell a story about who is weaving the best langur tales', because she doesn't have 'the scientific authority to name the facts' (1991, p.105). In this instance she seems to be suggesting that monkeys actually exist outside the human imaginary. Elsewhere, she conceptualizes animals as a 'blank paper' for human inscription, for 'stories' of monkeys reflect human politics (2).

I would suggest a realist and structural approach may be most helpful in analyzing relations between humans and the environment. This does not necessarily mean the eclipse of issues of agency nor the outright rejection of modes of poststructuralist thinking. I would accept the poststructuralist notion that 'nature' is a social construct, but hold that 'nature' is constructed not as a series of narratives or stories, but in terms of discourses, sets of ideas or symbolic regimes which are concretized in institutions and processes. In addition I feel it necessary to draw upon a 'realist' conception of the environment as having an objective reality beyond human ideas and beliefs. I

would concur with Walby (1992, 1997) that perhaps the most desirable approach is one which can identify structures (interrelated sets of power relations that shape society), whilst also drawing upon discourse analysis in the conceptualization of these structures. The sociology of the environment generally under-theorizes power relations based on human domination, which form the cornerstone of ecological approaches. Such approaches are not specifically theorized in terms of the sociological debates outlined in this section, but I would argue they implicitly adopt some of the arguments I have developed here. The following sections examine the green literature in terms of its implications for the ideas of the social construction of 'nature' and a system of social structures and practices in which human beings exploit and dominate the environment, and in the case of certain animal species, can be said to oppress them. Plumwood (1994) asserts there are three positions within green theory: social ecology, deep ecology and eco-feminism. The best known is deep ecology, theories which treat anthropocentrism (human-centredness) as the root of environmental problems. Social ecology analyses ecological problems in terms of human social hierarchy, and eco-feminism, sees the domination of women and the environment as sharing a common ideological foundation (Warren, 1990; Merchant, 1980).

SOCIAL ECOLOGY

Social ecology sees environmental abuse, exploitation and oppression as a direct result of the domination of groups of human beings by other groups of humans – 'intra-human domination'. It draws upon radical traditions, mainly anarchism, for an analysis of ecological problems in terms of human social hierarchy. It does not conceptualize human dominance of the environment as an independent form of domination, but sees it as interrelated to oppressive systems of hierarchy amongst humans based on class, gender and race. Whilst I will critique social ecology for reductionism in denying the partially autonomous nature of human domination of the environment, I accept the importance of an analysis which refrains from homogenizing humans, and am sympathetic to the acceptance of social ecologists of hierarchy amongst animals.

Intra-human domination and environmental exploitation

For Bookchin, the founder of social ecology (Rozack, 1989) and arguably the most significant contemporary anarchist thinker (Marshall, 1993), the key form of exploitation is not of the environment by humans, but is intra-human:

'...the very concept of dominating nature stems from the domination of human by human, indeed, of women by men, of the young by their elders, of one ethnic group by another, of society by the state, of the individual by bureaucracy, as well as of one economic class by another or a colonised people by a colonial power.' (Bookchin, 1980, p.62).

Humans are not equally responsible for environmental destruction, and particularly in his recent work, Bookchin is hostile towards deep ecology's theory of anthropocentrism, which contends environmental abuse results from human relations with nature and is the primary system of domination. Bookchin asserts the opposite: the domination of nature came after the domination of human by human, results from it, and is secondary to it (1990, p.44). Bookchin provides a complex account of the emergence of social hierarchy, arguing there are a number of material conditions that give rise to first, the oppression of women via the establishment of patriarchy (as he prefers, *patricentricity*), then of the oppression of other groups of humans (in terms of class, race and sexuality, these oppressions generating, peaking and assuming different forms at different historical locations), and finally, of the environment (1980, 1989, 1991). King has developed his argument about linked hierarchies in an eco-feminist direction, arguing nature domination results from a socially constructed mind set based upon dualism, that 'has its material roots in the domination of human by human, particularly of women by men' (King, 1990, p.106-7). Whereas deep ecologists argue the most significant oppression is that of nature by humans, social ecology argues the cause of this oppression lies in the oppressions within the human species itself. Social ecology's ability to account for a plethora of oppressions is its key strength, and although I would accept critiques of Bookchin as sometimes lacking sufficient depth and clarity (Marshall, 1993), the ambition of his theorizing is impressive (3).

Bookchin has not succeeded however in resolving the problem of the relationship between various forms of social oppressions and their environmental consequences, and has in effect created a hierarchy of oppressions. He argues the domination of nature is a result of 'the domination of man by man' (1980, p.63) which lies in the institution of the patriarchal family and the concept of '*patricentricity*' (male centered society), which he unfortunately does not develop (1971, p.76). This could be seen to place Bookchin in the eco-feminist camp, yet Bookchin's most significant hierarchy is not patriarchy, but the state, which accentuates all social hierarchies and disempowers and alienates people (1971, p.27), and the operations of capitalism (1971, 1986, 1991), his theorization of gender being surprisingly minimal. Bookchin has been criticized by deep ecologists (see Foreman in Chase, 1991) for a relegation of 'nature' which Bookchin conflates with the 'environment'. There is some evidence for such criticism. For example, Bookchin sometimes pays limited attention to the human-nature relationship, and on occasion refers to the environment as 'merely' nature (1989) - a position criticized by deep ecologists as anthropocentric. Bookchin is sceptical of the deep ecologists and eco-feminists attack on Western scientific rationality, which he feels they have replaced with a mystical '*wilderness reverence*' (1991, p.xviii). He is also unreservedly hostile to postmodernism, which in dismantling 'rational', 'logical' and 'elegant' macro theory shows itself as a pluralist defender of the status quo by denying theorization of oppressive systems (1991, p.xvii). Bookchin retains reason as the supreme value, and the basis of

human identity and difference from nature. In doing so, he has an unfortunate tendency to construct human difference from other animals as superiority, for 'we' are 'a very unique species' (p.xix).

Thus Bookchin is antagonistic to any blurring of boundaries between humans and the environment, and is keen to demarcate the distinctiveness of human beings for example: 'animals form communities, they do not form societies. Society is the exclusive preserve of humans...' (p.xxi). He argues there is a fundamental difference between humans and the environment based on evolutionary development, and differentiates non-human nature as 'first nature' and humans as 'second nature' (p.xxi) by virtue of their 'reason' and ability to interact reflexively with their environment. Bookchin has defended humans against the tendency of deep ecologists to 'blame' human beings as a species for environmental abuse (Foreman, in Chase, 1991), rather than the social structures of oppressive relations under which many of them live. Bookchin's analysis however, unfortunately marginalizes human dominance, in an over-emphasis on the uniqueness of the human, and a dismissal of the possible conceptual blurring of the boundaries between humans and some animals as suggested by Haraway (1991). This said, Bookchin's contention that human domination and the domination of the environment are intrinsically linked is important. Both the domination of nature and of groups of human beings over other human beings in terms of class, gender, sexuality and race are produced by the construction of 'Otherness' - the construction of groups of humans and the natural world as 'Others' (Bookchin, 1986, p.26). This fosters a global philosophy of 'rule' and social structures based on with dominance and submission (p.55). I would argue however, that the hierarchical systems Bookchin mentions, are separate systems of domination, whilst concurring that these systems interlink by the common ideological and structural tenet of hierarchy.

The value of modernism: science and technology

Social ecology values much which deep ecology rejects, and postmodern environmental theory problematizes, such as the scientific paradigm of Western modernity, and its associated technology. Bookchin concedes there is much to criticize in contemporary science, but asserts this is due to the assimilation of science by the 'established social order' (1971, p.57) which has resulted in science becoming a part of the mechanism of domination of society and the environment, it is not a problem inherent in scientific epistemology. He does not see that certain perspectives within scientific knowledge may bear responsibility for encouraging relations of dominance over nature, assuming science is a neutral means of inquiry that may reinforce or contest the 'social order'.

Bookchin sees the ecological sciences as being particularly useful for a radical politics (1971, pp.58-60). Ecology understands the natural world in terms of ecosystems, food webs of interlacing plant and animal relationships, the organizing principle of which is interdependence (Bookchin,

1991, p.26). He argues as ecology asserts there is no hierarchy in 'nature', it offers 'no case whatsoever for hierarchy in...society' (1991, p.36). Bookchin seems unable to differentiate between different epistemologies in scientific inquiry, and fails to distinguish certain scientific positions as methodologically problematic and theoretically biased. Thus in defending ecology, Bookchin defends most scientific inquiry as part of his uncritical defence of rationalism, whereas deep ecologists and eco-feminists have tended to critique some approaches and selectively appropriate others. The latter is close to Benton's (1994) assertion, that we should be critical in our appraisal of scientific knowledge, but not disclaim all theoretical perspectives within the sciences. Bookchin also defends technology, arguing in his early work that technological development has placed the West in a potentially revolutionary position (1971, p.33). We are 'on the threshold of a post-scarcity society' (1971, p.10), wherein technology could liberate humans from want and work, rather than being used in a manner harmful to both humankind and the planet (p.17). For Bookchin, technology is potentially neutral, its usage dependent on prevailing social relations. Bookchin fails to distinguish not only between science and technology, but between his reverence for science as a rational methodology, and the possibility certain epistemological positions within science may carry discourses of domination (e.g. racism, sexism) to which he is opposed.

An ethics of rationalism? Social ecology and natures

Bookchin rejects any critique of Western rationality and thereby seems to defend anthropocentric notions of human superiority. Humans are regarded as 'second nature' i.e. they are self-reflexive, thinking beings that can act as the voice of first nature (1990, p.182). He dismisses deep ecology's arguments for environmental 'intrinsic value', and argues nature has rights to the extent humans see fit to confer them (1991, p.xxxv). Human value however, is intrinsic and hinges upon: 'reason, science, art, and technological innovation' (1991, p.xxxvi). In order to avoid any claims biologically superior humans may make to dominate nature, Bookchin proposes an 'ethics of complementarity' which: 'gives due recognition to more advanced degrees of sentience,...but in no sense does it place these attributes of life in any hierarchical system based on command and obedience' (1991, p.xxxvii). He proposes a conception of environmental hierarchy based on degrees of differing 'sentience' (i.e. cognitive awareness, ability to experience pain and pleasure), as the variety of non-human animate beings are highly differentiated in terms of biotic development (1991, pxxvii). This avoids the problem of the homogenizing ethical tendencies of some deep ecologists who argue all animals have the equal right to 'live and blossom' (Foreman, in Chase, 1991). Bookchin argues, rightly in my view, that hierarchy does not necessarily imply domination.

However, Bookchin contends further that hierarchical relations of domination and submission apply only to intra-human domination with organized, systemic practices and institutions, a conception I would dispute by asserting that humans as a species dominate what is external to them

- the non-human animate 'environment'. Bookchin would see such an application of dominatory hierarchy to the environment an 'anthropomorphic projection' (1991, p.xxiii), and here lies the crux of the problem with his position. Despite his admission of animal hierarchy, Bookchin still posits a fundamental and unbridgeable divide between humans and other animals. I have argued that Haraway (1991) has been correct to problematize the human/animal boundary, and Bookchin is mistaken in seeing humans and all animals as incomparable categories. However, Haraway, like deep ecologists, fails to note that whereas boundaries between primates and humans may be an arena of comparison, relations between humans and molluscs may be a little less 'cyborg'. I would want to combine Haraway's boundary hurring between humans and other animals, with Bookchin's understanding of a hierarchy amongst animals, wherein human relations with other life forms should be based on an appreciation of difference in terms of complexity and sentiency, not on a conception of superiority and domination. I would depart for the positions of both theorists however, in arguing that the social construction of 'nature' imposes relations of dominance upon all elements of the environment, which although vastly differentiated are homogenized as Other, in a society organized around the principle of human domination.

Bookchin rightly contends that the key fault of deep ecologists is the homogenizing of humans in terms of blame for environmental problems. Likewise, I would argue the concept of difference should be applied to the environment. We are not 'apart' from the environment as Bookchin suggests, but separated from it by the artificial construct of nature which places humans in systematic domination over the environment. Bookchin denies this, arguing intra-human dominance is a priori, but as will be argued throughout this chapter and the next, oppressive systems are related in complex ways and have partial autonomy. Bookchin is opposed to an ethics based on intuition and intrinsic worth adopted by most deep ecologists and many eco-feminists (1991, pp.xxxvii-xlviii). However, as argued below, it may be possible to combine the idea of intrinsic worth with Bookchin's appreciation of difference in the environment, rather than argue for an equality of intrinsic value, a 'Gaian soup' which Bookchin rightly finds unpalatable. Much of the hostility between social and other ecologies is constructed around Bookchin's entrenched rationalism which leads him to inaccurately caricature eco-feminism as Goddess worship and deep ecology as wilderness reverence (p.xv). He is mistaken in ignoring the differences between deep ecology and eco-feminism, for the latter has much in common with social ecology (Biehl, 1991, p. 157) in insisting social hierarchy and the domination of nature are intimately connected.

Eco-socialism

Some social ecologists have sought to apply the insights of socialism rather than anarchism, to the environment. In their attacks on the structures and ideology of industrialism and economic growth, deep ecologists have shown themselves hostile to socialism, but eco-socialists have

asserted it is the use capitalism makes of industry (production for profit not 'need'), rather than industry per se as problematic (Weston, 1986, p.4). Weston argues the root cause of environmental problems is poverty (1986, p.4), and re-distribution of wealth the solution (p.156). He fails to define 'wealth' and 'need', leaving unanswered the deep ecological critique of Western affluent societies as unsustainable. Pepper argues much of the green programme is derived from socialist principles (Ryle, 1988, p.117). However, eco-socialists employ the heritage of socialist thought in a selective manner, the 'utopian socialists', Kropotkin, Godwin, and Proudon. The utopian socialists are part of a hidden history of minority socialism, and to argue greens identify with much of socialist thought is untenable. Kropotkin et al are anarchists to which the green movement acknowledges its debt (Kemp and Wall, 1989), and in which tradition Bookchin continues. Eco-socialists accuse deep ecologists of favouring authoritarian solutions to environmental problems (Pepper, 1984). However, the most popular deep green solution to environmental crisis is anarchist (O'Riordan, 1981, p.307). Most deep greens, in their support for bio-regionalism (self reliant communities living in co-operation with local ecology, based on communal ownership, Bahro, 1986, p.87; Sale, 1985, pp. 40-132), echo anarchic rather than socialistic principles.

DEEP ECOLOGY

Deep ecology is that to which most academics and activists refer when considering green political and social thought. It sees environmental abuse and exploitation as a product of human relations with the environment rather than intra-human relations. It will be argued deep ecology's theorization of exploitative relations between humans and the environment as systemic, is its key strength. However, I would dispute the terminology describing such systemic relations and prefer 'anthroparchy' (human domination) rather than anthropocentrism (human-centredness). In addition, it will be asserted that the ethical position of deep ecology is problematic, for in seeking to develop a non-anthropocentric ethics, it fails to account for difference and diversity both between and amongst human beings, and the non-human animate environment.

Anthropocentrism

The key contribution of deep ecology to social theory is the concept of anthropocentrism, which is most often defined as 'human-centered' and 'human-instrumental' (Dobson, 1990, p.63). Deep ecologists tend to argue contemporary Western society is anthropocentric, and has a dominant world view in which the non-human world is both conceptualized and treated in terms of means to human ends. Deep ecologists question the enlightenment project of placing human beings and their faculties (especially reason) in a pre-eminent position with respect to the 'natural' world.

Many deep greens acknowledge the exploitation of the planet is linked to intra-human forms of domination, often contend that anthropocentrism is the most deep-rooted form of exploitation. If humans can abandon this most deep-seated form, deep ecologists argue, then other dominations will consequently be eradicated. Fox (1989) goes so far as to assert that human domination of nature accounts for forms of human domination, a position which can be seen as reductionist, similarly to some feminist positions which argue that patriarchy can account for forms of domination such as of humans over the environment (Collard, 1988; for critique see Ramazanoglu, 1989; Barrett and Phillips, 1992). Anthropocentrism, for Fox, is the a priori oppression, it is not created by intra-human domination, and whilst he recognizes other oppressive systems, Fox sees them as irrelevant to human dominance of nature (Fox, 1989, p.14). Deep ecologists fail to offer any explanation of forms of intra-human domination and are unable to consider the possible ways in which forms of intra-human domination and the domination of nature may relate. They often make little distinction between humans - seeing all peoples (of developed nations) as equally responsible for the devastation of the environment (Foreman in Chase, 1991). However, just as exploitation of third world peoples affects their relationship to the environment, so do forms of oppression in developed societies.

This critique can be illustrated by an examination of deep ecological theories of environmental sustainability and strategies of change based upon them. In looking for solutions to ecological problems, deep greens propose radical measures: limits to growth (Irvine and Ponton, 1988, p.36), cuts in consumption (Porritt, 1984, p.174), reassessment of need (Porritt, 1984, p.196), localism (Goldsmith, 1972, p.86), non-violent defence (Tolkar, 1987, p.121), redefining work (Elkins, 1986, p.97; Gorz, 1985), and commune living (Bahro, 1986). Most controversial, is the proposal to limit population growth in order to reduce the total world population (Porritt, 1986, p.190; Catton, 1989; Irvine and Ponton, 1988, p.22; Bunyard and Morgan-Grenville, 1987, p.94-6), which illustrates the problems latent in deep ecology's inability to account for intra-human oppression. Deep ecologists argue the world population should be reduced in line with its carrying capacity, accepting the Malthusian position that population tends to outstrip food production (Catton, 1980). The left have argued world hunger is caused by mal-distribution of resources, rather than an insufficiency (Lappe and Collins, 1978; Bradford, 1989, p.14). Eco-feminists agree, considering 'carrying capacity' to be dependent upon our assumptions of human impact on the environment (Cuomo, 1994, p.93), and Greer (1985) argues the overpopulation thesis is a product of a Eurocentric reverence for the Western standard of living (p.402). Feminist have contended that social, political and economic inequity are the causes of world hunger, and high infant mortality and poverty promotes a burgeoning population. Cuomo argues wimmin are often sexually disempowered and not in a position to refuse sex with men (1994, p.96), and in societies placing a premium on evidence of male virility and prestige of (male) offspring, wimmin's reproductive disempowerment feeds population growth. In addition, attempts to instill 'family planning' may be perceived as an

inappropriate and Hartmann (1987) argues the birth control movement in the developed world has been shaped by a legacy of racist eugenics. Deep ecologists are rightly criticized for regarding humans as undifferentiated rather than 'divided by the oppressions of race, sex, material means of life' (Bookchin, in Chase, 1991; Salleh, 1984); thereby failing to consider that environmental problems may be influenced by intra-human oppressive systems.

I would suggest it is efficacious to combine the insights of both deep and social ecologies. I accept the conceptualization of human relationships with the environment as systematically and systemically exploitative and based upon differential and unequal power. However, as seen from the example above, deep ecologists can be simplistic and reductionist in arguing that this is a priori to other systems of domination. Deep ecologists tend to homogenize human beings and need to account for their differential impact on the environment via a sensitivity to the ways in which human dominance over nature interacts and intersects with dominations of gender, race and class.

Mechanistic science vs. 'green' science

Crucial to the deep ecological position is a critique of Western modernity. According to deep ecologists, our environmental problems are caused by our intellectual relationship to the world, based on scientific rationality in general, and mechanistic science in particular. This relationship is anti-holistic, intellectually we think in terms of parts of a system, rather than systems as a whole. Capra (1983) argues mechanistic science effectively destroyed the organic world view of medieval European society, and replaced it with a domineering one. As a result, human relations with the natural world changed from contemplation and co-operation to domination and control (Capra, 1983, p.31-41; also Eastlea, 1981). Whereas Bookchin sees the scientific paradigm as potentially neutral, deep ecologists argue the ontological and epistemological basis of certain kinds of science (mechanistic) is problematic. This does not mean deep ecologists reject all forms of scientific inquiry, and they have drawn on certain approaches to vindicate their standpoint.

Theoretical physicist, Capra, has painted a very different picture of the universe than did Newton, for whom reality was composed of certain atoms. Capra proposes less tangible 'fields of probability' in which 'particles have a tendency to exist' (Capra, 1983, p.77), and are egalitarian - no particles being superior. Capra and Spretnak (1985, p.29) use particle physics to buttress a green world view of an interrelated web of interdependent systems. Such 'systems analysis' is also invoked by Lovelock in his 'Gaia hypothesis', which argues the planet is kept healthy by mutual interdependence with the organisms that live upon it. Lovelock claims the earth is an organism capable of immortality, but that the human race is unlikely to prove conducive to its long term health. If humans continue to 'foul the nest' he posits, our future is likely to be in jeopardy as the earth seeks to maintain itself (1979, p.107). Porritt contends the Gaia hypothesis gives scientific

weight for rejecting anthropocentrism (1984, p.279), yet as Dobson argues, it is likely anthropocentrism is latent in the adoption of Lovelock (1990, p.45), for his model may give credence for human instrumental reasons for preserving the environment.

Whatever the problematics of particular scientific theories adopted by deep ecologists, their adoption of some positions indicates that unlike Bookchin, they do not perceive science as ontologically and epistemologically monolithic. Deep ecologists question whether certain scientific paradigms may themselves be ideologically shaped. In questioning the Enlightenment project, deep greens (and some social ecologists e.g. Rozack, 1992, ch.7) indicate the ideological content of mechanistic science, and its relationship to forms of anthropocentric oppression, whilst refraining from a dismissal of 'science' per se. This said, deep greens critique mechanistic science as a structure of anthropocentric oppression alone, and not as part of a number of oppressive systems. Eco-feminists (and others, e.g. Eastlea, 1981) have critiqued mechanistic science as not only natured, but also strongly gendered (Merchant, 1980; Bleier, 1984; Shiva, 1988). Again, the problem for deep ecology is it provides a critique based on anthropocentrism, ignoring the possible impact of intra-human dominations.

An ethics of intrinsic value?

Deep ecology has two ethical arguments for why humans should be concerned for the environment. The first is problematically anthropocentric - humans will benefit, the second, more characteristic of deep ecology - the environment has 'intrinsic value' i.e. value in itself. Whilst the intent of the latter approach may be laudable, the outcome has proved problematic, for deep ecologists have tended to adopt a reductionist position which homogenizes the diversity of the non-human animate environment and argues 'all' the environment has the same value, and should be treated similarly. They have often also homogenized humans with the environment, or failed to account for differences amongst humans.

For many theorists, an ethic of intrinsic value covers 'all life', the whole environment has 'value' in itself (Bunyard and Morgan-Grenville, 1987, p.281; Fox, 1986, p.7). Naess argues for an intuitive world view that values streams, landscapes, wilderness etc. (1984, p.202), known as the 'land ethic' (Bradford, 1989, p.7). A key problem has been providing the basis for intrinsic value, and outlining the content of what 'intrinsic value' may consist. Most theorists have appealed to human 'intuition', but this remains open to the criticism of anthropocentrism - humans are expected to give objects intrinsic value (Dobson, 1992, p.51) because of empathy with the environment. There is also the difficulty that parts of the biosphere may have a conflict of interest with others. To salvage the principle of biospherical egalitarianism, Fox (1989) has suggested intrinsic value is not evenly spread, which Dobson alleges makes 'nonsense' of the term (1992, p.56). As a solution,

some theorists propose the concept of an 'ecological consciousness' which connects the individual to the world (Bunyard and Morgan-Grenville, 1987, p.282). The individual needs to cultivate an 'extended self', a sense of self that goes beyond their own identity and enables them to identify with the non-human world. However, this approach still cannot solve the difficulties of a possible conflict of interest. Humans even with an expanded sense of self may see the survival of their own self-hood as commensurable with a degree of environmental exploitation (Dobson, 1992, p.59). Deep ecologists fail to indicate the forms conflict between the human and non-human lifeworld might take, and how ^{they} might be resolved. In addition, Plumwood (1993) argues deep ecology's incorporation of nature into a theory of the self makes human identification with nature an individual psychic act rather than a political practice. Thus much deep ecological theory gives individualistic accounts which emphasize personal transformation (Bradford, 1989, p.9), failing to provide a theory of social rather than individual change.

I feel here it is imperative to draw upon two of Bookchin's contentions: first, that both the human world is differentiated and structured by systemic power relations (based on class, gender and ethnicity) which posit differential relations to the environment; and second, that the environment is itself biotically highly diverse and differentiated. The acceptance of a hierarchy amongst the non-human environment is, I feel, imperative if we are to posit a less distinct boundary between humans and the environment as Haraway (1991) has suggested. This hierarchy may be biologically established in terms of species diversity and differential sentience, as argued in the previous section. I also feel such an acceptance of hierarchy does not involve the acceptance of human domination. I would concur with Bookchin that we do not need to accede to the deep ecological stance that everything in the natural environment has 'intrinsic value' that is equal. Rather, we need to cultivate a respect for difference and diversity that precludes human dominance. Deep ecologists would see this as anthropocentric as humans are conferring value, but I am not convinced that because humans give the environment value, they inevitably do so in a self-interested manner.

I think such respect for difference and diversity can result in non-dominatory differential relations with an incredibly diverse environment, i.e. our respect for rivers, the domestic pig, and the slug necessitates differential treatment. Deep ecologists have insisted that for value to be intrinsic it must be equal, seemingly suggesting equal value means equal treatment, but it is not clear how this must be the case. We need to establish an ethics that sees the environment as possessing value, but which develops a complex and variegated conception of value which is able to allow for difference and not proscribe a blanket relationship between humans and the environment. The environment should not, I would suggest, be ethically homogenized by the concept of equal value, but should be conceptualized as having 'differential value', involving respect for differences in type, form and interest, of the differing aspects of the non-human animate world. In addition, humans should not be ethically homogenized as equally responsible for environmental problems as

many deep ecologists suggest. The establishment of a non-dominatory ethics, which values both humans and the non-human animate environment is beyond the scope of this thesis, and probably the boundaries of sociology as a discipline, but I would suggest the 'environment' has value in itself, but depart from deep ecologists in seeing the environment and its 'value' homogenous. To contend that a non-dominatory ethics of differential intrinsic value with respect to the environment is possible, is not synonymous with arguing 'nature' has value. 'Nature' refers to concretized sets of ideas (discourses) that reflect and construct relations of human domination. The environment is homogenized as 'nature', and constructed as a series of objects of limited 'value'. In establishing a non-dominatory ethics, the current valuation of the environment requires dramatic overhaul.

FROM ANTHROPOCENTRISM TO ANTHROPARCHY

I feel the ability of deep ecology to conceptualize environmental abuse as a system of exploitation and dominance is its main strength. This said, I would strongly dispute the contention that anthropocentrism is an a priori domination, or one capable of explaining other systems of dominance. I concur with social ecologists that environmental abuse is related to intra-human oppression, but reject the argument that intra-human oppressions are solely contributory. Environmental destruction is not necessarily a species generated problem as deep ecologists suggest, but one generated by particular groups of human beings operating in particular contexts, a product of both anthropocentrism and intra-human systems of oppression.

The term 'anthropocentrism' itself is insufficient. It is not just the case that contemporary society is anthropocentric, assuming the environment exists only to serve human ends. Human beings dominate the environment, controlling, manipulating, exploiting and abusing. A more appropriate term, which suggests the extensive nature of structures of human dominance, would be 'anthroparchy' - human domination of nature. I accept the deep green analysis of the dominance of nature as a separate structure of dominance, but dispute it is the sole explanation for environmental exploitation, and question its ability to explain other systems of domination. Anthroparchy interconnects with other systems of oppression based upon class, ethnicity and gender. All forms of green theory have failed to analyze anthroparchy as a system of oppression composed of structures, sets of oppressive relations. In the first section of his chapter I argued for a realist and a structural approach to a sociology of the environment, but one that also draws upon discourse analysis in establishing such structures (a position elaborated in Chapter 3). This thesis attempts to conceptualize human relations with the environment in terms of systemic domination, and will propose a number of possible structures that might be constitutive of such a system. Whilst suggesting anthroparchy can be conceptualized as autonomous however, it will be posited that this system of dominance operates alongside, and in articulation with, other systems of intra-human

domination. The final chapter will suggest the structures which may compose anthroparchy, developed in the light of the empirical research.

ECO-FEMINISM

Eco-feminism can be seen as both a form of green theory, and of feminism, and is also the theoretical ground in which the possible connections between gender and ecology have been most fully developed (see Chapter 3). It will be introduced briefly here to outline the way it draws upon the insights of both social and deep ecology in attempting to synthesize human domination of the environment with a particular form of intra-human domination – patriarchy. However, it will be critiqued as reductionist, for it has a tendency to reduce human dominance of the environment to intra-human gender dominance, similarly to the tendency of social ecology to reduce the former to class dominance and the power of the state. It will be suggested that anthroparchy and patriarchy are best conceptualized as separate yet closely interrelated dominations, and the two chapters which follow will elaborate on the possible strengths of a ‘dual-systems’ approach for examining such interrelations, and overcoming the different reductionism’s of the three ecologies.

Patriarchy and the domination of the environment

Eco-feminism is an umbrella term for a variety of perspectives which examine the nature of the connections within systems of domination amongst groups of humans and the domination of nature. The most important theoretical issue surrounds the conceptual links between the domination of wimmin and nature in both patriarchal ideologies and their concretization in patriarchal structures and processes. Eco-feminism argues the oppression of nature, and of wimmin are part of the same logic of domination, and relates this to a theory of patriarchy. Like some variants of socialist feminism (e.g. Eisenstein, 1979), eco-feminism could be seen as a form of dual-systems analysis that attempts to account for oppressive relations via an examination of interrelations between a number of systems of domination. Most eco-feminists see human domination of the environment as related to a patriarchal world view which also justifies the domination of wimmin, seeing the dominance of wimmin and the environment as conflated, constituting one system (Griffin, 1984; Shiva, 1988). Whilst arguing for a dual systems approach, I concur with socialist feminist dualist accounts which examine contradiction between systems as well as accommodation, stressing that each system is semi-autonomous (Hartmann, 1981; Walby, 1986, 1990).

There are different perspectives in eco-feminism, but I would dispute Davion’s contention there are two dichotomous groupings of theorists, one of which is ‘not feminist’ (Davion, 1994, p.8). One group involves those primarily interested in ethics and includes Plumwood and Warren. Warren attempts to elucidate the nature of an ‘oppressive conceptual framework’ (1990, p.129)

subordinating wimmin and nature. Plumwood (1991) examines rationalism from an eco-feminist perspective and asserts it is the major conceptual underpinning of the dominations of wimmin and nature. Johnson and Johnson (1994) use the term 'conceptualist' to describe this theorizing and include Adam's analysis of violence against wimmin and 'meat' animals (1990), Spiegall's comparison between human and animal slavery (1988), and Mies account of gender, environment and development (1986). A second group of theorists are negatively labeled by Johnson and Johnson as 'essentialist' (1994, p.106) and by Davion as 'ecofeminine' for they supposedly 'uncritically embrace unified...views of feminine sides of gender dichotomies' (1994, p.17). This group includes Griffin, Shiva, Eisler, Starhawk, and Salleh. In addition to those cited by Davion (1994, pp.8-27), I would add: Daly, Collard, Henderson, and Merchant, amongst others. What differentiates this group is not a lack of feminism, I would argue, but their association with a radical feminist theory of patriarchy, which they sometimes use less cautiously than they might.

Griffin et al share with Warren and Plumwood a concern with the 'oppressive conceptual framework of patriarchy' responsible for the domination of wimmin and nature. However, they do tend to emphasize that patriarchal gender roles may result in wimmin being potentially more empathetic with the environment. This is an aspect of Adams (1996) most recent work, indicating division between these groups of theorists may not be as clear cut as Davion (1994) and Johnson and Johnson (1994) have suggested. Griffin et al may be less critical of the patriarchal construction of gender than they might be, but they do not embrace patriarchal femininity in its entirety, but re-appropriate certain aspects. This does not mean they can be labeled 'essentialist' in any way suggestive of socio-biological reductionism as some critics have suggested (Jackson, 1994, p.115), for they see gender as socially constructed without reservation. Jackson argues all eco-feminisms are 'essentialist' because they rely on a concept of patriarchy which is 'monolithic, ahistorical and reductionist' (1994, p.128), but as I will argue in Chapter 2, such criticism is not implied in the concept of patriarchy per se, but depends on the complexity of the manner in which it is deployed.

All eco-feminisms argue there is a common conceptual framework, based on a logic of domination, hierarchical thinking, value dualism and 'power-over' conceptions of power, via which wimmin and nature are oppressed. According to Warren (1994), this logic uses premises about morally significant differences between human beings and 'nature', along with a premise that these differences allow humans to dominate non-humans. She asserts the same logic allows for the patriarchal domination of wimmin, for in Western culture, wimmin are associated with nature. This position has been criticized for feminizing nature and naturalizing wimmin (Jackson, 1994, p.123), but I would argue this is not a problem of the eco-feminist literature itself. Rather, eco-feminist approaches argue patriarchal society has naturalized wimmin and feminized the environment as part of the social construction of the oppression of both.

Griffin (1984) examines Western patriarchal thought and its conceptual subordination of wimmin and nature, as opposed to the valued association of men with culture, rationality and abstraction. Griffin and Salleh (1984) both contend the inculcation of gender has meant wimmin are not required to separate themselves from their material conditions of existence as are men; and have greater potential ecological consciousness, and Shiva (1988) advocates a re-valuation of the 'feminine principle' as a solution to environmental abuse. Eisler (1989) and Starhawk (1989, 1990a, 1990b) are concerned with patriarchal religion and its gendered and natured implications. Warren criticizes these theorists as biologically determinist for arguing wimmin are closer to nature than men (1987, p.14; also Jackson, 1994, p.123). However, Griffin et al never assert wimmin's potential ecological consciousness is predicated on biology, but is socially constructed via their material experiences in patriarchal society. Both groups of theorists, exemplified by the positions of Warren and Griffin, bridge the gaps in deep and social ecologies by arguing intra-human domination (patriarchy), and the domination of nature are linked.

Mechanistic science and patriarchy

An important strand of eco-feminist thinking has been a critique of scientific rationality and mechanistic science as world-views which sanction or even created the oppressions of wimmin and nature (Merchant, 1980; Bleier, 1984; Shiva, 1988; Birke, 1994). Like deep ecologists, eco-feminists argue mechanistic science objectified the natural environment and removed ideological barriers to its exploitation, but the eco-feminist position accounts for gendered as well as natured aspects and implications of scientific discourse (a position further elaborated in Chapter 3). This deconstruction of rationality and mechanistic science by deep ecologists and eco-feminists is one of the major criticisms social ecologists make of the former. Biehl (1991) argues that in dismissing the Western framework, eco-feminists thoughtlessly abandon the whole tradition including its positive aspects: democracy, reason and scientific inquiry and the science of ecology (Biehl, 1991, p.98). However, eco-feminists are specific in their critique: mechanistic science and its associated rationality (Merchant, 1980). Merchant does not remove wimmin and 'nature' from their historical context as Biehl suggests, but argues a specific historical and cultural context has structured their oppression. Warren concurs, claiming oppressive Western patriarchal conceptual frameworks such as that of mechanistic science are part of the construction of domination of wimmin and nature (1990, p.127). Thus eco-feminism provides a specific critique of mechanistic science, taking account of intra-human domination as significant in the scientific domination of nature.

Eco-feminist ethics and female intuition

Plumwood (1991) argues against a social ecological approach to environmental ethics which privileges reason over emotion and assumes the human self is essentially rational. She contends

social ecology uses rationality to separate humans from nature, and embodies a logic of domination based on a reason/emotion dichotomy that has been crucial in creating the separation of humans from nature in the first place (Plumwood, 1991, p.5). This framework, she asserts, must be rejected in favour of a concept of the self which sees humans as continuous with nature. However, she rejects the deep ecological theory of the expanded self, arguing the obliteration of all distinctions between humans and nature is not a solution, but that recognition and respect of difference is what is important (1991, p.13), as I have argued above.

Other eco-feminists have argued that wimmin have an expanded sense of self already, due to their material conditions of life under patriarchy, and the patriarchal discourses of femininity which do not force them to separate themselves from the environment as must most men. Shiva argues the devalued 'feminine principle' is synonymous with 'the ecological principle' (Shiva, 1990, p.191), a position which rather homogenizes femininity. She seems to suggest the devaluation of the feminine is the problem, rather than the construction of gender itself, but should make explicit that whereas some roles assigned to wimmin under patriarchy are devalued sources of potential strength and change, others may not be. Salleh asserts wimmin's lived experience under patriarchy provides a basis for an alternative ecological consciousness (1984, p.340). Wimmin, unlike men, do not have to recourse to abstract ethical constructs to formulate such a consciousness, they already have the 'expanded self'. Salleh is prey to the same criticism, for adopting patriarchal femininity uncritically, ignoring the contradictory ways in which femininity affects the environment.

The alternative position is held by Plumwood who argues against accepting the feminine and rejecting the masculine, and rejects both (Plumwood, 1988, p.23), proposing we select human values on the basis of 'independent criteria of worth' (1993, p.24), which she problematically does not specify. In addition, she holds that we must view the environment as differentiated and is careful in resisting the homogenization of the environment, and allowing for possible hierarchy within it. Whilst I concur with Griffin and Salleh that wimmin's material experiences under patriarchy can engender environmental consciousness, such consciousness is not inevitable, nor gender exclusive, and depends upon the material realities and cultural contexts of wimmin's lives. I concur with both Plumwood and social ecologists however, that the idea of ecological consciousness based on the idea of an expanded self is problematic. We need to establish criteria for a variate conception of intrinsic value for the environment, but it is not clear female gender roles necessarily place wimmin in a privileged position in the articulation of such criteria.

Eco-feminism provides an understanding of the links between intra-human gendered domination, and the domination of nature. For most eco-feminists, patriarchy and the dominance of nature can be seen as one system (Griffin, 1984), or forms of dominance with a common root in hierarchical modes of thinking (Warren, 1994). I would argue gender and nature are separate systems of

oppression, but that they are closely linked. The concepts of linkage which eco-feminist theory provides require further elaboration, to be undertaken in Chapter 3. The final section of this chapter returns us to 'malestream' green theory, with a critique of the literature specifically on animals.

ANTHROPARCHY AND THE CONTROL OF NON-HUMAN ANIMALS

This section examines literature on human relations with 'Other' animals, which some assert is not 'intrinsically' green, but has become incorporated within the green approach (Goodin, 1992, p.132). Most concerns the issue of 'rights' for animals in a 'speciesist' society, although some does examine the treatment of animals in a context which accounts for intra-human oppression.

Animism and intrinsic value

Animism is part of the world view of pagan spirituality adopted by some deep ecologists and eco-feminists (Porritt, 1986; Griffin, 1984; Starhawk, 1984, 1990), and can be seen as part of the project of creating the 'expanded self'. Animism is held to be evident for example, in the belief systems of Native Americans, which conceives humans as dependent on nature for survival and success (Brown, 1993), and who abuse their environment and other species at their peril. Animism is an earth-orientated value system in which everything is endowed with soul, or effectively, with an intrinsic value which precludes environmental abuse. Modern societies have a human-centred, human exclusive value system of anthropocentrism, which, argue deep greens, is responsible for the abuse of animals and the environment, and must be replaced 'with a life-centred philosophy' (Porritt, 1984, p.206). Radical feminists such as Daly have seen anthropocentrism as patriarchal and named this value system death worshipping/death loving, arguing for a biophilic (life loving) philosophy (Daly, 1979). Social, deep and feminist ecologies have paid much attention to the issues of the rights or value of animals, plants and other parts of the environment. We have seen attempts to develop an 'intrinsic value' ethics within the 'rights' mode of discourse, and attempts to transcend that discourse, and establish an ethical system based on an animistic 'ecological consciousness'. Most literature on 'animal liberation' has been rooted in the former approach, at odds with the animistic value system of deep green and eco-feminist thought.

Speciesism and animal rights

Some argue animals are discriminated against because they lack rights in speciesist society. 'Speciesism' (a corollary to racism and sexism) is the belief humans are entitled to treat members of other species in ways it would be deemed morally wrong to treat humans, a discrimination based on species membership (Ryder, in Rollin, 1981, pp.89-90). The ethics of speciesist society precludes rights for animals, by arguing animal interests are tied to the existence of humans who

are competent to develop concepts such as 'rights' (Frey, 1980, p.23-7), or on grounds of biological (Rollin, 1989, p.10) or linguistic difference (Akerman, 1980, p.72).

In arguing the philosophical case for animal rights, Singer (1979, 1990), and Regan (1988), drawing on scientific research indicating conscious awareness in non-human animals, argue animals have interests and thus 'rights', because they are 'sentient', ie. possess a capacity for pain, suffering and enjoyment, albeit such capacities differ between species. Thus Singer is opposed to the speciesist construction of animals as objects rather than 'living, suffering creatures' (1990, p.69). This is an improvement on the approach adopted by Tester (1991) which anthropocentrically suggests we should care for animals because it will make us feel good about ourselves. The strength of Singer's realism is that he allows animals an independent existence and interests outside the human imaginary. This is also true of Regan (1988), although his approach uses sentience only as a starting point for developing the argument that a being must have a sufficiently complex psychology that it can be said to have fears, preferences, hopes, moods and thus be 'subject-of-a-life' (1988, p.367). Whereas Singer includes all vertebrate animal species groups (mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish) as within the boundaries of 'sentience' (4), Regan's position is an avocation of adult mammal rights, for few non-mammals are regarded as 'subject-of-a-life' (1988, p.367). Whereas I have criticized the 'land ethic' of deep ecologists for homogenizing the environment, I feel Regan's approach is anthropocentric, in concerning itself with animals only to the extent they are similar to humans.

Singer (1979, 1981, 1985) argues for a progressive extension of the principle of equality from humans to animals, and Midgely (1983) similarly claims we are impelled to treat 'all sentient beings as inside the moral community' (1983, p.89). Singer concurs, but contends: 'equality does not require equal or identical treatment; it requires equal consideration' (1990, p.2; 1985). This extension of rights claims does not make the case for the unqualified intrinsic value of animals, and deep ecologists regard such theory as restrictive, ignoring the ethical position of lakes, forests etc. (Naess 1984, p. 202). Deep ecology itself however barely acknowledges the existence of animals as such, save to condemn domestic animals as human artifacts (Vance, 1995, p.174). Indeed as Plumwood (1993) has argued, deep ecological ethics are so abstracted they seem incapable of theorizing environmental diversity.

The strength of Singer's position is that he is willing to differentiate between different parts of the anthroparchally homogenized environment, and allow for the differential treatment of the multivariate species of non-human animal. In addition, he is willing to discuss the question of environmental hierarchy, the disavowal of which has so problematized deep ecology's conception of intrinsic value. However, whilst differentiating the environment, Singer fails to differentiate humans and to discuss the possible intersection of intra-human discriminations with those based

upon species membership. Luke (1995) also argues the ethics of Singer and Regan are problematically universalistic, being insensitive to intra-human oppressive structures and the complexity both of peoples identities, and their relations with other animals (Luke, 1995, p.296). In addition, Singer (1981) and Regan (1988) rely on a hierarchical conception that only certain animals have a 'life worth living', which Suzanne Kappeler (1994, p.333) has seen as dangerously elitist. The approaches of Singer and Regan are limited, as they only establish ethics for human relations with a limited part of the environment, which I think is likely to be endemic in a rights based approach dependent on humanistic criteria for the extension of rights claims. In using 'rights' discourse, Singer and Regan argue for a 'rational' approach to the treatment of animals. Deep ecologists would regard such theorizing as anthropocentric for Singer and Regan have a tendency to work from humanist assumptions, ie. the more like humans the animal, the more 'rights' it has.

Singer and Regan demand that animal liberationists be 'reasonable' in their approach to animal oppression (Singer, 1990, p.iii; Regan, 1988, pp.94-8), an emphasis arguably placing them within Enlightenment discourse of rationality (Luke, 1995, p.293) which eco-feminists and deep ecologists have critiqued (Donovan, 1990, p.351). Luke (1995) asserts the positions of Regan and Singer are patriarchal (1995, p.291), because they operationalize a framework of patriarchal norms in which reason subordinates emotion (p.292). Kappeler (1995) concurs that 'rights' approaches to ethics are part of discourses of domination in establishing boundaries of difference across which rights do not transmute (1995, p.331). Donovan (1990) points out that Singer and Regan are criticizing 'womanish' sentiment and emotion, and are trivializing both wimmin and an emotional response to animal abuse (1990, p.351), and Collard (1988, p.96) observes this fear of appealing to emotion reflects patriarchal scholarship. Recent eco-feminist approaches have sought a new direction in animal rights theory that bases concern for animals in the context of wimmin's caring traditions (Donovan and Adams, 1996). Whilst such an approach overcomes the anthropocentrism of 'reason-based' theories and has been seen by some as the basis of a non-patriarchal ethics (Luke, 1995), it is problematic due to its uncritical adoption of patriarchal gender roles, and the tendency to homogenize the environment similarly to intrinsic value approaches.

Antonio (1995) has suggested that an ethical approach rooted in 'care', should be supplemented by a respect for diversity and difference in nature – an ethic of 'care-respect' (1995, pp.214-5). We need to educate ourselves in order to understand difference and diversity, and see animals as highly differentiated by species, having differing kinds of experiences, levels of awareness and physiological, social and psychological 'need'. 'Care' refers to the imperative for species preservation and survival, and 'respect' to the differential and species specific valuation of diversity. This approach is both less homogenizing of the environment, and less problematically gendered in its notion of 'care'. It is not dissimilar to the idea of respect for diversity and difference which I have suggested may be more appropriate than a 'rights' or 'intrinsic/equal value' based

approach to human relations with the whole environment, not just other animals alone. However, there is a problem with all ethical approaches to the oppression of animals - individualism. The oppression of animals must be established in its socio-political context, as a system composed of structures, webs of oppressive relations. We need to see how intra-human oppressive structures, in addition to those shaping human/animal relations cross-cut and interrelate. Very little social theory has attempted such a project, but the impassioned work of Rifkin, has been a counter to the over-concentration upon ethics in examining human/animal relations.

Humans, animals and social relations

Rifkin links the rearing and killing of animals for food and the politics, economics and culture of modernity. He concentrates on the case of cattle in particular, arguing beef is particularly significant in terms of Western culture and economies, manifest in a socio-economic structure observable at particular historical junctures in certain locations: the 'cattle complex' (Rifkin, 1994, p.3). Rifkin claims Western 'civilization' has been developed around the human-bovine relationship, with Pagan worship of bovine deities (1994, p.9). He sees the rise of Christianity in Europe as instrumental in transforming cattle from objects of worship to those of contempt, thus noting the significance of animistic belief systems in precluding systematic animal abuse. He also acknowledges the changes the structures of intra-human oppressive systems, impacting on human/animal relations, noting cattle represented the oldest form of mobile wealth, whose change in status from divinity to commodity reflects human reconceptualization of nature.

Rifkin asserts that eighteenth century British colonial demand for beef was rooted in male domination and class distinction for meat was seen to insure strength and virility, and was a symbol of rank amongst the nobility (p.54). In the United States, colonialism created the largest pastureland in the world, white settlers exterminating Amerindians or forcing survivors onto reservations, slaughtering buffalo and replacing them with cattle converting grain into meat. Although Rifkin says nothing of the anthroparchal manipulation of animals, nor of the gendered implications of violences against a feminized Indian people and the bison, his argument genocide and 'ecocide' developed symbiotically, is forceful. Rifkin examines contemporary Western beef eating culture, asserting meat myths have been used to maintain both male dominance and class hierarchies. He argues red meat is prized due to the particular qualities ascribed to its bloodiness, conferring strength, aggression, and sexuality and has traditionally been associated with masculinity (p.241). Whilst Rifkin attempts to look at both the cultural and material aspects of meat, he does so in dichotomous fashion. The culture of meat is seen in terms of consumption, and the material aspects in terms of production. However, production and consumption of meat are both material and ideological, as this thesis will suggest.

This section has argued that much of animal 'rights theory' can be seen as gendered and natured in its over-concentration on the significance of reason, and emphasis on rights for restricted groups of animals. I concurred for the need to avoid homogenization of the environment, and for an ethical approach in which the environment is conceptualized as highly diverse, and differentially valued. Just as feminisms are questioning the boundaries of difference within humans and between women, environmental sociologists and various green theorists should be prepared to question the boundaries of humanness. However, whilst the development of a non-patriarchal, non-anthroparchal ethics for the treatment of animals is important, there is also a need to examine empirically how animals are treated and conceptualized, investigating the extent to which discourses, institutions and processes may be systematic, the kind of approach suggested by Rifkin.

Conclusion

This chapter reviews the main positions within 'green' thinking: social ecology, deep ecology and eco-feminism, and examines various positions in the sociology of the environment. It has argued environmental sociology has been remiss in undertheorizing the power relations involved in the human treatment of the environment, but that some concepts and positions within it are useful in establishing the theoretical framework for the thesis. I have drawn upon both realist/structural approaches, and more postmodern relativist approaches which emphasize cultural construction. I have drawn upon relativism in order to argue that 'nature' is a social construct, ideological and political, which homogenizes the non-human animate world as separate from and different to the human. Similarly to the term gender, nature refers to socially constructed divisions on which domination is based. I have also drawn upon realism in order to argue that the environment refers to specific physiological entities, that this environment exists independently of human conceptions of it, and that human relations to the environment can be seen in terms of systematic structures of relations that have 'real' effect. I have also argued that where human relations of dominance over the environment are concerned, the environment has very little, if any, agency ie. it is not active in the construction of the processes, practices, relationships and institutions in which it finds itself. I feel a structural approach is imperative in the examination of such processes and institutions and in order to account for an absence of such agency.

The importance of green theory, is that it clearly identifies human relations with the non-human animate environment as dichotomous power relations. Social ecology contends that the abuse of the environment is a product of social hierarchy amongst humans, intra-human oppression, based upon class, race and gender, although its analysis of the latter has been criticized as inadequate. Deep ecology argues environmental exploitation is a result of an anthropocentric society in which the environment is seen as a series of objects which serve human needs. Although it provides a much needed account of the abuse of nature as systematic, it is unable to account for the ways in which

intra-human systems of oppression interact with human dominance of nature. The key strength of social ecology was seen to be its ability to theorize social complexity and to relate intra-human dominations to the domination of the environment; its main fault, is the marginalization of nature's domination. The evaluation of deep ecology is converse; its key strength is the identification of anthropocentrism as a separate and extensive system of domination; its weakness, an inability to account for the cross-cutting impact of intra-human oppressions on human dominance of the environment. This thesis attempts to develop an approach that draws upon the strengths of both these positions.

It was argued 'anthropocentrism' is too weak a term, and 'anthroparchy' more appropriate, for it captures the deep rooted systemic quality of human domination of nature. In addition, it is suggested that a dual systems approach may prove efficacious in accounting for the linkages and disparities between human dominance, and intra-human domination. Eco-feminism has attempted to theorize some of the connections between gendered and nature's domination, but has tended to analyze primarily at the cultural level and ignore the material concretization of oppressions. Most eco-feminist accounts see the domination of women and nature as one system of oppression and are unable to account for disparity between forms and degrees of dominance. Nevertheless, eco-feminism is best placed to synthesize analyses of human/nature relations with those of intra-human relations. This thesis will attempt to develop a dual systems approach in examining relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy, developing some eco-feminist approaches in Chapter 3.

The green literature on animals has tended to focus on relations between humans and all other animal species, failing to develop a conception of both humanity and animality as diverse and differentiated, and to examine the dynamics of connection and incongruence between the 'animal world', and intra-human relations at both a material and a symbolic level. No particular ethical standpoint is advocated here, although it is suggested that a philosophical position which allows for the appreciation of, and care/respect for, multi-diverse animal species which have differing kinds and forms of 'intrinsic value', may avoid both the homogenizing of the animal world, and an elitist anthropocentrism. In addition, it is suggested that research be undertaken in order to identify and problematize human ideas and beliefs about 'nature' and 'animality', and the institutions, processes and practices shaping the lives of animals.

Finally, the conception of 'sentientcy' proposed by some animal rights theorists is useful in arguing a case for diversity of animal species, and differentiating situations of environmental domination, exploitation and oppression. Green theorists argue humans control the environment in negative ways, although forms and degrees of control may differ. I will refer to this overarching control as dominance, and suggest all parts of the non-human environment are dominated. Exploitation refers not to control but to objectification of the environment and its use as a human

resource, for example: the appropriation of the labour of animals, or the depletion of savannas by agriculture. Oppression refers to situations in which certain animals, who are reflexive within their environment and are sentient (aware, capable of feeling pleasure, pain, fear and distress). Oppression may occur where such animals are restricted, incarcerated, beaten, raped (forced to have sex by humans), separated from other members of their species and/or social group, killed, or otherwise caused frustration, terror or distress. The research for this thesis rests on the assumption animals are real, have an experience separable from human ideas about them, and that many are sentient creatures capable of experiencing 'oppression'.

Notes

- (1) Some feminist theorists who have tended to favour structural explanations have adopted a similar stance, as Walby contends, echoing Marx: 'women act, but not always in circumstances of their own choosing' (1997, p.7).
- (2) One of Haraway's most problematic claims in terms of human/animal relations, is that monkeys, via their human inscription, are 'actors' in the social construction of nature (1991, p.12). In this instance, she objectifies monkeys as carriers of human stories, and denies any evidence of the abuse of primates in experimental science (Adams, 1989; Birke, 1994).
- (3) Bookchin's work certainly is ambitious. *The Ecology of Freedom* is the most clearly so, wherein he deploys theoretical approaches from the natural sciences, history, pre-historical and contemporary anthropology, sociology and political science in attempting to analyze why and how the social hierarchies of class, 'race' and gender emerged along with the development of the state and government, and the human domination of the environment, and how all such hierarchies may be undermined and eventually 'dissolved'. With the current influence of postmodernism on social theory, and the move by some social theorists away from complex macro approaches, the term 'ambitious' may be seen as harsh criticism. I prefer however, to use 'ambitious' in terms of its positive dictionary definition, and thus see the scope and complexity of Bookchin's work as 'requiring much skill', and its conclusions 'challenging'.
- (4) Singer is uncertain as to the possibility of sentience in some non-vertebrates, and is keen to carefully demarcate boundaries for practical purposes such as the solution to daily potential moral dilemmas. For example, can we eat arthropods? (no, cautions Singer, we should give the crab the benefit of the doubt, and there is a lack of conclusive evidence that the 'screaming' lobster is perfectly unaware it's being boiled alive); can we drown chrysanthemum chomping molluscs such as snails and slugs in lager? (probably, their sentience is negligible although they enjoy beer, and they ruin the biotic diversity of a garden). This does remove the 'classic' problem posed for deep ecologists as to whether the 'parasite and its host have an equal right to live and blossom', for Singer effectively excludes other coelomates from rights claims (i.e. worms, echinoderms (e.g. starfish) and tunicates (e.g. sea anemone's)); and multi and unicellular animals (e.g. bacteria) are excluded. Although not in favour of a 'rights' based approach to human/animal relations, I think the demarcation of boundaries to certain kinds of treatment is important if one accepts the conception of intrinsic but differentiated value and differential treatment, but detailed discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis, my very limited philosophical knowledge, and my rusty 'O' level biology.

CHAPTER TWO

PATRIARCHY, SEXUALITY AND PORNOGRAPHY IN FEMINIST THEORY

Introduction

This chapter examines the literature on gender, focusing on theories which argue in terms of systemic male domination of women. It begins with an examination of theories of gender relations, and discusses the extent to which differing forms of thinking have deployed systemic approaches. I first examine liberal feminist and Marxist and socialist feminist approaches which have tended to reject, or have significant reservations about, a theory of patriarchy; proceeding to examine positions which have deployed a systemic concept of patriarchy, radical feminism and socialist feminist dual systems theory. The chapter theorizes patriarchy in the context of this research by drawing upon certain feminist positions, and argues a dual systems approach might be most helpful in an attempt to compare and contrast differing forms of domination. The final section discusses some of the feminist literature on pornography in the light of debates outlined here, and in relation to the empirical research for this thesis.

Systems, structures, discourse and gender relations

Key sociological debates may be discerned in the theorization of gender relations, and particularly controversial is the debate between structural approaches which tend to analyze gender relations in terms of systemic domination, and postmodern and poststructural approaches which tend to see gender relations in terms of a diffuse and fragmentary notion of power.

Liberal feminists tend not to analyze gender relations as systemic and structural, but have conceptualized the latter as a series of discriminatory practices. Gender differences and inequalities are usually conceived of as a product of socialization into dichotomous social roles reinforced by tradition. It will be argued liberal feminists tend to provide a descriptive account of specific practices, rather than analyze power dynamics at the macro-level. In the 1970s, socialist/Marxist and radical feminisms shared the assumptions that women were systemically oppressed, and that the search for causal explanation was important, emphasizing the significance of structural analysis (Barrett and Phillips, 1992, p.2). During the 1970s and into the 1980s, the key areas of dispute around issues of domestic labour, reproduction and paid employment, situated such theorizing within the bounds of structural and systemic analysis. Debates took place over which structures were most significant, and how they involved the articulation of gender with class. Socialist feminists argued capitalism as a system benefited from women's oppression, and derived material benefits from women's socio-economic roles. Important also was discussion of whether a single

system, capitalism, was responsible for gender oppression, or a 'dual systems' approach was appropriate, in which patriarchy was seen as a separate system which interrelated with capitalism.

From the late 1980s and through the 1990s there has been a shift toward poststructural and postmodern theorizing wherein the certainties of anti-capitalist revolutionary theory and praxis have been replaced by a fragmentary theorization of 'difference', and the adoption, some would argue, of a radical pluralism (Evans, 1995, p.111). Thus early 'second wave' socialist feminism can be seen as structural whilst most recent developments have been poststructural/postmodern. In addition, whereas early second wave theorizing tended to emphasize material factors in analysis (eg. the specific nature of wimmin's work in paid employment and the household), and paid limited attention to the role of ideology (despite exceptions e.g. Mitchell, 1977; Barrett, 1980); recent theory and empirical studies have emphasized the ideological representation of gender. This move towards postmodern ways of thinking is not characteristic of all contemporary developments in socialist feminism. Those attracted to dualist approaches have retained systemic and structural analyses, continuing to emphasize the significance of class with respect to gender (particularly in interrelation with region and age, Walby, 1997). Radical feminism continues to emphasize the importance of a systemic and structural analysis of patriarchy, a system of male domination of wimmin (Bleier, 1984) which exhibits itself differentially culturally and historically (Rowland and Klein, 1996, p.14). The institutions and processes which compose the system of patriarchy are conceptualized as webs of gendered relations, structures, which both sustain and create male power. These structures include: the law or the state, the various institutions that can arguably be seen as part of the structure of culture (such as religion, language, the media and education), the family/household, sexuality and reproduction, violence against wimmin and children.

The debates discussed in the previous chapter on structure/agency and the tensions between structural analysis and poststructural/postmodern approaches, are further developed here in the context of feminist theory. Structural and systemic approaches to gender relations provided by radical feminism and socialist feminist dual systems theory have been criticized for exhibiting a 'false universalism' (Eisenstein, 1984) and an inability to account for difference amongst/between wimmin (particularly an insensitivity to 'race', Carby, 1982; Lorde, 1994). As a result, there has been a tendency for feminist analyses to refrain from 'grand theory' of explicative causation, and focus upon micro-level analysis in terms of localized and historically specific studies, a move from a structural analysis of 'real' phenomena to one which emphasizes the symbolization of oppression (Barrett and Phillips, 1992, pp.4-7). However, the impact of poststructural/postmodern thinking on feminist analysis has caused some concern particularly regarding its political implications (Bordo, 1990, p.149; Bell and Klein, 1996), the deconstruction of claims to a knowledge approximating objectivity (Di Stephano, 1990, McLellan, 1995), and most importantly, the inaccuracy of analysis involving 'denial of significant structuring of power' (Walby, 1992, p.31). Thus similarly to the

debates discussed in Chapter 1, the theorization of gender relations has been affected in important ways by debates between approaches which prioritize human agency and those focussing on social structure, and the related tensions between modernist/structural and postmodern/poststructural ways of thinking. Whilst it will be argued some critiques of systemic and structural accounts are pertinent, a structural account of patriarchy is both possible and desirable, albeit one which is sensitive to difference and diversity between/amongst wimmin.

It is not inevitable that the adoption of a structural approach to gender relations entails the eclipse of poststructural approaches. The notion of 'discourse' deployed in this research will be developed in Chapter 3, but suffice to say here, discourse analysis is seen as compatible with a structural approach, for it is able to identify multifarious and diversely nuanced sets of gendered ideas, and illuminate their specific concretization in institutions and practices. It will be argued that in some of Foucault's work (1971, 1972, 1976(a), 1976(b), also 1979), discourse is used in a manner not dissimilar to that deployed by research for this thesis. Foucault is often seen as poststructuralist (Weedon, 1987; Said, 1988), but I feel his work involves elements of both structural and poststructural approaches. Whilst Foucault himself does not explicitly speak of 'structures' it can be argued that in emphasizing the significance of oppressive discourses articulated via certain institutions, he can be seen as drawing upon a notion of structure. Discourse analysis, I will later argue, may be incorporated within a structural approach to gender relations, helping us to understand the specific content of patriarchal structures by indicating how the symbolic and material articulate in sets or groups of social relations of power.

The arguments outlined in Chapter 1 for a realist and structural approach, are further developed here, but the format of this chapter will be slightly different. Rather than discussing debates around structure/agency and modernism/postmodernism prior to a critique of specific theories, I shall intermesh such debates with an examination of various feminist approaches. These arguments will be drawn together in the middle section of this chapter which argues for a structural analysis of patriarchy as a system of dominance which is delimited by boundaries of gendered power relations, and is not seen as able to explain other forms of dominance based on class, 'race' etc. unless combined with the analysis of capitalism and racism for example, in a dual systems approach. I will draw particularly upon the work of Walby (1990, 1997) in arguing for the efficacy of a structural approach as compared to postmodern approaches to gender relations, exemplified by the work of Butler (1990, 1993). This section will identify a number of patriarchal structures and indicate ways certain of these interlink with structures from other systems of domination, suggesting the possibility of a dual systems approach that might take account of the dominations of wimmin and animals. Such theory will be developed in the light of the empirical research for this thesis, and elaborated in the concluding chapter.

Ideology, materialism and pornography

The final section of this chapter proceeds with an examination of a specific area of feminist debate, pornography, which will be one of the empirical case studies in this project. In this section, another sociological debate is pertinent - that of the relationship between 'material' and 'ideological' aspects of analysis.

The term 'ideology' carries with it a plethora of meanings, and has been defined in differing ways in social theory. It has been used to refer to different kinds of secular and political creeds, or more generally, to anything which 'pertains to ideas' (Ryan, 1970, p.221). Marx used the term to refer to images or reflections of reality that actually obscure what is 'real', images of 'the world turned upside down' which both express and justify the interests of the dominant class (Giddens, 1979, p.167). Marx's usage is similar to certain feminist approaches which stress the dominant 'ideas' are those of male dominance (eg. Figs, 1970) the effect of which is to obscure, or even 'reverse' reality (Daly, 1980). Thus ideology can be seen as not simply the realm of ideas and beliefs, but also as reflecting and constructing interests and power relations, ie. ideology is embedded in and constitutive of, social structure. In this thesis, ideology and materialism are conceptualized as two distinct yet interlinking layers within social structure.

Marx's position is problematic in that he seemed unable to encounter the possibility that his own ideas were themselves socially produced rather than 'how things really are' (Giddens, 1979, p.173), and whilst he suggested that there was a distinction between 'ideology' and the 'truth' about social life, he never made clear how such a distinction should be made (Ryan, 1970, p.224). Ryan argues in Marx's defence, that his argument about ideas being reflective of class interests should be seen as flexible, as for Marx, any effort to unmask exploitation should be seen as an attempt to tell some kind of truth (1970, p.229). Habermas (1984, 1987) sought to overcome some of the difficulties apparent in Marx's approach by conceptualizing ideology not as either a realm of ideas, or a reflection of the interests of the dominant class as Marx suggested, but as both. Thus Habermas sees ideology as a symbolic system ('ideas') but one which is at the same time a system of 'distorted communication', with variate levels of distortion. Whilst I am not quite convinced by Habermas's terminology, I would concur that ideology may be both simply the symbolic realm of ideas and beliefs and also a reflection of power relations of domination (1). In this research, 'ideology' will refer to the symbolic regime of ideas and beliefs which is neither an accurate reflection of 'reality', nor a picture of that reality 'turned upside down'. It is however a 'distortion', for the symbolic is shaped by various systems of domination which both construct and justify oppressive relations. For example it will be argued that symbolic representations of people as pornographic texts are not unmediated reflections of how women and men are, but representations which caricature both sexes and their sexualities, in terms of patriarchal relations.

I see ideology as different from culture. In this thesis, culture will be defined in a fairly narrow way as pertaining to certain institutions and practices. Thus I perceive 'culture' not to pertain to the whole of society in a loose sense, or to a gamut of symbolic representation, but as a certain interrelated group of institutions encompassing education, religion and the range of institutions which compose the media (e.g. publishing houses, news agencies, television companies). The structure of culture is closely linked to ideology, for cultural institutions for example, universities, mosques and churches are productive and constitutive of 'ideas and beliefs', and the multifarious media produce a plethora of symbols and images. However, I see the ideological or symbolic as a far broader category which can be seen as a constitutive level of all social structures. For example, paid employment can be seen as having both material aspects in terms of institutions and practices of industrial production and service provision, and also ideological aspects such as symbolic regimes attached to particular kinds of employment.

From a Marxian perspective, 'materialism' refers specifically to the economic sphere and the means and relations of production, and the mechanisms via which the material means of life (food, shelter, clothing etc) are produced and distributed (Kolakowski, 1987, p.363). Some Marxist feminists have argued the term should not be defined so narrowly, but refer incredibly broadly to 'lived experience' or what 'is' (Pollert, 1996, p.649,651). I shall use the term in a wider sense than the traditional Marxian usage, but far more specifically than Pollert, to refer to physical practices and institutions and their associated power relations. Material aspects of the analysis will usually focus on the economic relations within industrial production, but on occasion, non-economic processes and institutions are seen as having a strongly material presence, such as forms of physical violence, and the legal and coercive powers of state institutions.

The feminist literature on pornography reviewed in this chapter will be criticized for an almost exclusive focus on ideological aspects of pornography, analyzing pornography as a regime of representations, rather than looking at pornography as an industry. Whilst I have distinguished between the material and the ideological, I do not see these categories as separable in any dichotomous fashion. Rather, the ideological and material are closely intertwined and interrelated, whilst also being different. I would avoid an approach which collapses these categories as it would be unable to account for conflict/difference/disparity between the two. The interrelation between the material and symbolic takes place within social structures and their institutions and processes, and within forms and processes of human action. Thus for example, pornography can be seen as assuming ideological form in terms of regimes of representation, and material form as an industry. This chapter does not locate pornography in one particular structure of patriarchy however, but argues that pornography is part of a number of such structures. This is reflected in the review of some of the feminist literature on pornography, where pornography is seen as part of structures of sexuality (it is a particular regime of sexual behaviour and desire), violence (it has been argued

pornography has real effect in encouraging violence against women, and physical violence is involved in making pornography), culture (it constitutes a range of texts of popular culture through which a regime of representation is disseminated) and finally, the state (which has been seen to legitimate pornography in law, and in police and local state protection of the industry). This chapter concurs pornography is part of patriarchal structures of violence, sexuality and culture, whilst criticizing certain radical feminist positions for ignoring the influence of cross-cutting systems of oppression, in this instance, anthroparchy. It will argue pornography may not only be gendered (in terms of the representation and construction of 'masculinities' and 'femininities') but also 'natured' (in terms of the representation and construction of 'humanities' and 'animalities').

LIBERAL FEMINISM

Liberal feminism (Friedan, 1965, 1981; Richards, 1982; Midgely, 1983; Pateman, 1988; Okin, 1980, 1990) sees gender 'difference' and inequality as a product of prejudice and ignorance, of out-dated sexist attitudes, which operate to disadvantage women in specific contexts, such as the education system or job market. Most liberal feminists attribute sexism to socialization in the family, education system and popular culture (Currell, 1974), institutions which disseminate a gender ideology which justifies and legitimates the exclusion of women from sources of social power in the public sphere (Elshtain, 1981): paid employment (Friedan, 1965) and the formal political system (Stacey and Price, 1980; Randall, 1987). Liberal feminist approaches to the position of women can be seen as similar to environmentalist approaches to the environment: the position of women is seen as a 'social problem' of inappropriate treatment, to be remedied by incremental reform in order to establish genuine equality of opportunity. Liberal feminists, like environmentalists, do not speak of domination, exploitation or oppression, and do not see gender as inequitable structured relations. Indeed, liberal feminism often seems to emphasize an androgynous equality rather than one which argues specifically in terms of women's interests (Evans, 1995, p.29; Tong, 1989). Most liberal feminists emphasize the possibility and desirability of minimizing sexual difference, and stress the positive attributes of each gender in the realization of androgyny.

Gender ideology

Early second wave liberal feminists such as Friedan (1963) argued gender inequalities were a product of an ideology of gender difference that obscures the reality of a 'naturally' equal humanity. Friedan argued women have been indoctrinated by popular culture (women's magazines in particular) into a narrow, stereotyped and derogatory femininity. Such gender ideology excludes women from paid employment and confines them to domestic labour and child rearing. Contemporary liberal feminists such as Wolf (1991), have adopted a similar position but developed it in the context of changes in gender relations, arguing for example, that Friedan's myth

of feminine domesticity (the 'feminine mystique') has been superseded by one of feminine beauty, a 'beauty myth' which controls and disadvantages women once they are educationally successful and enter professional employment. Friedan originally advocated an individualist solution to the problems of sexist gender ideology, encouraging women to combine homes and careers through furthering their education. More recently however, Friedan (1981) has moved from such an individualist conception of equality of opportunity, to one of welfare liberalism (Tong, 1989). Other liberal feminists have stressed the enlightenment prioritization of reason as a supreme human value. Richards (1980) argues feminism is a matter of fighting injustice to women based on the 'irrational' grounds of sex. Okin (1990) echoes this concern for 'justice', but like Friedan (1981), argues in terms of traditional liberal conceptions of equality, believing both sexes should be equally placed within society as it is now organized, with the proviso child care be available so women can realize equality in paid employment.

These liberal feminists argue gender difference and inequality is socialized, and can be changed by a realization of equality of opportunity. They do not see inequalities as structural nor systemic, embedded in the institutions and processes of contemporary Western society, nor do they account for other forms of dominance which may interact with gender such as race and class. Liberal feminists, particularly in the early second wave, argued progressive socialization, combined with legislation against discrimination, could eradicate disadvantage. It contended for example, that integration of women into paid employment (Friedan, 1965) and political life (Pateman, 1988) would eradicate the problematic gendered division between public and private spheres (Elshtain, 1981). Evidence suggests however, that many women in paid employment tend to be segregated in low status jobs with limited security (Hakim, 1979; Walby, 1986), and black feminists have criticized the assumption of the benefits of paid work as ignoring the experiences of women of colour, whose employment status is compounded by racist structures (Phizacklea, 1983, 1988), affording them little benefit (hooks, 1984). Liberal feminism can be seen to advocate change in gender relations that may involve the advancement of some (white, middle class) women in a society that will still be stratified in ways in which people will experience inequality. Okin, Friedan et al confine their analyses to the dissemination of a problematic ideology of gender inequality. Whilst this thesis holds ideology is of significance, socialization theory is not particularly helpful in understanding how gendered ideas are deployed. It will be argued discursive analysis may be best placed to explain both the construction and maintenance of structures of patriarchal power.

Pluralist individualism

Liberal feminism attributes gender discrimination to sexist ideas and practices, but does not see discriminatory gender ideology as part of webs of relationships or structures. Liberal feminists do not conceive gender relations in terms of systemic relations of domination and thus do not speak of

a system of patriarchy. In eschewing an analysis of social structure, liberal feminists provide an individualist account of women's agency, and are optimistic gender discrimination can be combated by women's social mobility and renegotiations of their relationships in home and workplace, facilitated by a pluralist 'democratic' state in whose political elite they increasingly assume positions of power and authority. Thus they see wimmin as able and active in re-making and changing gender relations in a fairly straightforward manner.

In some respects, there is case which can be made for a similarity between such liberal approaches, and those of feminists who have moved closer to postmodern ways of thinking. Both liberal and postmodern feminisms emphasize the ability of wimmin as individuals to change their lives, and see gender relations as fluid and changing (Weedon, 1987). As Evans (1995) has noted, postmodern feminism (unlike liberal feminism), does not deploy the language of individualism explicitly, but invokes it implicitly, for the emphasis of postmodern feminism on 'differences' necessitates a prioritization of the individual (1995, p.132). Both approaches question the possibility and plausibility of an over-arching system of patriarchy, and of an approach which sees social structure as restrictive of wimmin's lives and action. This said, there are some significant differences between the two approaches. Postmodernism has rejected 'grand narratives' including liberalism with its prioritization of human reason and rationality. For Weedon (1987), liberal feminists belief in human rational consciousness is 'essentialist', part of a universalizing discourse of modernity. Postmodernism has had little impact on liberal feminism, but this is not the case with respect to many Marxist and socialist feminist approaches.

MARXIST AND SOCIALIST FEMINISM

Marxist and socialist feminism has changed dramatically in the last fifteen years or so, moving from revolutionary socialism to social democracy, a shift which has accompanied a demotion of concern with class, and an increasing tendency to focus on other kinds of 'differences' between groups of wimmin. The distinction between Marxist and socialist feminism is imprecise, and may depend upon ones categorization of socialist thought. I would distinguish Marxist feminists as dismissive of theories of a system of 'patriarchy', asserting the primacy of class in determining gender relations which are analyzed as resultant from the operations of capitalism. Socialist feminism has not theoretically dismissed patriarchy, but sought to investigate its interrelation with capitalism, elucidating the complexities of gender and class whilst not granting primacy to either.

Capitalism and the systemic oppression of wimmin

In the 1970s and early 1980s, Marxist feminism (Beechey, 1978; Bruegal, 1979; McIntosh, 1980) largely saw gender inequality as symptomatic not of a system of gender oppression, patriarchy, but

as derivative from class oppression, capitalism. Marxist feminists reject the concept of patriarchy, generally hostile to any suggestion that a 'separate theory of gender relations' is needed as this would be 'confusing and unnecessary', and arguing gender relations are constituted by class relations and can be accounted for by historical materialism (Pollert, 1996, p.650). Thus class exploitation determines gender inequality which is rooted for many Marxist feminists in the bourgeois family (McIntosh, 1980) which oppresses women through unpaid domestic labour (Dalla Costa, 1973; Malos, 1980; Vogel, 1983). Male workers are reproduced and maintained by women at no cost, rendering the role of the housewife strategically important for capital (Malos, 1980, p.178). However, Marxist feminism fails to explain why it is women who perform most domestic work, and are relegated to the reserve army of labour. Some Marxist feminists attempted to combine materialist class analysis with those of ideology, such as Mitchell (1975, 1978) and the early Barrett (1980) seeing gender as constructed by discourses of masculinity and femininity, but were problematically unclear as to the relationship of discourses and economic relations. Black feminists argued 'white' feminism ignored the experience of women of colour in prioritizing the 'family' as a key institution of women's oppression. Household form differs according to ethnicity, many argued, and the family is less oppressive for black women than for white, and may be a source of support in a racist society (Davis, 1981; Carby, 1982; hooks, 1982, 1984; Parmar, 1982). In addition, the significance of the family as an institution of social control has changed as household composition in Western societies has altered, with fewer marriages, a rising divorce rate, and a greater number of households headed by women, and some Marxist feminists have shifted their concentration to paid employment as a key structure of women's oppression (Beechey, 1977, 1978, Beechey and Perkins, 1985; Breugel, 1979).

This thesis departs from Marxist feminist approaches which suggest women's oppression derives from capitalism, and will argue that patriarchy is an autonomous system of oppression. In so doing, it will draw upon radical feminist theories of patriarchy as an independent system, and upon socialist feminist dual systems theories which see systems of oppression as autonomous yet interlinked, in order to examine relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy.

Relations between capitalism and patriarchy – dual systems theory

Dual systems theory has been employed by socialist feminists in an attempt to combine analyses of two interrelating systems of oppression: capitalism and patriarchy. I concur with those who see such analyses as a variant of socialist feminism (Tong, 1989; Bryson, 1994), rather than exponents who have seen it as a further strand of feminist thinking (Walby, 1990). I do not feel dualist theorization is of necessity socialist feminist however, and would contend any attempt to examine possible interrelations (and contradictions) between two systems of oppression which are seen as having their own autonomy (however limited) can be conceptualized as dual systems approaches.

At this point I will discuss the early works of socialist feminist 'dualist' theorists, appraising the more contemporary work of Walby (1990, 1997) at a later juncture.

Eisenstein (1979, 1981) argues gender relations are produced by both patriarchy and capitalism, and sees a strong linkage between the two systems, contending they constitute a single system of capitalist-patriarchy. Both parts of the system are mutually dependant, with capitalism providing patriarchy with an economic structure, and the latter providing the former with a legal and political system. Problematically, Eisenstein does not demonstrate such linkage, but assumes symbiosis exists. Her model cannot account for the ways patriarchal forces may shape the economy, and those of capital shape the state, and I feel it unlikely that the legal system and the organization and functions of the state are based solely upon the needs of patriarchy. Because Eisenstein attributes different structures to different systems, she cannot claim capitalism and patriarchy are a unity. The early work of Young (1981) is critical of dualism in general, and Eisenstein in particular, arguing her approach allows Marxist analysis to remain largely a priori and unmodified, because patriarchy is conceptualized as pertaining to the ideological, and where this is not so, patriarchal material relations tend to be conceptualized as circumscribed by the household. Thus even in the work of a theorist who attempts to give equal importance to both patriarchal and capitalist forces, the effect is conflation and an elevation of the importance of the latter.

Hartmann (1979, 1981) avoids the problems inherent in a conflatory approach, by conceptualizing the two systems as analytically distinct but closely interacting, a position I would accept. For Hartmann, such interaction takes place at work, and to a lesser extent, in the household. Wimmin's labour is expropriated by capitalism and patriarchy in the form of domestic labour and paid employment, and the former contributes to their disadvantage in the latter. The reverse is also the case, she suggests, for wimmin's lower pay and employment status make them more likely to cohabit with a man, establishing a cycle of disadvantage. However in keeping the systems distinct, her model does not acknowledge the ways the systems link, other than by their result - gendered oppression. In addition, it is unlikely that wimmin's oppression results from the expropriation of labour alone. Whilst Hartmann and Eisenstein acknowledge patriarchy is partially responsible for wimmin's oppression, their analyses are limited in that they circumscribe patriarchal and capitalist relations as pertaining only to labour. Thus they speak of two structures of capitalist-patriarchy: the household, wherein wimmin undertake domestic labour, and paid employment, wherein wimmin are segregated in disadvantaged positions and relations vis-à-vis men.

I feel a dual systems approach may be able to capture interrelations between oppressive systems, which should be seen as separate but interacting, and that the identification of structures, within which the articulation of oppressive relations takes place is a strength of dualist analysis. This said, Eisenstein and Hartmann problematically only identify two structures wherein oppressive relations

interact resulting in an account which restricts wimmin's oppression to labour alone and ignores other forms oppression may take, such as violence. In addition, they over-emphasize symbiosis between the two systems, failing to allow for nor explain potential disparity and conflict.

Socialist feminism and postmodernism

Other Marxist and many socialist feminists have moved in the direction of postmodernism (e.g. Barrett, 1980, and consequently, 1987, 1992; Young, 1981, and subsequently, 1987, 1990). Young began writing as a revolutionary socialist influenced by radical feminism (1981), but her later work (1990) reflects a postmodern concern with 'difference' and 'identity'. Young is of interest, because like some other socialist feminists (e.g. Phillips, 1991, 1993), she is influenced by postmodernism but draws back from some of its theoretical implications. Young now has little interest in the idea of systemic or structural oppression, being latterly concerned with a range of marginalized 'groups' (wimmin, gay men and lesbians, various peoples of colour) and notions of equality and group 'difference'. She is no longer concerned with the working class, which may reflect the view that class is no longer a major social and political divide due to the growth of internal class divisions (Dunleavy and Husbands, 1985). Alternatively, Young may be convinced by arguments that capitalism has become a 'disorganized' oppressive system (Offe, 1987), with greater 'flexibilization' and segmentation of labour, resulting in a decline of working class homogeneity (Lash and Urry, 1987). Young fails to argue for her exclusion of class and I think her selection of certain forms of 'marginalization' is limited. Like Walby, I am sceptical of arguments for disorganized capitalism and feel we are seeing new forms of capitalist organization in the late twentieth century (1992, p.39), as systems of dominance are dynamic and adapt whilst retaining their oppressive nature ('restructuring' themselves, Walby, 1997).

Whilst some postmodern feminists have deconstructed concepts of group identity for fear this may over-homogenize and stereotype 'group members' (Butler, 1990), Young (1990) retains the significance of identity politics, arguing group analysis enables feminists to examine the similarities and differences across 'cross-cutting' groups in terms of oppressive relations. She sees this as able to account for difference, whilst retaining a non-individuating politics based on an interactive radicalism of differentially oppressed groups. Young does not construe difference in the same way as postmodern feminists who have been keen on destabilizing group membership (Butler, 1990; Flax, 1990), but wishes to re-vamp liberal democratic political systems in order to facilitate group heterogeneity, full participation in liberal democratic institutions (1990, p.97). She assumes the US political system is basically democratic and capable of reform to facilitate the participation of the marginalized. Although sympathetic, Phillips (1993) has identified problems with Young's radical pluralist democracy in terms of group closure and the exclusionary nature of liberal 'democratic' political systems (1993, pp.97-8). The difficulty with Young's position

however, is not political, but analytical. She does not explain why and how groups are marginalized, nor how group overlap may identify the complexities of oppressive relations. I feel socialist feminist dual systems theory has been far more successful in capturing the complex and contradictory interrelations between different oppressions by utilizing a structural approach. It is to such approaches and their postmodern critics, to which I now turn.

THEORIZING PATRIARCHY: RADICAL FEMINISM

Radical feminism is distinctive from liberal and Marxist feminisms in contending the oppression of women is systematic and systemic, and should be conceptualized as produced by an independent system of male domination. The concept most commonly used to describe such a system of is 'patriarchy', a system of structured dominance in which men as a group dominate women as a group, and from which most men largely benefit (Millett, 1970). Radical feminist analyses differ as to the origin and constituent structures of patriarchy, but concur patriarchy is not derivative of any other system of dominance and inequality.

Patriarchy

The distinguishing characteristic of radical feminism is that a system of gender dominance, patriarchy, is responsible for gender oppression. The latter is not, for radical feminists, produced by other dominations such as class and race, but is autonomous, although this is not to suggest that a system of patriarchy does not exhibit different forms and degrees of oppressive severity, across time and cultural space (Rowland and Klein, 1996, p.14). Radical feminists do not cast all men as some form of 'enemy', equally responsible for the oppression of women (as charged by Segal, 1987; Spelman, 1988). Patriarchy is used by radical feminists to emphasize the social construction of gender as a system of power relations that is changeable, not immutable. Mackinnon (1989) argues gender is not about 'difference', but about social hierarchy. Gender relations may result in the expression of differences, but difference between men and women is not the issue of relevance. Mackinnon is often misrepresented for advocating a 'biologically determinist' position (Butler, 1993, pp.238-9), but it is clear she sees gender as a social construct which can also be oppressive for some men. Mackinnon (1994) argues men have unequal power in a patriarchal society, particularly if they are seen as 'insufficiently masculine', and she contends men can be 'feminized', and be subjected to patriarchal violence such as rape. Mackinnon's notion that some men may be feminized as a means of subordinating them in power relations, will be employed in the empirical research for this thesis. It will be argued for example, that in soft core pornographic representation, images of men are often feminized when consumers of material are gay men, but are masculinized when the consumers are straight women. Mackinnon's differentiation of men and their power locations, is similar to the point made by Walby (1990), that to deploy a theory of

'patriarchy' does not homogenize men, but allows us to distinguish 'patriarchal men' from those who are not. Mackinnon does not argue that all wimmin are equally likely to be subjected to the same forms and degrees of patriarchal dominance, but that experience differs widely, and is shaped by cross-cutting oppressions of class and race.

Theories of patriarchy have been criticized as purely descriptive (Coward, 1983), unable to explain the origins of male power (Bryson, 1992). This accusation is strange, for the question of origins is one most feminisms avoid, as much speculation is inevitable. Some radical feminists have attempted to examine the origins of patriarchy and asserted this lies with decline of matrilineal descent (Lerner, 1986; Reed, 1987), change of value system associated with hunting (Collard, 1988), decline of Goddess worship (Stone, 1977; Lerner, 1986; Eisler, 1988; Starhawk, 1990), discovery of the male role in reproduction (Rich, 1977; O'Brien, 1981), and development of agriculture (Fisher, 1987). These theories have been accused of bias and lack of evidence, but they do not claim to 'prove' the origins of patriarchy, and as Millett points out: 'Conjecture about origins is always frustrated by a lack of evidence.' (1970, pp.27-8). Such theories do provide a counter to similarly dubious mainstream literature, and will be briefly examined in Chapter 3.

Patriarchal theories are also accused of a homogenizing conception of men as 'enemy', the logical solution to which is lesbian separatism. There are incredibly few radical feminists who label all men 'enemies' (possibly Gearheart, 1982; Solenas, 1983), and whilst revolutionary radical feminists (Coveney et al, 1984; Jeffreys, 1990) have advocated abstinence from heterosex as a strategy for patriarchal destabilization, this is not the majority radical feminist position and does not involve 'man-hating'. It is a simplistic reading of radical feminist theory which implies all men oppress all wimmin, and to the same extent and in the same ways. Relatedly, patriarchy has been accused of ahistoricism, false universalism (Coward, 1983) and over-generalization of wimmin's oppression (Lorde, 1981; Ramazanoglu, 1989). For example, Rich (1977) has an account of patriarchy that seems to remove wimmin from their social context in emphasizing a common experience of mothering, and Dworkin (1974) links foot-binding in pre-revolutionary China to the plucking of eyebrows. Black feminists have criticized such theorizing for obscuring racism (hooks, 1982; Carby, 1982; Davis, 1990; Collins, 1991) and argued it reflects a white, Western perspective (Lorde, 1981; Ramazanoglu, 1989; Spelman, 1988). However, radical feminists have rarely argued patriarchy is an historical constant nor denied the existence or cross-cutting influences of other oppressions (such as race: Griffin, 1981; Dworkin, 1981; Bowen, 1996; and class: Mahony and Zmroczek, 1996). Segal (1987) contends radical feminism sees wimmin as passive victims. However, all radical feminisms emphasize the importance of political action (Dworkin, 1988b; Bell and Klein, 1996), and sees its theorizing as helping to identify political struggles (Spender, 1985).

Some of the ways the theory of patriarchy has been used may exhibit a tendency to universalism and demonstrate a lack of sensitivity to historical location, cultural norms and differences amongst/between wimmin (particularly in earlier works eg. Dworkin, 1974; Brownmiller, 1976), but I concur with Walby (1990) this is not inevitable nor endemic in the theory itself, but a feature of the analyses provided by some of its less cautious exponents. Postmodern feminists would see even a careful, historically grounded, culturally specific theorization of gender relations as patriarchal as problematic, for they find the idea of a system of male domination per se a denial of both difference amongst/between wimmin and the fragmentation of social life endemic in postmodernity. Such a position will be considered in the section on postmodernism which follows.

A structural approach

In addition to a systemic notion of male domination, radical feminism has usually understood patriarchy to be composed of webs of relationships that exhibit some degree of regularity. These relations can be seen to be articulated in processes and institutions which form structures. Radical feminists dispute the relative significance of the structures identified here, but would probably concur with their identification. The key structures of patriarchy for radical feminists, are violence (Hanmer 1978; Hanmer and Saunders, 1984; Daly, 1979; Brownmiller, 1976; Dworkin, 1974, 1981, 1988a, 1988b); sexuality (Dworkin, 1988a; Jeffreys, 1985, 1990; Coveney et al, 1984; Griffin, 1982, 1988; Rich, 1980; Mackinnon, 1982, 1989) and culture (Daly, 1973, 1979, 1984, 1988; Spender, 1980, 1983), and in early works, the family (Millett, 1970; Firestone, 1971).

Male violence against wimmin constitutes a system of social control (Hanmer, 1978; Hanmer and Maynard, 1987; Caputi, 1988; Russell and Radford, 1994). Radical feminists have argued for example, that rape and domestic battery *are* systemic and systematic, and relatively common (Mackinnon, 1989, p.332), political acts the effect of which is to maintain certain forms of power relation in which most men are privileged whether they carry out such acts of violence or not (Hanmer, 1978, p.229). Others have adopted a broader definition of 'violence' and seen pornography as a form of violence against wimmin that takes both physical (it has the effect of causing violence) and non-physical (wimmin can be 'assaulted' by textual representation) form (Mackinnon, 1989, 1994; Dworkin, 1981).

Sexuality reflects male desire and is a mechanism via which patriarchal conceptions of femininity are imposed on wimmin. Heterosexuality is a key institution of patriarchy organizing many aspects of gender relations (Johnson, 1974; Rich, 1980; Mackinnon, 1989; Jeffreys, 1990). Some have seen sexuality as a system of social stratification fused into one system with patriarchy, and speak of hetero-patriarchy (Hanmer, 1989). Mackinnon sees gender, power and sexuality as very closely interacting, and sometimes suggests interaction may be so close, she almost gives the

impression these three categories are conflated (1989, pp.126-131). I do not think this is her intent, but that she is trying to indicate the extensive nature of the sexualization of gendered relations of power. Mackinnon concentrates her critique on heterosexuality, but it is clear that she sees homosexuality as implicated in patriarchal power relations, for she argues that sexuality may be so scarred by gendered relations, that it is shaped by relations of subordination and dominance whatever the sexuality of the participants. More recently Mackinnon (1994) has adopted a similar stance to Jeffreys (1990), arguing patriarchy sexualizes inequality and that such sexualization is the 'velvet glove on the iron fist' of gendered domination.

Others have emphasized the role of cultural institutions and forms in creating and reproducing male dominance, such as education (Spender, 1980), language (Daly, 1989), the media and popular culture (Caputi, 1989; Spender, 1995). Spender (1980) has argued language is patriarchally controlled and a mechanism of enforcing subordination. She further argues (1983) that knowledge, both academic and popular is patriarchal and effectively obscures an understanding of male social power. Kappeler (1987) and Caputi (1989), have contended patriarchal ideology is carried by a variety of texts of popular culture, from romance novels to horror films. Daly (1973, 1979) contends sets of patriarchal ideas (such as those of male dominated religion) are concretized in specific practices that are institutionally rooted (for example in the treatment of wimmin by the church in terms of exclusion, violence etc.).

Some radical feminists, particularly those writing in the 1970s (Greer, 1970; Figs, 1970; Morgan, 1970) saw the household as a particularly important structure of gendered oppression. According to Millet: 'Patriarchy's chief institution is the family' (1970, p.33) which sustains male power in the public world in addition to being oppressive itself due to domestic exploitation which has been seen as the 'economic base' of patriarchy (Delphy, 1980). Other radical feminists argued it is sexual and reproductive rather than the domestic exploitation in the household that is important (Firestone, (1971) 1988, p.21). This is a more contemporary position (O'Brien, 1981; Corea, 1985; Klein, 1996; although there are exceptions, Delphy, 1984), emphasizing the radical feminist prioritization of structures of violence, sexuality and culture in their analysis of patriarchy. The family and reproduction are structures which are both ideological and material, shaping economic, legal and physical conditions of reproduction of both children, and work in the household (Hartmann, 1995; Delphy, 1984, p.217).

Radical feminism places wimmin at the centre of its analysis, and refuses to assimilate their needs and experiences into pre-existing perspectives. A key shared experience is wimmin's domination by male social power. Radical feminist theory seeks to expose this patriarchal domination, analyze how it is maintained, and thereby challenge it successfully. To argue patriarchy is an autonomous and structured system of oppression is not necessarily to exclude the

possibility that it interacts with other oppressive forms such as class and race, or nature. Some radical feminists do tend to suggest that patriarchy can account for other forms of domination (Collard, 1988; Daly, 1988), but this is not implied by a theory of patriarchy per se. I would adopt the radical feminist concept of a system of domination based on interrelated areas of oppressive relations (structures), and whilst patriarchy has bearing upon other kinds of oppression, and shapes them in significant ways, the human domination of the environment for example, cannot be reductively explained by gendered dominance.

POSTMODERNISM AND GENDER RELATIONS

Postmodernism can be seen as standing in direct contrast to radical feminism in that it has fragmented the concept of gender by arguing it is too internally differentiated to be utilized in a unitary manner, and has denied the possibility of overarching theories of patriarchy based upon such unitary concepts. Postmodernism rejects the 'grand narratives' of all-embracing world views (such as theories of patriarchy) which it is claimed, demonstrate a falsely universalizing picture of the world which denies differences amongst oppressed groups. Some socialist feminists have seen postmodern ideas as pertinent in theorizing gender relations (Flax, 1992; Fraser and Nicholson, 1990) or even as 'identical' with the feminist project (Meese, 1986, p.xi). Most radical feminists have resisted the 'postmodern turn' in social theory, criticizing male postmodernists as patriarchal in the de-gendered and idealist nature of their theorizing (Brodribb, 1992).

The rejection of patriarchy as a 'grand narrative'

Postmodernism rejects both the Western conception of reason (which radical feminists have also questioned, Waters, 1996), and the search for 'truth' which it contends can only be provisional, as objectivity and verification are impossible. The search for truth and certainty must be abandoned as a dated product of a past era (modernism). The present, it is argued, is postmodern, and society characterized by fragmentation, diversity and diffuseness (Jameson, 1982), thus postmodern theories reflect uncertainty and fragmentation. Just as postmodernism is critical of Marxism for purporting to have a God's eye view (Fraser and Nicholson, 1990, pp.2-3) of the organizing principles of society, radical feminism in particular is criticized for having a Goddess's (third) eye view - patriarchy, a 'grand theory' of wimmin's oppression. Whilst refraining from an analysis of wimmin's oppression in the 'real' world (because that world cannot be real, Flax, 1991, p.199), postmodernists have seen a theory of patriarchy as itself oppressive.

Flax (1990) has argued strongly for a postmodern feminism (Hekman, 1990, p.157) which can account for all forms of gender relations, including those which do not reflect male dominance (Flax, 1990, pp.22-4). Fraser and Nicholson are trenchant in their critique of theories of patriarchy

as totalizing, difference-reducing (in terms of race, class etc) and universalist (1990, p.31). As argued above however, it is not apparent that theories of patriarchy homogenize all social relations between the sexes as oppressive, but may actually facilitate distinction (Walby, 1990). Mackinnon (1996) argues such critiques of patriarchy make the inconsistent assumption that the concepts of race and class are 'real', in deconstructing gender which is not (1996, p.50). She argues postmodern feminists are themselves reductionist in homogenizing 'white women' as not oppressed (p.52). She further contends that to argue wimmin are systemically oppressed is not to dismiss other systems of oppression which interrelate with patriarchy, but in order to establish the need for patriarchy's gender specificity she examines how the concept of privileged 'white wimmin' is constructed as patriarchal discourse. She argues even when we look at the situation of the most 'privileged' wimmin in modern Western society, we see oppression (pp.53-4) on the basis of gender which affects all wimmin eg. sexual harassment and rape.

McLellan (1995) argues the position of Flax, Fraser and Nicholson is not actually feminist, for it sees the 'uniform features of gender identity (as) definitively subsidiary to other differences' (1995, p.404). McLellan charges Flax et al with a failure to recognize that complex 'modernist' approaches can account for social complexity whilst retaining 'grand theory' such as that proposed by Walby (1990) (McLellan, 1995, p.399). He argues postmodern feminism is impossible, for whilst Flax et al appear to have embraced postmodernism, their position is in some ways similar to complex modernist accounts. Flax still demonstrates an allegiance to some form of standard via which to evaluate theory (1990, p.212), and is concerned postmodernism may commit the 'fallacy' of 'presuppositionlessness' (p.224). Nicholson compromises her postmodernism by re-introducing structure and even system accounts into discursive analysis: 'by admitting *big categories* into narrative accounts, we can acknowledge the possibility of *structural features of societies remaining relatively static over time*' (1992, p.98, my emphasis). Hekman (1990) has argued one of the benefits of postmodern feminist epistemology is its understanding of 'all knowledge' as contextual, but I think even she would avoid a complete denial of the 'real' unless prepared to concede, as McLellan mischievously posits: 'that the earth was flat during the time that it was perceived to be so' (1995, p.402). Thus postmodern feminism, may not be quite so 'post' as it may at first appear.

Most radical feminists have refused to accept the postmodern deconstruction of patriarchy as have some socialist feminists (Barrett, 1992; Segal, 1994) and so have been labeled 'essentialist'. It has been alleged radical feminist approaches exemplify the 'essentialist' assumption of a 'true' female experience which assumes wimmin's experiences are patriarchally the same and obscures differences created by cross-cutting oppressions (Ramazanoglu, 1989; Spelman, 1988). However, those theories most heavily criticized for 'essentialism', such as those on mothering (Ruddick, 1990) and reproduction (O'Brien, 1981; Corea, 1985) never argue for a 'true' experience of female biology, but that such experiences are presently socially and culturally defined in a patriarchal

manner. I concur some theorists either do not engage in cross-cultural comparison (Chodorow, 1978) or when they do so, analysis is weak on contrast (Daly, 1979). However, it is not clear that a theory of patriarchy itself is 'essentialist', or inevitably denies the existence of other forms of oppression as postmodern feminists have charged. Radical feminists are not 'essentialist', but some are less cautious than they might be. There is some pertinence in Richardson's (1996) contention that radical feminism is caricatured in its critique as 'essentialist', with only a few radical feminist theorists repeatedly cited in a reductionist picture, (as provided by Alcoff, 1988, pp.408-414), which is an unrepresentative view of relatively old radical feminist texts used to assert 'patriarchy' is dated (Richardson, 1996, pp.143-4). This said, I feel analysis of patriarchy could be made more sensitive to other oppressions via the adoption of a dual systems approach, investigating how patriarchy may interrelate with other forms of domination.

'Essentialism' and the theorizing of gender

'Essentialism' is a criticism made of theories which are held to reflect 'a belief in the real, true essence of phenomena' (Fuss, 1989, p.xi), the idea 'things' have fixed properties throughout time. Poststructuralists and postmodernists (Derrida, 1978; Lyotard, 1984, 1988; Jameson, 1982; Harvey, 1989) and some feminists (Nicholson, 1990; Butler, 1990; Segal, 1994) have rejected the categories of men and women as 'essentialist', prone to sociobiological naturalization of human 'nature'. Despite the often explicit disavowal of biological determinism by radical feminists so accused (eg. Rich, 1977, pp.12-13; Griffin, 1988, pp.94-9; Raymond, 1994, p.xix), some postmodern feminists have made concerted efforts to label them as such (Alcoff, 1988). Fuss (1989) has interestingly contended that postmodern social constructionism is partially refuted by its own logic, i.e. that everything is, (essentially!), socially constructed rather than biologically given (1989, pp.2-6). More importantly, Thompson (1996) has pointed out the critique of essentialism relies on the same framework it purports to reject, for 'essentialism' depends 'on a master narrative of truth...it is judged to be false from a position which is outside all positions' (1996, p.334). Ferguson refrains from criticizing feminist conceptions of 'women' as biologically essentialist, but claims they are 'socially essentialist' in assuming static social divisions between men and women (Ferguson, 1989, p.54). Postmodern feminists have contended 'women' and 'men' are constructs which lack coherence and are culturally and historically variable (Flax, 1990). Femininity and masculinity have been seen as so pluralistic gender is dismissed as a category of analysis (Fraser and Nicholson, 1990). However, it is not clear that to conceptualize gender denies plurality, or change (Weedon, 1987, p.105) over time. Some have argued gender involves the articulation of race and class differences (Mies, 1986), and the renegotiation and restructuring of institutions and processes and their associated power relations (Jeffreys, 1990; Walby, 1997).

Some radical feminists have criticized postmodern deconstructionism as not only denying the reality of gender, but as denying the concreteness of wimmin's bodies, by speaking of them only as texts (Brodribb, 1992). As Spretnak (1996, p.323) notes, postmodern feminism reflects a disembodied view of the world which is unlikely to be helpful in understanding the concrete forms of domination enacted on wimmin's bodies. Klein (1996) is concerned that by endorsing 'multiple subject positions' postmodern feminist theorists of the body (e.g. Butler, 1993; Grosz, 1994) adopt a libertarian stance in which 'anything' goes in terms of the physical treatment of female bodies which are texts on which anything may be 'inscribed' (1996, p.350). It seems as though to speak of the body as matter (as flesh, blood, bone and sinew) which can experience pain and pleasure is seen as 'essentialist' by postmodern feminists who insist we speak of bodies as representations or texts that can be reconstructed (Haraway, 1991, p.163). Butler (1990) for example, emphasizes the dualism between 'culture' and 'nature' so criticized by radical and eco-feminists (Griffin, 1988; Plumwood, 1993) in suggesting the body be seen 'as the medium' which must be destroyed and 'transfigured' for 'culture to emerge' (1990, p.130). The postmodern deconstruction of the real into narratives and texts is as problematic for wimmin as it is for animals, as discussed in Chapter 1. The deconstruction of the real is unable to capture the dynamics of both gendered and natured power which is embodied in specific (physical) practices upon the (real) bodies of wimmin and animals. Ironically, such deconstruction returns us to a key motif of the Enlightenment tradition postmodern feminists claim to oppose, an anthropocentric privileging of human mind over matter.

Gender as 'difference'

Postmodernism has emphasized specificity and subjectivity to such an extent it has questioned concepts such as 'woman' as misleading labels that obscure the diverse realities they claim to represent (Flax, 1986, 1990; Nicholson, 1990). Flax argues established concepts need to be rethought in a manner which allows them to 'float freely' (Flax, 1992, p.457), seeming to suggest specific conceptualization is almost irrelevant. Some have been concerned that in deconstructing wimmin and gender as concepts, feminist politics is thereby deconstructed, and Lovibond has argued this may be 'politically convenient' for those (men) advantaged by the project of modernity (1989, p.22; also Di Stephano, 1990; Waters, 1996). Maynard, defending the concepts 'race' and 'black', argues such generalized categories are of importance to a politics of resistance, and their radical deconstruction is linked to a 'benign pluralism' (1994, p.11). Feminists attracted to postmodern approaches often still see a political need for concepts of race, class and gender (Phillips, 1992, p.28), and even Butler in one of her weaker moments concedes 'there is some political necessity to speak as and for women' (1993, p.15).

Such criticism is not only political, but analytic, for the accentuation of difference can obscure any evidence of oppression, and black feminists have voiced concern that conceptual

deconstruction may displace the understanding of racism and gender oppression that wimmin of colour have obtained via an Afro-centric feminist epistemology (hooks, 1991; Collins, 1990). Walby (1992) argues the concepts of gender, race and class should be retained on analytic merit, and postmodern approaches have gone 'too far' in their emphasis on difference and fragmentation, for in their dispersal of notions of power and identity, they ignore social context and 'preclude the possibility of noting the extent to which one social group is oppressed by another' (1992, p.35). Contrary to poststructuralist notions of difference, she argues there are widely repeated features of gender relations (structures) and there are sufficient interconnections between the latter to talk of a system of patriarchy (p.36). Walby is concerned that the move towards poststructural and postmodern forms of discourse analysis involves the eclipse of a notion of structure (p.49), and proposes a dual (or triple) systems approach to capture the complexities of gender, race and class dynamics. However, I am not convinced we must choose between discourses and structures as our mode of analysis (nor I feel is Walby more latterly, 1997), and will later argue for a combination of structure and discourse wherein the latter can catch the complexities at a micro-level, which facilitate the construction of the former at the macro-level.

Agency and the eclipse of structure

The postmodern deconstruction of the self into multiple identities has been seen as part of the expansion of theories of agency as opposed to structure in sociology (Craib, 1992, p.27). Postmodern sociology has stressed the action of the subject in changing discourses of femininities and in its emphasis on subjective motivation, postmodern feminism sees itself as avoiding both the 'essentialist' denial of difference in a conception of contingent identity (transformed by political action), and a 'structuralist' denial of wimmin's agency (Weedon, 1987, p.41; Charles, 1996, p.10).

I feel the success of postmodern feminist understandings of wimmin's agency is dependent in part on the extent to which they are willing to deconstruct the subject. Charles has argued, 'the notion of a unified subjectivity is essential to feminist practice' (1996, p.32), and some feminists have sought to combine the notion of a socially constructed, flexible and diverse identity that can incorporate difference, with the articulation of a feminist politics that emphasizes both female solidarity and a transgression/transmutation of patriarchal constructions of womunhood (Roseneil, 1996). I would argue such a partial deconstruction of the gendered subject is plausible, but a more radically deconstructivist position (e.g. Butler, 1990, 1993) over-emphasizes the fluidity of gender boundaries to such a degree that an understanding of power relations is lost. In addition, the deconstruction of the subject may be so severe, that people as active agents, seem very remote, and as Maynard remarks: 'no-one in postmodern analyses actually appears to do anything' (1994, p.19).

There are two problems however with the postmodern feminist stress on agency that apply to all the approaches, whatever their success in understanding wimmin as active agents. First, is the extent to which supposedly changing discourses of gender have actually had an impact on wimmin (Maynard, 1994), for as Jeffreys notes (1994, 1996) in her critique of Butler (1990), it is uncertain whether the majority of wimmin actually realize that a whole new range of gender identities are actually 'open' to them. Second, whilst postmodern feminists have been keen to deploy discourse analysis, they seem to have lost Foucault's understanding of discourses as powerful (1971, 1976(b) 1979) and resistant to change. Feminism can utilize postmodern insights to guard against over-generalization, ahistoricism and ethnocentrism (Nicholson, 1990), and can use discourse analysis to demonstrate how power is constructed (Weedon, 1987; Ramazanoglu and Holland, 1993). However, in its stronger forms the extreme relativism of postmodern feminism seems unable to differentiate between situations of freedom and those of oppression. Whilst an understanding of wimmin's agency is undoubtedly of importance in feminist theory, the restraints upon such agency need also to be identified. In arguing for a realist approach that sees wimmin as more than texts, and gender as relations of power exhibiting some consistency of form, I feel an analysis of gendered social structure is the means of identifying such restraints.

STRUCTURAL AND POSTMODERN APPROACHES TO GENDER RELATIONS

'Indeed, any attempt to totalize the social field is to be read as a symptom, the effect and remainder of a trauma that itself cannot be directly symbolized in language. This trauma subsists as the permanent possibility of disrupting and rendering contingent any discursive formation that lays claim to a coherent or seamless account of reality. It persists as the real, where the real is always that which any account of "reality" fails to include. The real constitutes the contingency or lack in any discursive formation. As such, it stands theoretically as a counter both to Foucaultian linguisticism, construed as a kind of discursive monism whereby language effectively brings into being that which it names and to Habermasian rationalism which presumes a transparency of intention in the speech act that is itself symptomatic of a refusal of the psyche, the unconscious, that which resists and yet structures language prior to any "intention."'

Butler, 'Arguing with the Real', *Bodies that Matter*, (1993, p.192)

'To claim objective truth for one's statements is to lay ones cards on the table to expose oneself to the possibility of refutation. It is to make it clear that one is talking about something, and saying that that 'something' is thus and not so; this makes it possible for others to point out features which are not as claimed and hence disprove your opinion.....Non-realism.....licenses any and every form of dogmatism....It enables the theorist to say 'since I am not claiming objective truth for my theories, I can go on saying what I like, and your counter-examples have no relevance for me' – and then go on saying things that have no point at all unless they are making claims about how the world is.'

Collier, *Critical Realism* (1994, pp.13-14)

'...postmodern theorising is marked by a relativism that tries to persuade us that any theoretical construction, however bizarre or crude is just as true or false as any other. It is also not suprising that postmodernist theory tends to adopt a style where the lack of depth

of substantive analysis is concealed by a quasi-poetical language glorying in the obscure...I do not believe...that to insist on clarity of expression is a form of intellectual terrorism.'

Mouzelis, *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong?* (1995, p.55, p.11)

This section argues for a structural and systemic theory of patriarchy, similar to that proposed by Walby (1990), whilst accepting certain difficulties with such a position. The argument for the necessity for a realist ontology and a structural approach is established via a critique of the postmodern idealism of Butler (1990, 1993) as being similarly problematic in the extremity of its relativism in theorizing gender relations, as was argued in relation to the work of Haraway (1989, 1991) in theorizing 'nature' and human/animal relations.

(En)acting the narrative - gender as performance

Butler challenges the notion of gender as being incapable, even if modified, of accounting for difference. Her focus (1990) is the fragmentation of identity, specifically whether there is any coherence to the category 'lesbian' (1990, p.5), but this is intertwined with the key question of whether 'womun' can be regarded as any kind of unified subject. She argues, as have many postmodern feminists, that gender cannot be separated out from other forms of 'difference'. Butler however takes the argument further, contending 'gender' cannot be detached as a concept (we are to assume this applies also to race and class) from the 'discursively produced identities' of individuals. Thus use^{of} the representational term 'womun' is problematic, for its definition may be exclusive, or a product of the context of current gender relationships (the 'heterosexual matrix').

Butler contends identity is socially constructed via action. Gender or any form of social structure is not a priori, as she puts it: 'the "doer" is invariably constructed through the deed' (1990, p.142). There is no certain 'reality' for Butler, the self constructs the acts and is thereby constructed, and fluidity of identity is crucial, being the mechanism by which change is facilitated. For Butler, there is no 'truth', no 'real' female identity we can strive for, we have to act within the gender identities of the historical and cultural location in which we find ourselves. Butler refers to this process as 'performance', we act in terms of gender identities and relations - they are not 'real', but what 'we' do. Change comes from the internal disruption of such gender categories primarily via parody in the form of drag. Men dressing as wimmin for example may adopt a stereotypical 'feminine' apparel and behaviour, but this:

'...also reveals the distinctness of those aspects of gendered experience which are falsely naturalized as a unity through the regulatory fiction of heterosexual coherence. In imitating gender, drag implicitly reveals the imitative structure of gender itself - as well as its contingency.' (1990, p.137)

This is because drag does not parody an 'original' femininity, but the concept of such an original gender identity (p.138) and the idea of 'gender' and of 'womun' as unitary categories. For Butler, it can illuminate the extent to which wimmin play at being feminine, to which they imitate wimmin. We change gender therefore, by performing a different script. However, as Benhabib (1992) argues, gender is not constructed exclusively by our action, and it is a reductionist position which contends so. Benhabib is unclear how Butler's gender performance is to be changed unless wimmin can 'have a say in the production of the play itself' (1992, p.215), hinting at a notion of social structure within which human action takes place.

This is the crux of the problem I believe, with Butler's understanding of gender relations. To speak of gender as 'playing' and 'performance' obscures a sense of gender relations as relations of power which can be oppressive, and exhibit a significant degree of continuity over time. In addition, this denial of any patterning in gender relations, and a view of agency as constructive of reality, is highly individualist in a liberal pluralist (not a radical pluralist) sense. I believe that Butler sees the world through the lens of the individual who refuses categorization (1993, pp.ix-x) as a 'womun' or a 'lesbian' or whatever. There's a little sense of social structure in Butler's world of text and narrative (unless her weakly defined concept of the 'heterosexual matrix' is an admission of structural relations). In her defence, it could be argued Butler's concern is limited to the imposition of categories and identities, but still I am concerned onto *what* these categories are actually imposed. Are people real, or are they, body and psyche, blank pages for social inscription? Butler acknowledges such questions in her more recent work (1993, p.xi), reiterating her contention (1990) there is no pre-gendered self:

'Subjected to gender, but subjectivated by gender, the 'I' neither precedes nor follows...but emerges only within and as the matrix of gender relationships themselves.' (1993, p.7)

Although Butler does not explicitly acknowledge it, I think she is concerned here with the relation between structure and agency, or more precisely, reflecting her concerns, between ideology and agency. Butler can be seen as a social constructionist although she is aware that this raises problems for a theory of performativity (1993, p.7). She speaks of gender as imposed, a 'regulatory schema' 'within' the 'productive constraints' of which we live (p.xi) but fails to discuss the precise nature of this 'schema', 'who' imposes it and how, for this would be to concede a notion of structure in the idea of construction. We are left with the rather odd picture of an agent who is produced by some norms of gender (which previous agents alone produced), who somehow (how?) would/could resist them.

To escape the dilemmas of constructionism, Butler pushes the argument further in renouncing externality, ie. any 'thing' that produces a construct. Butler's world is one of flux in which all is process, we cannot speak of a material world but a process of materialization. Thus Butler writes a

book on the 'body' (1993) without discussing bodies at all - as Klein (1996) remarks, these are 'virtual bodies' of a world of text and narrative. Despite some comments to the contrary, I believe for Butler, there is no world beyond the text, she does not merely contest ('argue with') the 'real', she does not think it is there. As the body is a text, its parts can be seen as symbols which can be re-figured and re-arranged, 'disrupting' and 'displacing' the status quo. Thus lesbians can acquire the signifier of the penis, the phallus, as a dildo, which Butler sees positively in disrupting gender relations (1993, p.91). As Klein (1996) notes however, Butler's alternative images are highly patriarchal. Butler sees this as inevitable, for she does not feel it is possible for us to think or act outside the dominant narratives. Thus we: 'resignify the very heterosexual constructs by which (lesbianism) is partially and inevitably constituted' (1993, p.128). Some feminists have welcomed Butler's theorization of the 'lesbian phallus' as a step towards the development of positive, pluralistic theories of sexuality (Ussher, 1997, p.167). However, others have suggested a more radical position involves the displacement of phallocentrism and the eroticization of wimmin's bodies rather than plastic and rubber 'penises', and thus the displacement of 'traditional masculinist contexts' (Chisholm, 1995, p.36), and possible transcendence of dualism in sexual roles.

In writing of lesbian resignification, Butler has been heavily criticized by radical feminists for extensively drawing upon male theorists in whose work wimmin are marginalized (Brodribb, 1992; Hoff, 1996). This is not the crux of the problem however, which is Butler's lack of consideration of gendered power. As Jeffreys (1994, 1996) has contended, the difficulty with Butler's work is her inability to account for the 'reality' of wimmin's oppression, or to 'invisibilise the power relations of male supremacy' (1996, p.361). Jeffreys argues Butler has an 'idealist understanding of the oppression of women' (p.364), and makes the point wimmin's oppression does not reside in 'feminine' apparel or demeanor, but in social structures that constrain them physically, economically and sexually. Butler fails to see gender relations as those of power and therefore that most men have interests that are served by patriarchal social relations. hooks (1994) has demonstrated a similar concern with the efficacy of representation (or 'texts') in altering actual social structures and practices, or indeed, in understanding the latter. I find it difficult to see how Butler's conception of gender relations as 'fabrications manufactured and sustained' through 'signs and other discursive means' (1990, p.136) can apply to certain aspects of wimmin's experience, such as domestic violence, rape or segregation in the workplace.

In contrast to postmodern approaches to gender relations discussed earlier in this chapter (Flax, 1990, Fraser and Nicholson, 1990), Butler does not qualify her relativism or her idealism. Gender is a role we play, a narrative we enact, the body is a text for social inscription for particular gendered narratives. There is no structure as such, merely action and those texts/narratives which are realized by it. As was apparent in Chapter 1, I find such an approach unhelpful in understanding relations of power which I feel have a corporeal existence and 'real' effect. Whereas Flax and

Nicholson do concede the possibility of social structure which might exist alongside their discursive commentary of text and narrative, Butler does not allow for this.

In some ways, Butler's position can be seen to have certain similarities with Giddens theory of structuration (1979, 1984). Butler's agents, for example, her lesbians in drag (aping femininities or masculinities), are self-reflexive with regards to their performance of gender, endorsing Giddens view of the agent which 'reflexively monitors' its conduct (1979, p.253), aware of the circumstances in which they act. Butler never explicitly refers to social structure, whereas Giddens deploys the concept in reference to social 'institutions' (Mouzelis, 1997, p.117). Giddens notion of structure is dynamic and volatile however, for structure is produced/reproduced via reflexive agents (Giddens, 1979, p.255) who draw on their understanding of their social situation and through their action reproduce and change it. Giddens tends to prioritize the agent in the production and reproduction of social structure and 'systemness' (1979, p.106), despite his disclaimer neither structure nor agency is 'more basic' (p.257), and crucial to structuration is a conception of the active and choosing agent. Agents must be able to 'act otherwise' in any given situation (p.56) and to 'organize' their 'wants' (p.58), and it is this notion of choice which distinguishes humans as 'actors' from other animals, whose 'behaviour' is not action (p.56) (2). For Giddens people must be able to choose to reproduce social institutions or alter them in their reproduction of social relations (p.63). Giddens suggests choice is 'real' i.e. it involves making of decisions with causal effect, denying the possibility agents may perceive themselves choosing, despite a lack of effectiveness of those decisions due to structural constraints. Giddens does not fully deploy his theory of 'structuration', constantly referring to structure and agency as separate yet interactive (see Mouzelis, 1991, 1995). I think Butler's understanding of action and process operationalizes Giddens' sense of the conflation of a continually dynamic structure/agency whilst rendering the latter a priori in her stress on process and transformation. Giddens does speak of structures whereas Butler does not, but sees them not as external to agents, but as implicated in the production/reproduction of social systems (1984, pp.41-5), and I feel it is such implication to which Butler alludes. Giddens (1984) could be read to argue action pre-supposes structures which in turn are reproduced/alterd via action (a position I would not dispute) but I feel he gives more priority to action than this, seeing structure as 'part and parcel' of human conduct (Mouzelis, 1991, p.27).

For Archer (1995, 1996) and Mouzelis (1991, 1995, 1997), the conflationary tendencies of Giddens position is implausible, and both advocate a dualist understanding of structure/agency, as argued by Lockwood (1964; see Mouzelis, 1997, pp.111-14). Mouzelis (1991) and Archer (1995) see structure and agency as possessing their own emergent properties which are not reducible to each other. Mouzelis (1991) suggests agency and structure are likely to be co-present in any given situation, but their degree of importance may vary, in some situations structure will predominate in analysis, in others, agency (1991, p.101, 158). An approach which assumes equal co-presence he

sees as reductionist, and argues such an approach inaccurately minimizes social hierarchy (1991, p.141). However, Mouzelis (1995) provides a qualified critique of Giddens, arguing structuration theory can be 'restructured' in a way which renders it useful (1995, p.101). He wants to replace the concepts of action and agency, by those of 'social games' people 'play'. What Mouzelis means by this is most unclear as the concept 'social game' is not defined, or discussed in relation to a notion of structure. As Layder (1996) charges, the analogy of 'games' seems rather close to the very poststructural and postmodern theories of social action which Mouzelis is so dismissive.

Archer (1995) is more enthusiastic in asserting that structure and agency are independently variable, and advocates a social realist ontology in which structures and agents belong to different emergent strata of social reality. She rightly contends (1996, pp.688-9) the problem with Giddens' approach is not only his conflation of structure/agency which prevents investigation of the specific interplay between the two, but an over-emphasis on the 'minutiae of everyday activities' (p.688) as the action through which structure is mediated. For Archer, structure is something more than 'social practices' which, when regularized become 'institutions' which are 'ever in a fluid process' (1996, p.689). Rather, social structures demonstrate regularity over time and are a priori, or 'pre-existent', a position of Bhaskarian realism (Bhaskar, 1989, p.4):

'we are all born into an on-going social context,...take our places in the prior distribution of resources, be sanctioned by its laws and confront its organisations' (Archer, 1996, p.683)

Thus structures (sets of systematic institutional/organizational/procedural relationships) which have a degree of continuity and regularity, can be said to pre-exist successive cohorts of agents, whilst being dependent on those agents for their replication and alteration (1996, pp.696-7). Archer (1995) argues structural properties are often resistant to change and may take considerable time to alter. Structural properties, can be ontologically established via empirical investigation, for structures have real existence (emergent features/powers that cannot be reduced to their constituents, see Sayer, 1992, p.119) and effect. Thus for Archer, structures are 'real', or rather, real. Archer concurs with Sayer (1992) that structures are objects (practices, institutions, roles) with emergent properties that have powers and liabilities, that exist regardless of our interpretation of them (Sayer, 1992, p.92, pp.5-6).

Through the relation of a critique of Butler to one of Giddens, drawing upon Mouzelis and Archer, we have moved far from postmodern approaches. I would endorse Archer's 'modernist' conception of social relations as both systemic and structural, but at the same time changed and transformed by human action. Whilst gender relations are transformative and dynamic, they do exhibit regularity and continuity, and I would argue, have a real existence beyond our 'performance' of them.

Gender as structured relations of power

Walby (1990, 1992) has argued for a structural approach to gendered social relations, but one in which structures are 'constantly recreated and changed by the social actions of which they are composed' (1997, p.7). I feel Walby's analysis of gender relations exemplifies the approach to social theory suggested by Archer (1995, 1996). Walby's structures are real, and have concrete effect, composed of closely interacting sets of institutions, roles and practices that exhibit continuity over time (are 'relatively enduring', Collier, 1994, p.16) and demonstrate certain regularities (Walby, 1990). They are structures of power relations that involve oppression and exploitation, but they differ across time and cultural, national, regional and local space (1997, pp.7-12). Walby suggests structures affect agency, which in turn reproduces and transforms them.

Walby is accused by critics of providing an over-concentration upon structure at the expense of agency, and some have charged her with an Althusserian 'abstract structuralism' (Pollert, 1996, p.639) in which interactive relations between agency and structure are lost, for action is determined by structure. Walby sees patriarchal structures as important sets of relations of power which are deep seated, and not always readily apparent, having what Bhaskar calls 'ontological depth' (Bhaskar, 1978). Collier (1994) would define this as a 'strong' form of Bhaskarian realism in which structures are conceived of as transphenomenal (going beyond appearances), and counterphenomenal (sometimes contradicting appearances) (1994, pp.6-7). This does not imply Walby (nor Bhaskar) see the world as an Althusserian puppet theatre. Whilst Walby sees structures as limiting, they are not determining, patriarchy changes (restructures) through feminist contestation (Walby, 1988; 1997). Bhaskar (1979, 1989) similarly argues structures do not determine agents, but both survive and change via human action. I concur with Bhaskar (1979) that the reproduction of structures is the most common form of human action, and will argue this with reference to the empirical findings of this research. I think this is Walby's contention when she argues agency involves 'constrained opportunities' (1997, p.7), although her recent work is concerned to show the transformative nature of gendered structures. This conception of action as primarily structural reproduction is a stark contrast to Butler's (1990, 1993) notion of the reflexive agent, but is implicit in a structural approach. As Bhaskar states most clearly:

'the properties possessed by social forms may be very different from those possessed by the individuals on whose activity they depend...purposiveness, intentionality and sometimes self-consciousness characterize human actions but not transformations in the social structure...people, in their conscious activity, for the most part unconsciously reproduce (and occasionally transform) the structures governing their substantive activities...people do not marry to reproduce the nuclear family or work to sustain the capitalist economy. Yet it is nevertheless the unintended consequence (and inexorable result) of, as it is also a necessary condition of, their activity...when social forms change, the explanation will not normally lie in the desires of agents to change them in that way, though....it *may* do so.' (Bhaskar, 1979, p.35)

Walby (1997) has developed this notion of dynamic structures in arguing uneven change has been taking place within the structures she identified in her earlier work (Walby, 1990). She contends we can see both gender convergence with men amongst more privileged wimmin (young, educated, employed) and shifting formal political relations with the increase of state feminism, and entrenched relations of patriarchal inequality in other areas and involving groups of wimmin differentially stratified. Social structures, she maintains, are changed and recreated by actors both male and female, individually and collectively, in ways which reinforce and alter power relations.

Walby deploys a theory of patriarchy (1990) conceptualized as a system of social structures in which men dominate, exploit and oppress women. She is interested in particular, in the ways in which different oppressive systems and their constituent structures interact, which makes her work of particular interest in relation to this thesis. In her earlier work (1986) she focuses on interrelations between gender and class, providing a complex and historically specific conception of the ways patriarchal and capitalist structures interact in both mutually constitutive and conflictual ways. Her attempt to demonstrate patriarchy and capitalism should be conceptualized as separate yet interlinked, is more complex and empirically rich than the forms of dual systems theory outlined earlier. Walby (1990) attempts to suggest a theory of patriarchy which may account for the range of gendered relations of power in modern Western societies. This involves a structural account of patriarchy as a system of gender oppression which is cross-cut by others (specifically class and 'race'), and which locates her theorizing in a middle position between dualists such as Eisenstein (1979) and Hartman (1981), and radical feminist conceptions of patriarchal structure.

Walby (1990) proposes a model of patriarchy composed of six relatively autonomous patriarchal structures: employment, household, culture, violence, sexuality and the state, emphasizing the significance of the household, the state, and particularly paid employment. She argues patriarchy is an historically changing animal with the ability to adapt to a dynamic environment in terms of the forms which it takes and the degrees it demonstrates (1986, 1990), contending in Britain in the last 150 years, we have seen a change in patriarchal form from private (household) to public (employment and state). Wimmin are no longer controlled individually by males in the family and excluded from both power and public, but are now controlled collectively, primarily by the state and within paid employment. Contemporary patriarchy does not exclude wimmin she contends, rather, it maintains control by segregating them in subordinate roles. What remains an historical constant however are 'wider patriarchal structures' of sexuality, violence and culture, those forming the focus of radical feminist theories of patriarchy. In each form of patriarchy the six structures remain, but the significance of household production and employment and the state shift historically. Walby is correct to suggest patriarchy changes in form and degree over time, and her argument that patriarchy has assumed increasingly public form is one I would not contest. Walby's acknowledgement of patriarchy as a system which is both relatively stable yet dynamic, and can be

seen to alter across time avoids the criticism of ahistoricism (Rowbotham, 1979) leveled at earlier dualist accounts (Eisenstein, 1979). Dualist theory (Hartmann, 1981) has also been criticized for prioritizing one system of oppression over others, stressing relations of compatibility and accommodation (Young, 1981), and insufficient theorization of certain systems of oppression (eg. capitalism, Pollert, 1996). Whilst some of these criticisms apply to earlier formulations of dualist theory, I do not feel they apply to Walby (1986, 1990, 1997) who provides a wide-ranging yet complex and historically and culturally specific account.

Pollert (1996) however, is antagonistic to Walby's selection of six patriarchal structures, arguing gender relations are 'everywhere', and their analysis within six structures is arbitrary 'Why not four, or forty, or whatever?' (1996, p.645). Walby's selection is based upon certain 'sets' of gendered relations that can be seen as closely interrelated groups of institutions and processes that capture relatively discreet arenas of wimmin's experiences in modern Western societies and can be seen as key sites within which certain oppressive relations cohere. Walby (1990) undertakes an exhaustive review of feminist and other literature in social theory in order to identify particular sets of relationships and develop the six structures, the operation of which is evaluated against existing empirical material. I concur with Walby's identification of six arenas of intermeshing relations, feeling for example, that paid employment is a site for different kinds of gender relations than pertain to the household. I find her institutional definition of 'culture' helpful, as I think that certain similar relations and processes do pertain between education and the media, and her definition enables us to distinguish between what pertains to ideology as a generalized realm of ideas and beliefs which may reflect oppressive relations, and certain types of institutions and processes that articulate the latter in specific ways.

However, whilst I concur with the specificity of her structures, I find Walby's circumscribing of particular structures restrictive at times, and think she underplays the links between/across them. Some phenomena do not fit easily into one particular structure, but may embody different types/sets of patriarchal relations at once. It will be contended pornography embodies three different kinds of patriarchal relations which pertain to the structures of culture, violence and sexuality, rather than the one kind, cultural, within which Walby analyzes it. Whilst I would agree sexuality and paid employment embody distinct sets of patriarchal relations, those relations are semi-autonomous and partially overlap. For example, certain forms of paid employment, such as sex work, are more sexualized than others. Some forms of sexuality may subject some groups of people to patriarchal relations articulated by the state (criminalization of certain behaviour) whereas other groups may remain largely outside such relations with respect to sexuality. Walby's prioritization of certain structures is also contestable. For Walby, the key patriarchal structures are household production in the nineteenth century, paid employment in the twentieth, with the increased significance of the state. Whilst such prioritization may pertain to analysis of the

articulation of patriarchy with capitalism, I will argue that in examining relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy, structures of violence, sexuality and culture, are of most significance.

Feminists have remained antagonistic to dualist theories, even when analyzing interrelations between two oppressive systems such as those based on 'race' and gender. Maynard and Afshar assert that the interrelations of oppressive systems are too complex to be 'readily comprehensible' in a 'simple way' by dual systems approaches (1994, p.2), and Pollert (1996) similarly argues with respect to class and gender that in 'social process', the two categories are not separable (1996, p.654). Whilst there are problems raised by dual systems theory, they do not revolve around a lack of complexity. As argued in the following chapter, there are not only two systems of oppression relevant in the analysis of specific cases of oppression, there may be three, four or more ('race', class, nature, gender etc.). Rather than seeing dualism as a specific form of feminism (Walby, 1990), dualist analysis will be used in this thesis as a useful approach in analyzing specific cases which may involve oppressive relations from different oppressive systems.

I do not think the identification of particular structures and their relations is straightforward, particularly when relations between two oppressive systems are being investigated, for relations are necessarily contingent and articulate in complex ways that are not easily isolated. This said, I believe a structural approach is needed to account for power relations with respect to gender, and is particularly pertinent to this research which seeks to examine the intricacies of relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy. As argued in Chapter 1, an explanation which stresses agency, or conflates agency with structure would prove highly problematic. As Craib argues, explanations of social structure and of agency are of different types (1992, p.21). In the case of the former, we are looking at particular arrangements of relationships. In the latter, we need to understand agents thinking, intentions and interpretations. Whilst a theory of patriarchy may be constructed that involves both structure and the agency of oppressor and oppressed, this is not possible in the case of anthroparchy in which the agency of the environment is an implausible arena for investigation in the sense that we cannot know for example, what animals intend, nor accurately understand their perceptions. This chapter proceeds with an account of the structures of patriarchy felt to be of most relevance for an analysis of interrelations with anthroparchy, and will end with an examination of literature on pornography, a phenomenon which is seen to be located in all of these structures.

STRUCTURES OF PATRIARCHY

Four structures of patriarchy are of particular concern for an analysis of patriarchal and anthroparchal relations: sexuality, culture, violence and the state. The feminist literature in these areas is reviewed here, and questions raised for this research. The ways the structures of patriarchy outlined here might interrelate to anthroparchy will be developed in the concluding chapter.

Important in outlining the content of the structures of patriarchy will be analysis of discourses of patriarchal power. The form of discourse analysis deployed by this research and its relationship both to feminist theorizing and the ideas of Foucault is discussed in detail in Chapter 3, but the relationship of discourse to structure requires a brief consideration. The combination of discourse analysis with a structural approach is one which is rare, but not entirely novel in feminist theorizing. I think Walby has shifted her position on the efficacy of such a combination of approaches. She has demonstrated reticence towards discourse analysis seeing it as standing in contradistinction to a structural approach to gender relations (1992), but has deployed the concept of discourse in examining the content of the patriarchal structures she outlines, particularly in the case of culture and sexuality (1990), and has moved to a position of endorsing such a combination of approaches (1997, p.5). Some radical feminist theorists have utilized discourse analysis within a structural approach in an implicit rather than explicit fashion.

Mackinnon (1989) analyzes the law as the means by which patriarchal ideas are institutionalized, incorporated or concretized into the patriarchal structure of the state. Sets of patriarchal ideas about for example, rape, abortion, sexuality and pornography (Mackinnon, 1989) are discourses of patriarchal power which can be identified in legal texts. For Mackinnon, the law as a text obscures the oppression of women by appearing neutral whilst embodying patriarchal discourse, thus;

‘no law gives men the right to rape women. (but) This has not been necessary, since no rape law has ever seriously undermined the terms of men’s entitlement to sexual access to women...No law guarantees that women will forever remain the social unequals of men. This is not necessary, because the law guaranteeing sex equality requires, in an unequal society, that before one can be equal legally, one must be equal socially. So long as power enforced by law reflects and corresponds - in form and in substance - to power enforced by men over women in society, the law is objective..’ (Mackinnon, 1989, p.239)

Thus liberal legalism, for Mackinnon, is a mechanism for making patriarchy invisible and legitimate. The law as a text is based on patriarchal discourse (and discourses of other oppressions, p.237), which are concretized into legislation enforced by the structure of the state. The law is a means of concretizing discourse: ‘a real moment in the social construction of these mirror-imaged inversions (patriarchal ideas) as truth’ (p.238). The state is seen as particularly significant for Mackinnon, because it is able (via law) to legitimate the social structures which construct the ‘reality’ of women’s oppression in paid employment, domestic labour, violence and popular culture (p.244). The way discourse will be conceived in relation to structure is similar to that suggested by Mackinnon. Discourses are conceptualized as sets of ideas (or ‘meanings’, Smart, 1989 (4)), that are embodied in texts (such as pornographic images) and assume concrete form in institutions and processes which interrelate to form social structures. Discourse analysis is seen as a means of unpacking the content of patriarchal structures in terms of the ideas embodied within them and the corporeal forms they assume.

Sexuality

Sexuality is socially constructed by discourses (sets of ideas concretized in specific practices and institutions). Discourses are ideas, in this case, ideas about sexuality, which are not 'disembodied' but concretize themselves in text, process and institution. This research will investigate whether these discourses are based around dichotomous power relations that are gendered and natured, in order to see if there is overlap between structures of gendered patriarchy and natured anthroparchy.

There are links between sexuality and other structures of patriarchy. Outside the household, sexuality is publicly defined and enforced via the agencies of the state (eg. social services), and culturally defined and disseminated via popular culture (eg. pornographic imagery). Since the 'sexual revolution', sexuality has become entrenched in popular culture and is increasingly significant in the control of women. Dominant discourses of sexuality remain premised on patriarchal dualities of dominance and submission and are a mechanism to enforce the social control of women once removed from the control of the private sphere (Jeffreys, 1990). This is similar to Dworkin's (1983) argument patriarchy has shifted from a farming mode wherein women are reproductively controlled within the household by husbands, to a brothel mode. She argues with the decline of privatized control over women and female sexuality (women do not necessarily marry nor remain monogamous), public modes of cultural control over women become increasingly significant, particularly pornography (Dworkin, 1981). Dworkin, like Mackinnon (1987, 1989) tends to conflate gender and sexuality. In claiming pornography as the most important contemporary site of women's oppression, she argues as if it is the exclusive means of oppression, and assumes all women are subjected to the same mode of control in the same way. However, certain women are not. Some Asian women particularly, are still strongly subject to privatized controls in terms of labour, reproduction, sexuality and culture. Although in public patriarchy, the patriarchal sexualization of popular culture is a crucial mechanism of control, this does not imply that this operates to the exclusion of other private structures. This research will test the applicability of Dworkin's notion of the reproductive brothel (patriarchal control of sexuality and reproduction via new reproductive technologies), with respect particularly to the management of farm animals, to ascertain the extent to which farming can be seen to demonstrate relations of patriarchal sexuality.

Taking pornography and meat as case studies, the empirical research for this thesis investigates the extent to which the latter can be seen as an expression of patriarchal sexuality whose production involves gendered relations of power and dominance. A key question will be whether patriarchal sexuality also forms a key structure of anthroparchal relations; whether there are possible comparisons between the sexualized construction of human bodies as pornography, and non-human

animal bodies as meat. Research needs also to take account however, of the question of whether mechanisms of domination apply differently in each specific case study.

Culture

Patriarchal culture involves the creation and deployment of sets of patriarchal ideas, discourses of femininity and masculinity, and the representation of gender (Bonner et al, 1992) through specific institutions and processes. The latter refers primarily to the media and forms of popular culture (eg. film, literature, advertising), and also to educational and religious institutions and the formal processes of education, and to institutions and processes of leisure (eg. sport, art). Contemporary discourses of femininity do not focus only on domesticity, as in nineteenth century Britain, but also on sexuality. As more wimmin contest and reject the exclusively domestic role, the cultural control of wimmin moves to a more public arena. Discourses of femininity articulated in popular culture such as 'women's magazines' for example, have incorporated wimmin's paid employment which they once stigmatized, although they still often prescribe gender differentiation. Whether in paid employment or not, wimmin are encouraged by the discourses of feminine sexuality to be alluring to men, sexually available, and sexually skilled in the satisfaction of male desire. Discourses of masculinity have changed this century but to a lesser degree. Whilst masculinity is no longer represented in film and other forms of popular culture by the attainment and keeping of a dependent wife, paid employment for men retains its importance as a signifier of masculinity, with certain kinds of work seen as more appropriately masculine than others (Cockburn, 1983, 1985), and high status or heavy manual work conferring masculinity via its association with powerful expressions of male heterosexuality.

This research investigates the representation of discourses of gender (femininity and masculinity) and nature (specifically, humanity and animality) in texts of popular culture (magazines, advertising, film etc.) involving meat and pornography. It seeks to examine whether the representation of meat and pornography involves the deployment of discourses which are gendered and/or natured. It also examines the paid employment associated with the production of these phenomena, in order to investigate whether work associated with killing and sex is able to confer masculinity upon males working in such environments (as suggested by Cockburn, 1983), and if this differs in form or degree to employment cultures in other forms of labour.

Violence

Patriarchal violence is usually seen by feminists as violence against wimmin (and children) alone (Pizzey, 1974; Dworkin, 1988; Caputi, 1988). It takes various forms, from rape, child sexual abuse, the battering of female partners to less physically harmful instances of sexual harassment

animal bodies as meat. Research needs also to take account however, of the question of whether mechanisms of domination apply differently in each specific case study.

Culture

Patriarchal culture involves the creation and deployment of sets of patriarchal ideas, discourses of femininity and masculinity, and the representation of gender (Bonner et al, 1992) through specific institutions and processes. The latter refers primarily to the media and forms of popular culture (eg. film, literature, advertising), and also to educational and religious institutions and the formal processes of education, and to institutions and processes of leisure (eg. sport, art). Contemporary discourses of femininity do not focus only on domesticity, as in nineteenth century Britain, but also on sexuality. As more wimmin contest and reject the exclusively domestic role, the cultural control of wimmin moves to a more public arena. Discourses of femininity articulated in popular culture such as 'women's magazines' for example, have incorporated wimmin's paid employment which they once stigmatized, although they still often prescribe gender differentiation. Whether in paid employment or not, wimmin are encouraged by the discourses of feminine sexuality to be alluring to men, sexually available, and sexually skilled in the satisfaction of male desire. Discourses of masculinity have changed this century but to a lesser degree. Whilst masculinity is no longer represented in film and other forms of popular culture by the attainment and keeping of a dependent wife, paid employment for men retains its importance as a signifier of masculinity, with certain kinds of work seen as more appropriately masculine than others (Cockburn, 1983, 1985), and high status or heavy manual work conferring masculinity via its association with powerful expressions of male heterosexuality.

This research investigates the representation of discourses of gender (femininity and masculinity) and nature (specifically, humanity and animality) in texts of popular culture (magazines, advertising, film etc.) involving meat and pornography. It seeks to examine whether the representation of meat and pornography involves the deployment of discourses which are gendered and/or natured. It also examines the paid employment associated with the production of these phenomena, in order to investigate whether work associated with killing and sex is able to confer masculinity upon males working in such environments (as suggested by Cockburn, 1983), and if this differs in form or degree to employment cultures in other forms of labour.

Violence

Patriarchal violence is usually seen by feminists as violence against wimmin (and children) alone (Pizzey, 1974; Dworkin, 1988; Caputi, 1988). It takes various forms, from rape, child sexual abuse, the battering of female partners to less physically harmful instances of sexual harassment

(Kelly, 1988). This definition is narrow, and as Daly (1979) suggests, patriarchal violence does not only involve female victims and male protagonists, but also wimmin inflicting patriarchal violence on wimmin. Some radical feminists have rightly noted certain forms of violence are patriarchal although they do not involve a female human victim, such as: warfare (Pierson, 1988; Mc Allister, 1982; Enloe, 1983), the environment (Caldicott and Leyland, 1983; Griffin, 1984; Warren, 1994, Plumwood, 1993), racism (Griffin, 1981; Spiegel, 1988), animals (Collard, 1988; Adams, 1990, 1995, 1996; Benny, 1983). This thesis adopts a definition of patriarchal violence which extends to all groups which suffer systematic gendered and sexualized violence. Violence also takes non-physical form, involving the threat of physical violence, or the fear of violence, which may restrict behaviour and function as a mechanism of social control (Hanmer, 1978). In addition, violence can be suggested, for example in images in pornography, and other forms of popular culture. Discourses of masculinity include machismo, according to which it is appropriate for men to use violence against each other and against 'Others'. Macho violence can be seen at a premium in male dominated employment based around killing, such as war (Enloe, 1983). This thesis examines the meat and pornography industries, in order to investigate whether they are characterized by patriarchal and anthroparchal relations of violence.

The State

The modern state is a patriarchal institution, although it is shaped by systems of domination other than patriarchy. In Weberian political sociology the state is defined as a set of institutions which makes rules and governs the polity with sovereign authority, and monopoly of legitimate force (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987), a definition ignoring structural bias, compromised sovereignty, and legitimate privatized force (e.g. domestic violence). In reductionist Marxist accounts, it is an institution of class domination alone (Miliband, 1969), run by and acting in the interests of, the capitalist class; or it is seen to functionally maintain the social, economic and political conditions ensuring the maintenance and stability of capitalism (Poulantzas, 1973).

Liberal feminism notes the absence of wimmin in formal political institutions and the public sphere, explained by gender role constraints (Currell, 1974; Randall, 1987; Lovenduski and Norris, 1996). Marxist feminists account for structural bias by focussing on capital-labour relations and the household. Barrett and McIntosh (1982) argue the state indirectly supports wimmin's oppression by supporting the bourgeois family necessary for capitalism, ignoring the fact men benefit from wimmin's domestic labour. Eisenstein (1984) argues the state upholds the interests of both patriarchal and capitalist systems - run by male capitalists who uphold the interests of men and capital, but underestimates conflict between the interests of both systems. Radical feminists tend to look at non-decision-making and exclusion of issues from policy-making which accounts for patriarchal bias which minimizes gendered conflict and the articulation of wimmin's grievances.

Hanmer (1978) asserts the state is an instrument of patriarchal domination which legitimates male violence as a means of controlling women through a lack of intervention in welfare provision and criminal justice. Radical feminists have noted the patriarchal collusion of the state with respect to: rape (Womens Aid, 1980; Kelly 1988), 'femicide' (Radford, 1994; Lees, 1990; Smith, 1988), and battery (Hanmer et al, 1989). Mackinnon (1989) asserts the state reflects male interests, and law reflects patriarchal discourses and concretizes patriarchal power relations through policy. Whilst I would concur thus far with Mackinnon's account, she problematically ignores structured inequalities other than gender. Hanmer differs, for whilst she does not account for class and 'race', neither does she imply the state is not capitalist and racist in addition to being patriarchal.

Radical feminists generally ignore positive state interventions on behalf of patriarchal forces eg. periodic criminalizing of abortion. Marxist feminists and dual systems theorists are correct in arguing the interests promoted by the modern state are not exclusively patriarchal. The state is patriarchal but is also capitalist and racist in composition and function. This project investigates the extent to which the state maintains patriarchal and anthroparchal power via support of, or lack of intervention in meat and pornography industries, and also the possibility that legal texts (e.g. legislation governing slaughter houses) may deploy discourses of domination.

PORNOGRAPHY AND PATRIARCHAL SEXUALITY

This final section reviews feminist literature on pornography. It critiques radical feminist analyses for ignoring the naturing of pornographic images, and looks at the ways this literature may illuminate the debates on the patriarchal structures of sexuality, violence, culture and the state; and potential links between the oppression of women and animals.

Defining pornography has proved a matter of contestation within feminism. Feminist definitions tend to stress gendered discourses in pornographic images rather than sexual explicitness (Rogers, 1990, p.16). Most radical feminists would define pornography as degrading women (Lederer, 1982, p.28; Swartz in Chester and Dicky, 1986, p.13), but liberal, postmodern and some socialist feminists see pornography as explicit, but not necessarily sexist (McIntosh, 1992; Segal, 1994). Dworkin defines pornography according to its ancient Greek etymology, as the depiction of women as 'vile whores' (1981, pp.200-1) for which she has been criticized for ignoring pornography's development in the Victorian context (Norden, 1990, p.16). Foucault defines pornography as a discourse in which female sexuality is problematized (1981, p.121), with which some radical feminists concur (Hoff and Gubar, 1989, p.20). Dworkin explains feminist dispute in defining pornography as resultant from the ambiguous nature of 'complex' forms of sexual violence. 'Simple' forms of sexual violence (e.g. rape, battery), are private, have individual victims, and are condemned by all feminists. 'Complex' forms (e.g. harassment, pornography,

prostitution, dowry burning, genital mutilation) are public, and involve mass complicity of men, wimmin, and some feminists (1988b, p.177). Assiter argues Dworkin's definition of pornography as violence belittles the qualitatively and quantitatively different experiences of wimmin who suffer physical violences (1989, p.65), although Dworkin argues pornography is manufactured using violence (1981, ch.5). Whilst I concur degrees of violence require distinction, it will be argued production of pornography may involve physical violences, and some images involve the depiction of violence. I would not define pornography as patriarchal violence alone however, and feel it should be considered as an aspect of patriarchal culture and employment also.

Pornography and gender

In the 1970's, second wave feminisms were united in opposition to pornography (Hoff, 1989), but in the 1990's most liberal and postmodern feminists contend pornographic content is becoming pluralistic. It no longer caters for heterosexual men but for a range of sexualities, and can no longer be considered part of wimmin's oppression (Rich, 1988, p.340; Rubin, 1988; Vance, 1984; Segal, 1994, 1997). In contrast, from the 1980's, much radical feminism focussed on a critique of pornography.

Dworkin (1981) analyses the content of pornographic images and argues a powerfully illustrated case by applying a model of patriarchy to a range of pornographies. According to Dworkin, patriarchal society is based on male authority (1981, p.13), backed by male physical strength which patriarchy cultivates. Violence maintains the system via the inculcation of fear in wimmin as a group by men collectively (p.16). Dworkin is criticized as 'essentialist' (Assiter, 1989; Segal, 1987) for suggesting men are: 'biologically aggressive' (Dworkin, 1981, p.16). However, Dworkin actually asserts the opposite:

'The third *tenet of male-supremacist ideology*... is that men are biologically aggressive, inherently combative, eternally antagonistic, genetically cruel.' (1981, p.16, my emphasis)

The association of men and masculinity with violent sex and violence is a product of patriarchal social construction, not biology (Dworkin, 1981, p.53). Another aspect of male power is what Dworkin, following Daly (1979) calls the power of 'naming'. In patriarchy, experience, values and expression are male defined. Cultural and physical forms of domination are mutually reinforcing (1981, p.18), and because the power to name and to enforce naming is fused, Dworkin argues patriarchal language is a form of violence (p.18). Mackinnon (1994) similarly argues speech and text are instances of violence against wimmin. Dworkin asserts patriarchy is based on male ownership (1981, p.19), sexualized wealth (p.20), and sexuality constructed around phallic potency and dominance (p.23). She applies this model of patriarchy to pornography, and argues all these forms of male power are discernable (p.25). For Dworkin, pornography has a number of themes: it

portrays wimmin as sexually available and insatiable (1981, ch.7) and sexually masochistic enjoying sexual violence (ch.5); it objectifies wimmin as objects for male sexual use and control (ch.4); and promotes phallogentric sexuality (p.215).

In common with other radical feminist analyses of pornography (Griffin, 1988; Lederer et al, 1982; Rhodes and McNeil, 1981), Dworkin is criticized for 'blaming individual men' (Assiter, 1989, p.68). However, she never argues men are biologically pre-disposed to denigrate wimmin, but are taught by pornography 'to despise women, to use women, to hurt women' (1988b, p.23). That said, her terminology is problematic, for example, she continually refers to the penis as a symbol of terror for wimmin (1981, ch.2). In deconstructing the pornographic image of wimmin, she fails to deconstruct the pornographic image of man, tending to reduce men and their sexuality, to their cocks, and all heterosex to patriarchal violence. I believe this a problem of semantics not intent. Dworkin's pornographic penis is the continually erect patriarchal phallus, which alone can symbolize violent aspects of patriarchy. Dworkin unfortunately caricatures both men and their genitalia in much the same way as the pornography of which she is so critical.

The strength of Dworkin's position is that she sees pornography as part of patriarchal structures of culture, violence and sexuality, sanctioned by the state, and some concepts of her analysis are developed in this research: such as ownership and the construction of wimmin as 'whores'. There are however, problems with her analysis. First, it examines ideological aspects alone, failing to analyze pornography as an industry. Second, Dworkin ignores the naturing of pornography. She analyzes the cross-cutting oppression of racism (1981, pp.210-217), arguing pornographic characterization differs for black wimmin involving the sexualization of their skin, but tends to conflate gender and race. Whilst I concur racist oppression is sexualized and gendered, these processes are not synonymous. Whilst Dworkin alludes to animal metaphor in pornography, she assumes this is a mechanism denigrating wimmin, but this research investigates animal metaphors as evidence of the possible presence of discourses of nature in pornography, wherein sexualization and abuse of animals becomes part of a discourse of oppression applied to wimmin. To see the operation of such a discourse as patriarchal alone, denies the possible oppression of animals.

Pornography and nature

Griffin (1981) is of most interest to this thesis amongst radical feminist accounts, for she acknowledges the naturing of pornography. She sees pornography as the expression of patriarchal fear of the body; and rejection of 'eros' (loving emotion). She contends patriarchy fears the power of nature represented by sexual womun, and pornography is a means of controlling female sexuality (Griffin, 1981, p.2). Pornography expresses the desire for self mastery and control of the natural, sensual and animal aspects of humanity, along with characteristics of femininity such as

love, care and nurturance (p.64). According to Griffin, patriarchy constructs dualisms key to wimmin's oppression, defining wimmin as 'Other', associated with 'nature' and removed from 'culture' which is male (p.13). As 'Other', wimmin are objectified by patriarchal culture of which pornography is a part (pp. 13-16). Griffin argues pornography constructs a sexuality based on sado-masochism: socializing men into sadism, so they see wimmin as objects, and wimmin into masochism, so they accept their objectification for male sexual service. Griffin is optimistic as to the possibility of change and argues for a need to reevaluate our bodies as spirit as well as matter, and our sexuality as an emotional as well as physical, so we may develop a sexuality premised on equality rather than oppression (pp.253-263).

Griffin claims pornographic culture projects its idea of the natural, animal and bestial onto sexualized wimmin (p.71). This gendered, natured and sexualized objectification reinforces the subordination of wimmin and is a mechanism of patriarchal control, and the desire to control or 'silence' 'nature' that sexual women represents (p.13). Objectification reduces wimmin to their bodies, and as nature is devalued by patriarchal culture, this is a mechanism of subordination (p.64). I accept wimmin are natured in pornography, and the function of natured in the subordination of wimmin. However, Griffin sees natured as a patriarchal mechanism for the oppression of wimmin, rather than a product of a separate but interrelated system of dominance. By referring to the oppression of animals as merely a metaphor for the oppression of wimmin, Griffin like Dworkin, fails to account for natured oppression. Her analysis is strongest when examining the influence of patriarchy and racism in pornography. She rightly argues much pornographic symbolism is racist (p.159), but unfortunately conflates the two systems of oppression arguing 'the pornographic mind and the racist mind are really identical' (p.158).

Griffin's concept of the pornographic 'Other' is useful and will be used in this research with reference to gender and nature. However, she has a tendency to see oppressions that cross-cut gender as synonymous with it. In comparing yet never contrasting the construction of patriarchal Others, she ignores the specificity and complexity of different forms of oppression. Whilst I concur links between some oppressive systems are strong, their structures and degrees are diverse. This thesis investigates the operation of patriarchy and anthroparchy in pornography, examining incongruence as well as comparison. Although Griffin alludes to the oppression of nature by patriarchal 'culture', this functions metaphorically as a signifier for the oppression of wimmin and people of colour, effectively obscuring the oppression of animals.

Pornography and culture

Kappeler analyzes pornography by focusing on sexual representation in patriarchal culture, in the form of literature in particular. She argues the function of the gendered spectator is crucial -

pornography is made for men to watch (1986, p.52). Berger has contended pornography developed from the tradition of the female nude in oil painting in which female bodies and sexuality were objectified for male consumption (Berger, 1972; Saunders, 1991; Nead, 1992). Kappeler similarly argues wimmin in cultural forms such as art or pornography are objectified by the process of representation (1986, p.52) which is patriarchal, as male subjects have power to define and evaluate. With the exception of gay male sub-culture, she argues the aesthetic itself is gendered female. Representation under patriarchy is gendered, and pornography part of a continuum of cultural representations objectifying wimmin (p.101). Kappeler rightly sees pornography as patriarchal, but fails to account for the articulation of other oppressions, such as anthroparchy, in cultural representations.

The emphasis on representation is both the strength and weakness of her position. In examining patriarchal codes of representation, Kappeler locates pornography in its cultural context (Coward, 1987), but her argument implies all representation is pornographic. Whilst liberals have defended pornography as 'radical' art (Carter, 1993), Kappeler condemns art as high culture pornography (1986, p.25, 102). Gubar asserts the 'inextricable entanglement' of these terms should lead us to adopt another, 'pornartgraphy' (1988, p.58), taking Kappeler's argument to its logical conclusion, the conflation of art with pornography. There are barriers to wimmin's authentication of painting (Greer, 1981), film (Khun, 1985), literature (Spender, 1980) and pornography (Califia, 1988); and Kappeler is correct to suggest when wimmin create cultural texts, these can reflect patriarchal constructions. However, to argue representations never contest patriarchal ideology (p.146) is to overstate the case. There are female authored patriarchally challenging representations in contemporary popular culture however few (Marshment and Gamman, 1988). Whilst pornography is part of patriarchal culture, being a part of art, literature and popular culture (magazines etc) it is also part of patriarchal structures of violence and sexuality. Whilst analysis of representations is important for this thesis, it sees pornography not as form of ideological representation alone, but as finding material expression in an industry which may employ violence in commodifying sexuality.

Pornography and violence

There are three foci in the debate as to whether pornography causes violence against wimmin. First, the effect of pornography on the behaviour of individual men has been investigated by both malestream social scientists and feminists. Second, feminists argue pornography is linked to sex crime: rape and the serial killing of wimmin. Third, there is debate on whether the treatment of models in the industry involves violence.

Pornographic effect studies focus on individual male psychology to ascertain whether exposure to pornographic increases: arousal in 'normal' and 'rapist' males (Abel, 1977; Zillman and Bryant,

1982), rape fantasies (Malmuth, 1981), aggressive behaviour (Barrett and Donnerstein, 1978; Baron, 1979), acceptance of rape myths and violence towards women (Zillman and Bryant, 1982, 1984), tolerance towards rapists (Donnerstein and Malmuth, 1984), and if it reduces respect for women's rights and encourages women to be viewed as sexual objects (Kelly, 1985; Donnerstein et al, 1987; Zillman, 1989). The 'evidence' from such studies is dubious due to methodology and ambiguous findings (Cummerbutch and Howlett, 1990), and employed in diametrically opposing arguments by the malestream (Donnerstein and Malmuth, 1984; Thompson, 1994), and feminism (Itzin, 1992; Assiter and Carol, 1993).

Some feminists have drawn on different evidence to argue pornography causes violence. In the early 1980's, Mackinnon and Dworkin, attempted and eventually failed to ban pornography via an Ordinance for the city of Minneapolis, defining pornography as sex discrimination and violation of women's civil rights. The evidence for the need of such an Ordinance was presented by personal testimony of 'victims' of pornography at public hearings (Everywoman, 1988). This effects evidence redressed the malestream focus on men, by concentrating on women's experiences. The evidence paints a grim picture and contains examples where pornography inspired male violence with close bearing on this project, where women are reduced to the status of a kept or hunted animal and treated as such. For example, one woman's husband acted out a scene from a magazine, and raped her using a dog as a dildo (1988, p.104). The degree to which this evidence is systematic is debatable, and the forums in which it is delivered ethically questionable (Thompson, 1994). Whilst I acknowledge pornography is infused with discourses of power that may recommend or endorse certain forms of behaviour, reliable research on exact effects is problematic.

Some radical feminists have linked pornography to sex crime. According to Dworkin (1988b, p.14) the essence of pornography is the eroticization of murder. Caputi (1989) attempts to demonstrate the pornographic content of the sexual murder of women, femicide (Radford, 1994). She argues serial sexual killing 'constitutes a mythic and ritualistic gynocide' which functions as a form of sexual terrorism (1989, p.3) incorporated into popular culture in the form of 'gorenography' (in Radford and Russell, 1994). Caputi asserts sex-killers are regular users of hard core pornography (1988, p.164), and that pornography encourages sexualized murder and culturally legitimates it by eroticizing such violence. Smith (1988) argues it is not pornography alone which legitimates sexualized murder, but the media and the state, who, unlike the sex-killer (Holloway, 1988, p.131), differentiate 'innocent' and deserving victims (1988, p.127). Caputi et al see sex crime as extreme patriarchal violence, but fail to see it as part of the anthroparchal paradigm of butchery. Discourses of sex crime refer to the hunting and stalking of women and their death and dismemberment, experiences rare for women but common for animals. In radical feminist analyses of sexualized murder, violence against animals as 'meat' or 'sport' are marginalized as metaphorical illustration of violence against women. This thesis investigates the connections

between patriarchal and anthroparchal violences, but will not anthropocentrically reduce violences against animals to metaphor, but analyze them as instances of oppression.

Liberal thinkers argue there is no violence involved in making pornography (Talese, 1980; Thompson, 1995). Radical feminists see wimmin working in the industry as victims of violence with patriarchally defined consciousness, or as patriarchally collusive. Kappeler argues models have internalized patriarchal ideology, and collaborate with men who objectify them for economic gain (1986, p.157). Lederer's interview with a former model substantiates this point: 'women come in (to the business) under a lot of stress. They're usually desperate...need money for some emergency' (Lederer, 1982, p.47). Auditions require wimmin to strip naked, 'lecherous' photographers dictate what models do (p.50). The more a woman works, the more limited her options become in 'soft core' photography and she is then likely to encounter physical violence in 'hard core' films. Agencies are unscrupulous, and models perceive themselves at risk (p.58). Male models can be older, have better long term career prospects and some claim they chose jobs for sex, not necessity (Hebditch and Amming, 1986, p.90). Pornographic modeling is a gendered form of employment, and this thesis investigates possible coercion involved in modeling, and the extent of power dichotomized sexualization which characterizes the process. It also examines the possibility pornographic production may be natured as well as gendered.

Pornography and the state

Much feminist debate on pornography has focused on the appropriate response of the state. Some liberal, socialist and postmodern feminists argue pornography has changed, now challenging gender stereotypes. As such, there is no need for increased state regulation, and possible grounds for liberalization (Carol, 1991, 1995), and feminist encouragement of the development of woman-centred sexual material (Segal and McIntosh, 1992). Many argue as the liberal state is not progressive (Wilson, 1992), censorship of pornography involves co-optation with the right (Thompson, 1995), thus could be directed against any sexual material.

Radical feminists criticize liberals for protecting pornography as 'freedom' (Dworkin, 1981, p.208). Dworkin and Mackinnon co-operated with New Right politicians to guarantee passage of legislation restricting pornography (later overturned). Legislation was passed in Canada, although it bans Dworkin's own novels (1989, 1990) and thus may not be employed in a manner they may wish (Kelly, 1988, p.72). Radical feminists supporting increased state regulation assume a connection between a critique of pornography and support for censorship (Blue in Chester, 1988, p.107; Itzin, 1992); failing to question the ability of the state to legislate to protect wimmin. It is ironic that Mackinnon, whilst advocating legal reform against pornography, acknowledges the state is patriarchal (1989, p.170). Radical feminists have been rightly sceptical of the ability of the

'liberal' state to secure change (Levine, 1970, 1984; Farrow, 1974). Male dominated political systems (Randall, 1987), producing policy usually reflecting male interest (Lovenduski and Norris, 1994), relying on male dominated agencies of enforcement (Hanmer, Stanko, Radford, 1989) with patriarchal conceptions of reality (Hattie, 1989; Smith, 1988) are unlikely to pass legislation, nor ensure its enactment in a feminist sense. In investigating pornography and meat, the state will be seen to legitimate patriarchy and anthroparchy via its non-intervention; and to act positively in terms of policy making largely in the interests of patriarchal and anthroparchal forces.

Pornography and sexuality

Some radical feminists have seen pornography as part of patriarchal sexuality; others have argued heterosexuality under patriarchy is itself pornographic. Some also see the development of pornography as reflective of the change in forms of patriarchal domination from private to public mode. Sexuality is considered in this research as a key structure wherein patriarchy and anthroparchy interrelate, but although some radical feminist theories of sexuality are pertinent, many are problematically 'nature-blind'. They either ignore sexualized control of other 'Others', or use the oppression particularly of animals as a metaphor for the sexual control of wimmin, obscuring anthroparchal oppression.

For some radical feminists, sexuality is the 'primary sphere of male power' (Mackinnon, 1982, p.516). Mackinnon goes so far as to argue sexuality and gender are inseparable (1987), failing to account for aspects of patriarchy which are not sexualized (Bryson, 1994). Early 1970's feminism identified sexuality as 'male defined'. Firestone (1971) claimed heterosexual 'love' was a mechanism of patriarchal control. Millett (1970) saw patriarchal power as phallic power. Heterosex was criticized as serving male desire and irrelevant to wimmin's satisfaction (Koedt, 1970) whilst dominated by intercourse (Hite, 1977). Much of this writing was heterocentric (eg. Greer, 1970), and gave the impression patriarchy could be altered by wimmin demanding more from sex and men, although some theorists have revised their previously uncritical approach (Greer, 1985).

For others, the issue was not simply pleasure, but the patriarchal construction of desire. Heterosexuality was declared a socially constructed (Millett, 1977) compulsory political institution (Rich, 1980), defining boundaries in relationships (Jeffreys, 1985; Rich, 1980; Faderman, 1981; Raymond, 1986), and reducing feminist political resistance (Johnson, 1974). Revolutionary feminists argued in heteropatriarchy, wimmin come under the social, sexual and emotional control of individual men, providing domestic labour and emotional support (The Leeds Revolutionary Feminist Group, 1981), and in 'loving their enemies', are patriarchal collaborators (Onlywomen, 1981). Whilst 'revolutionary' feminists have been right to argue heterosexuality is constructed and reproduced as an instrument of male control (Coveney, 1984, p.13), their move from critique to

political lesbianism is flawed. Men often exercise power via heterosex, and objectify women in heterosexual relations (p.15), but it is not clear how such power dynamics will alter with a withdrawal of feminists from heterosex. It may be revolutionary feminists cannot envisage change in men, and separatism is a counsel of despair, but political lesbianism also ignores the variety of lesbian experience by defining sexuality as a political decision (Leeds., 1981, p.5), and whilst I concur desire is influenced by patriarchal constructions, it is not exclusively so determined.

Dworkin (1976) criticizes heterosex itself as pornographic. She claims intercourse is patriarchal due to phallocentrism, and an act of possession and ownership (1988a); the 'hunting' of women is basic to male pleasure and social dominance (1988b, p.14); there is no phenomenological division between heterosex and violence (1988a). Heterosex is violent because men, emotionally 'alienated' under patriarchy, distance themselves from intercourse via objectification of women (1988a, p.51). Intercourse under patriarchy is pornography in practice (p.75/6). Women internalize their possession by men and experience it as erotic, thus heterosex erodes female independence (p.78). Dworkin's analysis is problematically individualist, concentrating on the psychological impact of heterosex, and providing no solution but dubious examples of women who reject heterosex (p.155). She fails to distinguish between heterosex as discourse of power, and the men and women who engage in it (p.22). Chesler does make such a distinction, although she also argues male sexual fantasies and practices are pornographic constructions (Chesler, 1978). Men desire women who will fulfill their sexual/power needs, and confirm their sense of masculinity (Chesler, 1982, p.49). Chesler however, claims men often do not experience heterosex as empowering, and pornography may be used to bolster masculinity, as it depicts heterosex in terms of male power. Thus sex and pornography remain separate although overlapping categories, whereas for Dworkin they are conflated. The separation of men from masculinity as a social construct is a strength of Chesler's analysis, but like Dworkin, she ignores the possibility women may experience heterosex as powerful (Segal, 1994).

Some radical feminists argue sexuality is changing form and degree, and is an increasingly important patriarchal structure. Liberals, argue the opposite. Weeks (1981) argues historically, developments in capitalism led to changes in sexuality with the development of the bourgeois family and ideology of heterosexual monogamy, domesticity, and stigmatization of homosexuality which Soble claims led to the development of pornography for sexually alienated men (Soble, 1986). The form of sexuality is changing again argues Weeks (1981) - decline of the nuclear family leads to the replacement of heterosexual monogamy by polymorphous formations of sexual diversity. He argues for a 'radical pluralism' in which individuals freely choose sexualities, and 'radical sexual minorities' (including pedophiles and flashers, Weeks, 1989) have a key role to play. 'Radical pluralism' has focused on sado-masochism, sex involving pain, dominance and submission (Young, 1978, p.85; Spada, 1979, p.126); presented as an outlaw force struggling

against censure (Califia, 1986, pp.30-34); and so defended by some feminists (Ardill and O'Sullivan, 1987).

Radical feminists have tended to argue 'radical' sexualities, such as lesbian s/m, often remain patriarchal (Carola, in Chester and Dicky, 1986, p.169). Jeffreys argues sexual pluralism is a form of patriarchal retrenchment which has increased the sexualized commodification of wimmin. She argues there was a sexualization of wimmin and stigmatization of those socially/sexually independent in response to first wave feminism (1985). The sexual revolution of the 1960's recruited wimmin into heterosexuality in the face of perceived breakdown in familial structures, and 'sexual liberation' was the 'freedom for women to take pleasure from their own eroticized subordination' (Jeffreys, 1990, p.3). Heterosex has the political function of maintaining wimmin's oppression, via the eroticization of power difference, which becomes co-terminous with heterosexual desire (p.307). However, Jeffreys acknowledges power difference can permeate same-sex relations also, and is seen in gay male culture, and s/m lesbianism (1994). Many of Weeks 'perverse' sexualities, Jeffreys would rightly regard as patriarchal constructions; and their pornographic expressions are examined in this research along with traditional pornography, investigating the possible presence of anthroparchy in for example, s/m pornography (possibly evidenced for example in bondage, whips, cages, muzzles etc, Spada, 1979, p.140).

Dworkin (1983) makes a similar point in arguing the sexual revolution facilitated change from a 'farming model' of patriarchal sexual control where wimmin remain in monogamous relationships of patriarchal marriage for reproduction, to a 'brothel model' where sexual arrangements are more temporary, and all wimmin are available for non-reproductive sex with men. In farming mode, wimmin are lowly yet superior to those in the 'brothel':

'from prized cows to mangy dogs, from high bred horses to sad beasts of burden...it is grander being the earth, being nature, even being a cow, than being a cunt with no redeeming mythology.' (1983, p.184)

Dworkin refers to wimmin as animals to describe the extent of wimmin's oppression, but fails to account for the oppression of animals themselves. For example, she asserts reproductive technologies will be promoted to enhance the efficiency of the farming mode of patriarchal control, ignoring parallels in the reproductive treatment of domestic animals and wimmin (unlike Corea, 1985). When analyzing the brothel model, she recalls the treatment of animals. For example, pimps refer to 'their' wimmin as their 'stable', a false analogy asserts Dworkin for 'Horses are treated better as they are more valuable than women. Prostitutes are treated like women.' (p.179). This is untrue: most animals in anthroparchal society are treated worse than humans due to physical captivity. Race horses past sporting and reproductive service may be slaughtered and eaten, but whilst 'old' wimmin may be treated badly, they are rarely killed and never eaten. For Dworkin, the

analogy is justified, as wimmin are biologically thus morally superior to animals (p.45). Her use of animal metaphors as a signifier of wimmin's oppression is misguided. She confirms the oppression of animals by the same devaluation of nature which has been a patriarchal mechanism to secure the oppression of wimmin. I concur with Jeffreys and Dworkin that sexuality is a key, and increasingly public structure of patriarchy, but do not share their pessimism, for to argue oppression is increasingly sexualized, is not to argue that oppression is increasing per se, for patriarchal structures are contested may change in positive ways.

Conclusion

This chapter has found feminist approaches which operationalize a theory of patriarchy as a system of dominance and oppression to be most convincing. I would concur with radical feminists that the oppression of wimmin is not reducible to any other form of domination (as Marxist feminists suggest), but is autonomous, although I feel it articulates and interacts with other forms of domination in complex ways (as dual systems theory has argued). Radical feminism has identified a number of patriarchal structures (sexuality, violence, culture, the state), which operate to construct specific oppressive instances, such as pornography. However, radical feminism can be criticized for taking little account of the ways patriarchy may intersect with other systems of dominance. This is not because such theory is problematically 'essentialist', but because it is sometimes rather carelessly used with minimal attempt to account for difference. Dual systems theory has examined relationships between systems of oppression, concentrating on patriarchy and capitalism. The key strength of certain dual systems approaches is their ability to account for conflict between systems and contradictions within specific oppressive contexts, thus allowing for difference and complexity. This thesis attempts to develop a dual systems approach in examining relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy, drawing upon certain radical feminist concepts of patriarchy, along with the more adequate aspects of theories within the green literature.

Drawing upon radical feminism and dual systems theory, the chapter has argued for a structural approach to the analysis of gender relations. It has critically evaluated postmodern and poststructural analyses of gender and found their emphasis on agency problematic for an approach which seeks to capture the systematic nature of power relations. The chapter has drawn upon critical realism in both feminism and social theory in general, arguing that gender relations articulate in institutions, processes and procedures which have certain effects and can be considered real, rather than heuristic devices theorists may use. This does not mean agency is considered irrelevant, and it has been argued that within a structural account of patriarchy, people may have choices and options and may act as agents of/within patriarchal structures or may also contest them. Thus whereas in Chapter 1 it was argued that animals in an anthroparchal society have minimal agency, this is not the case with respect to patriarchal relations, which are constraining but not

determining. In arguing for a structural approach to gender relations, the insights of poststructural and postmodern theorizing are not dismissed. I have argued there is much potential in combining a structural approach with discourse analysis, and feel that such an approach has arguably been deployed by some feminists. Discourses can be conceptualized as sets of related ideas concretized in human action and processes and institutions of social structure. In understanding structures and the complex relationships of power of which they are composed, discourse analysis can identify the ideas about gender (and nature) and forms that they assume.

Radical feminists have rightly argued pornography sexually objectifies those defined as patriarchal 'Others', may involve patriarchal violence, and is largely sanctioned by the state. However, analysis of pornography as a regime of representations has paid attention almost exclusively to gendering. This thesis examines the possibility pornography is not only characterized by patriarchal discourses of gender, but anthroparchal discourses of nature also. It will investigate whether 'pornography' involves sexualized objectification of bodies in gendered and natured ways, and whether meat and pornography are defined by patriarchal and anthroparchal constructions of sexuality. Research examines whether pornography, as part of patriarchal culture, sexuality and violence, is shaped by anthroparchy, investigating relations between the two systems in terms of ideological aspects of representation, and material aspects of economic and physical practices and institutions, through a comparative case study of pornography and meat.

Notes

- (1) Althusser (1969) would have disputed such a conception arguing ideology is not the representation of 'reality' but 'is' an integral part of such 'reality' defined in terms of material economic relations (Benton, 1984). Althusser cannot allow ideology such autonomy from economic relations, which for him are a priori (Craib, 1992, p.166). The strength of Habermas' conception is that ideology is allowed semi-autonomy from material economic relations.
- (2) This is arguably an anthropocentric sleight of hand. As I argued in Chapter 1, animals, depending on their degree of sentiency, may have 'wants' they may be 'able to order', but within a society structured around (almost total) human domination they do not have the ability to choose in order that any such 'wants' might be realized.
- (3) Although by no means a radical feminist, and having recently developed her thinking in a postmodern direction (Neale and Smart, 1997), Smart (1989) has a position similar to Mackinnon. Smart contends patriarchal structures (violence, paid employment, cultural representation) are largely immune to modification by liberal legalism which reflects patriarchal discourse (1989, pp.114-5), and is less convinced than Mackinnon that the patriarchal structure of the state may be able to reflect anything approximating feminist discourse (Smart, 1992). Examining British 'obscenity' legislation she contends legal texts reflect and concretize patriarchal discourses (which she refers to as 'hidden codes' or 'dominant meanings', 1989, p.137), which are themselves reflected in pornography.

CHAPTER THREE

MAKING THE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN GENDER AND ECOLOGY

'As...the snoolish destruction and poisoning of the Earth and its inhabitants and surroundings escalates...Particularly loud and pleading are the Voices of animals, whose victimisation and suffering at the hands of the rakes and rippers of patriarchy are similar in many ways to the rape, battering, torture, and massacre of women.'

Daly, *Webster's First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language* (1988, p.49)

Introduction

This chapter examines literature which makes connections between gender and ecology, and raises questions for investigation in the substantive research for this thesis. The previous chapters argued both gender relations and human relations with the environment might most helpfully be theorized via a systemic and structural approach, and that a dual systems theory may be best placed to capture the complexity of interrelations between patriarchy and anthroparchy. This said, it was felt elements of poststructuralist thinking may also be useful, in particular, Foucauldian discourse analysis. This chapter contends some feminist theorists have already combined discourse analysis with a systematic and structural approach to patriarchy, albeit in an implicit rather than an explicit manner, and will argue the work of Daly (1979) is indicative of such an approach. There are multifarious definitions of 'discourse' and the chapter is cognizant of differing interpretations of Foucault's work. I will argue Daly (1979) deploys a notion of discourse as part of an oppressive regime of power, a notion which is evident particularly in Foucault's earlier work (e.g. 1971), but far less apparent in some of his later theorizing (e.g. 1981). The fourth section of this chapter draws on Daly and Foucault in developing a series of seven discourses which may be seen to be deployed in gendered and natured ways. I conceptualize discourses as sets of related ideas which are shaped by, and themselves construct oppressive situations, because they are embedded within actions, processes and institutions. Discourses are seen as operating within and across social structures of power, and analysis of discourses is seen as a means of examining the nature and forms of power relations in specific contexts (such as the areas of empirical research for this thesis).

In examining the theoretical and empirical connections established between gender and nature, the other sections of the chapter concentrate largely on eco-feminist literature, although contributions from 'malestream' sociology and social anthropology also feature. In Chapter 1, two kinds of eco-feminist theory were identified. One group of thinkers (eg. Warren, 1990, 1991, 1994; Plumwood, 1993, 1994; Davion, 1993) are closer to green theory, concerned primarily with ethical debates. A second group are most closely related to radical feminism (e.g. Griffin, 1984; Merchant, 1980, 1985; Shiva, 1988; Daly, 1979, 1984, 1988; Adams, 1988; Corea, 1985; Ruddick,

1989) and can be seen as 'radical eco-feminist'; and it is with such theorists this chapter is most concerned.

Radical eco-feminism sees patriarchy as responsible for our currently destructive relationship to the earth (Leyland, 1983, p.72). It has attempted to develop theoretical links between feminism and ecology with specific reference to sexuality, motherhood and reproduction, warfare, and male violence. Much of this writing is criticized as 'essentialist', for apparent allusion to the 'special' knowledge, emotion, sensuality, thought and morality of wimmin (Segal, 1987; Spelman, 1988; Davion, 1994), mooted a separate 'female world' in opposition to 'male culture'. Such theorizing is often critically labeled 'cultural feminism' (Evans, 1995), but is more accurately described as a form of eco-feminism that is closer than other variants to radical feminist analysis. Much of this theorizing will be defended from accusations of essentialism both biological and social, and many of the insights produced by this feminism are considered helpful in pinpointing symbolic and material links between gender and nature. However, eco-feminist approaches will be criticized for homogenizing dominations based on gender and nature as the product of one all embracing system of oppression, patriarchy. It will be argued such homogenization prevents us from capturing the complexity of oppressive relations which can be both similar in form and degree and mutually constitutive, but also divergent and conflictual, and it will be suggested a dual systems approach may overcome the problems associated with theoretical homogenization.

The chapter has six sections. The first four examine general theoretical connections between patriarchy and the domination of nature, the last two look at issues related to the empirical research for the thesis. The first two sections look at patriarchal discourses of gender and nature, first contemporary, then historical. The third section briefly examines literature on wimmin's spirituality in the context of neo-paganism, and the speculative search for the origins of patriarchy, and its implications for ecology. The fourth section outlines the discursive analysis to be deployed in the empirical research, and identifies a number of discourses in which gendered and natured power may interact. The fifth section examines literature on food and eating in terms of gender and nature; the sixth focuses on patriarchal control of reproduction and motherhood, and suggests possible comparison with the anthroparchal control of reproduction in domestic animals (1).

GENDER AND NATURE IN PATRIARCHAL DISCOURSE

A number of radical eco-feminists have argued patriarchal discourses carry gender dichotomous norms and values which feminize the environment and animalize wimmin, constructing a dichotomy between wimmin and 'nature', and male dominated human culture. The gender roles constituted through such discourses render wimmin in closer material proximity and relation to the environment than men, with greater potential to develop an ecologically sensitive value system.

These theorists further contend a new culture based on re-valuation and radicalization of certain 'feminine' qualities, can contest the ecologically destructive system of patriarchy.

Patriarchal discourses of gender and nature

Radical eco-feminists (Griffin, 1984; Collard, 1988; Eisler, 1989; Starhawk, 1989, 1990a; Daly, 1988) tend to argue contemporary patriarchy deploys different discourses of masculinity and femininity which associate wimmin with 'nature' and men with 'culture'. Patriarchal culture venerates 'masculine' ideals of virility, strength, self-control, emotional reserve, competence, rationality, aggression, etc; and devalues 'feminine' qualities of motherhood, caring, sensitivity, fastidiousness, fragility, dependence, emotionality, timidity, tenderness, sensuality, non-violence etc. (Ruth, 1981, p.5-7; Lowe and Hubbard, 1983, p.2-3). Some of these 'wimmin's values' are seen by radical eco-feminists as positive and patriarchally contesting; the most significant being 'peace', 'connectedness', and 'nurturance'. Patriarchal society, these feminists argue, fosters in wimmin the value of peace, non-violence and respect for life (Freer, 1983; Elshtain, 1985, 1989; Ruddick, 1990) to which Daly (1988) refers as a 'biophillic' (life-loving) capacity (also Collard, 1988). By contrast, according to Griffin (1984, 1992) and Daly (1979, 1988), patriarchal culture venerates death and violence, and encourages a male preoccupation with dominance and control over wimmin and nature. King contends eco-feminism is about the 'connectedness and wholeness' and integrity of living things (1983, p.10). Patriarchy, by contrast, enshrines a hatred of wimmin and nature, and this 'masculinist mentality' is responsible for environmental devastation (p.11). Wimmin, many eco-feminists argue, must articulate the interests of the oppressed and excluded, such as animals, for patriarchal society allows them to think connectively, and empathize with others due to their nurturing role (Griffin, 1984; Freer, 1983; Eisler, 1988). This is more difficult for men, as discourses of patriarchal masculinity construct men as separate from 'nature' and inculcate hierarchical intellectual structures justifying exploitation (Warren, 1993, 1994).

This is the basis on which some theorists (Salamone, 1982; Benny, 1983; Birke, 1994; Adams, 1976, 1990, 1994, 1995) posit a gendered concern with the treatment of animals. Salamone (1982) claims wimmin have a closer connection to animals than most men, as wimmin and animals have similarly been abused at male hands. In addition, wimmin have herstorically been concerned with birth, healing and care, and support roles for men, inculcating the value of nurturance which wimmin are able to apply to animals. As discussed in Chapter 1, some propose a new basis for animal rights theory by arguing wimmin have a sense of responsibility towards animals deriving from their praxis of 'caring' (Donnovan and Adams, 1996). Benny contends it is females of domestic animal species which are most likely to be oppressed via control of their sexuality and reproductive powers, involving varying degrees of physical violence and emotional deprivation (1983, p.142). She argues wimmin can relate to the suffering of domestic animals, as they have

shared reproductive experiences. Adams (1976, 1990) argues meat eating is part of patriarchal culture feminists must reject. Thus some eco-feminists contend that wimmin, patriarchally conditioned to adopt the values of nurturance, empathy and non-violence, are in a position of possible contestation regarding the treatment of animals and eating of meat.

Eco-feminists have been criticized (Segal 1987; Spelman, 1988) as 'essentialist' for considering wimmin innately superior and in harmony with nature because of traits based on female reproductive capacities. Griffin, for example, argues wimmin are less alienated from nature than men, and motherhood is a means of connecting wimmin with nature (Caldicott and Leyland, 1983, p.5). But it is socially constructed discourses of femininity which define wimmin in roles resulting in a consciousness of their embeddedness in natural processes, and whilst this may be heightened by biology (menstruation, pregnancy and birth) it is not determined by it (1984, p.167). Whilst Griffin ignores the possibility men may connect to nature through their bodies, she does not exclude it. Her point is that socially constructed gender roles constrict wimmin to a more bodily material experience. Patriarchy sows the seeds of its own destruction, for wimmin's experience has potential to raise ecological consciousness. For most postmodernists, even if Griffin's position can be shown not to be sociobiological, it can be accused of social essentialism in over-homogenizing the life experiences of wimmin, failing to account for differences in terms of age, ethnicity, class and historio-cultural location. Segal (1987) argues she is unaware the female values she wishes to 're-value' are products of patriarchal socialization. However, Griffin is selective in her re-valuation of patriarchal femininity, selecting only some 'feminine qualities' as pertinent. The critique of female experiential homogenization is pertinent and I do think Griffin underplays differences between/among wimmin, but I do not feel this is an inevitable product of conceptualizing 'wimmin's experiences' but a result of Griffin's generalized account.

Griffin (1984) traces a history of patriarchal thought concerning nature and wimmin. She notes patriarchal religion regards the natural world as transient matter, and because wimmin are seen as closer to the earth due to reproductive capacity and greater sensuality, they are labeled nature not culture. Figs (1970) similarly contends matter/nature has been de-valued in the history of patriarchal thought, and the association of wimmin with 'nature' has been a mechanism of oppression. For Griffin, patriarchal ideology whether sacred (Judeo-Christian) or secular (mechanistic science, malestream academia) is misogynist and speciesist, its discourses structuring men into abstract rational thinking, and wimmin into intuitive thinking. Figs argues patriarchal ideas are highly adaptable and can survive intellectual change such as that associated with modernity (1970, p.113). Daly (1979) goes further and argues pre-modern (religious) and modern (scientific, rational) patriarchal thought are similar forms of patriarchal 'myth'. Griffin documents methods of human domination and control over the environment, arguing such control has been patriarchally conceptualized in terms of gendered sexual possession. She implies domestication of

animals and wimmin is similar - premised on feminization, sexualization, and control of sexuality (1984, p.66). For example, Griffin links imaginary voices of cows and wimmin as mothers reproducing under the auspices of patriarchal technology, indicating wimmin can empathize with animals due to common experiences. However, she implies womun's status is worse than other animals (p.129), effectively denying the extent of anthroparchal control of, and violences towards, animals. In addition, to imply patriarchal discourse is all-encompassing, denies contestation of the dominant paradigm, precluding Griffin's own concept of change.

Radical eco-feminist culture

Griffin's model of social change involves transition from domesticated feminine to feminist consciousness, where wimmin learn to relate to themselves, their bodies and their environment:

'we know we are darkness. Like the carbon from the air which becomes the body of the plant, and the body of the plant in her mouth becoming her own dark blood...washing from her like the tides' (p.167)

Griffin entreats readers to enter a 'new space' of wimmin's culture, wherein material and social life are structured around the needs of the earth and species diversity. Daly (1988) refers to this wimmin's culture as the 'Background' reality, in contradistinction to the 'Foreground' false culture of patriarchy. Griffin's wimmin's space however, is problematically not new, but filled with the stereotypically feminine: pots and pans, washing, cleaning, nappies, storage jars and needlework (p.170). This seems limited if wimmin can only build an alternative culture from the domestic sphere to which they have often been patriarchally confined, and begs the question of how domesticity may be radicalized. Griffin's answer lies in a spiritual connection of womun and nature, and a re-appropriation of the symbol of the witch as a patriarchally contestatory symbol (see also Daly, 1988; Morgan, 1978). In 'wimmin's space' we thus can see visions, read dreams, heal, grow strange plants and communicate with animals (p.180)

All wimmin can enter such space, she asserts, for they have an understanding of the necessities of life (p.118), particularly through experiences of reproduction. Yet not all wimmin give birth, nor do they desire to. Whilst her contention wimmin's gender roles facilitate ecological consciousness is tenable, her concentration on motherhood denies the variety of wimmin's experience. Griffin says nothing of the differential relationship of womun to the environment that may be constructed as a result of the influence of other intra-human oppressions (based on 'race' and class), which cross-cut patriarchal structures and are implicated in its discourses. As Soper (1994) contends, such theorizing does sentimentalize motherhood and domesticity, and Delphy (1987) argues it reduces patriarchal oppression to a simple case of misrecognition. Delphy suggests wimmin's oppression would not disappear if caring and nurturant domestic work was re-valued more positively. She sees

such an argument as 'idealist' and unable to take account of the material mechanisms of wimmin's oppression. For Delphy, the domestic sphere is a major site of exploitation of wimmin's labour, and it is such exploitation which leads to the devaluation of wimmin and the values associated with femininity, not the other way round.

I concur that Griffin has a tendency to sentimentalize female domesticity, ignoring exploitative patriarchal relations in the household. This said, I am not convinced Griffin's account can be dismissed as 'idealist'. Griffin does document concrete patriarchal practices which oppress wimmin and animals (e.g. work, reproductive control), as well as contending there are close^{connections} between the patriarchal construction of femininity and animality at the symbolic level, encoded in religious and scientific texts. Griffin is not arguing simply that wimmin's domestic work be re-valued more positively, but for a radical re-conceptualization of womunhood that is patriarchally contesting, and for a re-conceptualization of human relations to the environment. Men are conceptualized as distanced from 'nature' as their social power allows them greater control over their lives, and those of wimmin and nature. Griffin provides no solutions for men's alienation from nature, for ecologically sensitive behaviour is a product of wimmin's experience, and this is a difficulty with her account. It's strength is the indication of how discourses of gender and nature coalesce at the symbolic level and may result in similar material treatment of wimmin and the environment.

Daly is also keen to re-value aspects of patriarchal discourse, but her means of so doing is more complex. Daly argues patriarchal discourses have actually reversed reality, and are so deeply embedded in our consciousness that feminist knowing is an act of 'dispossession' (1979, p.28). Feminists secure change via 'spooking' (reclaiming female power/knowledge), 'sparking' (building a wimmin's culture), and 'spinning' (creating non-patriarchal structures). Similarly to Griffin, she argues wimmin must adhere to the 'call of the wild' (1979, p.343), in order to discover the 'lost thread of connectedness within the cosmos' (p.393). In creating non-patriarchal culture, Daly re-appropriates myth and language. Critics mistakenly see this as word games, rather than discursive analysis, and some charge Daly herself as working within the patriarchal discourse of Catholicism (Segal, 1987). Daly is keen to re-define words (1988), but I think much of her work can be seen as Foucauldian (as argued later in this chapter) in that it involves deconstruction of patriarchal discourses (1973, 1979), analysis of their concretization in institutions and praxis (1979), and their reconstruction as a feminist politics of empowerment (1979, 1984). Daly uses irony with heavy hand, of which her critics seem unaware, and her use of Catholic discourse is parody. I would however, question her use of neo-pagan discourse, which she neither stands within (1991), nor subjects to critique. Daly's wimmin's culture is criticized as the preserve of an elite, with both men and the majority of wimmin excluded, for wimmin can only be involved if affluent, white, Western, educated and dependent-free (Segal, 1987, p.21). However, Daly acknowledges hers is

but one vision of post-patriarchy and Segal seems unaware that Daly recognizes (1984, p.4) and positively regards (1991, p.xxxii), profound diversity amongst wimmin..

Daly has a position similar to Griffin on the patriarchal division of 'nature' from 'culture'. She argues wimmin and the environment inhabit the same space, the 'Background' (1984, 1988). This is the arena of reproduction of species within which the experiences of wimmin and animals are similar. The Background is 'true' reality, unlike the 'foreground', or 'surface consciousness' (1979, p.26) of public patriarchy: paid employment, religion, politics, media, warfare. Background experience enables wimmin to connect to animals, and feminism must be guided by an appreciation of species diversity and ecology: 'Trees, Stars, Animals of all Kinds' are feminist 'companions' on 'the Wicked Weaving Journey' into post-patriarchy (1988, p.90). In re-valuing and radicalizing the Background, patriarchy and environmental abuse are challenged, and Daly is optimistic of wimmin's abilities to change and grow (Spender, 1985). She refuses to suggest wimmin have a 'mission' to save the world from ecological disaster (1979, p.21), contending feminist/ecological political action are one, for feminist thinking is ecological (*gyn/ecological*).

Daly does not have a purely 'idealist' account, for like Griffin (1984), she emphasizes the corporeal treatment of wimmin and animals and their abuses by patriarchal social structures. Whilst neither Daly or Griffin utilize the term 'discourse', I think they have a notion of the latter as sets of ideas that are infused with relations of gendered power, and have 'real' effect. This is also clear in Griffin's work on pornography (1981) and war (1992). Daly is more explicit in her identification of structures of patriarchy (1979, 1988): reproduction, employment, institutions of politics, the media, warfare and religion, but I feel she is contradictory in holding that one structure, reproduction, is most significant, being a key location of wimmin in patriarchal society, and a transformatory realm of patriarchal contestation. Neither Daly nor Griffin can be labeled biologically 'essentialist', although in emphasizing the commonality of wimmin's experience, they may demonstrate a tendency to homogenization, and ignore the cross-cutting influences of oppressions based on race and class as qualitatively and quantitatively affecting the form and degree of wimmin's oppression.

Perhaps the major criticism I would make of Daly, Griffin, and other radical eco-feminists, is that they conceptualize environmental abuse as a patriarchal spin-off, rather than a manifestation of a system of oppression which may have relative autonomy from patriarchal relations. Adams and Donovan (1995) have similarly contended that patriarchy is 'prototypical for many other forms of abuse' (1995, p.3), and Kappeler (1995) has echoed Daly and Griffin in asserting that one patriarchal structure - reproduction - is 'the pivot of all speciesism, racism, ethnicism, and nationalism' (1995, p.348). Whilst in Chapter 2 I accepted much of the radical feminist conception of patriarchy as a theory of gender oppression, I depart from the contention patriarchy alone can explain other forms of oppression, exploitation and domination. I feel such a position is

reductionist, for it cannot account for differences in forms and degrees of domination. Wimmin, according to radical eco-feminism, are closer to nature due to the values they hold. These are socially constructed, and based on wimmin's material experiences under patriarchy, which encourage empathy toward animals. Wimmin and animals are patriarchally constructed as 'Other' via sexualized, gendered and natured discourses which have 'real' effects. Whilst I concur with such contentions, they raise the question of differences in experience between wimmin and animals. This research will investigate the possibility of similarity and difference in the forms, degrees and extent of the oppression of wimmin and animals, and argue that levels of difference necessitate a dual systems approach to relations between gender and ecology.

GENDER AND NATURE IN THE DISCOURSES OF MODERNITY

Other eco-feminist theorists have developed an historical approach to the relationship between gender and ecology, by looking at the changing discourses on wimmin and nature which accompanied the transitions to modernity in Europe. Merchant (1980) identifies mechanistic science as a key structure in the control, domination, and exploitation of wimmin and nature, but unlike Griffin, who is unspecific about the origins of domination, she attributes the 'death of nature' (human domination of the environment), and the move from a gylanic (female centred) to patriarchal society, to the scientific revolution. Shiva (1988) and Mies (1986) have focussed on Western modernity in terms of the impact of development in the 'third world' as a process characterized by gendered, natured, (and for Mies) class based relations of domination. As argued with respect to Daly and Griffin, Merchant and Shiva do not use the term 'discourse', but their accounts capture a sense of discourse in their investigation of the concrete impact of shifts in paradigm, which they hold, accompany modernization. Mies account is rather different, and I would not suggest that she operationalizes 'discourse' analysis, but provides a more straightforwardly structural account of modernization, sophisticated in its theoretical intermeshing of structures of neo-colonial capitalist patriarchy.

The gendering and natureing of modernity

For Merchant, mechanistic science is a patriarchal discourse, and its development as a new intellectual paradigm led to the debasement of wimmin and nature. Modern Western philosophy, she contends, has constructed a dichotomy between nature and male dominated civilization. The latter, in the guise of rationalism, scientific and technological development, has been responsible for defining wimmin as the second sex, establishing a hierarchy of species involving oppressive relations, and legitimating the human domination of the natural environment. Merchant suggests that mechanistic science sanctioned the exploitation of nature, unrestrained commercial expansion, and a new socio-economic order subordinating wimmin. She traces the decline of an older,

animistic and gynocentric European worldview based on co-operation between humans and nature, and claims we need to rediscover such pre-modern ideas as a solution to the present environmental crisis and as a means of patriarchal contestation. Shiva (1988) examines the impact of Western modernity on underdeveloped countries (focussing on India), arguing the oppression of woman and nature is linked, and discourses of modernity (particularly science) are patriarchal. Shiva's solution to the oppression of woman and nature is similar to Merchant's, we must rediscover pre-modern conceptions of nature and gender. She argues woman in the Indian context already have such a conception, the 'feminine principle' or 'prakriti' (p.xiv) which emerges from their daily practices as partners with the environment in food production. This is an holistic perspective, based on non-violent ways of conceiving and acting to sustain life. In the Hindu paradigm, spirit and matter are not separate, 'nature' is viewed as an active force, as in animistic pre-modern European thinking, whereas the Western worldview separates woman and 'nature' from male 'culture'.

For Merchant and Shiva predominant discourses of nature have altered with modernity. Merchant argues modernizing Europe saw a transition in the symbolization of the environment from viewing the cosmos as full of ensouled beings, interrelated in the ecosystem, to viewing the latter as autonomous entities operating as machines (1983, p.xviii). In pre-modern Europe, the environment was usually symbolized as a nurturing mother, within an animistic discourse which prevented widescale environmental destruction (pp.3-5) and which declined with the rise of modern science which discursively constructs nature as 'disorder' and legitimates control (p.123). However, although organic, the Renaissance world view was hierarchical with respect to gender and nature and Merchant fails to recognize hierarchy was amplified in (rather than created by) modernity (Eastlea, 1980). Patriarchy and anthroparchy preceded the transition to modernity. The same critique can be made of Shiva, who asserts the impact of modernity marginalized 'prakriti' and established patriarchal Western science. Shiva fails to account for the patriarchal nature of Indian society prior to modernization (Jayawardena, 1986, pp.78-80), and the patriarchal organization of rural areas (p.256) where 'prakriti', according to Shiva, prevails.

Mies (1986) also focuses on woman in developing countries, and contends they have an empathetic relation to nature due to the production in which they engage. Unlike men, woman see their bodies as part of the productive process, and regard the environment similarly. Mies argues woman do not relate to productive appropriation in terms of dominance or property relations, as they often do not own their own bodies, let alone the land and are thus inclined to 'make grow and let grow' rather than assert dominance over nature (1986, p.16). Shiva asserts this connection between woman and nature is undermined by industrial capitalism, which marginalizes woman, peasants, and tribal peoples as workers, with ecological consequence (1988, p.44). It is questionable however, whether patriarchy was produced by gender segregation in production alone,

as Shiva and Mies suggest, or that the gendering of anthroparchy can be reduced entirely to role differentiation.

Merchant and Shiva prioritize patriarchal relations in accounting for human domination of the environment. Whilst Merchant does see capitalism as significant, and Shiva emphasizes relations between patriarchy and Westernized 'development', they do not unpack sets of oppressive relations but homogenize them as part of patriarchal modernity. Mies (1986) is less explicitly concerned with the environment, but has a more complex theorization, examining capitalism and patriarchy as interconnected systems of oppression (capitalist patriarchy, which interconnects with racism via an international post-colonial gendered division of labour) which have structures in which they interconnect (paid labour, the household) and structures specific to them (patriarchy involves sexual violence, for example). Mies' account is problematic in theorizing environmental exploitation (particularly in the 'third world') as a by-product of the restructuring of international capitalism, rather than produced by analytically autonomous relations of domination. Thus Mies provides a more complex account of modernization than Shiva or Merchant, although the domination of nature is marginalized. The domination of the environment is related to dominations based on class, race and gender, but I feel connections between these forms of domination might most effectively be analyzed through a dual systems approach in order to catch the complexity of their differentiation's. In addition, a strength of the analyses of Shiva and Merchant compared to Mies is that they do not analyze domination solely in terms of systems and structures as does Mies, but have a notion of discourse in their analyses. Whilst Mies focus is primarily on production relations, Shiva and Merchant are concerned with alterations in predominant sets of ideas about gender and nature, that are infused with power relations and have a real effect on social, economic and political processes, practices and institutions.

Power, gender, nature and scientific knowledge

Merchant asserts the control of nature and woman was justified and enabled by mechanistic science and philosophy rooted in capitalism and patriarchy. Baconian science sexualized and feminized the control of nature (pp.164-9), reducing woman to near invisibility, and nature to machine (pp.180-2). However, Daly (1979), Griffin (1984) and Figs (1970) argue the scientific paradigm built upon established patriarchal discourses, primarily those of Judeo-Christianity, in which woman were defined as inferior, and human domination of the environment legitimated. Shiva characterizes 'Western' science as reductionist due to its epistemological denial the environment may have some form of intrinsic value (1988, p.21). The widescale destruction of nature that accompanied modernity is rightly attributed to the scientific revolution, but the scientific revolution fitted into, and manipulated to its advantage, existing hierarchical systems of power in which the domination of woman and nature had already begun. Shiva (1988) argues the

scientific revolution caused environmental exploitation because of its association with industrialism. The industrial revolution converted economics from the management of resources for needs satisfaction to commodity production for profit, and modern science provided ethical justification and technological means for the necessary exploitation of resources. Shiva fails to acknowledge capitalist relations precipitated commodification for profit and resource exploitation prior to industrialization (Porter, 1990). Whereas there is overlap between the development of capitalism and the scientific revolution in the seventeenth century (Merchant, 1980, 1985), Shiva wrongly assumes nineteenth century European industrialization and modern science were mutually reinforcing, despite three centuries separating their genesis.

Shiva and Merchant's critique of science as patriarchal and environmentally destructive is part of a wider feminist critique of science. Fox-Keller argues science has been produced by 'a particular sub-set of the human race' (1985, p.7), and Harding, that science is a 'Western, bourgeois, masculine project' (1986, p.8). Green historian Eastlea, has also noted the gendered production of such knowledge (1981, p.70), and historian of science Kuhn (1962), its ideological content. Thus whilst modernity has been regarded as generally patriarchal, the sciences have sometimes been seen as particularly so. The characteristics of science are seen as gendered (Harding, 1986, Fox-Keller, 1985), and scientific objectivity identified as a 'male' way of relating to the world, whereas intuitive ways of thinking are feminized and evaluated in the scientific paradigm as subjective (Hubbard, 1990). Haraway has sought to move beyond critique of paradigms of scientific rationality as ones of domination, arguing modernist scientific categories have constructed the separation between humans and the natural world, and to overcome human domination, we must deconstruct such categories. She contends we should conceive all objects of knowledge (animals, the environment and even machines) as 'agent in the production of knowledge' and as sufficiently indistinct that we may speak of 'compounds' of hybrid organisms (1991, p.212). She argues concepts of objectivity and objects of knowledge are constructed in terms of Western modernity, and are concepts of fixity, determinism and objectification (1988, p.591-6) which encourage dominant groups of humans to conceive the natural world as objects for human use. She contends we should approach the natural world not as objects but as 'agents' constructed via narratives.

Haraway's critique of science involves analysis of issues relating to animals which have been sadly absent from other feminist accounts (Harding, 1986, 1989; Bleier, 1984). She does not establish separation of humans and animals as a means of refuting patriarchal biological determinism (Hubbard, 1990), but attempts to deconstruct biology in asserting 'nature' is a social construct. Similarly to Butler (1990, 1993), she goes so far as to claim physicality is also socially constructed: 'Bodies are not born; they are made' (1991, p.208). I accept Haraway's questioning of feminist resistance to seeing wimmin as animals, although it is unsurprising feminists have resisted

such a conception, considering its historical use as a means of patriarchal oppression (Birke, 1991, 1996). However, as contended in Chapter 1, Haraway insists on disturbing the boundaries between human and animal via an extreme social constructionist position which denies any 'reality' to animals beyond human constructions of them. I concur feminism is at fault for deploying Enlightenment tradition in order to separate wimmin from animals (Plumwood, 1991, p.19), and think Haraway's blurring of human/animal boundaries may be useful in dismantling anthroparchal discourses. However, rather than deconstructing the physical, I feel it may be helpful to acknowledge socially mediated (but not determined) physicality for all beings, and see animals, like humans, as social, and their societies differing. This may guard against universalizing tendencies in speaking of animals, and discourage conceptual separation of humans from 'animals'. As contended in previous chapters, the postmodern deconstruction of modernist categories is problematic for it gives us few theoretical tools with which to analyze concrete expressions of oppressive structures.

Haraway's dismissal of scientific knowledge as a 'story' (1991, p.187) with no greater degree of objective 'reality' than any other (for 'Science is culture' 1991, p.230) is highly problematic. Shiva is right to draw back from complete relativism, arguing that in producing non-patriarchal knowledge we are not required to reject an attempt to comprehend the world in rational terms, nor the idea forms of knowledge can be subjected to critical evaluation via empirical testing, a position consistent with the critical realism advocated in Chapters 1 and 2. I accept theories and methods are shaped by prevailing discourses, and feel no form of inquiry can be utterly free from discourses of social power and contestation, a position with which as McLellan has remarked 'no modernist would disagree' (1995, p.402). This said, I would reject an extreme relativist position that asserts no knowledge is an improvement on any other for: 'it (is) impossible for any researcher...to study gender with any authority' (Haraway, 1991, p.77). If this is the case, one wonders why Haraway (or Flax and Nicholson, as charged by McLellan, 1995; or Butler, as charged by Evans, 1996) bothers to write about gender, or indeed anything else for that matter.

Whilst like Shiva and Merchant, I question the status of mechanistic scientific knowledge and see it imbued with patriarchal and anthroparchal ideology, I would not want to reject the idea that some forms of knowledge are more valid than others. Knowledge produced from inquiry that attempts objectivity, informed by an understanding of discourses and structures of power, may be an appropriate balance between uncritical avocation of universalizing truth claims, and the consensual stasis of extreme localized relativism. In rejecting all aspects of science as a discourse of oppression, radically deconstructive accounts of science throw a methodological and epistemological baby out with the ideological bathwater. Eco-feminists can, I feel, acknowledge some positive aspects of scientific inquiry (loosely defined), and strive for knowledge which attempts to theorize social complexity and attempts to develop upon and improve knowledge. Such

a position is important primarily because of its analytic strength, but political necessity is also an issue. Unlike Haraway, I do not feel that we are approaching a condition of postmodernity 'living through a movement from an organic, industrial society to a polymorphous information system – from all work to all play' (1991, p.161), wherein 'White Capitalist Patriarchy' is being replaced by an 'Informatics of Domination' (p.210). I believe capitalism, racism, patriarchy and anthroparchy are all dynamic and transformative but still, unfortunately, very much with us, and the empirical research for this thesis suggests some aspects of the operation of such systems. Feminist theory must attempt to analyze the complex and interrelated reality of such dominations, and I will argue it is possible to utilize and combine the insights of a critical realist and structural dual systems approach, with the detailed sensitivity of discourse analysis. It is unfortunate that eco-feminist theorists, despite adopting different perspectives, have remained antagonistic almost without exception, to a dualist approach in examining relations between gender and nature.

Dual systems or systemic webs?

In reviewing feminist theories of patriarchy, I indicated the possibility of a dual systems theory drawing upon the interrelations between patriarchy and anthroparchy. However, eco-feminists, whether closer to radical feminism (Griffin, 1984; Daly, 1988) or ecology (Warren, 1987; Plumwood, 1993) have been implicitly or explicitly hostile to dualist analysis for similar reasons.

Daly, Griffin, Merchant, Shiva et al. see the abuse of animals and the environment as a product of patriarchy. Warren's position is similar, for she argues feminism is a movement which can end all forms of oppression, including that of the environment (1987, p.133), and that a 'patriarchal conceptual framework' of 'power-over' (power as hierarchy and dominance) is responsible for a range of oppressions (1994, pp.181-186). Plumwood appears to hold a slightly different position, but I would argue it has little to distinguish it from that of Warren. Plumwood contends systems of oppression based on ethnicity, sex, nature etc. are interconnected and form an interlocking 'web' of oppression (1994, p.78-9). This does not mean different forms of oppression are indistinguishable, they are relatively autonomous, distinct yet related (p.79). Problematically however, although Plumwood argues oppressions within the 'web' have 'distinct foci and strands' and 'some independent movement', she adopts a similarly conflatory approach to Warren in arguing 'ultimately', forms of domination have 'a unified overall mode of operation, forming a *single system*' (1994, p.79, emphasis mine). Plumwood is rightly critical of dual systems theory (e.g. Walby, 1990, 1992) for ignoring ecology (1994, p.83), and argues 'social ecological feminism' (which she defines as including Mies, 1986; Haraway, 1989; Shiva, 1989) takes account of the range of oppressions within the 'web'. Plumwood's position here is rather contradictory. On the one hand, she concurs with criticisms of dualists (Young, 1981; Mies, 1986, p.38) as emphasizing the unification between systems of oppression. On the other hand however, Plumwood's own work

tends to emphasize similarities and marginalize any differences between oppressive systems. Whilst she argues oppression must be conceptualized in terms of multiplicity, in reducing the 'web' of oppressions to 'a single system', with a 'common structure and ideology' (p.81), she provides an analysis which stresses symbiosis and denies conflict, just the approach she claims to avoid.

Multifarious oppressions are interconnected, and I partially accept Plumwood's 'web' analogy. However, I strongly dispute her contention oppressions constitute one overarching system. Systems of oppression based on ethnicity, class, gender and nature interrelate in complex and contradictory ways, and are best conceived as independent yet related. Rather than a congruent 'web', systems of oppression interrelate and intersect in the more complex manner of the planes of a snowflake, which takes unique form across time and place. Thus particular instances of oppression demonstrate unique and specific articulations of various combinations of oppressive systems. The difficulty lies in how interconnections between systems of oppression may be investigated. The strength of dualist analysis is its ability to investigate, in a detailed empirical way, the interconnections between autonomous yet related systems of oppression (e.g. Walby, 1986). Dual systems analysis may imply a theorist sees only two systems of oppression as significant but this is not inevitable. Walby is rightly criticized by Plumwood (1994) as 'nature-blind', but whilst her focuses is on relations between capitalism and patriarchy, she does not deny the significance of oppressive systems such as race. Dualist analysis provides a means of investigating the structures and processes of the individual systems of oppression, and the ways in which they articulate and interrelate in complementary and antagonistic ways.

By eschewing dualist analysis, eco-feminists have demonstrated a tendency towards reductionism by either seeing the oppression of both wimmin and nature as a product of patriarchy (Daly, 1979, Griffin, 1984), or of an overarching 'logic' or 'system' of domination (Warren, 1994; Plumwood, 1994). The oppressions of wimmin and animals are too divergent to be adequately encapsulated by such approaches. In order to investigate in detail the relations between these oppressions, a dual systems approach analyzing contradictory relations of patriarchy and anthroparchy will be employed, with reference also to capitalism and ethnic hierarchy. It is hoped such an approach is able to account for both complexity and difference, combined with an understanding of the operations of systemic oppressions. Such complexity however, is not to be captured solely by the adoption of a dualist approach, but as will be argued later in this chapter, by the deployment of a discursive approach within a generally structural framework.

PATRIARCHY, ANTHROPARCHY AND MYTHOLOGY

The pre-historical search for origins of oppressive systems is necessarily speculative, but merits brief coverage here for two reasons. First, it counters the contention gendered and natured

domination are relatively modern (Merchant, 1980; Shiva, 1988). Second, it indicates the origins of patriarchal and anthroparchal domination may have been similar. The section proceeds to look at the contemporary significance of animism for feminist neo-pagan theorists, who exemplify the re-valuation of pre-modern European relations to nature which Merchant (1980) recommends.

Feminist pre-history - the origins of patriarchy and anthroparchy?

Feminist pre-historical anthropology adopts an evolutionary model which posits a transition from gynlany (Eisler, 1989; Gimbutas, 1982, 1990), gynocentric/matrifocal society (Lerner, 1986; Starhawk, 1990b), or matriarchy (Reed, 1976; Stone, 1977), to patriarchy. The establishment of patriarchy was not a biological inevitability (Goldberg, 1976), but a takeover of spiritual, political and social power, which these theorists suggest was both gendered and natured.

Mainstream paleoanthropology has generally seen Paleolithic society as characterized by male dominance through game hunting, and its interpretation of archeological evidence has upheld the assumption of a patriarchal society. Thus Paleolithic cave art is often interpreted as depicting men hunting and killing animals for food, and numerous depictions of fecund wimmin have been explained as an early form of pornography (Fisher, 1980, p.136-7; Collard, 1988, ch.2; Eisler, 1989, p.5-6). However, feminist scholarship sees the Paleolithic period as one likely to have been characterized by an animistic worldview, providing the foundation of the Goddess religion which was to emerge in the Neolithic period. Feminist interpretations of Paleolithic cave art have tended to see depictions of 'weapons' as images of vegetation, depictions of fecund wimmin as probable manifestations of reverence for wimmin as creatrix (1989, p.4; Lerner, 1986, pp.148-50; Stone, 1977, p.28-9), and depictions of 'hunters' have been seen as possible illustrations of shamans and their animal familiars (Fisher, 1980, p.139). Gimbutas argues Goddess worshipping Neolithic societies lived in harmony with nature (1990 p.xv), as the parthenogenic Goddess reflective of the lunar cycle was the key artefactual symbol, and reverence for nature (the moon) and wimmin was linked (p.321; Shuttle and Redgrove, 1988, p.192). The Goddess was commonly symbolized in animal form and animals held to possess sacred power (Gimbutas, 1990, p.317; Eisler, 1989, p.18). Mellaart claims Neolithic societies were developed civilizations in which wimmin participated in religious life, were priestesses, social leaders and respected members of society (Starhawk, 1990b, p.37; Mellaart, 1965, pp.86-88; Lerner, 1986, ch.7). Gimbutas claims evidence points to the existence of a peaceful society (1982, p.17) that was equalitarian and unstratified (1982, ch.2). Stone contends matrilineity was the norm, wimmin legal owners of property (1977, p.49), and sex was regarded as sacred (p.54; Lerner, 1986, p.103). These theorists collectively argue in Goddess worshipping animistic societies, wimmin, animals and sexuality were seen as sacred, and this was reflected in an absence of gender stratification.

What happened to such societies is even more speculative in terms of archeological evidence, but Gimbutas, Stone, Lerner and Eisler adopt a similar thesis. From 5000 BC Chalcolithic and Neolithic peoples in the Near East suffered cultural disruption from invasion (Eisler, 1989 p.43) by migratory waves of northern pastoralists who were Indo-European, Aryan and Semitic (Gimbutas, 1977, p.293; Lerner, 1986 p.162-3). The religion of the invading peoples was patriarchal, glorifying hunting, warfare, sacrifice, and an all-powerful male god (Lerner, 1986, ch.9; Stone, 1977 p.82). According to Eisler the invading peoples adhered to a dominator rather than a partnership model of social organization, based on developing technologies of warfare (1989, p.45). Starhawk contends there was mutual consolidation of hierarchies of kingship, war, class/caste, slavery, and gender (1990b, p.46), and spiritual value was denied for wimmin and animals, who become objectified as the bounty of war (p.55; Lerner, 1986, pp.76-101). Patriarchy and human dominance over nature did not emerge with modernity argue these theorists, but with pre-historic change from Goddess worshipping animism, to male dominated hierarchical religions which laid the foundations for the emergence of Judeo-Christianity.

Gender, nature and neo-Paganism

'Patriarchal religion' (Judaism, Christianity, Islam in particular) has been critiqued by eco-feminist Pagan theorists on account of its theoretical separation between matter and spirit which has led to the dominance of humans over the natural environment (Freer, 1983, p.131). Patriarchal spirituality, like secular science and rationality is based on a conception of human superiority over 'nature', and over wimmin, who are designated less spiritual, and more animal and sexual (Figs, 1970). Some argue this led to the exclusion of wimmin from spirituality and legitimated gender difference (Starhawk, 1990). The separation of matter and spirit has been seen to have deleterious environmental consequences (Bloom, 1991, p.4) and legitimized killing and abuse of other species (Adams, 1990). Some eco-feminists (Adler, 1986; Starhawk, 1989, 1990; Eisler, 1990) have argued neo-Paganism and modern Wicca have potential to contest relations of gendered and natured power. Feminist witchcraft is an holistic philosophy and its mythology, in contrast to those of 'patriarchal world religions', reveres wimmin and the environment (Greenwood, 1996, p.109).

Some theorists have drawn upon early modern connections between gender, nature and neo-Paganism looking at the herstory of the European witchcraze of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries. Merchant (1980) argues witchcraft was conceptually animistic (p.140), and the witch is a potent eco-feminist symbol, independent of and opposed to, patriarchal authority, and working with the natural world in mutual aid. Dworkin describes the witchcraze in which nine million wimmin died (Crowley, 1989) as gynocide (Dworkin, 1974). Daly (1979) draws back from asserting 'witches' were the 'first feminists' (Mitchell, 1974), but argues they represented wimmin living outside patriarchal authority. Daly omits that some accused may have been practicing Wiccans

(Jong, 1982), whose beliefs were politically subversive for the state (Eastlea, 1981, p.111-142; Bloom, 1991) and nobility (Starhawk, 1990a, p.207; Adler, 1986, p.19). The 'burning times' exhibit a number of patriarchal and anthroparchal relations: sexualized violence (Trevor Roper, 1974; Daly, 1979, Eastlea, 1981), violence against animals (burning of 'familiar') (Starhawk, 1990a), criminalization of gynocentric herbalism (Ehrenreich and English, 1973; Oakley, 1976), the attempt to eliminate pagan animism (Adler, 1986, p.19; Eastlea, 1981, pp.111-142, Bloom, 1991) and female social (Trevor Roper, 1978) and sexual (Starhawk, 1990a, p.207) independence.

Adler found feminism and ecology were key motivations for contemporary Pagan religious praxis (1986, p.22). Paganism is polytheistic, acknowledging a variety of gods and goddesses, and multifarious forms of spiritual manifestation, and animistic/pantheistic, seeing divinity as inseparable from, and immanent in, nature (p.25). The Goddess is seen as a positive symbol, enabling wimmin to value themselves and connect to the environment (Starhawk, 1989, p.78), with the Horned God encouraging men to adopt a respectful relationship to wimmin (1989, p.101). In witchcraft, sexuality is a sacrament (Crowley, 1989), and rape sacrilegious (Starhawk, 1989, p.12). This precludes the identification of wimmin with animal physicality as a means of oppression. Wiccan thought is based on appreciation of diversity, a key tenet of ecological thinking (Dobson 1991, p.143), and for Adler, pagan animism impels ecological consciousness, for if we see all things as connected, we have a political responsibility for the natural world (1986, p.410).

Neo-Pagan eco-feminism can be seen to be 'essentialist' to the same degree as any other religious philosophy, in that it posits absolute normative 'truths' about social life. It is less defensible from postmodern critique than for example, deep ecological conceptions of 'intrinsic value' pertaining to the environment, for Wiccan philosophy posits the concept of 'immanence' (of 'spirit' which runs through all life, but is concentrated particularly in organic matter, and can be channeled by sentient beings, (Starhawk, 1990a, p.136; 1990b, p.8) which it neither substantiates nor defends. Thus within eco-feminist Wicca there is a holistic conception of spiritual embodiment in nature, and of a 'true self' corrupted by patriarchal and other oppressions (Greenwood, 1996, p.111), which is at odds with postmodern conceptions of pluralistic identity (McNay, 1992, p.121). As Greenwood (1996) points out, feminist Wicca constitutes a 'reinvention' of mythology in which 'Nature and the Goddess become symbolic of an essential femininity, the antithesis of patriarchal society' (1996, p.114). Critics of eco-feminism have demonstrated particular hostility to its spiritual content, seeing it as reinforcing cultural stereotypes associating wimmin with 'nature' (Segal, 1987). Greenwood asserts using the Goddess as a political symbol offers a vision of a true feminist self that may deny differences amongst/between wimmin (1996, p.118), and Haraway claims she would 'rather be a cyborg than a goddess' (1991, p.181). Whilst I would concur eco-feminist Wicca involves an 'essentialist' conception of the self, I am not convinced this necessarily involves the eclipse of difference. Starhawk (1989) has a highly interchangeable and fluid

conception of the self which she does not describe in terms of masculinity and femininity in a dichotomous fashion, but as dynamic and diverse (Starhawk, 1989, p.9). Whilst postmodern feminists can criticize eco-feminist Paganism as 'essentialist' in its conception of a 'true self', that self is not one which reinforces patriarchal gender stereotypes, but arguably is a post-patriarchal contestatory self which celebrates diversity. Western neo-Paganism is only an aspect of eco-feminist praxis, it is an arena in which ecological and feminist insights coalesce. Whilst it may be open to an 'essentialist' critique, I feel this is more likely to be a result of its status as a religious belief system, rather than in its homogenizing of gender or other relations of oppression.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND RELATIONS BETWEEN PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY

This section discusses the possibilities of, and some tensions attendant with, the combination of discourse analysis with a dualist structural approach in the analysis of relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy. I argue for a conception of 'discourse' as interrelated sets of ideas which concretize themselves in specific practices, processes and institutional formations. Discourses should not be seen as part of ideology, but as conceptually distinct by virtue of their attachment to, and their nature as embedded in, social institutions and practices. Discourses are part of the architecture of relations of domination, or for Foucault, technologies of power. Drawing on certain aspects of the theorizing of Foucault (which is often seen as poststructuralist), and on the radical feminism of Daly, this section argues for a particular understanding of discourse, and suggests a series of seven discourses which may be expressive of patriarchal and anthroparchal relations.

Relations between discursive and structural analyses

The discourses suggested in this section are both theoretically and methodologically significant. I conceptualize discourses as 'middle level' concepts. By this I mean that I see them as less abstracted from my empirical research for the case studies, than the concepts outlined in the previous two chapters, i.e. those of system and structure. I think ^{that} this notion of discursive analysis as closer to empirical data, and as more reflective of the detailed and variant formations of power evidenced in such data, is Foucault's own sense of the nature of discourse. I will elaborate Foucault's own deployment of discursive analysis slightly later in this section, but at this juncture, my purpose is to discuss the extent to which my conception of discourse is abstracted in relation to what can arguably be seen as the more 'macro-level' analyses in this thesis, system and structure.

Foucault contends that his use of discourse analysis constitutes a genealogy (his method of historical analysis) (Foucault, 1976a, in Kelly, 1994, p.21). For Foucault, genealogy involves theoretical production that is firmly located in or enmeshed within the empirical material from

which it is derived. In speaking of his use of genealogy and discourse as a research method Foucault emphasizes the importance of examining power relations not at a highly abstracted level, but one which is specifically and empirically rooted:

'analysis (of power) should be concerned...with those points at which it becomes capillary,...invests itself in institutions, becomes embodied in techniques...I have tried to see in what ways punishment and the power of punishment are effectively embodied in a certain number of local, regional, material institutions, which are concerned with torture or imprisonment, and to place these in the climate - at once institutional and physical, regulated and violent - of the effective apparatuses of punishment.' (Foucault, 1976a, pp.34-5)

I am sympathetic to Foucault's stress on the embeddness of discursive analyses in empirical case study research, and his effort to 'link the material and the non-material together in a theory of discourse' (McNay, 1994, p.108). I also feel such analyses can be related to a wider and more abstract theoretical framework, and that Foucault might best be seen as having a complex and at times contradictory, rather than as is often assumed, an antagonistic, relation to such theorizing. Whilst Foucault charges that 'global, totalitarian theories' such as Marxism may sometimes prove a 'hindrance to research', he also allows they 'continue to provide in a fairly consistent fashion useful tools for local research' (Foucault, 1976a, p.20). Thus he suggests that the local, fragmentary, detailed and empirically derived knowledge produced by discursive analysis might be combined in some fashion with macro theoretical conceptualizations.

Foucault himself might appear dismissive of macro-theorizing when he alleges for example, that 'anything' can be deduced from class analysis and be seen as a product of the systemic operations of capitalism. However, I do not think he is eschewing class analysis per se here, merely its more crude application divorced from empirical instances. Foucault argues we must theorize 'beginning from the lowest level', looking at how mechanisms of power function through 'repression or exclusion' and 'identify the agents responsible' in a specific way (1976b, in Kelly (ed.), 1994, p.38). I think Foucault is capturing here a notion of discourse as a form of micro abstraction that may then inform more macro analysis. For example, in the following excerpt from one of his lectures, Foucault relates his own discursive analyses of madness, punishment and sexuality to macro conceptions of system and structure:

'it was not the bourgeoisie itself which thought that madness had to be excluded or infantile sexuality repressed. What in fact happened instead was that the mechanisms of the exclusion of madness, and of the surveillance of infantile sexuality,...came to be *colonized and maintained by global mechanisms* and the *entire State system*...the bourgeoisie has never had any use for the insane; but the procedures it has employed to exclude them have revealed and realized...a political advantage on occasion even a certain economic utility, which have *consolidated the system* and *contributed to its overall functioning*....The bourgeoisie could not care less about delinquents....but it is concerned about the *complex of mechanisms* with which delinquency is controlled, pursued, punished, and reformed' (Foucault, 1976b, p.39, my emphasis)

Thus for Foucault, we must first analyze 'phenomena', 'techniques' and 'procedures' of power through discourse analysis at the 'most basic levels' i.e. in limited, specific, empirical instances, and then, and interestingly, 'above all', show how these specific discourses of power and their effects are 'invested and annexed by more global phenomena' and engaged with by 'more general powers or economic interests' (Foucault, 1976b, p.37). I will shortly contend that this combination of discursive and more macro analysis is a key strength of Foucault's earlier work on madness and punishment, and is seen to be present also in the work of the 'final Foucault' (Bernauer and Rasmussen, 1988) on government. It is the sense of discourse almost as a tool, a method from which to develop macro analysis, that informs the way in which discourse is utilized in this thesis.

Discourses are conceptualized here as patriarchal and anthroparchal ideas which may be seen to be embedded within social/economic/political institutions and practices. Such institutions, processes and practices can be grouped, and as argued in Chapter 2, sets of systematic and relatively enduring institutional/organizational/procedural relationships can be conceptualized as structures (Archer, 1996, p.696). Discourses will be seen as operating within and across structures, and as embedded in empirical phenomena and constitutive of power relations. Similarly to Foucault, I see discourses as specific, detailed and complex operations of power.

Discourses can be differentiated from structures in terms of kind and scale. Discourses are less abstracted, closer to empirical material, and are also differentially abstracted, being a different order of conceptualization. As we move from empirical cases towards abstraction, complex webs of discourses may be seen to be constitutive of wider structures of social power, i.e. intermeshing discourses form parts of wider and more generalized power relations within practices and institutions. This is not to suggest certain discourses are contained in a discreet manner within particular institutions/practices that themselves interrelate to form structures - the relationship between structure and discourse is unlikely to be so straightforward. Discourses are not conceptualized here as fitting neatly and exclusively within particular structures, but I envisage that a particular discourse may be evidenced, in differing form and content, within/across a number of structures, and across the structures of a variety of oppressive systems. Thus discourses derived from various systems of social domination intermesh in a web across social structures which are also seen as distinct but overlapping and interlinking. I wish to contend the identification of such discourses may be a means of examining the intersections between different oppressive systems. Discourses provide, as I believe Foucault can be seen to suggest, a theoretical basis which, being empirically rooted, accounts for social complexity, and from which we may develop theorization at a more abstract level.

This brings us to the question of the relation of discourse analysis to the methodology on which this empirical research is based. Discourses comprise collectivities of interrelated themes which

carry relations of power, and such discourses may be evident in cultural texts, social practices, and institutions. The empirical research will examine the extent to which the seven discourses identified in the latter part of this section can be seen to operate as part of patriarchal and/or anthroparchal relations within certain texts of popular culture (soft core pornographic magazines and novels; food/cookery magazines, articles and books) and institutions and their related procedures (the meat industry and its procedures of slaughter and butchery, the practices of animal farming; the pornography industry and its production relations). The discourses suggested in this section draw upon some of the literature reviewed so far, such as Griffin (1988), Merchant (1980), Dworkin (1981, 1983), and Mackinnon (1989), but the most important theorist here is Daly (1979). Daly herself does not utilize the term 'discourse' but I will contend in some respects, her operationalization of the eight themes she identifies as constitutive of patriarchal relations is not dissimilar to the deployment of discourse in some of the work of Foucault (1971, 1979), and further, that she overcomes some of the problems feminists have identified with Foucault's approach (Hartsock, 1990; Ramazanoglu, 1993).

Foucauldian discourse analysis

Foucault analyzes power as operating through the 'functioning of a discourse', the multiplicity of discourses constructing 'relations of domination' (1976b, pp.31-34). He concentrates on historical reconfigurations of knowledge and trends of social organization, arguing changing relations between formations of power and kinds of knowledge are intrinsically linked. This general conception of 'discourse' is akin to that deployed by this thesis, although I would describe Foucault's 'configurations of knowledge' as symbolic regimes and his 'formations of power' as social institutions, processes and procedures. Like Foucault, I see the symbolic and institutional as 'intrinsically' related, whilst being analytically distinct, for as Sheridan (1980) argues, Foucault's concept of 'genealogy' involves the assumption of a 'tie', not a conflation, between institutions and sets of ideas (bodies of 'power-knowledge').

Discourses of power for Foucault are 'everywhere', all people are subject to them for discussion of objects and phenomena, for example human bodies and sexuality, can only take place within the confines of discourse, and even forms and conceptions of resistance to dominant power relations are contained within them (Foucault, 1981). Foucault contends that at various times throughout history, there were important shifts in 'discursive fields of knowledge' i.e. what counted as serious discussion of subjects such as madness, disease, wealth, crime and sexuality. He documents the changes in predominant discourses in order to demonstrate how the content of different discourses structures the ways in which individuals think and talk about objects of investigation, which he contended, consequently constituted new forms of power and domination surrounding the object under investigation. Discourses 'discipline' the subject in unseen ways, and we are constantly

embedded within a 'netlike organization' of discursive power relations although there may be discursive gaps, for 'individuals circulate' between 'threads' of power (1976b, p.36). I would concur with McNay (1994) however, that despite his claims to the contrary, Foucault does see discourses as almost all-encompassing (McNay, 1994, p.102).

Discourses are not merely sets of ideas, but also institutionally rooted social practices which structure the social world. For Foucault, discourses are not heuristic devices alone, but are applied practices which have 'real effects' (1976b, p.35). In the previous chapters, I argued for a realist approach to conceptualizing social systems and structures, and would contend that discourses should likewise be seen as real in form and effect. Foucault does not explicitly deploy the notion of social 'structure', but I believe this to be implicit in much of his work, such as his early research on madness and punishment, and later work on government. Here, power is seen as a 'negative, dominatory force' (McNay, 1994, p.102) which operates via social institutions and their related procedures (Foucault, 1971, 1979). The case is far less apparent however with respect to his work on sexuality in which power is seen to operate in a more pluralistic manner, and analysis tends to favour representation rather than institutions (Foucault 1981, 1985, 1986) (2).

Foucault comes closest to explicitly discussing structures in examining the nature of knowledge. Here, he echoes the position of linguistic theorists such as Saussure and Chomsky who incorporate discourse into a very strong notion of structure and system (to the extent that the latter are conceptualized as a 'prison-house', Jameson, 1972). In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), Foucault discusses the 'rules of formation' which govern the production of discourses in any given period. Although Foucault conceptualizes discourses of power as dynamic, diverse and heterogeneous, he contends they are produced within an 'episteme', a condition of possibility of discourse. The 'episteme' is 'an *a priori* set of rules of formation that allow discourses to function' (McNay, 1994, p.52). Foucault (1972) goes as far down the path of structural analysis to suggest (echoing Marx) that there is a distinction between superficial empirical knowledge ('connaissance') and deep level epistemic structures ('savoir'), a position not utterly dissimilar from Bhaskarian realism. Indeed at one point Foucault distinguishes between 'primary' or 'real' relations and 'secondary' relations (1972, pp.45-6) in which he seems to suggest a 'real' socio-economic realm exists independently of and *a priori* in relation to, the 'discursive realm'. In addition, social actors are unaware of such conditions of possibility, even if they are practitioners of particular discourses. If we take Archer's (1996) definition of social structure as 'relatively enduring' institutional/organizational/procedural relations, I think there is a case to be made for Foucault capturing a notion of structure here, of which agents are largely unaware, and within which discourses operate.

Such a notion of structure can be seen to be operationalized particularly in Foucault's earlier and his final work wherein discourses are almost conceptualized as structuring forces, having power to constitute (but not entirely determine) both ideas and their related social institutions and practices. In *Madness and Civilization* (1971) and *Discipline and Punish* (1979) discourses are conceptualized as compatible with systemic and structural notions of power, as McNay (1994) argues with respect to the latter, discourses are:

‘ineluctably bound up with regimes of power. Systems of power bring forth different types of knowledge, which in turn produce material effects on the bodies of social agents that serve to reinforce the original power formation.’ (McNay, 1994, p.63)

Such a conception suggests the possibility that knowledge produced by the human sciences is in the service of the dominatory regime, which may arguably be criticized for an almost Althusserian structuralism wherein subjects are denied critical reflection within discourse (McNay, 1992, p.153). Here, Foucault seems to conflate discourses with structure, and discourse becomes ‘a structuring principle which governs beliefs and practices, ‘words and things’’ (McNay, 1994, p.69).

In his writings on government, this conflation can most clearly be seen. Foucault rejects a legalistic notion of the powers of the state, arguing ‘government’ is constituted by discursive disciplinary techniques. Government is seen as a process of disciplining a population through ‘biopolitical’ control which aims to increase collective productive efficiency (McNay, 1994, p.114). The state is not a composite of institutions and functions, but of discursive process a: ‘grid of disciplinary coercions whose purpose is in fact to assure the cohesion of...(the) social body’ (Foucault, 1976b, p.42). Foucault seems to use discourse as a structuring mechanism here, and there is much slippage in his terminology for this ‘grid of disciplinary coercions’ is at once also ‘a discourse, an organization’ (p.42). Thus discourses create and maintain social structures such as state institutions which through their discursive disciplinary procedures create a ‘society of normalization’. At this juncture, Foucault leaves concern for locality and empirical embeddedness far behind, positing such ‘normalization’ has ‘global functioning’ (1976b, p.44). I do not find such conflation of discourse with structure particularly helpful, and am more sympathetic to the approach suggested in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, in which discourses are active bearers of systemic power relations, which operate within structural constraints. This is not to argue Foucault has a static notion of discourse, rather discourses and the ‘discursive rules’ (structures) within which they are constituted, alter dynamically (McNay, 1994, p.66). I concur whilst discourses (and structures) are part of systems of domination, they are historically and culturally contingent.

Foucault is primarily concerned with disciplinary discourses which operate via the body, and are relations of power which marginalize deviancy and establish and support an encroaching normalization. Said (1988) has argued much of Foucault's work is concerned with the ‘other’ and

'otherness', the construction of deviancy and dehumanization of the deviant. Foucault refers to particular cases of the construction of 'madness' (1971), 'crime' (1979) and 'sexuality' (1981) and the discourses of power operating within and through the asylum, the prison and the professions of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy to 'normalize' the subject. Foucault's deployment of discourse alters, and I find his earlier usage in particular that of *Madness and Civilization* more helpful to an understanding of systemic relations of power than the less institutionally rooted notion in the volumes of *The History of Sexuality*.

In his study of madness (1971) Foucault examines the causes and consequences of the 'Great Confinement' of the seventeenth century in absolutist Europe, which brought about the internment of significant numbers of people. He investigates the extent to which religious, philosophical and medical ideologies combine with social and economic forces in transforming the conception of madness as socially tolerable, to one in which insanity becomes equated with the 'uncivilized' as a result of the preoccupation with 'reason' which followed the Enlightenment. This alteration in the symbolization of madness had direct and concrete effect on the treatment of those identified as 'mad' who were consequently confined and brutalized within asylums and workhouses. Foucault operationalizes concepts of 'humanity' and 'animality' (1971, p.83) in analyzing the treatment of the mad who are perceived as almost an antithesis of 'humanity'. The social construction of oppressed groups as 'other' by the imposition of a distinction between the 'human' and other animals, is, I will argue, one of the discourses which can be evidenced in both patriarchal and anthroparchal form. Here, Foucault conceptualizes discourse as linked to systemic domination, in particular capitalism. He contends for example, that in the context of the emergent power relations of capitalism, those confined were regarded as violators of bourgeois morality who were justifiably condemned and punished (1971, p.61). Confinement was an economic measure, a form of social control which served the needs of the capitalist system, and constructed and enforced capitalist work ethics and practice (p.64). He contends the absolutist state saw any kind of unreasonable behaviour (defined according to capitalist requirements) as justification for confinement, and thus the asylum, police and courts had authority to incarcerate a variety of groups defined as socially deviant: the insane, unemployed, criminal, beggars etc. The coercive nature of such new practices and institutions established by an increasingly powerful and interventionist state, was obscured Foucault contends, by the deployment of discourses which couched such oppression of the 'deviant' in terms of 'rationalist' state welfarism providing a humanitarian gloss over structures of social control. However, Foucault fails to consider how the notion of 'madness' was deployed in constructions of gender, in addition to class (Chesler, 1972).

At this stage in his work Foucault operationalized a negative view of power in terms of almost totalizing relations of domination. Foucault views the individuals categorized and 'repressed' in the Confinement as passive victims of discourses of power, an analysis which has been accused of

failing to account for human agency (Giddens, 1984, p.155), and Habermas (1989) contends Foucault's loose and homogenizing theory of power fails to identify the complexity of forms and degrees of institutional power in modern capitalist societies. Whilst I would depart from a totalizing perspective (in terms of intra-human domination) and feel discursive power relations are differentially institutionally embedded, I feel Foucault's use of discourse is helpful in understanding the detailed operation of domination. This conception of oppressive discourses of power which structure social life is also evident in his work on punishment and the development of prisons, wherein deviation from capitalist values was punishable by a different form of discipline and surveillance to that exercised in the asylum. Foucault (1979) argued discourses were enmeshed with the practices of discipline, surveillance and constraint, which created new bodies of knowledge and thus new forms of power over individuals. The development of the prison induced a new 'subtle power' of punishment wherein the exhibitionist public 'spectacles' of execution and torture were replaced by a body of 'expert' knowledge undertaken by 'professionals' in 'reasonable' punishment - warders, doctors, psychiatrists, social workers, criminologists (1979, pp.110-115). The discourses he describes are incredibly powerful forms of social control, they construct identities, regulate bodies, desires and selves, and compliment prevailing relations of capital, almost invisibilizing the active human agent who seems unable to contest their construction as either members of minority groups/communities marginalized in discourses of 'deviancy', or homogenized as part of a docile majority via the power of 'normalization' (1979, p.138).

There are different readings of Foucault's early work, with some critics seeing elements of 'essentialism', and others seeing a strongly relativist social constructionism. Derrida (1978) argued Foucault (1971) essentialized the insane as possessing an authentic form of 'unreason', a contestatory grouping against oppressive and normalizing rationality. Gutting (1989) argues similarly that Foucault sees madness as a profound otherness which he romanticizes as having some authenticity (1989, p.109). Deleuze's (1988) reading of the same work as postmodern, is very different, as he contends for Foucault (1971), 'madness' is an 'empty space' onto which society projects its discontents. These contesting readings exemplify I feel, Foucault's incorporation of elements of modern and postmodern approaches. Deleuze's appraisal is apposite for Foucault's work on sexuality, where he adopts an explicitly constructionist relativism in which the body becomes a text for social inscription and sexuality a series of narratives (Foucault, 1981, 1985), and power is not longer conceived of as primarily an oppressive force, but as multiple and enabling (1981, p.18). I concur with McNay that in his work on sexuality Foucault loses his earlier sense of discourse as connecting the symbolic to material practices of oppression (1994, p.47), and concentrates on symbolic representation (McNay, 1992, p.157). In so doing, Foucault unfortunately loses an analysis of oppressive relations of power. I do not think *Madness and Civilization* is an essentialist work, but I think there are elements of social realism within it as well as a humanist concern for intrinsic human value, and it is to this which Derrida and Gutting object. Foucault (1971) can be

seen as realist to the extent that he sees discourses as having a real existence and effect in constructing social practices and institutions. Discourses define certain people as animals, facilitate their incarceration and legitimate physical violence and psychological abuse against them. Foucault does not romanticize the 'mad' (at least, not until the last pages!), but in conceptualizing human beings as having value, he finds their brutal treatment obnoxious.

In his work on madness and punishment, Foucault deploys a notion of discourse that has similarities with that to be utilized in his research, where discourses are conceptualized as embedded within and as constructing social systems - institutions and their related procedures. Foucault's notion of power through discourse is most usually negative, 'expressed in strategies of repression and exclusion' (McNay, 1994, p.3). In his work on madness in particular, Foucault expresses a strong sense of the injustice attending the transitions to modernity in Europe with the silencing, marginalization, derogation and brutalization of the mad as an 'other' (Said, 1988). I would depart from the almost totalizing power Foucault attributes to discourses of oppression, but feel the deployment of a discursive analysis imbued with a strong understanding of dominatory power relations is helpful in examining the complexities of systemic and structural power relations of domination. Such a conception of discourse enables us to identify sets of ideas which are concretized in specific practices, processes and institutions. It enables us to examine in detail, the operation of power relations within and between structures of systems of oppression.

Foucauldian poststructuralism and feminism

Foucault's work on sexuality has been seen as particularly valuable by some feminists as a mechanism for conceptualizing 'gender', 'sexuality' and 'the body' within a framework of social constructionism that may provide a useful counter to 'biological reductionism' (Ramazanoglu, 1993, p.7), or 'essentialism' (McNay, 1992, p.3). However, I think Foucault's work on sexuality is perhaps his most problematic. Whilst his earlier work conceptualizes power as a repressive force, his work on sexuality conceptualizes power as enabling, and I would suggest he is able to adopt a more plural account of power because he is unable to see gender as a category of repression, exclusion and domination that is intermeshed with constructions of sexuality (3). Foucault (1981) examines changing discourses on sexuality which accompanied modernity, and argues that particularly with the development of psychoanalysis, discourses of power-knowledge based on 'scientific' observation and surveillance became concerned about 'perversity'. Foucault still speaks of social institutions in connection with discourse, arguing the family became the site in which sexual behaviour was 'normalized', ie. confined to reproductive heterosex. However, discourses on sexuality, far more so than those on madness and crime, are seen as positive and creative forces, not primarily as negative and controlling. Postmodern theorists such as Weeks (1985) and Butler (1993) have developed such notions in conceptualizing power with respect to sexuality as an

enabling force in which free individuals may struggle against normalization. Some feminists have argued Foucault's work is paradigmatic of postmodern theorizing and criticized it (Hartsock, 1990) or endorsed it (Heckman, 1990) on such a premise, however, as argued above, many elements of his work may be seen to be associated with modern theorization.

Hartsock (1990) is trenchant in her critique, claiming that despite Foucault's sympathies for subjugated groups, his dispersed notion of power and rejection of systematic knowledge precludes an analysis of how oppression operates (1990, p.171). Hartsock ignores Foucault's work other than the material on sexuality, much of which is based on the deployment of the very categories Hartsock claims are necessary to effective analysis, such as those of 'repression' and 'domination'. Kellner's (1988) critique of Lyotard (1984) is pertinent here in defending Foucault. Kellner argues Lyotard's usage of the term 'grand narrative' is careless, for whilst postmodernists have been correct to problematize universalistic meta-narratives which posit ahistorical notions of knowledge, they have 'lump(ed) together' (1988, p.253) such meta-narratives with macro-social theory. Such theory, he suggests, is necessary for the analysis of large scale inequalities, whilst being able to theorize complex social diversity. Whilst Foucault is critical of the 'Master narrative' of the Enlightenment, for much of the time, he engages in macro-theory and attempts to analyze structures of domination. I do not think it is Foucault's refusal to engage with macro-theory per se which is the problem, but his inability to theorize gender relations.

Foucault (1981, 1985, 1986) contends discourses constructing sexuality are not direct forms of repression, but subtle forms of 'normalization'. Domination and resistance are perceived as opposing effects of the same power relations, thus labeling groups 'deviant' provides such groups with an identity from which resistance may be constructed (1981, p.101). Foucault gives the impression gender and sexuality is an issue of choice wherein the individual has a fairly substantial 'practice of liberty' in the interpretation of discourse (1985, pp.10-23). The emphasis in the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* for example, is on the diffuse, heterogeneous and changeable nature of power relations, and thus the Victorian family is not seen as a repressive force in relation to sexuality, but an arena in which diverse discourses of sexuality are played out (1981, p.100).

As Walby (1990) argues, in denying any structural significance of the bourgeois family in relation to dominant discourses of power surrounding sexuality, any notion of systematic and dominatory power is lost. Foucault neglects to discuss the implications of gender inequality for sexual discourse, failing to consider whether one gender may be controlling the other by use of discourses of (hetero)sexuality in which male action and pleasure are privileged (Walby, 1990, p.117). In arguing power is a principal of all human relationships, analysis loses its critical edge - we cannot speak of benign and malign forms of power (Fraser, 1989). Habermas (1987) contends such a conception of power is fundamentally problematic for the whole enterprise of radical

critique, for if critique is seen as itself a form of repressive power, then radical theory cannot criticize dominant power formations without in the process undermining itself (Kelly, 1988, p.2). Sawicki (1988a) has voiced a similar concern that Foucault offers us no stance from which feminists may critique social relations of domination, for if we accept the notion of power developed in his work on sexuality, then we cannot speak of men as a group exercising power over women. Foucault's failure to see sexuality as embedded within gender relations of social domination, may explain why his analysis of sexuality is more pluralist than that of other cases.

In the previous chapters, I contended power can be seen in relations of oppression. Animals are oppressed by humans as a species within anthroparchy; and women oppressed by men as a species within patriarchy. This is not to suggest such relations are universally uniform, they adopt historically and culturally specific form, vary in degree, and are characterized by contestation. I concur with Grimshaw (1993), we can deploy discourse analysis without accepting the pluralist conception of power we see in Foucault's work on sexuality (1993, p.56), and discourse analysis is deployed both theoretically and methodologically within this thesis. It is seen as a method of identifying patriarchal and anthroparchal relations of power, but also as a reality of power relations, for discourses, as I suggested above, are 'real', and operate within and across structures of domination. The identification of common discourses across particular empirical cases may suggest similarity (or divergence) in specific forms and degrees of power relations between/across different systems of domination. In addition, discourse analysis is a means of undertaking a detailed analysis of the operation of power relations within oppressive structures. Discourse analysis enables us to speak of a number of differing discourses of power with specific constructions and effects that exemplify relations of gender and nature. It also provides a means of examining linkages and interrelations of oppressions at material and ideological levels, for discourses are sets of ideas embodying power relations, which are embedded in institutions and behaviour and have real effect.

Feminists adopting Foucauldian analysis have tended to do so from a poststructural or postmodern perspective, drawing on Foucault's work on sexuality and a plural and symbolic understanding of power (Sawicki, 1991). However, I suggest below that it is possible to infuse discourse analysis with radical feminist notions of systems and structures of power.

Radical feminism and discourse analysis

Daly has been criticized particularly trenchantly for providing a universalist, ahistorical theory of gender relations (Spelman, 1988, Segal, 1987). Like most radical feminists, Daly (1979) operationalizes a concept of patriarchy, and sees patriarchal oppression as a cross-cultural and trans-historical phenomenon. Daly also prioritizes the explanatory power of theories of gender dominance and sees patriarchy as the 'basic paradigmatic model' for other forms of oppression and

violence, such as racial violence and genocide. She also provides a structural account of patriarchal relations in terms of interconnecting structures of violence, culture, and sexuality which can be identified in particular empirical cases. Thus there are stark differences between her form of theorizing and that of Foucault, particularly his work on sexuality where he views power as enabling as well as repressive, and throughout which he refuses to conceptualize power as the property of a particular group. Whereas Foucault demonstrates the extent to which power relations are historically dynamic, Daly (1979) seems to emphasize the continuity of power relations and their forms and degrees of oppression. This said, I feel there are some similarities in the approaches of the two theorists which involves their use of discourse analysis.

Whilst Daly does not refer explicitly to 'discourses', I feel she is operationalizing a conception not dissimilar to the of Foucault in his early work (1971, 1979). Daly (1979) analyses patriarchal relations in terms 'most specifically of language and myth' (p.11). For Daly, language and myth are sets of interrelated ideas which carry relations of power and have a 'real' effect in structuring social institutions and practices, and as such, I think she can be read as having a notion of discourse. The bulk of contemporary knowledge she denounces as 'patriarchal scholarship' which is thoroughly ideological, but she sees the purpose of feminist scholarship as providing contestatory knowledge, new language and myths which can challenge patriarchal power-knowledge. Daly has been labeled 'essentialist' in describing patriarchal and feminist knowledge as belonging to different spheres, the 'foreground' reality of patriarchal ideas, and the 'background' reality of women's lives and experiences, which she is accused of assuming are 'authentic' (Segal, 1987). I think Daly has a rather more Foucauldian take on power-knowledge than her critics perceive however. Unlike feminist Wiccan theorists such as Starhawk (1989, 1990a, 1990b), Daly does not invoke the idea of a 'true' feminist/pagan self, although she thinks patriarchy distorts women's relations with each other and with nature. In her more recent work (1984, 1988, 1993, 1996) Daly draws on imagery from feminist witchcraft, but I feel Daly sees such myths as significant not due to their spiritual 'truth' (1984, p.47), but their power as contestatory discourses.

For Daly (1979, p.37) 'Patriarchal society revolves around myths', which can often be seen in mythic 'conglomerates' (p.44) of male dominance, which I would term sets of interrelated ideas or 'discourses' of male dominance. The first section of *Gyn/Ecology* is devoted to analysis and identification of such discourses particularly within Judeo-Christianity which she had earlier sought to deconstruct rather tentatively (1973). In *Gyn/Ecology* she argues forcefully that Judeo-Christianity along with other 'world religions' is constituted by patriarchal discourse. Such discourses are reflected and in turn regenerated in social practices and institutions in a patriarchal society (p.37), and dominant relations of power often force people to act within (or to 'reactualize') patriarchal myth or discourse (p.46). For Daly, patriarchy is created and maintained via myth (discourse), which contains 'stolen power' due to patriarchal 'reversal', ie. the discourses deceive

by suggesting the reverse of reality is the 'truth'. She contends for example that gynocentric myths of female power have been appropriated by patriarchy, with female presence and agency in Christian myth eliminated (1979, ch.1). Daly suggests discourses of patriarchal religion have been incorporated into modern forms of knowledge, as 'postchristian extensions of christian myth' (p.89). These discourses of power-knowledge can be identified in forms of popular culture (the media, film, novels) and in secular systems of thought such as mechanistic science.

Daly identifies eight abstractions through which patriarchal myths are 'incarnated' in institutions or processes (p.31). I think these abstractions may be seen as discourses, for they are sets of patriarchal ideas which Daly sees as embedded within specific processes and institutions. The concretization of patriarchal discourses in institutions and practices she describes as a 'sado-ritual' syndrome involving the infliction of violence against wimmin. A key element of patriarchal discourse, is the concept of 'reversal' where wimmin's power is denied, and female solidarity undermined. Within patriarchal discourses, wimmin are expected to participate in sado-rituals, including the carrying out of violence against other wimmin (1979, ch.s 3,4), making them 'token torturers'. This constitutes the 'primordial mutilation' (p.41), she describes as the murder/dismemberment of the Goddess, or 'the self-affirming be-ing of woman' (p.111).

Having suggested eight abstractions (or discourses), Daly proceeds to examine the way they are 'embedded' (p.109) in five specific empirical cases of violence against wimmin: the practice of widow burning in India (suttee), footbinding in pre-Revolutionary China, female 'circumcision' in Africa, the witchburnings of early modern Europe, and gynecology in contemporary America. Daly suggests in each case, her eight abstractions may be discerned in structuring patriarchal relations of violence, sexuality and culture. There is similarity here with Foucault's research on madness and punishment, wherein he attempts to identify discourses of power-knowledge within institutions and practices, and like Daly, Foucault is passionate in denouncing the violent treatment of those subject to oppressive (for Foucault, 'repressive') discourse. However, whereas Foucault analyses certain discursive deployment in certain specific historical cases, Daly is more ambitious. Her case studies are drawn from across five centuries and five different cultural locations, and it is her breadth of scope in the selection of her case studies which poses one of the major problems with her analysis. Daly concludes the same patriarchal processes are evident in all five 'sado-rituals' (p.394). She conceptualizes the latter as examples of the same forms of violence, and indicates such violence operates to the same degree in each case. Daly sees only similarity rather than any elements of difference either in the content of discourse and its application in specific cases, nor the form and degree of violence in the 'rituals'. As I argued with respect to Foucault, a key strength of discourse analysis is its ability to provide a detailed and subtle account of power relations, which enables us to account for difference. Daly's account is not subtle, and does not allow for change in discourses or the degrees and forms of violence deployed by patriarchal institutions.

Despite a lack of subtlety and a tendency to over-generalize however, I do not think Daly's work can be regarded as 'essentialist'. Throughout, she argues it is socially constructed discourses of power which define social life, and which structure both men and wimmin into enacting violence against wimmin. Admittedly, the picture she paints of men is one which is bleak, for they appear almost exclusively as agents of patriarchal power structures. She does not assert however that all men are inevitably patriarchal agents in all situations, it is simply the case that within her empirical studies they are so. I think Daly is silent on the position and role of men in patriarchal society, but I do not think this renders her work 'essentialist'. Particularly in her later work (1984, 1988) Daly is concerned with the creation of feminist discourse that contests patriarchal power. Whilst I would concur with critics that the deployment of discourse in the middle section of *Gyn/Ecology* (where she analyses her case studies) can be seen to give a depressingly static view of patriarchal relations, I do not think she does perceive patriarchy to be unchanging. Throughout her work taken as a whole (1973, 1979, 1984, 1988, 1993), she demonstrates a great optimism in the power of wimmin to change both themselves and patriarchal social structures. She is concerned with discourses of resistance, she sees her theorizing as active in their creation (1984, 1988).

One of the major strengths of *Gyn/Ecology* is Daly's ability to integrate an implicit deployment of discourse analysis with an understanding of the structural and systemic nature of patriarchal power. Whereas I am critical of Foucault's work on sexuality for operationalizing a pluralistic notion of power which denies the regularities and patterning of its deployment, Daly's analysis identifies the ways power is structured within and through procedures and institutions to the benefit of certain groups. I would suggest however, that such an analysis would be strengthened by an understanding of differences and divergences within discourses, and the differential concretization of those discourses in terms of the forms of domination they assume, and the oppressive degrees to which these may operate. Thus discursive relations should be seen as demonstrating contingency as well as certain regularity. A final but significant criticism, is Daly's tendency to over-homogenize oppressive relations. In seeing patriarchy as 'paradigmatic' for other kinds of domination, she ignores qualitative differences in relations of domination that are produced by the intersection of gender with class and race, and she has a tendency to focus exclusively on for example, clearly patriarchal expressions of racism (1979, chs.3,4,7) rather than examine differences in dominations based on gender and 'race'. I have argued a theory of patriarchy is necessary in the analysis of gender relations, but that in order to account for social complexity, a dual systems approach may be efficacious. As its title might suggest, *Gyn/Ecology* demonstrates Daly's concern regarding the environment, but she is unequivocal in her dismissal of eco-feminism (p.21).

In her later work, Daly demonstrates a keener awareness of the connections between violences against wimmin and animals: 'As Namers, we Name such atrocities as pornography and the torture of animals as evil' (1988, p.45). She has a particular concern with animal experimentation, but also

refers to animals within agribusiness whose suffering 'beggars description' (1991, p.xxvii). Problematically, although she names abuse of animals patriarchal, she does not demonstrate this, nor indicate incongruence in the treatment of wimmin and animals. The connection of wimmin and nature in Daly's model (1979, pp.30-31) is weakly presented via symbol and metaphor, but any evidence of the abusive of the treatment of animals is absent. Daly claims her model can account for all oppressions, yet it is based entirely on comparison between historically and culturally diverse cases, and does not allow for potential difference. Daly sees the abuse of animals (1988, p.49) and the environment (1979, p. 355) as a product of a patriarchal society which is 'biophobic' (nature phobic). This position is anthroparchally reductionist, for the oppression of other animals becomes a by-product of the oppression of wimmin. In this research, it is hoped that a dualist approach may guard against any such tendency.

This research draws upon Daly (1979) in a number of ways. It attempts to use a form of discourse analysis to analyze particular case studies whilst it is hoped, allowing for the possibility of difference within/across cases, and attempting to theorize possible differences as the result of divergent systems and structures of domination. I think Daly's identification of eight patriarchal abstractions, or as I see them, discourses, is useful, but they require conceptual development in order to account for other forms of domination, in this case, anthroparchal oppression. This research also draws on Foucault's understanding of discursive practices in constructing the 'Other' within oppressive power relations, and will argue that discourses of gendered and natured domination deploy and construct a notion of 'Otherness'. This research draws on Daly (1979) and Foucault (1971) in conceptualizing discourses as 'real', for they actively structure social relations. Drawing on Daly, Foucault and the eco-feminist literature, I feel a number of discourses can be suggested which may form part of patriarchal and anthroparchal relations of power.

The discourses identified below may be unrecognizable as a development of Daly's abstractions, or as she calls them, the 'Eight Deadly Sins of the Fathers' (1979, pp.30-31) as they are rather radically modified. However, my development of a series of discourses, and much of the conceptualization for the thesis, is indebted to Daly's comparative theorizing across different oppressive scenarios. Daly's 'sado-ritual' system is constructed through eight interconnected abstractions conceptualizing patriarchal relations: aggression, possession, procession, obsession, assimilation, elimination, fragmentation, and professions. The first seven of these are developed and conceptualized as discourses of power, some of them being renamed: the Other, sexualized consumption, ownership, deception, objectification and fetishism, fragmentation and violence. These discourses are both 'real' and structural, for in Daly's words, they are 'incarnated' within and through 'the institutions of patriarchy' (p.31). Daly's description of her concepts is very brief, and limited in its specificity. The description of seven discourse which follows is far broader than that provided by Daly in part due to a concern to account for a variety of forms of domination. The

discourses suggested here are necessarily briefly outlined, for their precise operation and content is contingent, and will be specified and elaborated through the empirical research for this thesis. In examining her five case studies, Daly (1979) continually refers to the operationalization of her eight abstractions, or 'deadly sins'. The empirical research for this thesis will attempt to operationalize the discourses outlined below, arguing particular instances may be illustrative of certain discursive expressions of patriarchal and anthroparchal power relations.

1. Gender, nature and the Other: relations of dominance and subordination

One of Daly's discourses is 'aggression', which she argues involves the definition of wimmin as the patriarchal 'enemy' and thereby the victims of violence who are subordinated in sexualized power relationships. However, this conceptualization is too narrow to account for oppressions other than gender. A more appropriate concept is Foucault's notion of the 'Other', which can be common to a number of systems of oppression. In hierarchical societies, certain groups are constructed through a discourse of Otherness, as objects subordinate to the dominant subject. The category Other is heterogeneous, it may not refer only to wimmin, but can include people of colour, gay men, animals etc. The category Other is able to link systems of oppression, as different types of Others may be victims of similar forms of subordination. My development thus takes us away from Daly's concentration upon violence and the victimization of wimmin. However, I think the idea of wimmin as Other and as the subject of patriarchal violence or 'aggression' need to be considered separately rather than conflated. In this research, the construction of two categories of Other were to be investigated, those based on gender and on nature. In patriarchal and anthroparchal societies, violences are systematically carried out against those discursively designated Other on the basis of gender and nature.

2. Sexualized consumption

Daly asserts discourses of 'assimilation' or 'gynocidal gluttony' involve the consumption of 'the living flesh' of wimmin under patriarchy. This is a rather crude definition of patriarchal consumption, which falsely suggests it is normative to kill and consume wimmin, and masks the killing and physical consumption of animals in meat eating society. This research will refer to a discourse of sexualized consumption which is seen to involve the construction of Others as passive and receptive, in order that they be consumed. Consumption takes different forms and operates with different degrees of physical violence. It may be overt and literal, such as the eating of animal flesh which requires the physical violence of killing, or may take more obscure metaphorical form, such as the physical consumption of the pornographic representation of the body through masturbation. Consumers of Others (animalized and feminized bodies) may be anthroparchally defined as human in every instance, and patriarchally defined as male in most cases.

3. Ownership and commodification

Daly defines the discourse of patriarchal 'possessions' as male possession of female energy or spirit. This however, is a highly idealist notion of 'ownership'. Dworkin (1984) has a more material definition which conceives wimmin as male 'chattel', despite legal reform in liberal democracy, ignoring the material impact of differing legal categorization. Wimmin and animals in patriarchal and anthroparchal society may be conceptualized in legal discourse as property. However, in contemporary times, this form of ownership usually applies to animals not wimmin. However, ownership can also take the looser economic forms of a high degree of material dependence which may have real effects on human or animal agency in terms of the ability of Others to choose differently (4). Alternatively, ownership may involve the ability to produce commodities that can be subsequently owned by those who produce them. This second form of ownership applies for example, to the case of pornography. Others (models) are not legal chattel of pornographers, but may be financially dependent upon the latter, and pornographers will have ownership rights over the commodification of the models body in the form of photographs etc.

4. Deception

According to Daly discourses of 'deceptions' that can be seen in patriarchal 'processions' are the crucial legitimators of patriarchy. Deceptions deny and obscure the reality of patriarchal structures by apparently reversing reality. I would argue there are more ways of deceiving than reversing, but concur with the definition of deception as functioning to deny the operation of oppressive systems. In this research, discourses of deception can be seen to have an important role in denying levels of patriarchal and anthroparchal violence, but the efficacy of deception is affected by the agency of Others. Animals have no means of contesting anthroparchal deception, whereas wimmin are anthroparchally privileged in this instance.

5. Objectification and fetishism

For Daly, discourses of 'obsession' constitute 'male lust' which is a sexuality pre-occupied with 'genital fixation and fetishism' (1979, p.31). Whilst I concur discourses of patriarchal sexuality involve fetishism and depersonalization, Daly's concept requires clarification. In patriarchal and anthroparchal society, fetishistic sexuality is premised upon objectification, to which Daly alludes but does not develop. In this research, objectification will be defined as involving devaluation of living, animate beings via their reduction to the status of inanimate being that can be used/abused by those with subject status. Dominated Others are objectified and consequently subject to discourses of fetishism. The meat animal and the pornographic model, for example, are discursively constructed as object within different forms of text, and sexualized

fetishistically, i.e. with an emphasis on certain parts of the objectified body. Discourses of fetishism may be gendered and/or natured. The form and extent of objectification and fetishization may vary. Others may be objectified metaphorically and/or physically, involving different degrees of violence. Anthroparchal barriers operate strongly here, for example, human bodies are prevented from literal objectification via slaughter.

6. Fragmentation

Daly defines the discourse of 'fragmentation' rather strangely as the process by which wimmin's lives are limited and confined to domestic labour and glorification of subservience (1979, p.31). This is a narrow and inappropriate definition, I feel. In this research, the discourse of fragmentation can be defined as the physical fragmentation of human or animal bodies, or the fragmentation of the experience of Others. A variety of degrees and forms of fragmentation may be apparent, which may be gendered and/or natured. Fragmentation is premised upon the objectification of the bodies of Others, which facilitates their material or ideological division and prioritization into specific parts. For example, animals may be physically divided into pieces of meat; pornographic models may be metaphorically divided into sexualized body parts via images.

7. Violence

For Daly, the patriarchal discourse of 'elimination' is an expression of 'misogynist envy' which attempts to remove all independent wimmin. Whilst violence is strongly suggested within this discourse, Daly fails to capture the ways in which dominant ideas about violence may embed themselves within specific practices, processes and institutions. In this research I conceptualize violence as operating both structurally and discursively. Structures of violence refer to specific practices and procedures and institutions through which forms of physical violence are present, whereas violence as a discourse refers to the multiplicity of social ideas about violence which can be seen to be embedded in procedures and institutions etc. The discursive construction of violence in patriarchal and anthroparchal society may be either physical or psychological. Both can be seen as 'violation' - an abusive act of power. Whilst there may be similarities in discursive content in terms of violence, there may be differential concretization of such discourses, i.e. violence may be similarly symbolized in gendered and natured form, but not similarly actualized. The systematic quality of different forms and degrees of violence is contingent and may be affected by the interaction between oppressive social structures. For example, killing is anthroparchally systemic for meat animals whose slaughter is routinized, but is patriarchally rare in the case of femicide. Battery and rape are systemic in both oppressive systems, affecting wimmin and domestic animals. There are different forms and degrees of violence which are anthroparchally and patriarchally specific. For example, wimmin may be controlled by public discourses of violence against wimmin

which generate actual fear amongst women, of violence on the street and in their homes. There are also anthroparchal discourses suggestive of violence against animals, or other parts of the environment, but in most cases, these discourses will be embedded in practices of physical violence. For example, the control of animals is almost always physical, involving incarceration, tethering etc. Whilst some forms and degrees of physical violence in which discourses are embedded constitute an area of overlap of patriarchal and anthroparchal systems, others indicate difference (5).

The four chapters of empirical research in this thesis investigate the extent to which the above discourses might be seen to be deployed within the case studies. It is not necessary that each case study exemplify identical characteristics. It has been argued with respect to Daly's research, that an attempt to stress comparative aspects may result in an over-general analysis, and the above concepts have been broadened in order that they might adequately accommodate difference. Discourse analysis is undertaken in this research to ascertain whether discourses of domination which reflect and construct gender and nature can be seen to interrelate, and if such interrelation may suggest the kinds of relations occurring between patriarchy and anthroparchy. The final sections of this chapter focus on literature specifically connected to this research: the relationship between gender, nature and food, and between gender, nature and reproductive technology.

GENDER, NATURE AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF FOOD AND EATING

Sociological literature on food and eating is of relevance to the empirical research for this thesis which investigates the gendering and naturing of the production, distribution and preparation of food, particularly meat. Contemporary Western culture problematizes the relationship between mind and body, with the body often considered separate from, and inferior to, the self (Turner, 1984, ch.8), a legacy of Christianity and scientific rationality wherein bodies are evil or insignificant (Turner and Hepworth, 1991). Our contradictory and ambivalent relation to 'bodies' is apparent when considering eating (Rifkin, 1994, p.234; Lupton, 1996, p.3) and sex. These acts connect 'nature' (or physicality) and 'culture' (Murcott, 1986, p.110), ritualized in ways reflecting social structure. Barthes declares food orchestrated communication (1979, p.168), and argues cultural beliefs are evident in the selection of animals as food, and in the ways they are killed, prepared and consumed. This section focuses largely on the culturally specific context of Western societies wherein the vast majority of people have good access to food, and a relatively wide range of foodstuffs from which to choose. It will be argued that in such societies food selection, preparation and consumption is shaped by discourses which may be constitutive of patriarchal and anthroparchal relations. Before considering contemporary discourses around food and eating however, we shall first examine certain anthropological perspectives suggesting that in human pre-history processes of gendering and naturing may have pertained to food and eating.

The origins of culture: man the hunter or the vegetarian woman?

Malestream anthropology has often been preoccupied with the role of man-the-hunter in the development of human society (Collard, 1988). For example, Knight (1991) contends the transition of protohominids to humans had material cause - change in food supply, when, with the onset of the Ice Age, male group hunting became paramount. Females, 'immobilized' by off-spring, went on lunar synchronized sex strike to encourage men both to hunt, and to bring home the mammoth. Due to blood taboo, men could not eat the bloody meat, and brought it home to be cooked by wimmin who had social power through distributing cooked meat. With the end of the Ice Age, people dispersed to hunt, braking female solidarity and power and creating an exploited female labour force of gatherers. However, Knight's assumption of male protection of females is questionable and amongst 'non-developed' societies is not characteristic, group hunting involving wimmin (Fisher, 1980, ch.9). Second, some suggest throughout the Paleolithic period, both hunting and gathering were in evidence (Eisler, 1988, p.42), and early humans, for the first few million years in frost free zones, lived almost entirely on vegetable food (Fisher, 1980, p.56). Knight constructs a theory of the origins of culture in an abnormal situation affecting limited parts of the globe. In southern climes, according to Fisher (p.180) wimmin provided the bulk of the diet, and Collard argues wimmin's provision of food as gatherers is of most significance to the origins of culture, rather than the patriarchal institution of the hunt (1988, ch.2).

Reed (1976) is unconvinced early woman ate meat at all, contending she neither participated in the hunt nor ate the kill, but acted as totemic protectress of vulnerable species, including her own offspring (1976, p.70). In contemporary 'primitive' cultures, wimmin have a vegetarian diet, and men a meat based one (p.71), and Reed argues wimmin make connections between eating human and animal flesh (p.72), which leads to the maternal clan imposing totem and taboo thus restricting male behaviour regarding sex and eating (pp.73-6). Reed reinterprets male imposed female seclusion in eating (Levi-Strauss, 1987), arguing wimmin were not forbidden but themselves refused to eat with men, and in 'primitive' society wimmin cook all foods except meat (p.92). Reed asserts wimmin did not hunt, did not eat meat through choice, and did not cook it for male consumption, nor were they dependent on men for food. It could be speculated wimmin held social, economic and spiritual power in predominantly vegetarian societies, and Collard (1988) argues the origins of patriarchy can be traced to the intensification of hunting (p.40). Whilst I concur hunting is patriarchal, it can also be seen as natured. Fisher (1980) argues patriarchy originated with the development of agriculture in which domestication of animals set the pattern for the domestication of wimmin. Domestication would lead to the development of animal breeding, involving forced coitus for females and castration of non-breeding males (p.192), which resulted in the discovery of fatherhood, and demise of woman's reproductive magic - the transition from matriliney to patriarchy (p.195). Thus whilst conventional scholarship places great importance on the hunt and of meat in

the origins of human culture, feminists counter this with evidence of female distaste for hunting and meat eating, and possible links in the origins of the dominations of gender and nature. Whilst this research cannot investigate such contentions, it does examine the contemporary treatment of domestic animals to investigate possible gendering.

The gendering and naturing of cooking and eating: theoretical perspectives

There are a number of differing theoretical perspectives on the ways in which food and eating may be mediated through social relations. The approach adopted in this research is one that is consistent with a generally structural approach, whilst also deploying discursive analysis.

Structural functionalists have been interested in the ways individuals' actions and values are structured through social norms and expectations which are linked to the broader structural organization of particular societies. Anthropologists such as Levi-Strauss and Douglas have tended to combine a structural perspective with a notion of discursive practice in viewing food and eating as if meals were linguistic texts with inherent rules which required exposure. They have also tended to favour functionalist understandings of societies as consensual and stable, wherein food and eating serves to support co-operative behaviour or structures of kinship. Levi-Strauss (1970) treated food practices as a language which is structured by the primary binary opposition between 'nature' and 'culture' he saw as endemic to all cultures. Of all animals, only humans cook their food, and for Levi-Strauss (1978), this creates a boundary between 'civilization' and the natural world, and cooking transforms nature to culture (pp.478-9). Methods of cooking, he contends, reflect cultural belief. Meat orientated cultures prefer roasting as it provides bloody food closer to the rawness of slaughter. Societies with a meat and vegetable diet both roast and boil meat, plant based cultures rarely prepare meat and boil most plant food. Boiling creates greater boundaries (fire and water) between nature and culture (p.489). Roast meat is closer to the kill and embodies both nature (raw inner meat) and culture (cooked surface). Researching Amerindian tribes, Levi-Strauss found roasting a predominantly male activity, and boiling predominantly female. He contends boiling, being economical had plebian association, and more wasteful roasting, aristocratic (p.484). Similarly, Rifkin argues roasting is associated with power, privilege and celebration, and boiling relegated via its association with frugality. In medieval Europe, roasting meat was aristocratic, whilst peasantry and lowly town dwellers boiled their meat (1994, p.238). In contemporary Western cultures, roasting is celebratory requiring more expensive cuts of meat, and stewing more mundane. This research investigates cooking as a gendered and natured activity, wherein different food, differently cooked is designed for different consumers.

Douglas (1975) argues meals themselves encode and structure social events, for the consumption of food is ritual activity, and meals are microcosms of wider social structures (1975, p.273). In

analyzing a 'typical' British meal, she notes the centre-piece is always meat, although class structures may affect the quantity and quality of meat involved. Murcott (1983) has undertaken a similar analysis of the rules and structure of the cooked dinner (or 'proper meal'). Murcott also notes that in British history, there is a gendered food hierarchy in which red meats have been associated with masculinity and white meats, fish and dairy products associated with femininity (Murcott, 1983, p.111). Twigg claims in early twentieth century Britain, red meat was seen as inappropriate for pregnant or lactating wimmin who should eat 'light' foods - fish, chicken, eggs, mirroring their 'feminine condition' (1983, pp.21-2). The later twentieth century saw the reproduction of gendered food hierarchies as seen in research on working class families wherein men are consistently favoured with most and best quality meat (Kerr and Charles, 1986, p.140).

Bourdieu asserts in French culture, meat and gender myths still prevail, and 'charcuterie is more for the men..crudities are more for the women, like the salad' (1984, p.190-2). Bourdieu contends in meat-eating cultures men believe eating red meat, especially beef, is inherently more masculine than eating white meats or fish. He argues fish is seen as unsuitable for male consumption because it is too 'light' and will not prove sufficiently filling. Like fruit, fish is 'fiddly' food which 'male hands' find 'difficult'. Men gulp food, wimmin pick and nibble, the latter damaging for the male sense of self (p.190). He concludes meat is male food as it alone can nourish men and provide them with strength, energy and 'blood' (p.192). Structural functionalist accounts tend to be rather descriptive, and that of Bourdieu for example, does not engage with the broader social, political and economic context in which food is produced, prepared and consumed.

Some feminist accounts have attempted to analyze the gendering of food and eating within a more critical structural approach, but have generally ignored the processes of naturing. Charles and Kerr (1988) for example, found that most men in British families were not keen cooks nor shoppers and caused more trouble in the kitchen by attempting to cook than helping their female partners. They contended the provision of a meal involving meat was seen by most wimmin as well as men as being a key part of a woman's role within the household. Murcott (1983) found wimmin rarely bother to cook for themselves but see cooking for their families as important 'service work' (1983, pp.84-5). Whilst Kerr, Charles and Murcott are right to analyze the preparation and consumption of food in the context of wimmin's domestic labour, there are a number of problems with their accounts. First, they accept the cultural assignation of meat as an appropriate foodstuff without questioning the power relations involved in its production. Second, they focus their attentions on the nuclear family alone. This research will examine the gendering and naturing of food in a range of texts of popular culture and does not assume that the gendering of food is co-terminous with its consumption in the 'family'. Third, an analysis of food and eating in Britain cannot ignore the impact of structures and discourses based on the oppressions of class, race and nature.

A more effective approach which combines a critically structural with a discursive account is adopted by Adams (1990). Adams supports the view articulated by those such as Bourdieu, that ancient food and gender biases continue to hold true. She argues the same system of stratification that places men atop the social hierarchy and wimmin at the bottom, places meat atop the food hierarchy and relegates plant food (1990, p.33). Adams contends whereas meat is associated with dominance, control and status, plants are associated with passivity and immobility. Meat in patriarchal societies she argues, is male identified food, and wimmin eat greater quantities of 'second class' foods such as vegetables, grains and pulses, eggs and dairy products (p.26). Meat is constructed as the most culturally significant food and the most nourishing, necessitating its locus in the male diet. Foods associated with wimmin, 'feminized foods' are considered inferior sources of protein (therefore strength) and some, such as eggs and dairy products, are feminized as they are by-products of the reproductive systems of female animals (p.27).

Coward has rightly asserted it is not only dairy products which are associated with wimmin, but confectionery also, which trivializes wimmin by suggesting childishness. For Coward, advertising depicting sumptuous gateau and chocolate is 'food pornography', a regime of pleasurable images targeted at female desire but encouraging guilt (Coward, 1984, p.103). Wimmin are expected to respond to such images either by eating the heavily sexualized confection, or to feast their eyes and deny their bodies (p.102). Coward argues that for wimmin, the pleasure of food is contradictory, for despite its presentation as a legitimate sensual pleasure, it is simultaneously forbidden. Coward's analysis of food advertising provides a critique of the gendering of certain contemporary discourses of food, but unlike Adams account, it is nature blind, ignoring the absent referent of female animals abused within the dairy and egg industries.

Adams is right to dismiss the objectification and commodification of animals as human property (1990, p.93), and compares the status of animals in the twentieth century to that of Western wimmin in the nineteenth. She makes some interesting observations about contemporary meat eating cultures, such as our linguistic and emotional separation from animals as meat wherein we use the 'absent referent' to obscure the origin of meat: beef for cattle-meat etc. (p.26), and the ways in which speciesism underlies much of our linguistic sexism (also, Dunayer, 1995). I would endorse the critique of feminists who inappropriately use the language of the oppression of animals to describe the treatment of wimmin (Kappeler, 1995; Davis, 1995), which renders animals 'absent referents' (Adams, 1990, p.42). The abuse of animals is recalled in concern for the abuse of wimmin, yet the concrete existence of the animals and their suffering is denied (1990, pp.43-6). Adams argues although 'meat' may be a metaphor for female experience, it is inappropriate, for, wimmin are not meat, not killed and eaten.

Whilst Adams is right to point out disparity in the treatment of wimmin and animals, she fails to draw comparisons with respect for example, to the relatively rare butchering of wimmin in sex crime, where wimmin are stalked, killed and often dismembered (Caputi, 1989; Russell and Radford, 1994). This is related to the major criticism of her analysis, an over-concentration on symbolic aspects of meat eating. Adams analysis is based on the deconstruction of images and ideas surrounding food and its consumption. Whilst she notes animal farming involves exploitation of the sexuality and reproductive capacities of female animals (p.43), material elements of her analysis, such as physical violence remain undeveloped. She does not adequately consider the oppression of animals by meat production, nor does she account for elements of meat which are not patriarchal. Her combination of a discursive and a structural approach is effective, but would have been more convincing had she examined the concretization of discourses of food and eating within a wider range of texts of popular culture than the literary novel. In addition, she could have analyzed the presence of gendered and natured discourse in the production of food (slaughter, butchery and farming) rather than focusing on preparation and consumption.

Adams more recent work examining connections between the battering of wimmin and domestic male violence towards pets (1994, 1995) deals with some previous omissions. She argues that in battery, domestic rape and femicide, violence against animals is consistently present, a strategic expression of male power and a means of control over wimmin and children (1995, pp.76-8). She draws parallels in forms and degrees of violence towards wimmin and animals, in terms of the sexualization of the violence and its role in the construction of machismo, and fruitfully integrates material and ideological levels of analysis. However, the problem remains that although Adams uses a clearly discursive and structural approach, she conceptualizes male violence towards animals as a product of patriarchy alone, failing to identify differences in form and degree, that could have been identified by a dual systems approach.

Poststructuralist accounts of food and eating (Lupton, 1996; Warde, 1997) assert structural approaches, however critical, ignore the 'lived experience' of eating, and deny human agency (Lupton, 1996, p.12). Lupton argues discourses around food and eating are highly diverse and changeable social constructions. Fragmented 'selves', she claims, have varied responses to different foodstuffs, and whilst food is shaped by power relations, such relations should not be seen as oppressive (p.13). Humans adopt, develop and resist discourse around food as they choose, thus:

'women who attempt to limit their food intake should not necessarily be understood as passive victims who are forced by a patriarchal society into starving themselves. Such women may find pleasure and self-assurance as well as privation and anxiety in this practice.' (Lupton, 1996, p.14)

Whilst I concur discourses around food and eating are social constructions, Lupton's approach encounters similar difficulties to that of Hannigan (1997) discussed in Chapter 1. In arguing all is

narrative and nothing 'real', Lupton dismisses for example, anorexia nervosa as a symptom of 'choice' in the contestation of food discourse. Similarly, she asserts the concept of 'diseased food' has little bearing on the problematic nature of food production, but is a construction of a BSE obsessed news media (pp.78-9). Her position, ^{here is} rather contradictory, for in her own research, she finds many of the gendered food preferences identified by Adams pertain (Lupton, 1996, ch.4). I feel Lupton overestimates the diversity of diet in Western societies, and underestimates the extent to which preparation and consumption of food remains a gendered process. In addition, she fails to account for power relations in terms of the selection of foodstuffs, and her account is thoroughly anthropocentric. I find it difficult to see that for the animals killed for meat, discourses of food are not oppressive.

Similar criticisms also apply to the work of Warde (1997), who like Lupton analyzes food and eating in terms of consumption and ignores the production of food entirely. Warde emphasizes the increased diversity of food stuffs and an increase in consumer choice (1997, p.40), but is more cautious than Lupton in his endorsement of a postmodern approach. He does concede that despite increased potential choice, where food is concerned: 'The discourses of judgement have an enduring structure' (1997, p.42), and that commodity culture appears to diversify and change far more rapidly in appearance than in 'reality' as there is a 'profound continuity' in 'food behaviour' (p.165). Warde's account is one of cautious plurality, and whilst I concur that consumer culture is often illusory regarding diversification with discourses of food and eating, demonstrating a high degree of continuity over time, in focusing on questions of 'taste', the power dynamics which are constituted through discourses of food and eating are absent from his account.

For wimmin preparing, discourses around food may have oppressive implications, and on occasion, meat eating can be seen to be related to patriarchal violence. In their study of domestic violence, ^{Dobash} and Dobash found violent men held a traditional view of domestic gender relations, expecting wives to provide them with appropriate food, appropriately cooked. Arguments about timing or content of meals were common, the most frequent complaint focusing on a lack of meat (1979, p.199). For example, one woman cited the cause of a battering as the preparation of a cheese rather than a meat sandwich (p.100). Pizzy found a similar connection between domestic violence and male meat eating, such as a woman scalded for cooking her husband a vegetable pie (1974, p.35). It would seem some men feel they are being denied their masculinity by not being fed meat, and may thus engage in violent behaviour.

A small minority of men reject meat eating culture, which is probably unsurprising since as Adams (1990) suggests, meat eating is part of the contemporary construction of masculinity. Alternatively, as Coward has argued, female eating per se is largely discouraged outside satisfaction of male desire. She acknowledges 'food pornography' encourages wimmin to cook for

men and children involving intense and devalued domestic labour (1984, p.103). However, she does not develop her analysis of the gendered political economy of food preparation, which is also absent from Adams (1990) account. This thesis develops many of the points established by critically structural feminist analyses of meat, but attempts to correct omissions of certain texts by investigating the material production of 'meat' as a form of gendered and natured violence against animals, and the political economy of cookery which is constructed within discourses of gender and nature. I will suggest both the eating and production of meat is structured by discourses of power which demonstrate interrelations of both patriarchal and anthroparchal systems of oppression.

GENDER, NATURE AND REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY

This section reviews the feminist literature on reproduction. This is of concern to the empirical research for this thesis, because it indicates specific areas of overlap between patriarchal control of the sexuality, fertility and reproduction of wimmin by new reproductive technologies, and anthroparchal control of animal sexuality, fertility and reproduction within farming. Some radical and eco-feminists have drawn parallels between the control of animal sexuality and reproduction, and the application of reproductive technology developed in farming practice, to wimmin. Some argue wimmin's reproductive experience increasingly resembles that of 'meat' animals, although I do not accept ^{the} pessimism of such accounts, which, in their often exclusive ^{focus} on the patriarchal significance of reproductive control, can be seen to be nature blind. However, some of the ideas reviewed here will be developed and applied in the empirical research for this thesis when investigating the meat industry. This section examines debates on reproductive technologies, proceeding to compare and contrast the management of reproduction with respect to wimmin and domestic animals, looking at reproductive technologies and motherhood.

The reproductive brothel?

Feminist literature has taken account of increased potential for medical management of, and intervention in, fertility, pregnancy, and childbirth, and the development of new reproductive technologies (NRTs). Some feminists voice concern as to potentially draconian (Faludi, 1992) and gynocidal (Dworkin, 1983; Corea, 1985) implications, whilst others see potential benefit of such technologies for wimmin. I would argue it is not technologies themselves that are problematic, but their conception as an anthroparchal mechanism for meat production, and their development as part of the patriarchal project of controlling female reproduction.

Some radical feminists in the 1970's were highly optimistic of the revolutionary potential of NRT's. Firestone (1971) contended reproductive difference was the basis for wimmin's oppression, and must be eliminated via artificial reproduction (Firestone, 1988, p.19). She claimed wimmin

must seize from men, control of the means of reproduction in order to liberate themselves. Most contemporary radical feminists have a very different position, seeing reproductive technologies rather than motherhood as problematic (Raymond, 1985). O'Brien (1981) argues wimmin have a continuous reproductive experience, involving intercourse, pregnancy, then birth. Men have a discontinuous experience, and thus seek reproductive ownership via obstetrics, gynecology and NRTs - a 'biological revolution' (Corea, 1985, p.9). Dworkin contends if this is successful, patriarchy will move into a new, absolutist period. She argues wimmin are controlled within a brothel model where they are available for non-reproductive heterosex, and a farming model of motherhood (1983, p.174). The farming model becomes more efficient via NRTs, enabling commodification of reproduction: a reproductive brothel system, wherein motherhood is deconstructed, with ovarian mothers who supply eggs, uterine mothers who give birth, and social mothers raising children (Corea, 1985, p.14). Corea notes in other animals, this process has already taken place, but rather than decreasing the need for mothers, it has the opposite effect, for female animals generate profit via meat and milk. Hanmer contends wimmin seeking NRTs have been 'blinded by science' (1985, p.104), and Dworkin (1983) and Corea (1985) that 'choice' of such treatment and motivation to choose is male controlled.

Such analyses are criticized for an inflated view of the power of medical professions (Stanworth 1987, p.17). However, they do not assume NRTs developed in animal husbandry will be applied wholesale to humans, for many would abuse men. Stanworth claims such theorists romanticize 'natural reproduction', and homogenize wimmin's reproductive experiences (1985, p.18). Petchesky argues respect for difference precludes criticism of NRTs for some wimmin demand them (1985, p.72), denying deconstruction of patriarchal discourses of female desire. However, for most of European history, pregnancy and birth have remained unmedicalized (Oakley, 1985, p.42), and we are not ignorant as to what such experience of childbirth might be, and it is not apparent this cannot accommodate 'difference'. There are similarities in the reproductive control of wimmin and Other animals which this kind of feminist literature tends to ignore, although wimmin are not likely to be farmed like Other animals, there are anthroparchal barriers to human exploitation.

Gender, nature and reproductive technologies

Reproductive technologies provide an important area of comparison between wimmin and animals, and involve their gendered and natured treatment. There are a number of areas of significance here: the practices of eugenics, the management of fertility and the application of various new reproductive technologies (NRTs) developed within animal breeding for the meat industry (Corea, 1985): artificial insemination by donor (AID), invitro-fertilization (IVF), and more rarely, embryo transfer, which is usually twinned with surrogacy (Stanworth, 1987).

Patriarchal and anthroparchal reproduction involves making products over which groups of men exercise quality control. In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, this could be seen in eugenic attempts to produce 'better' humans (Corea, p.17), practices originating in selective breeding in the meat industry. Birth control and sterilization, developed via animal experimentation, and utilized in animal breeding, have been applied to limit reproduction of undesirable humans (poor, promiscuous, unmarried, black; Greer, 1984, p.279). Whilst in animal breeding, technologies can produce offspring that become 'quality carcasses', in humans it could produce 'intelligent', white, males (Corea, p.21). Sex preference studies have indicated the desire for a daughter is deviant (Oakley, 1980), and some feminists argue the desire for male offspring is characteristic of patriarchal society (Pomeroy, 1975, p.46). Reproductive technologies like IVF enable sex selection, and Corea, Dworkin, O'Brien, and Collard are unequivocal - this means gynocide. However, whilst in anthroparchal society wherein farm animals are chattel property, one may envisage complete reproductive control and eugenic practice, Corea et al. ignore the agency of wimmin in patriarchy to contest patriarchal control of reproduction.

Techniques for the treatment of infertility in humans developed from reproduction in domestic animals (Corea, 1985). According to Corea, AID involves the manipulation of animal fertility and sexuality, with men often sexually stimulating male animals, or using an 'artificial vagina'. If an animal is unable to 'serve', an electrode is inserted into its rectum (Corea, p.36), or the animal may be slaughtered and sperm 'recovered' (p.37). There are taboos against AID in humans however. Corea argues AID jeopardizes patriarchal descent, providing wimmin with a means of reproductive independence (Corea, 1985, p.41). Smart notes since the development of the NRTs, the law has sought to extend the legal concept of paternity to 'attach' men to children (1987, p.103-5); and the patriarchal state and medical profession have limited access to AID for wimmin who may use it 'subversively'.

IVF and embryo transfer in humans involves complex procedures which require medical assistance (Pfeiffer, 1987, p.88). IVF refers to external fertilization with eggs obtained by operation. The group to benefit most directly from the application of this technology are men, the most likely cause of infertility (Corea, 1985). This is not the case for the male animal subjected to the continuous manipulation of his sexuality and fertility, and finally eaten. Wimmin are placed in a similar situation to animals. In both cases, impregnation is technical and medicalized, there are risks of anesthesia, surgery, trauma to ovaries and uterus, and the unknown effects of the hormones. Reproductive cycles are manipulated in farm animals to maximize profit; and in wimmin to maximize chance of pregnancy. A key difference between female human and animal patients however, is that wimmin actively choose to utilize such reproductive technologies. Embryo transfer in humans, similarly to that in farm animals, involves female egg donors and egg recipients having their cycles of ovulation and menstruation is synchronized. Also similarly, the technique of

'flushing' is used, but fortunately for wimmin, they are not slaughtered in order to 'donate' eggs. As Corea notes, AID poses no threat to the human sperm donor, whereas the egg donor risks infection, abortion, experimental drugs, ectopic pregnancy, impairment or loss of fertility, and even death. In farm animals, sperm 'donors' such as bulls are kept in solitary confinement and rarely allowed contact with other cattle, and manipulated by humans into ejaculating, or animals may be slaughtered for their sperm. In animals, embryo transfer involves surrogacy, transferring desirable genes into a docile host with a roomy womb. Animals are impregnated with an embryo from a larger breed, leading to difficult births, and common caesarian sections (Collard, 1988, p.116). By the early 1980s, human surrogacy was an industry in the USA (Zipper et al, 1988, p.119). The surrogate human mother, like her animal counterpart, produces a piece of merchandise, and even research sympathetic to surrogacy has found 'breeder' wimmin demonstrate 'grief symptoms' on giving up their babies. Female animals are also seen to demonstrate grief when their offspring are removed to be fattened for meat (Corea, 1985, p.237).

Reproductive technologies, developed within the meat industry to maximize reproduction, are now applied to humans. The application is gendered however, for these technologies are controlled by men, with wimmin experiencing the manipulation of fertility and sexuality, and medical intrusion that both male and female animals suffer. However, there are anthroparchal barriers protecting wimmin as humans, from the worst abuses these technologies have to offer. In addition, wimmin have some degree of agency in seeking fertility treatment, in meat animals, this is an uncontestable element of their anthroparchal and patriarchal control.

Motherhood

Hanmer (1985), O'Brien (1981), Dworkin, (1983), Corea (1985) argue NRTs are transforming motherhood deconstructing it in ways similar to that of meat animals. Men can extract eggs, transfer embryos, surgically birth human babies. They also breed animals for meat and dairy produce, and vivisection (Collard, 1988, p.71). Domestic animals have virtually no reproductive freedom, men decide how, when and how often they reproduce. Some feminists assert that medicalization of childbirth and pregnancy has seen similar developments in the treatment of wimmin. Faludi argues the American medical profession now regards the fetus as more important than the mother, who is a passive (1992, p.459), or increasingly, a 'hostile environment' for the foetus (Petchevsky, 1987, p.65; Hubbard, 1984, p.350). In the case of animals, the body of the mother and her potential offspring are owned by the farmer, scientist or pharmaceutical company, and the mother's body is regarded as an incubator. Birth is decreasingly an arena for wimmin's choice, and whilst demand for home birth increases, it is becoming criminalized in the US (Faludi, 1992) and disparaged by the medical profession in Britain (Oakley, 1987). In the US, one in four births is via caesarian section (Mitford, 1992), which if contested, may be enforced under feticide

legislation (Faludi, 1992, p.467). Oakley (1987, p.39) argues modern mothers are decreasingly likely to be an active child bearers, having little control over how they give birth. Animals have no control over such processes. They often experience caesarian section, or are killed in the 'birthing' process, and are usually separated from their young soon after birth.

Animal reproduction is as tightly controlled as we can at present envisage. The reproduction of humans is not, as wimmin can and do successfully exert their own wills in the reproduction process and are not inevitably duped by medical technology. Reproductive technologies have appropriated the power of regeneration in animals with almost complete success. As wimmin have more freedom to act as autonomous agents their reproduction is only partially subject to patriarchal control. Reproductive management is perhaps the most significant method by which animals are subjected to patriarchal and anthroparchal control, whereas for wimmin, it may be one method of patriarchal control amongst many. In both instances however, the control of reproduction is likely to be an important aspect of the domination of nature and gender.

Conclusion

This chapter has indicated many of the connections already established between gender and nature. Some feminists have contended that wimmin's material life experiences render them closer to nature than most men. Others have deconstructed the association of wimmin and nature in patriarchal discourse, some arguing this association was a result of modernity and the patriarchal ideology of scientific rationality. Some eco-feminists argue such an association between wimmin and nature was the product far earlier paradigm shifts, and that the domination of wimmin and the environment preceded the transitions to modernity in the West, whilst it was also intensified and assumed different forms with modernization. The chapter has contended one of the main difficulties with many eco-feminist approaches is a tendency to reduce the domination of the environment to patriarchal structures and processes, and to identify patriarchal discourses as both gendered and natured. I have argued such a conflationary approach carries a danger of reductionism in which patriarchy is seen as an explanatory theoretical schema for other kinds of domination. I feel there are sufficient differences in the form and degree of domination to necessitate a dual systems approach to the examination of the relationship between gender and ecology, and believe that a dualist approach allows us to capture the complexities of structural and systemic dynamics without marginalizing difference.

Feminist anthropology has indicated that in ancient societies with animistic and non-patriarchal belief systems, wimmin and animals may have been treated very differently. Ancient dietary practices and discourses around food and eating some eco-feminists have argued, may be evidenced in contemporary food consumption and distribution, which may reflect gendered and

natured structures. Although feminist literature on reproductive technology has tended to focus on gender alone, connections between patriarchal and anthroparchal structures may be evidenced in the control of reproduction, wherein similar procedures and technologies are applied to animals and women, although in different forms and to differing degrees. The empirical research for this thesis will further develop some eco-feminist ideas concerning both reproduction and food and eating.

The most important task of this chapter has been the discussion of the possibility of combining a structural dual systems approach to the analysis of relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy, with a discursive approach. This chapter has argued that some of Foucault's work indicates the possibility of undertaking discourse analysis within a generally structural framework which can take account of the systemic and oppressive nature of power relations. It has been argued there are some degrees of similarity between some of the theorizing of Foucault and that of Daly, for it is contended that Daly analyses patriarchal relations in terms of discourses which concretize themselves in structural relations of power. The chapter has developed a series of seven discourses by drawing upon the insights of both Foucault and Daly, and the review of the range of eco-feminist approaches which have attempted to combine the structural and the discursive.

The empirical research for this thesis investigates the extent to which the seven discourses outlined here: the Other, sexualized consumption, ownership, deception, objectification, fragmentation and violence, may be operationalized by the case studies. It will examine whether these discourses may be expressive and constitutive of structures of two distinct yet interlocking systems of oppression: patriarchy and anthroparchy. Whilst it should not be assumed other systems of oppression will be irrelevant to the research, the two systems under investigation were seen as crucial to the case studies, and others contingently relevant. The methodology adopted involves the identification of discourses at the symbolic level in ideology and belief, and their representational examination in certain texts, and the concretization of discourses of gendered and natured power in material forms of physical violence and exploitation. The following chapter outlines the methodological framework for such an analysis.

Notes

- (1) There are areas of eco-feminist interest absent from this analysis, such as the relationship between patriarchy and war (Chapkis, 1981; McAllister, 1982; Enloe, 1983; Hicks-Stein, 1984; Pierson, 1988; Griffin, 1992; Warren, 1994; Roseneil, 1995). However, the issues included here are felt to be the most significant for this research.
- (2) McNay (1994) gives the impression she sees this conception of power as productive as one which may *only* be evidenced in the volumes of *The History of Sexuality*. She contends that the predominant Foucauldian conception of power, contrary to Foucault's own claims, is overwhelmingly as 'a negative and dominatory force' (1994, p.111).
- (3) Foucault's work on sexuality, which ironically has been drawn upon most extensively by feminists, is his most problematic in terms of theorizing gender. In his work on madness, Foucault has a clear conceptualization of power relations as repressive, and draws upon elements of a framework of class analysis in his theorizing. In his far more pluralist analysis of

sexuality however, this stronger notion of power as a repressive force embedded within specific institutions is lost. I think the problem is Foucault's seeming inability to theorize gender in terms of repressive power, or even to theorize gender per se.

- (4) What I imply by a 'high' degree of material dependency is that the action of those subjected to such discourses of ownership is strongly controlled. For example, whilst I am materially dependent upon my employer, I have far greater agency within the restrictions of my contract with the University of East London (Plc), than does a model working for *Penthouse* who is dependent upon publishers and photographers to the extent they may be expected to have sex with them in order to guarantee further employment. In contemporary Western anthroparchal society domestic non-meat animals are most often constituted within a discourse of ownership as 'pets'. As such, they are most usually not legal property, but are extremely dependent upon the behaviour of humans who control their lives as pet owners in terms of food, physical freedom and social interaction.
- (5) Daly's discourse of 'pride' exemplified by patriarchal 'professions' is not included here, for it is felt Daly's sense of the term as involving 'inert' and 'mystifying' knowledge is already captured by discourses of objectification and deception.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methods employed for the empirical research undertaken for this thesis. According to Harding (1987), methodology involves theoretical as well as technical analysis, and this chapter reflects this observation by considering how the combination of discourse analysis and a structural approach for which I have argued in the first three chapters, might be operationalized in addressing the questions raised by the thesis.

The empirical research for this project was not undertaken in isolation from the literature review and the development of theoretical schema. Rather, the processes of theoretical development and empirical research took place simultaneously. Thus although the thesis is organised into chapters which may suggest a linear process in its historical development, research moved backwards and forwards continually between empirical research and theory building. Initially, such movement between the theoretical and the empirical was seen as a practical necessity, with theoretical development filling 'gaps' in empirical research time. Such 'gaps' were resultant from difficulties in establishing access to certain material which often proved time consuming, for example, setting up interviews at New Scotland Yard, or obtaining permission to observe procedures in abattoirs. In addition, gathering a sufficiently representative sample of texts for analysis took a number of years, for pornographic and food magazines are usually published monthly.

As research progressed, it became clear that such movement backwards and forwards between empirical observation and theory, was shaping the development of the latter. Whilst the decision to combine discursive and structural analyses was made fairly early on, the decision to adopt a dual systems approach was largely a result of having undertaken much of the research for Chapter 7 on the meat industry. I felt the empirical research revealed such disparity between forms and degrees of domination affecting women and domestic animals, that to subsume human dominance of the environment within an account of the systemic relations of patriarchy would result in an insufficiently complex theorization. Thus, perhaps the most significant theoretical decision in the development of the thesis, that to attempt to develop the idea of systemic relations of anthroparchy and the associated concept of 'nature', was made as a direct result of empirical research.

The methodology employed in this research does not reflect the usual concerns of 'feminist research practice' (Kelly, 1988) developed with respect to research on women (Roberts, 1981;

Bowles and Duelli Klein, 1983; Stanley, 1990; McCarl Neilson, 1990; Stanley and Wise, 1993). However, it does draw on aspects of such practice, such as the tendency to favour qualitative methods (Roberts, 1981), and echoes Kelly's assertion that it is not the methods feminists employ which renders their research distinct, but the questions they ask (1988, p.6). Oakley (1980, 1981) has argued with reference to research on women's experiences of mothering, pregnancy and childbirth, that the pre-conceptions of the researcher may be challenged by their engagement in empirical research, and that this process shapes methodological considerations. Such an interaction characterized the production of this thesis, and some of the methodological decisions arose as a result of carrying out parts of the empirical research. Methods were not selected entirely a priori to undertaking empirical research, but to some degree emerged within the research process itself. I did not come to the empirical material with a mind free of pre-conceptions, but with thoughts influenced by my engagement with some of the green, feminist and eco-feminist literature, and a sense of some of the questions on which research might focus. However, I was unsure of what methods could best be utilized in order to answer some of my questions until I engaged with the empirical studies, and such engagement in turn raised questions and problems which I had not envisaged.

The level to which inductive practice shaped methodology depended significantly on the degree of difficulty surrounding the research process determined by the specific case studies. The research on the symbolization of meat and pornography in texts of popular culture was relatively straightforward. The selection of texts for the data base and the discursive approach to their analysis were decided upon prior to empirical research being undertaken, and research was carried out in a manner similar to that initially envisaged. Research into representation in popular culture was research into that with which I was inevitably familiar - food advertising surrounds us on television and in magazines, pornographic imagery arguably pervades certain forms of the representation of the body within mainstream popular culture, and pornographic images are readily seen on the front covers of 'top shelf' magazines in most newsagents. Thus I had some notion of textual content and the discourses through which such texts might be constituted.

In researching the industrial production of meat and pornography, methods were inductively emergent. Research into the meat and pornography industries was engagement with an alien world and I was uncertain of the extent to which I would be able (both practically and psychologically) to 'engage' with it. Induction was inherent in much of the research practice in these cases. In undertaking interviews into the meat industry for example, the range of questions which could be asked, and the depth of material obtained varied. Initial interviews involved the collection of data which seemed rather unrelated to the project, but was necessarily assimilated in order to acquaint myself with the processes of meat production so that I could reframe questions in a more

appropriate way in the light of my knowledge. Such interviews were also much shorter than those conducted later in the research, as I learned through the process of interviewing the supplementary questioning necessary to obtain certain kinds of information. In addition, the extent of the interview sample, or the kinds of observation undertaken could not be established prior to the commencement of research. In both the cases of the meat and pornography industries, the 'snowballing' of the sample and access to observe certain procedures often took place within the interview process, as can be seen in this extract from an audio taped interview:

EC. 'And what happens (to the cow) after it's been stunned?'

E.H.O. 'Its stuck. It's raised up by a shackle on its back leg and has its throat slit with a knife which then gets stuck – forced into the chest cavity so the blood letting is speeded up. (The blood) pours out really quickly then. It's a bit off-putting to watch really.'

EC. 'Why, are you blood phobic?'

E.H.O. (laughs) 'Oh no, its because the free legs, the ones not in the shackle, keep kicking, and their eyes roll, so they look as if they're conscious of it all. They're not, well, specialist opinion says they can't be after the captive bolt (method of stunning). But they do look as if they're aware. You need to see it to get what I mean really.'

EC. 'Can I see it, can I go into a slaughterhouse? I had no luck with the City (of London Corporation) about Smithfield (meat market). Could you set it up for me?'

E.H.O. 'er yes. I mean, are you sure you want to? How strong's your stomach? (laughs).'

(interview, Specialist Advisor in meat hygiene and Environmental Health Officer, LB. Hackney, Dec. 1991)

This chapter was necessarily written at a relatively late stage in the production of the thesis, once the range of possible methods had emerged within through the process of empirical research. The details of the methods used are described in the second section of this chapter. It should not be assumed that the collection of data described therein was bound by a theoretical and methodological framework which was established before empirical research began. Rather, research and the development of theory took place simultaneously, and the research material itself interactively shaped the methods used.

The chapter is divided into two sections. The first outlines the framework within which the research is set, defining key questions for investigation that emerged from the theoretical development and literature review, and as noted above, were also emergent within the earlier stages of empirical research. This section discusses how such questions were to be investigated, focusing on the selection of four empirically based case studies. The second section examines the empirical research procedures in detail, and is divided into four accounts of research practice, one pertaining to each of the following four chapters of substantive research, in order to examine the specific methodological issues arising from investigation into each distinct area.

This section discusses this research in the context of feminist consideration of methodology, and the epistemological implications of the realist structural ontology suggested in the first two chapters. It proceeds to set up the questions to be investigated by the next four chapters of empirical research in relation to the seven discourses identified in Chapter 3. It argues that case study analysis may prove helpful in investigating relations between gender and nature, and proceeds to consider the reasons for the selection of the case studies utilized in this thesis.

Feminism and methodology

The feminist literature on research methods has limited bearing on the particular concerns of this thesis. Much of this literature has been concerned with undertaking research on wimmin whose lives and subjective experience the researcher seeks to understand, and whose ways of knowing are often seen as reflective of a certain kind of 'truth' due to their location within experience (Hartsock, 1987; Collins, 1990). Feminists have criticized orthodox empirical sociological research in a variety of related ways. For example, conventional questionnaires using pre-coded categories have been accused of distorting respondents meanings, and been seen as limited in their ability to investigate the complexity of wimmin's lives (Roberts, 1981; Duelli Klein, 1983) with which researchers are insufficiently familiar (Stanley and Wise, 1983; Stanley, 1990). Most literature is concerned with research on women, and the importance of attempting to understand wimmin's own accounts of their lives using qualitative methods (McCarl Neilson, 1991) which limit hierarchical relations between researcher and subject (Oakley, 1981). Such feminist research has been seen to involve political commitment (Maynard, 1990), for it is conceptualized not as research 'on women' (i.e. which records their lives and experiences) but research 'for women' which accounts for women's interests and aims to improve their lives (Duelli Klein, 1983, p.90).

Similar to much feminist research, qualitative methodology was seen to be the most appropriate for this study. A commitment to discourse analysis necessitated detailed study of the thematic codes and meanings within both texts and specific practices, and such research did not lend itself to the use of pre-coded categories as characterizes much content analysis (Thompson, 1994). Thus qualitative data forms the basis of this study, involving the analysis of documents, non-scheduled interviewing and observation, with no attempt to use questionnaires or means of statistical correlation. There were important differences however, between the methodology employed in this research and that often used by feminist researchers, due to the specific subject matter of this project. The accounts of feminist research above assume feminist research takes

wimmin as the research subject. This project however, involved dealing overwhelmingly with male subjects, many of whom were engaged in what I felt was highly oppressive behaviour. The expansion of feminist concern around gender has led to the study of men and masculinity (Chesler, 1978, Kimmel, 1987, Segal, 1990), but as yet, little theorization of the study of masculinity and of men in the context of feminist research practice (Lather, 1991). Whilst the study of men is important for analyses of contemporary patriarchy, it poses problems for the feminist researcher in terms of access and power relations in research, and in this project, led to an approach at odds with much of feminist research practice.

Whereas feminist work on methodology has been concerned to minimize the power of the researcher over her subjects (Oakley, 1981), during this research, I often felt disempowered as a researcher in relation to many of my interviewees (particularly police, pornographic photographers and meat packers) and felt ill at ease in certain contexts (sex shops, abattoirs) in which I carried out some of the research. Feminists undertaking research on women have rightly sought to actively involve their subjects, and avoid their objectification as information providers and a 'strange foreign species under the gaze of the colonial ethnographer' (Roseneil, 1995, p.12). In this research however, I was unconcerned with the active involvement of most of my subjects. Although not all my interviewees and correspondents were patriarchal or anthroparchal agents, the majority were, and whilst I collected their views and used their ideas as evidence, I was generally unconcerned with the validation of their interpretations. I did not interview the subjects of oppressive relations, farm animals and pornographic models, due to problematic logistics in the case of the former, and access difficulties in the case of the latter. I did view the majority of my respondents purely as information givers, and viewed men involved in the killing and butchering of animals, and the making and selling of pornography, as distinctly 'strange', and was as removed from them as possible for the sake not of 'objectivity', but self preservation.

Epistemological realism

The first three chapters of this thesis have argued for a realist ontology, wherein systems of domination of patriarchy and anthroparchy, their interactive and constitutive social structures, and expressive and constitutive discourses of power, can be seen as having a real existence and effect. The intention of the empirical research for this thesis is to empirically identify the presence and operations of possible structures and discourses of oppressive relations of power in historically and culturally specific case studies.

This does not locate this research within the bounds of the kind of 'feminist empiricism' so criticized by Harding (1986, 1987). In Chapters 2 and 3, I argued the epistemological position of

scientific rationality has been rightly and effectively subjected to feminist critique. However like Shiva (1988), I would want to hold on to the idea that some knowledge may be more complete and less distorted than other kinds, and would refrain from the abandonment of any notion of objectivity and the conception of a 'real' world independent of human knowledge about it as advocated by some postmodern feminists (Hekman, 1990). I would argue that feminist research can be both critical of enlightenment-objectivist epistemology whilst also developing and changing it rather than abandoning any criteria for empirical research which attempts to produce more complex and complete knowledge (Lovibond, 1989; Di Stephano, 1990; Walby, 1992).

Harding (1987) spends much time attempting to distinguish between her preferred 'feminist standpoint epistemology' and 'feminist empiricism', but I feel she herself acknowledges they are both often elements of the same approach (1987, p.186). Harding more recently has drawn on Lukacs in arguing oppressed groups may have a greater claim to objectivity due their 'point-of-view-ness' (Harding, 1991, p.120). She argues social subordination creates specific critical insights into dominant mind sets, and such insights enlarge and modify the state of knowledge in general. Harding acknowledges the importance of feminist empirical research which she claims, within a 'standpoint epistemology' can deliver less distorted, more objective knowledge which draws on the authenticity of wimmin's experience. This research tries to capture Harding's sense of the importance of empiricism which attempts to be 'objective', whilst appreciating the problems of bias associated with the Enlightenment character of such knowledge seeking.

The empirical research for this project takes the 'interests' of wimmin and of animals seriously, and is thus characterized by an eco-feminist political and theoretical commitment. In addition however, it does attempt to gain as accurate an account of the empirical cases as it is able, by critically examining material from a variety of sources involving very different perspectives. It will be apparent that the 'point-of view-ness' of some sources is taken to be closer to the reality of certain given situations than others. For example, in an anthroparchal society in which animals are objectified, the information provided by animal welfare groups is seen to be more likely to 'reveal' reality, than the views of those working within the meat industry who understand animals as objects, and who have a vested interest in obscuring any cruelties towards them. The evidence on the operation of the meat industry provided by animal welfare campaigners is not merely accepted however, but is critically evaluated in the light of empirical observation on farms, in meat processing plants, and in abattoirs, and in relation to material obtained from sources with different perspectives on the meat industry.

Whilst I have generally rejected postmodern feminist approaches to knowledge, this research is shaped by some of the concerns demonstrated by such approaches. Postmodern feminists have

criticized research which attempts to theorize in a cross-contextual manner (Nicholson, 1992) and argued for the importance of historical specificity (Lather, 1991). The case studies for this research are both contemporary and located in the British context. Whilst the theories argued for in this thesis may apply throughout modern societies, at other historical junctures, and across other cultures, it is beyond the scope of this project to examine such possibilities. Thus it will be argued that in Britain, in the late twentieth century, there may be evidence consistent with the theories outlined in this thesis. My use of 'big categories' (Nicholson, 1992, p.98) of analysis such as systems and structures of oppressive relations may provoke criticism from postmodernists, but I would not seek to assert universal application for the theoretical approach of this thesis on the basis of this research. Postmodern feminists may still critique this research as insufficiently specific, but as McLellan points out, this may be inevitable for postmodernists provide 'no rules which tell us when being specific is specific enough' (1995, p.406). Research can never be 'objective' in an absolute sense, but this thesis draws upon empirical research in order to examine the extent to which there may be 'evidence' consistent with the theories suggested in the first three chapters. Such research utilizes various methods in order, it is hoped, to achieve a critical and intersubjective account of how and why things may be seen as 'thus, and not so' (Archer, 1996).

In the chapters on the symbolic representation of meat and pornography, a number of texts of popular culture are examined. Within them, collectivities of themes will be identified which may be seen as expressive and constitutive of power relations. Individual themes can be seen as strands which collectively constitute discourses of power which frame the ways particular phenomena such as meat and pornography are represented as images and texts within forms of popular culture. Thus in Chapters 5 and 6 of this thesis, research involves making generalizations about the images/texts which comprise the empirical material. Such empirically based generalizations are seen as thematic, and form interrelated collectivities which are seen as discourses of power which express and constitute structures of social relations.

The research for Chapters 7 and 8 on the meat and pornography industries involves a different approach. Here, research involves three sources of evidence: documents, interviews and empirical observation. Whilst a discursive approach is adopted, I do not find those postmodern accounts which assume all kinds of 'narrative' are equally valid, particularly helpful, for the criteria by which narratives are selected seems to be the politics of the theorist rather than the empirical evaluation of various narratives (1). The three sources of evidence examined in these two chapters involve competing 'narratives' or versions on the same empirical instances, as can be seen in the following discussion of research for chapter seven on the meat industry.

People involved with different aspects of the meat industries and with different political orientations towards them are interviewed. Butchers, slaughtermen and farmers are fully implicated in the status quo, but local authority meat inspectors, in their role as meat industry regulators, have a more critical stance on industry procedure. Animal welfare activists exhibit a range of critical approaches towards the meat industry, varying in content and degree of radicalism depending on the ideological position of the pressure group with which they might be associated. Documentary evidence is also reflective of these three perspectives, such as material produced by those working in the industry (such as meat trade journals and breeders association publications), material produced by those regulating the industry (such as reports by the Farm Animal Welfare Council, government regulations, circulars and legislation, journals of the meat inspectorate), and written reports and pamphlets produced by animal welfare pressure groups. There is an attempt therefore, to gain information which encapsulates different perspectives on the same institutions and procedures. Such information critically and comparatively evaluated was seen as likely to provide a balanced account of the industry.

I have assumed that some accounts are less prone to inaccuracy than others, and that if two accounts could endorse each other this may be taken to be an indication of probable accuracy. Thus for example, in Chapter 1, we saw postmodern approaches to the environment have seen environmental problems as socially constructed, and Hannigan (1995, pp.166-9) has argued there is no 'reality' to BSE in cattle as a 'problem'. Chapter 7 of this thesis pays little attention to the issue of BSE, but research indicated Hannigan's position is problematic. The claims of animal welfare groups surrounding the dangers of eating cattle products were substantiated by the opinion of both the meat inspectorate and some butchers gained from interviews and reading meat industry journals. The specific details of the research procedures are outlined in the second section of this chapter, and it is felt that the range of material and sources drawn upon is broad and representative enough for it to be suggested that this research may provide evidence that may be consistent with some of the theoretical arguments made in the first three chapters.

Discursive analysis of case studies

The initial research question was whether a relationship existed between ecology and gender, and what forms any relations might assume, or specifically, that there were links between certain forms of sexualized violence against women and animals. I had become interested in this question partly from engaging with the limited literature on women and animals (Salamone, 1982; Benny, 1983; Collard, 1988; and in particular, Adams, 1990); and also by querying why the Meat and Livestock Commission's advertising campaign in the early 1990 s, had been based on the assumption that men were prime consumers of meat.

The initial 'hunch' in seeking to explain possible relations between gender and ecology, or more specifically, between gender and food consumption, was that sexualized violence against animals, such as that embodied in the production and consumption of meat, was patriarchal. It was also felt that sexualized violence against women, embodied in cultural texts such as pornography may not only be gendered, but could be analysed in terms of species relations also. It was initially conceived that the patriarchal organisation of society was responsible for both the oppression of women and animals. However, this initial conceptualization was to undergo significant revision as a result of initial research into the meat industry which indicated similarity in comparing the domination of women and animals, but also significant differences in the specific forms oppressions took, and the degrees at which, and contexts within which, they operated. As a result, a dual systems approach was developed. Further engagement with bodies of social theory on the environment led to the development of the concept of 'anthroparchy' as an autonomous system of oppressive structures and relations which interrelated with patriarchy. It was proposed that both these two systems of domination might be seen to articulate in particular instances of the oppression of women and animals, and a project was envisaged which could examine the interconnections between different systems of oppression.

In order to provide some empirical evidence which may indicate a relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy, case study analysis was undertaken. Systems of oppression are complex and diverse, and can be seen to operate in particular oppressive instances or cases. It would be impossible to undertake detailed study of the range of possible interrelations between oppressive systems across the spectrum of instances in which they might articulate, and detailed analysis was felt to be imperative in order to understand the complexity of relationships. Thus this research cannot claim to be an exhaustive account of patriarchal and anthroparchal interrelations. Rather, research is based on in-depth empirical studies of two instances of oppression in which it was felt anthroparchal and patriarchal relations may be seen to articulate, in order investigate certain connections between patriarchy and anthroparchy in contemporary British society.

The means of analysing the specific interrelations between patriarchy and anthroparchy was via an examination of discourses which, as argued in Chapter 3, are seen as expressive and constitutive of the structures of systems of domination. The case studies chosen were analysed in order to investigate the extent to which they deployed the discourses of gendering and naturing suggested in the previous chapter: the gendered and natured Other, sexualized consumption, ownership, objectification, fragmentation, deception and violence. The research did not intend to produce an uncritically comparative account, but investigate the possibly divergent processes of gendering and naturing between case studies as well as their similar constructions. For example, it was not assumed that if objectification was a feature of both studies, and took both gendered and

natured form, that the cases were identical in respect to objectification. Rather, each of the seven discourses may be deployed in different ways, and be present to different degrees.

Chapters 1 and 2 argued meat eating has been seen as anthropocentric (or anthroparchal) within the green literature, and pornography considered patriarchal within much feminist literature. Chapter 3 however, suggested both patriarchy and anthroparchy may articulate in specific instances of oppression such as pornography and meat, because these oppressive systems interact and articulate. In order to investigate such interaction, the research was to consider whether in the gendering of pornography, there is a sub-text of naturing; and conversely, within the naturing of meat, whether there is a sub-text of gender. The presence of such sub-texts, would indicate interrelation between the two systems. The purpose of the research was the investigation of such possible intersections, and a consideration of their role in the construction of patriarchy and anthroparchy. The case studies were examined to ascertain the extent to which they are characterized by the seven discourses, and in what form and degree these were expressed.

The cases were thus scrutinised for the presence of power relations of dominance and subordination involving either, or more pertinently, both dichotomous gendering in terms of the feminization of subordination, and the masculinization of domination; and dichotomous 'naturing' in terms of the animalization of subordination, and the humanization of dominance. The cases were also examined in terms of the extent to which sexualized consumption could be seen to operate in the constructing certain bodies as 'Others'. Third, the presence of possibly gendered and natured relations of ownership and production was noted. Fourth, the case studies were analysed in terms of their deployment of objectification and fetishization. Fifth, the cases were examined in order to ascertain ^{whether} they deployed discourses of fragmentation through either fragmentary symbolization of the body, or material forms of fragmentation such as the physical fragmentation (division or disassembly) of bodies, or the fragmentation of lived experience. Sixth, the studies were analyzed deconstructively in terms of the possible operation of discourses of deception which operate to obscure the power relations in certain practices, processes and institutions. Lastly, discourses of gendered and natured violence were examined, in terms of their symbolization and their material manifestation in physical form.

The selection of the case studies: why meat and pornography?

It was felt from the outset that a single case study would be insufficient and a comparative study would more thoroughly investigate the complexity of interrelations between gender and nature as it could account for differences in forms and degrees of domination. I felt that studies should be chosen which had already been analysed in terms of one of the two systems of

domination, and this research should concentrate on the possible identification of discourses constitutive of alternative relations of systemic power. Thus I was looking for a case study which had been identified as an instance of patriarchal oppression by (some) feminists, and another which had been identified as an instance of anthropocentric/speciesist oppression by (some) green theorists. In addition, I wished to select oppressive instances in which the presence of oppressive relations might have already have been suggested, whilst rarely being explored in any depth.

In part, the decision to compare two relatively different cases of instances of domination was a result of my critique of the work of Daly (1979). Whilst the conceptualization of discourse analysis deployed in this research draws upon this work, it has been argued that her research project may have been limited by its extensive range (see Chapter 3). Daly applied her model to five case studies across a variety of historical locations and cultural contexts all of which, she holds, similarly operationalize her discourses, so that different violences are similarly patriarchal in extent and degree. Her study erases the impact of historical and cultural location, and the form or degree of violence, and such flaws confirmed the need for a limited project, with two case studies located in the same historical and cultural juncture. In order to critically compare the cases, they also needed to be divergent. I argued in the first three chapters that much of feminist theory was nature blind and much of green theory gender blind, with eco-feminist approaches generally offering a more satisfactory frame of analysis. Thus two cases based on different instances of oppression were to be compared: one which green theorists have seen as anthropocentric/speciesist (or as I prefer, anthroparchal), and the other which many feminists have seen as patriarchal. If in an instance of anthroparchal oppression, gender can be seen to be present, and in an instance of patriarchal oppression, nature domination can be shown as a factor, then a relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy may be suggested.

From the outset of the research, there was a clear commitment to a feminist understanding of the treatment of animals, and thus the choice of a case study green theorists have characterised as anthroparchal was to involve animal abuse. A number of studies could have been chosen: 'zoological gardens', vivisection, the use of animals as entertainment such as circuses or in 'sport', eating animals as meat. Meat was selected as it is the most common and normative means of animal oppression, and could be analysed at both material and symbolic levels. Meat provided an opportunity for the kind of discursive analysis discussed in Chapter 3 to be operationalized. Meat can be seen to exist as a series of discourses about animals represented within anthroparchal ideology in texts of popular culture, and concretized in the cultural practices of meat eating and food preparation. In addition, meat assumes material form in practices of physical violence and other physical and psychological abuse of animals within the institution of the meat industry.

Another case study was sought for comparison with meat, drawn from instances of oppression which feminists often define as patriarchal. The association of meat with the violence of slaughter, led to initial investigation into the systematic killing of women. 'Femicide' (Russell, 1994) was mooted for comparison with meat and hunting, but it was felt access would prove problematic. Research would rely on analysis of press reports and police co-operation, the latter difficult to obtain; or be forced to rely on data from popular culture which would have concentrated on the ideological expression of discourses, ignoring their concretization in practices and institutions. Material on the hunting of wild animals was collected as it was envisaged this could complement material on meat, and be compared to sex-crime. Although material on hunting was relevant for research into meat it was not imperative and was excluded in an attempt to limit scope. Similarly to femicide, access problems would affect a study on hunting: observation could take place via a hunt saboteurs association, but an insight into the world views of the hunt would prove difficult.

Access was not the main factor in the selection of pornography as the case study for comparison with meat. Hunting and femicide are fortunately relatively rare, although systematic, instances of the oppression of animals and of women. They are often held to be 'extreme' and are generally condemned by most people in modern Western society, not only feminists, ecologists, and animal rights activists. Meat in contemporary Western society however, is both common and acceptable, even according to groups which may have a vested interest in estimating lower figures, approximately 94% of people in Britain eat meat (The Vegan Society, 1996). Evidence of the normalization and extensiveness of meat as a form of anthroparchal oppression, lies in the fact it constitutes an industry, one of the largest in Britain. Pornography is also common and widely accepted, at least by many men, and assumes institutional form in a mass industry. The key criteria for selecting meat and pornography were their prevalence, normalization and institutionalization in mass industrial form.

The selection of meat and pornography as case studies enabled a comparative investigation of material and ideological aspects of these phenomena. 'Ideological' aspects can be defined as the symbolic realm of idea and belief (see Chapter 2), involving the representation of meat and pornography in texts or popular culture in the form of books, magazines, television programmes and advertising. 'Material' aspects refer to physical and/or economic processes and relations. Research into these latter aspects primarily focused upon investigation into production methods and relations of the pornography and meat industries. This study does not seek to compare and contrast these two levels of analysis, rather both kinds of analysis are undertaken with respect to comparing and contrasting the phenomena of meat and pornography, and broadening the understanding of these phenomena. The material and ideological are not autonomous levels at

which oppressions operate, but ones that are intertwined. There cannot be absolute separation of the two levels, although certain chapters of research concentrate on one level more directly.

In investigating the ideological symbolization of meat and pornography, discourse analysis of the representation of meat and pornography in popular culture was carried out, by examination respectively of: food advertising, cookery coverage in women's magazines, and cookery books; and of pornographic magazines, films and novels. At the material level, research investigated the deployment of gendered and natured discourses within the industries of meat and pornography, focussing on the composition and world views of industry personnel via qualitative research by unstructured interviews. Methodological parallels could be established, interviewing workers in different aspect of the industries: facilitators (farmers, pornographic modelling agencies); producers (slaughterhouse staff, meat cutters, pornographic photographers); distributors (butchers, sex shop workers); and censors (environmental health officers, meat inspectors, customs officers, police). Further investigation by observation of the operations of the industries was undertaken where possible, in order to evaluate the status of the evidence provided by those working within the industries in either a productive or regulatory capacity, and also those involved in the articulation of protest. The specific details of the research process for each of the studies are outlined in the section below.

CARRYING OUT THE RESEARCH

This section considers the research methods in relation to each of the four chapters of substantive research. In each case, issues of access differ, and will be considered in their individual contexts.

Researching the meat industry.

Research into the meat industry involved observation and scrutiny of each stage of the production process. Material was sought from a number of sources, reflecting a divergence of opinion on meat production. I collected material produced by a range of groups campaigning for animal welfare, from those with co-operative links to the meat industry and a generally conservative perspective such as the RSPCA, to radical groups undertaking direct action against live exports of 'meat' animals to Europe, and involved in both covert and overt research in order to 'expose' cruelties within the meat industry such as Animal Aid. The material produced by such groups reflected discourses of contestation against speciesism/anthropocentrism/anthroparchy, but in taking the interests of animals seriously, and standing outside the ideological consensus of a society in which 'meat' animals are objectified, this material was seen as having some degree of

independent worth. Such material was produced by those who had no vested interest in the meat industry, unlike those involved directly (slaughtermen, meat cutters etc) or indirectly (the meat inspectorate) whose livelihoods depend on the rearing and killing of animals for meat.

I approached the Meat Inspectorate via local authority Environmental Health Departments, responsible for inspection of animals, meat, slaughterhouse premises and butchers shops, and the enforcement of relevant legislation. This provided an overview of the areas of possible investigation and an access route to observing the operations of slaughterhouses. The City of London Corporation has jurisdiction over Smithfield market, the largest point of butchering, buying, selling and distribution of meat in Britain. Permission to view procedures and carry out interviews at Smithfield was requested but refused on grounds no member of the public was allowed access without certification from the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF). However, it was consequently found that the Corporation denies most requests for access due to concern over negative publicity. In contrast, connections with the London Borough (L.B.) of Hackney proved fruitful. Interviews were carried out with Executive Officers in the Department of Environmental Health. Two people were interviewed, one, a specialist advisor in meat inspection I interviewed twice, and conversed with on a number of occasions over a two year period. These interviews and conversations provided access to relevant legislation, European Union and MAFF regulations and guidelines, critical reports conducted by government appointed bodies such as the Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC), and detailed description of the operations of slaughterhouses, against which the accounts provided by animal welfare groups could be critically compared. Unstructured interviews were most efficacious, as much was gleaned from answers to questions which interviewees were likely to consider subsidiary, such as those referring to gender; and much valuable information was gained from quips and asides. The number of interviews (three) was sufficient, for in interviewing more than one respondent, there were overlaps in information. A large amount of data was collected (via note taking and tape recorder) and it was felt that this form of in-depth questioning was more beneficial than a larger number of shorter interviews.

Two day long visits to slaughterhouses and meat packing/cutting plants in Havering, Essex were arranged. Interviews were conducted with the Chief Meat Inspector for the region and two other inspectors in the Department. Interviewees were encouraged to describe how they became involved in inspection, how they felt about this aspect of their job, personal experiences and particular likes and dislikes. Again, the unstructured interview, and conversation without the use of prohibiting tape-recorders proved most productive. In the slaughterhouses and cutting plants note-taking and the use of a tape recorder was impossible due ^{to} the noise, and the questionnaires designed for use in abattoirs were abandoned as they would be time consuming and thus unwelcome for workers in a

piece rate system. In addition, slaughtermen are ill prepared for such a task - there are few tables and chairs, the men are permanently wet and bloody, and some have limited literacy. Most were willing to 'chat' but were wary of 'interview-like' questions. Taping conversation proved impossible due to noise, and brief note taking sufficed. Such arenas do not lend themselves to research for one who is constantly on the move, climbing downstairs and steps slippery with water and animal fat in order to observe proceedings, shaking hands covered in blood and shouting across the din of animal noises, power hoses, electric saws and clanking chains. Although conversations were initiated with slaughtermen wherever possible, this was limited partly due to the presence of the local authority inspector (of whom workers were wary) who facilitated access. The most feasible method of recording information proved to be cataloguing insights, observations and recollections of conversations immediately after the event by tape recorder.

Butchering was accessed via interviews with independent butchers in North London. A snowball sample of three was established with the aid of one butcher who was also a lecturer at Smithfield. Although the butchers interviewed worked within greater London, they came from a variety of backgrounds in terms of the size of the establishment in which they worked, and their clientele. There was a fair level of trust established between researcher and researched in view of the fact the researcher was known to a common acquaintance within the industry. Unstructured interviews were used, for again, most of the questions of significance were asked as asides or additional points of interest. It was mooted to subject a sample of the butcher's clientele to a questionnaire. This idea was abandoned due to the reticence on the part of some butchers, and because it would expand the parameters of the project excessively. In addition, comparison with pornography may involve interviews with consumers which the researcher was not prepared to undertake due to the problems of respondent sensitivity.

Additional material on butchering was gained from interviews with young men (aged 19-28) working in unskilled meat cutting and packing at a plant in East London. A snowball sample of five was established, which meant respondents had worked in the same organisation. On observing operations in two meat packing factories in Romford, no interviews had been carried out with packers and cutters due to the prohibiting presence of an inspector. These interviews, however, were with temporary workers at a packing plant, a number of whom were acquainted with the researcher, and interviews were carried out in an office, rather than a packing factory. There was a fairly high level of trust between researcher and subject, and the researcher could be far more open about the nature of the research, and ask more direct questions in unstructured interviews. These interviews were effective in gaining an insight into how workers in meat feel about their job. In the slaughterhouse, the attempt to do this had limited success as there was little time to talk in depth to slaughtermen who were suspicious of a female researcher accompanied by a local authority

inspector. This sample of five was sufficient due to the amount of repeated information across interviews, and information provided by respondents who had undertaken similar work for different companies in different locations, who alleged the work was similar elsewhere. The cutting and packing plant was owned by a multi-national freight company which owned numerous such premises in Britain and Western Europe, and provided a representative location for research. These were some of the most successful interviews in this research (2), and enabled investigation into the sexual division of labour in butchering and meat cutting, and examination of the possible sexualization of butchering, and how certain economic practices may accentuate the fragmentary nature of the work.

Material on farming was gained via interviews with six farmers, one farming beef cattle, three dairy cattle (one of whom ran a 'pick your own' fruit and vegetable, and had run a battery farm in the past), one beef farmer's assistant, and one ostrich farmer. Interviews were also carried out with those involved in animal breeding, a sales executive with a multi-national pig breeding company, a cattle breeder, and the secretary of a cattle breeders association. In addition, the director of a company manufacturing equipment for factory farms was interviewed. The latter provided the key access point in this area, making contact with the variety of farmers listed above, and securing entry to the Royal Smithfield Show (1994), when interviews with some of the animal farmers and all of the breeders were carried out. These interviews enabled an insight into the range of animal farming in Britain, to ascertain the gendering and naturing of the processes.

An additional source of information on slaughtering and farming came from contact established with animal welfare pressure groups. Information was gained via telephone conversations, letters and pressure group publications. Groups included: Compassion in World Farming (CIWF), Animal Aid, The Vegetarian Society, The Vegan Society, The Green Party, Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, Lynx, Humane Slaughter Association, Animal Welfare Trust, Captive Animals Protection Society, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, Hunt Saboteurs Association (HSA), Campaign for the Abolition of Angling, League Against Cruel Sports, RSPCA, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Environmental Investigation Agency, The Movement for Compassionate Living, World Society for the Protection of Animals. With respect to farming, the material from CIWF and Animal Aid proved particularly useful in providing detailed descriptions of the living conditions of a wide variety of domestic animals. Interviews were carried out with the chief technical officer of the Humane Slaughter Association, and a senior scientific officer in the Farm Animals Department of the RSPCA, who was part of the team responsible for managing the Freedom Food scheme of 'welfare labelling' on meat products. The details of the research sources for this area are listed in Appendix 1.

Material gained from documents and interviews from and with farmers, animal breeders, slaughtermen, butchers, meat packers, meat inspectors and animal rights activists from a range of pressure groups was comparatively and critically evaluated. Where possible, empirical observation was used to confirm the evidence provided by documents and interviews. The account of this research (Chapter 7) makes rather grim reading, and I found research for this part of the thesis stressful and personally upsetting. I hope however, that the inclusion of a range of sources from differing perspectives, and the attempt to confirm evidence across sources, has enabled an account that, despite its eco-feminist perspective, demonstrates a critical intersubjectivity.

Researching the pornography industry.

The research on the pornography industry was the most difficult of the case studies in terms of access. The pornography industry, like the meat industry, is generally closed to the would-be observer. Whereas the production of meat is entirely legitimate in anthroparchal society however, production of pornography does not have the same level of immunity. The semi-legal status of the pornography industry means it is more closed to the researcher than the meat industry. Whereas I was able to observe various processes in the production of meat, this was not so with pornography, and research is necessarily based overwhelmingly on interviews. As a result, my account of the pornography industry is likely to be less accurate than that of the meat industry. Whereas I was able to confirm many of my findings on the meat industry by my own empirical observation, this was not the case with the pornography industry. A difficulty with this research (Chapter 8) is that it does not reflect the perspectives of those arguably seen as subjects of oppressive relations, the pornographic models. It does nevertheless reflect a range of opinions from those involved in the production and regulation of pornography in Britain, and whilst the conclusions drawn from this particular chapter of research must be rather more tentative than those for the other three, I feel that this research was as representative as I was able to make it.

The problems associated with this research certainly threw light on my own naivety as a researcher. On reading the radical feminist literature on pornography, I had been critical of an almost exclusive focus on the analysis of pornographic texts, rather than an approach which attempted to analyze the relationship between the symbolic representation of pornography and its material production. In retrospect, I can quite understand why this should be the case. It may be that there is so little published material on the pornography industry from a feminist perspective because of the degree of difficulty regarding access for feminist researchers. Despite the problems attendant with this case study however, I feel some of the insights it produced are consistent with some of the theoretical claims of the thesis, and whilst I am less confident about the evidence

provided by this research, I feel it provides a window, however small the frame and murky the glass, into an area on which little research has been undertaken.

The purpose of research was to investigate the pornography industry in terms of the production, distribution and consumption of material, as well as its control, and examine the extent to which production may be gendered and natured. Interviews were undertaken with those from various parts of the industry, photographers, sex shop workers, customs officers and police in the Obscene Publications Department (OPD) at New Scotland Yard (NSY). An additional area for investigation could have been the world-views of pornographic models, but this did not warrant obvious comparison with those animals who are turned into meat, who for obvious reasons are best observed rather than interviewed, and despite attempts to secure interviews with models, there proved many logistical problems in undertaking research into this area.

Three visits were made to the Obscene Publications Department at New Scotland Yard, and interviews were carried out with two senior officers and one junior officer (the Chief Inspector (CI) who was interviewed twice, a Detective Inspector (DI) and a Police Constable (PC)). Two civilian members of the Department were also interviewed whose role was the classification of material. The use of a tape recorder was prohibited during these interviews, and notes were taken for some of the questioning, although a surreptitious tape recorder in a jacket pocket proved successful. The number of respondents was appropriate in relation to the size and composition of the Department (approximately twenty people, two thirds of whom are civilians, the remainder police officers). Securing interviews was not easy, and the Chief Inspector was concerned about the use of officers' time. Research intended to investigate the extent to which production, distribution and sale of pornography was gendered and natured, and the world-views of agencies regulating pornography. Two customs officers at Heathrow airport were also interviewed to ascertain their views concerning the changing forms of pornography, and the ease of distributing material, to investigate the gendering of distribution and consumption.

Direct investigation into the industry proved challenging. Soft core magazines declined to be interviewed. Three photographers were interviewed who had worked for pornographic magazines by contract or free-lance. They were selected as they photographed material other than pornography and thus were included in published directories within the photography industry. Unstructured interviews were carried out to examine the nature of this form of photographic work from the photographers' point of view, the extent of control they could exert over the models, the material benefits for photographer and model alike, the role of the models, problems of publication and ownership of material, and power relations within the industry in general. Key issues were the relationship between the gendering and sexualization of different types of work.

In London's 'sex capital', Soho, there are approximately forty sex-shops. Three interviews were carried out in two of these. I felt further investigation into this area was unlikely to yield much new information, as there was a fairly high level of repetition of information across this small number. Questions were asked as to the types of consumer frequenting the establishments, the kinds of material sold and the ways the material was distributed. From these interviews, an insight into the organisation of the industry could be obtained, in terms of the power-relations within it such as those based upon class, race, gender and nature; and the possibility of violence and intimidation within the industry.

Access to pornographic models and their agencies proved insurmountably difficult. Although contact was repeatedly made, models in particular were concerned about their use of time, and some insisted on payment for an interview on a similar basis to payment for their regular work. In regard to the fact that this is often upwards of £200 per hour, I decided that unless a more accommodating potential interviewee could be found, this line of investigation would prove unfruitful. There were repeated attempts to secure an interview with a model, which were unsuccessful until the last six months of the research, when an interview was set up with a male model. This was abandoned as it was to take place in rather dubious circumstances (amongst other things, between two and three am!) and jeopardising my safety as well as sanity, seemed foolish.

This research proved the most difficult, and its findings are shaped by access the most markedly. Given the controversial nature of the research, the secretive nature of the industry and its position on the borderline of legality, and the incidence revealed by research of violence against producers and distributors and particularly their associates, it is difficult to see how more extensive research could be undertaken. In the circumstances, it is felt research was as successful in securing a rigorous a sample of interviewees (listed in Appendix II) as was practicable, although it must be acknowledged that the limitation of the sample, and the inability to verify findings via empirical observations makes this case study less conclusive as evidence than the other three, despite its consistencies with the theoretical position suggested in the thesis.

Researching the ideological symbolization of meat in popular culture.

The research on the ideological symbolization of meat and pornography involved discursive analysis of contemporary texts of popular culture in which meat and pornography were represented. Discourse analysis suggests that within cultural images, certain gendered themes may be seen for example, in the ways texts speak to the viewer about masculinity and femininity. Unlike much socialization theory (e.g. Sharpe, 1976), discourse analysis does not presume that masculinity and femininity are unitary constructs, but that they are characterised by general, often

ambiguous themes and tendencies. The origins of such analysis can largely be attributed to Foucault (1971), who contended cultural discourses not only shape and direct power relations, but that power relations are in fact constructed via such discourses (see Chapter 3). This research deconstructed cultural texts of meat and pornography in order to identify the presence of the seven possible discourses of gender and nature established in the previous chapter.

The research for Chapter 5 focused on the representation of meat in popular culture. Meat advertising was analyzed in terms of its subliminal and often obvious meaning. Adverts came partly from television and hoardings, but the most fruitful resource was women's magazines, and cookery books and magazines. Magazines from a variety of genres were viewed, and material collected from 1990 to July 1996. The magazines in the research sample included: *Good Housekeeping*, *Woman and Home*, *Woman's Weekly*, *Bella*, *The Sainsbury's Magazine*, *BBC Good Food*, *BBC Vegetarian Good Food*. A range of women's magazines was initially sampled in order to gain an insight into the various genres, and to select the most pertinent. Such a review could provide insight into the possible complexity of gendered discourse, and enable examination of possible sub-genres, and the presence of naturing.

Examination of meat advertising was undertaken to ascertain the extent to which meat is seen as something produced for male consumption. An additional issue was whether texts place women in the role of purchasers who buy and prepare meat for a presumed male partner. Further, there was the question as to whether the preparation of meat by women was sexualized activity with some forms of meat discursively constructed as connected implicitly or explicitly to male virility and potency, or assumed to have aphrodisiac qualities. The preparation of such male food, it was argued in Chapter 3, is often held to render women more sexually attractive to men. Thus the question for investigation was the extent to which the consumption and preparation of meat can be seen to be both a gendered and a sexualized activity, in which animals, as the victims of actual violence may be absent or obscured.

Cookery books were examined, the majority focusing on meat and fish cookery, and a minority of vegetarian cook books in order to examine the full range of the literature, and provide a representative sample. A bibliography of the books used is cited in Appendix III, which lists all the sources of data for the research on the representation of meat. The vegetarian literature was important to compare the extent of gendering and naturing in texts which precluded meat. The main focus of the books reviewed was British culinary tradition, but European cookery was also covered. In addition, as both traditional and modern schools were examined, there is some coverage of international cooking, as modern texts increasingly emphasise 'world cuisine'. The descriptions of meat and meat animals could prove useful in ascertaining how both are seen.

Again, an issue was whether the animals were generally absent from the depiction of meat as a product, obscuring the violences done to them. Subject to investigation was the extent to which meat is seen by both male and female authors as a gendered and sexualized phenomenon. This could be possibly evidenced both in the text, the descriptive terms used for meat and animal products, and in the pictorial representation of meat in photographs. I feel research for this chapter was based on a comprehensive and representative sample of texts which involve the ideological representation of meat. Such texts involved the articulation of a number of perspectives, mainly supportive of the status quo in relation to gender and nature, but also those which were contestationary.

Researching the ideological symbolization of pornographies.

The usual methods of social scientific inquiry into pornography have not been via discourse analysis, but pornographic effects studies in behavioural psychology, and content analysis in sociology. The former involves research in a laboratory situation and such experiments have been seen as ethically dubious, and unable both to reflect reality and contextualise research questions (see Chapter 2). Such research is concerned with the behavioural effect of pornography, whereas this project is concerned with the ideological content of the material, and its possible relation to wider structures of social power. Content analysis involves the review of material with the intent of isolating codes of imagery that emerge from the material and examining the frequency of their repetition across each genre (e.g. Reading University, 1990; Thompson, 1994). Such analysis does not provide the opportunity for detailed examination of the themes embodied in forms of representation, nor the examination of images in the context by which they are defined (Coward, 1986). It does not allow for the investigation of pornographic images as characterised by a 'regime of representations' (Bonner, 1990, p.252), sets of meanings which define images for the viewer. Pornography is seen in this research as a set of discourses that form a particular regime in which certain power relations are represented. This research investigates the extent to which these discourses may be gendered and natured. Discourse analysis was appropriate, for it could facilitate detailed examination of various themes within genres, whilst being able to take account of the subtleties of the constructions of gender, and the ways these inform of the construction of sexualities. The question for this research is the influence of gender and nature on pornography as a form of ideological representation embodied in texts of popular culture, and the relations of power expressed by it, and constitutive of it.

To gain insight into the variety of pornographic discourses, it was appropriate to review the whole range of pornographic genres, lawful and unlawful. Material that was legally available was relatively easy to obtain from newsagents and sex shops. A minority of the material produced is

however illegal, and in order to facilitate analysis of the latter, the Obscene Publications Department at New Scotland Yard was contacted. Problematically, viewing was only permitted within the Department and material was shown at great speed. This said, the Department provided an overview of the different pornographic genres and facilitated access to types of pornography that would have proved impossible to view due to its legal status. As a result of difficulties stemming from legality, it was felt that greater attention would be paid to an analysis of 'soft core' pornographic magazines available from newsagents and 'sex shops'. This decision was due to considerations of accessibility and finance, for hiring or buying hard core pornography is expensive. In addition, novels were analysed, particularly those which had received scant attention from feminist research - those written by women. Lesbian sado-masochist (s/m) material was examined in order to investigate the nature of 'new' pornographic genres to see if similar or divergent discourses to the mainstream pertain.

The media analyzed (novel, magazine and video) encompassed a range of pornographic genres: mainstream heterosexual for a male market (*Penthouse, Men Only*); mainstream heterosexual targeted at the more limited female market (*For Women*), lesbian (*Quim*), male homosexual (*Prowl*); sado-masochist (Pat Califia's collection of short fiction - *Macho Sluts*). The sources for this part of the research are listed in detail in Appendix IV. This was a diversified sample in terms of both media and genre, for if the material viewed at Scotland Yard was taken into account, practically every genre was surveyed in some medium. One genre that was ignored was that of computer pornography. There is debate as to whether pornography on the internet is a form of pornography that does not involve human exploitation (as no-one need pose for film or photograph), or whether it is the most pernicious form of pornography yet. Computer pornography does not involve the structures of an industry that has been the focus for this research, and involves a set of debates on the development of information technology per se that, it was felt, would broaden this research scope excessively.

With this omission, practically all other genres were reviewed, and examined for the possible presence of a number of the discourses suggested in Chapter 3: hierarchical power relations based upon a dichotomy between active and passive roles in the pornographic discourse. Dichotomous roles were investigated in terms of the potential gendering and naturing of the passive/object category. It was also questioned whether pornographic images are characterised by objectification, fragmentation, deception and ownership, and the ways in which sexuality may be represented. The research sought to understand the complexity of the relationship between the gendering, sexualization and naturing and whether these categories were synonymous, or whether they operate in variable combination dependent on context.

Conclusion

The case studies enabled an investigation into two instances of possible oppression. Examination was to investigate the extent to which these instances could be seen as patriarchal, characterized by gendering, and anthroparchal, characterized by naturing. The selection of two studies enabled a comparative approach that could account for differences as well as similarity, and thus show the complexities of the relationship between gender and nature.

Every attempt was made to secure a representative sample in terms of research data. In the chapters on the symbolization of pornography and meat this could be effectively achieved. Carrying out research into the industries however was more difficult in terms of access, and thus this research is more limited in terms of sample size and scope. Particularly with respect to the research on the pornography industry, the evidence produced is less conclusive than that provided by the other case studies. However, these parts of the research are as representative as was possible, and reflect a critical intersubjectivity based on comparison of evidence provided from a variety of sources. The research methods were affected by the subject matter, and are as rigorous as the nature of some aspects of that subject matter could allow.

The following four chapters are based on each of the four research areas: the symbolic representation of meat, the symbolic representation of pornography, the meat industry and the pornography industry. Each chapter cross-references to others in terms of theoretical linkages between the discourses and structures of oppressive relations identified. The case studies investigate the extent to which the seven discourses outlined in Chapter 3 may be seen to be deployed, in order to compare and contrast meat and pornography. These discourses may be seen to be gendered or natured, but should they be both, it will be suggested that meat and pornography may be seen as part of structures of oppression pertaining to both patriarchal and anthroparchal systems of oppression. The relationship between these structures of oppression, and the systems of which they are part, is further discussed and developed in the final and conclusive chapter of the thesis, in the light of the findings of the next four chapters of empirical research.

Notes

- (1) See my critique of Butler in Chapter 2, and in of Haraway in Chapter 1.
- (2) Compared to other interviews carried out for this research, these were, at the time less stressful in terms of the context in which they were undertaken. In retrospect however, undertaking them has made me feel particularly uneasy. The key respondent was, at the time, an undergraduate student I taught. After his two interviews had been carried out, I learned on the feminist network at the University at which I teach that he had been 'accused' of raping three different wommin. This has thrown a somewhat different light upon some of the particularly sexist comments he made during his interviews, some of which are quoted in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE SYMBOLIZATION OF MEAT IN POPULAR CULTURE

'The identification of raw meat with power, male dominance, and privilege is among the oldest and most archaic cultural symbols....The fact that meat....is still widely used as a tool of gender discrimination is a testimonial to the tenacity of prehistoric dietary practices and myths and the influence that food and diet have on the politics of society.' (Rifkin, *Beyond Beef* 1994, p.244)

'...food pornography is a regime of pleasurable images which...indulges a pleasure which is linked to servitude and therefore confirms the subordinate position of women.....the preparation of a meal involves intensive domestic labour, the most devalued labour in this society.' (Coward, *Female Desire*, 1984, p.103)

Introduction

This chapter investigates the contemporary meanings of meat as a symbolic regime, via analysis of its representation in texts of popular culture. It will examine whether the symbolization of meat can be seen as both patriarchal and anthroparchal by analyzing texts for the possible presence of gendered and natured discourses. Should such discourses be co-present in interactive relation, then it will be suggested that the symbolic regime constructing the social practices of meat eating and meat preparation may be constructed through both patriarchal and anthroparchal relations.

Chapter 1 argued contemporary meat eating culture exhibits an anthroparchal disregard for animals eaten as meat, and this chapter will examine the possibility that the symbolic construction of meat is also gendered, as well as natured. Chapter 3 indicated food preparation and consumption may be gendered. Meat has been seen by some social theorists as male food, and vegetables and certain foods derived from animals (fish, eggs, dairy) are designated female. This study investigates both the extent to which certain foods themselves may be gendered, and also whether the preparation and cooking of food is gendered. It examines the notion of a cultural food hierarchy, and looks at the ways in which such hierarchy might be established via discourses of nature, gender and sexuality. It will be argued that contemporary British food culture is not only anthroparchal in construction as some green theorists have suggested, but is also strongly gendered, and an arena in which discourses of patriarchy and anthroparchy interconnect. The chapter draws parallels with the next, which investigates the pornographic representation of the body, contending that the representation of meat in popular culture is similar in some ways to that of the body in pornography. Both chapters deploy a discursive approach in order to deconstruct the meanings within representations of meat and pornography.

This research is not a definitive nor an exhaustive account of the symbolic regimes of food in contemporary Western societies. The representations and discourses of food discussed here

emphasize 'traditional', white British (or more accurately, English) cooking. Certain genres of both the literature, and some aspects of the expanding arena of television cookery, are increasingly influenced by 'world cuisine', and some of these developments are discussed in this chapter. However, although food preferences in Britain are diversifying slightly, the representation of food in popular culture exemplifies traditional cuisine, which is still generally considered by the media and the cookery literature to be what most British people eat (Mossiman, 1993) and thus this will form the crux of the analysis.

This case study is based upon a range of symbolic representations of meat, from various sources. Different forms of food advertising were analyzed, in cookery and women's magazines, on television and hordings, sponsored by the meat industry and supermarket chains. This analysis concentrated on meat, but involved food advertising in general in order to ascertain whether gendering, naturing and sexualization in meat adverts takes similar or divergent form to that for other foods. Cookery literature was examined, both monthly food magazines, and books by popular authors. Articles and recipes were analyzed to evaluate the comparative importance of meat, and the social context of food preparation. Mainstream and vegetarian literature was reviewed in order to compare and contrast food discourses.

This chapter investigates whether the seven discourses suggested in Chapter 3 can be seen within this range of representations. These discourses are: first, that of the 'Other', which is constructed by relations of gendered and natured subordination and dominance. Second, sexualized consumption, the construction of Others as passive, attractive and available for metaphorical, or in the case of meat, literal, consumption by those in dominant power positions. Third, ownership and commodification - legal ownership, significant material dependence, or ownership due to commodification of Others. Fourth, deception, the denial of the operation of oppressive systems of power. Fifth, objectification/fetishism, the sexualized devaluation of Others as objects. Sixth, fragmentation, the physical or metaphorical division of bodies. Finally, violence, the symbolization of abusive acts of power including physical force, physical control and the inculcation of fear of violence. It will be argued that various aspects of food symbolization (upon which the sections of the chapter are based), may illustrate a number of these discourses, and be seen as constructions of both anthroparchal and patriarchal dominations. In most cases, there were many examples which could have been used to illustrate the presence of the various discourses for which I have argued, yet often, only one or two examples are cited here due to necessity for relative brevity. The examples cited have been selected because they are numerically common (for example, adverts for popular products), they illustrate particular discourses fairly clearly, and/or they assist economy by illustrating the deployment of more than one discourse.

The seven sections of this chapter are based on different aspects and dimensions of the processes within meat culture. Each section examines a different question. The first examines whether meat differs representationally from other food products, and may be symbolized within a food hierarchy. The key question for this section is the extent to which meat can be seen to be constituted via anthroparchal discourses. The second section looks at whether such possibly anthroparchally defined food (meat or animal products) may be gendered, and the third section investigates possible gendering in food preparation. Fourth and fifth sections examine the role of different animal foods within discourses of femininity both sexual and domestic. Sixth, different methods of meat cookery will be examined to investigate whether they are characterized by different processes of gendering and naturing. The seventh section examines recent changes in the consumption and cooking of meat. It assesses whether in the case of processed or 'deconstructed' meat, gendering and naturing may assume different forms, and operate to a different degree. Deconstructed meat forms an intermediary category for comparison before proceeding to non-meat foods. The symbolization of vegetable food and discourses of vegetarian cooking are examined for possible comparison and contrast with meat culture in terms of gendering, naturing and sexualization. The impact of the 'greening' of aspects of the representation of meat is also examined in order to evaluate whether such discourses may be indicative of non-patriarchal and non-anthroparchal developments in meat production and consumption..

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAT AS A CULTURAL SYMBOL

This section examines the symbolic place of meat in the cultural food hierarchy, and contends meat is the most highly valued food. It will be suggested that the placing of meat atop the food hierarchy illustrates the possible deployment of discourses of deception, objectification/fetish, and sexualized consumption.

In discussions of British cuisine by chefs and cookery writers, meat cookery tends to be emphasized. For example, chefs such as Mossiman assert meat is seen as a key feature of both every meal, and the daily diet (Mossiman, 1993, p.48). In the menus he selects as representative of British culinary tradition, meat is paramount: appetizers are preludes to the substance of the meal, fish courses are light, desserts finish a meal, which is centered around a meat course. Celebrity cook Smith, argues Britain is geographically geared to 'raising' good meat, thus: 'through the centuries, all our cookery books contain lashings of meat recipes.' (Smith, 1994, p.1). Mossiman contends the British were the first nation to breed and rear animals for meat, other Europeans ate meat from working animals (Mossiman, 1993, p.50). Thus he asserts that French cuisine is characterized by braising meat to tenderize it, with roast meat rarely available until the late eighteenth century, whereas in Britain, roasted meat became the key feature of cookery.

Literature on British cuisine indicates that from medieval times to the present, recipes have been largely meat based. Historically, wealthy households ate roast meat whenever possible, lower classes ate little meat, but consumed it regularly in diluted form in pies and puddings (Mossiman, 1993 p.50; Barry, 1992; Naim, 1996). Although bread and potatoes formed the staple diet of lower class Britons, dishes containing limited amounts of meat, or animal fat or blood, were the most valued food (Hopkinson, 1995). Mossiman argues the British diet has little altered bar the limited influences of European cuisine and that of immigrant peoples: 'meat and two veg' is not a cliché, but what British people eat. In European cuisine there is also a strong preference for meat (Luard, 1986), although European cooking has historically been restricted by the availability of local and seasonal produce thus in certain areas fish, 'seafood' and vegetables predominate (Butcher, 1990, p.7; Harris, 1993, p.110). In the plain cooking of British meat lies the celebration of meat as a powerful cultural symbol, which is cooked in a manner that associates it with the kill. As Mosimann comments:

'good meat tends to be considered not as an ingredient for a dish but as something to be appreciated for itself...Most meats or birds were simply roasted or grilled.' (1993, p.55)

As suggested later in this chapter, roasting tends to be the preferred method of cooking meat, as it preserves the bloodiness of the flesh, which can be seen to be associated with male virility or sexualized consumption. Prioritization of meat in food discourse can be seen as illustrative of anthroparchal deception, for the origin of meat in the violence of slaughter is obscured. Books on vegetarian cooking often offer meat 'substitutes' to: 'fill that gap on the plate' (McCartney and Cook, 1989, p.1). McCartney considers meat so significant it must be aped, and the 'Main Courses' section of her book for example, is filled with recipes using vegetable protein, textured and flavoured to resemble meat, although for some vegetarian cooks, meat replacement is a health requirement and not a reflection of meat culture (Canter et al 1985, p.129).

This section has attempted to illustrate that in cultural texts of British food, exemplified by cookery books, meat is placed in a hierarchical relation to other foodstuffs. Such a relation is not apparent in the quantity of meat consumed, but in its prioritization as the most valuable aspect of a meal, or most important ingredient in a recipe. I would argue the identification of the flesh of dead animals as food is anthroparchal. Natured discourses in cookery literature treat meat as an object for human consumption, denying its origin as the flesh of a sentient being. The discourses of meat define animals as objects whose flesh is the most prized of foods.

THE GENDERING OF FOOD

This section examines the extent to which meat is symbolically constructed with reference to gender, investigating whether certain foods are discursively constructed for male or female

consumption. Although only approximately between 3% and 6% of the population is estimated to be vegetarian (3% according to the MLC, 1997; 4.3% according to The Vegetarian Society, 1993; just under 6% according to The Vegan society, 1996), the meat industry seems concerned with the increasing numbers of people who are giving up meat (interview, senior scientific officer, RSPCA, Nov. 1994). In Britain, women are almost twice as likely to be vegetarian than men, as evidenced in membership of vegetarian and animal welfare organizations (correspondence, 1992, (1)), which may be the result of a gender dichotomous food culture in which meat is not associated with women. Four of the seven discourses are illustrated in this section: deception, objectification, the construction of the gendered Other, and sexualized consumption. The previous section suggested that meat food was both the most significant in British food culture, and anthroparchal, the focus of this section is the extent to which the eating of anthroparchal food is gendered.

Meat and masculinities

Meat advertising has a tendency to target male consumers, and there are two forms of gendered discourse through which masculinity is represented. First, there is a traditional discourse of masculinity which associates the former with the receipt of female domestic service within the home. Thus advertising may be based on the presumption (to be examined later in detail) that meat is cooked for male consumption within the nuclear family. Meat is symbolized as a product which a woman buys and cooks for her family, primarily her husband, rather than her own gratification, for the foods targeted for this purpose are dairy products and confectionery. A second discourse of masculinity is one which sexualizes men in certain gendered ways. Within this discourse, masculinity is associated with virility, physical strength and potency, and advertisements which deploy such discourse tend to target young single men as meat consumers.

An example illustrative of such a discourse is the advertising campaign sponsored by the Meat and Livestock Commission (MLC) in the early 1990's, the slogan of which was 'Meat to Live'. In each advert, a 'Meat to Live' caption is accompanied by photographs of young white men in sporty and active contexts: pushed into swimming pools, playing football or volleyball on the beach, performing cartwheels. The accompanying text carries a number of messages. First, the M of 'meat' is separated from the rest of the caption: (M)eat to live. 'Do you eat to live or live to eat?' asks the text, arguing meat constitutes one of the 'right foods' in a healthy diet. The images of active young men epitomizing healthfulness (BBC *Good Food* (GF), Jul. 1990, pp.64-5) confirms the message of the text: if men eat meat, they will have 'vitality for life'. Another of our seven discourses, deception, can also be seen to make its presence felt in this campaign. These advertisements carry the implication that contrary to medical evidence, a meat based diet is more healthy than a vegetarian one, and the most significant food group is proteins not carbohydrates (*Woman and Home*, 1991, p.46). 'A lean pork chop also has, pound for pound, less than half the fat

of a quiche. Around half of that is unsaturated and can be a factor in helping to lower cholesterol levels'. The claims of these adverts are an example of deception, for the assertion that half the fat in pork is unsaturated reverses the truth by careful wording. Meat has a relatively high fat content, and a food in which 50% of this fat is saturated is not 'healthy'.

In addition to the stress on health, is the gendered association of meat eating with male vitality as suggested by the various images of active men, and associated commentary:

'Energy. Boundless in some people. A little less evident in others. All kinds of factors determine the amount we have at any one time...meat is especially important...you don't have to go to any great lengths to rediscover your youthful energy. You just need to drop into your local butchers or supermarket meat department.' (GF, Dec, 1990, p.65).

The implication here is that men can remain youthful and vital simply by eating meat. The vital-giving properties of meat do not, I feel, reside in nutrition, but in the mythology of blood which infuses meat eating cultures. As we saw in Chapter 3, Bordieu (1984) observes that blood in meat is an important part of the construction of sexualized discourses of male potency. Such discourses of masculinity make the assumption that physical strength and sexual energy are male, and that these qualities are likely to be enhanced by meat food. Two discourses may be discerned in possible operation here: a discourse of gendered sexualized consumption which constructs sexual potency as a masculine quality requiring the regular consumption of meat, and a discourse of gendered Otherness, in which men are seen to possess specific and valued qualities from which wimmin, by their absence in such representations, are excluded.

Food and femininities

Gendered discourses of food and eating also involve the feminization of certain foodstuffs, such as fish, dairy products, eggs, vegetables and white meat. Eggs and milk, produced by reproductive manipulation of female animals, can be seen as 'feminized protein' (Adams, 1990). These 'foods' also tend to be discursively constructed as appropriate for consumption by wimmin. Thus food produced by female animals forms part of the construction of wimmin as the gendered Other in texts of food and eating in popular culture. Pregnant wimmin, children and elders have often been constructed as appropriate consumers of eggs and dairy products via discourses of domesticated femininity which deploy a concept of nurturance in the symbolization of these foods, although the health risks now associated with these foods (salmonella, listeria) may imply the presence of a discourse of deception, for their 'nurturant' properties are questionable (*Family Circle*, April, 1994, p.86). In women's magazines in which femininity is represented in terms of traditional roles such as cooking and child-care however, eggs and dairy products generally receive a positive press as a food for wimmin and children (for example, *Family Circle*, Nov, 1994, p.47).

Feminized foods are also constructed via the discourse of sexualized consumption. There are specific associations patriarchal food culture establishes between wimmin's sexuality and fish and 'sea-food'. Female genitalia may be likened physically to oysters in pornographic texts, and oysters themselves tend to be represented within food culture as 'feminine' food which is often held to possess the greatest aphrodisiac properties. An open crotch shot in a magazine may also be referred to in pornographic discourse as fish - a 'salmon sandwich'. The target groups for fish advertising tend to be wimmin in their twenties and thirties, as seen for example in advertisements for 'Colman's' 'sauces for tuna', aimed at working wimmin with little time to prepare food (GF, Jan, 1994). In the range of images, wimmin are depicted eating alone, or with the suggestion of company (e.g. another wine glass on the table), and captions refer specifically to wimmin: 'Woman eating tuna salsa' etc. This example indicates when wimmin choose food for their own gratification, they are encouraged to select food with gendered sexual associations. While domesticated woman is typically encouraged to eat and prepare meat for the pleasure of others (as argued later in this chapter) female desire in food tends to focus on foods which are represented within feminized and sexualized discourse.

Chicken is often discursively constructed as suited to female consumption, because it is relatively low fat, and bloodless. Recipes for chicken involving roasting whole birds tend to focus on the family or 'entertaining' whilst those targeted at female consumption usually involve boiled parts of birds in casseroles, soups and stews. Such recipes are usually prefaced by a few lines extolling the benefits of chicken: 'low in calories and fat' (*Good Housekeeping*, March, 1994, p.171). This is an illustration of the assertion of Levi-Strauss (1970) that boiled meat is female and roast meat male food. In gendered discourses of food and eating, meat is generally constructed as masculine food which enhances male virility and potency due to its bloodiness, but bloodless, boiled chicken is construed as more appropriate for wimmin, as it imbues none of the gendered qualities of sexualized consumption that symbolically attributed to other, particularly 'red' meat.

Milk, butter, cream and cheese are all associated with wimmin and children in food advertising which tends to be targeted at wimmin. In discourses of domestic femininity, mothers are encouraged to purchase highly processed products (eg. cheese slices or spreads) for children, under the illusion they are nutritious. Cream, butter and other cheese are generally sold as female food. Advertisements for these products usually feature the relatively rare female voice-over (eg. television advertizing for 'Churnton', 1995; 'Lurpak' butter/spreadable butter, 1994-7), or show wimmin eating such food (e.g. adverts for stilton, 1996-7). Cream and cream cheese are also sometimes constructed as 'food pornography' for wimmin within gendered discourses of sexualized consumption. In the early 1980s wimmin were encouraged to consume cream in cakes 'Naughty but Nice'. Cream consumption is often seen as a specifically female form of gratification, but one that wimmin due to their contradictory relationship to food will only partially enjoy. This

feminization and sexualization is illustrated by the advertising of cream cheeses such as 'Philadelphia' which (1993-7) has featured two wimmin competing for their share of cheese in 'appetizing' concoctions, and speaking of its consumption in a sexualized and feminine manner.

The representation of dairy products in popular food culture involves anthroparchal deception, for the oppression of cattle is absent from these advertisements or reversed and denied by 'humour'. 'Anchor' butter has for a decade run a series of television advertisements featuring jersey cows singing they are 'happy' and dancing to prove it. 'Anchor' spreadable butter's series encourages the viewer to think cattle have a vested interest in the dairy industry, as an anxious farm cat is concerned that humans have rejected butter for a new product which 'spreads straight from the fridge' (Mar. 1997). Most recently (Oct. 1997), Anchor have marketed their butter as 'free range' and deployed a language of environmentalism in presenting cows producing their butter as 'born free'. This is part of a discourse of anthroparchal deception, for even those working within the dairy industry with a vested interest in the minimization of public concern over animal welfare, admit the intense boredom dairy cattle suffer (see Chapter 7). Companies producing 'dairy spreads' have used puppets of cattle in order to ridicule them, such as the campaign (1994-6) of the bizarrely named 'I Can't Believe It's Not Butter!' in which politically active feminized cows resist encroachment of the butter market (*The Sainsbury's Magazine*, Nov, 1994). The suffering of these creatures on farms and in abattoirs is anthroparchally denied by the use of such 'humour'.

This section has suggested that gendered and natured discourses of popular food culture generally encourage men to consume meat, and encourage wimmin to avoid red meats, and consume fish, vegetables and feminized protein. Foods are not neutral products we consume according to taste or nutritional need. In anthroparchal societies, animals are objectified as food. The consumption of the anthroparchally defined Other ('meat' animals) as food takes gendered forms whose differential consumption is an important feature of the patriarchal construction of gender. A number of the seven discourses are illustrated by the material discussed here which exemplify deception (obscuring violences against animals), objectification (devaluation of animals into a set of objects with gendered associations) and the creation of a gendered Other via their implication in the construction of masculinities and femininities. In addition, gendered discourses of sexualized consumption can be seen in the sexualization of certain anthroparchally defined products for dichotomously gendered consumers.

FOOD PREPARATION AND THE GENDERED DIVISION OF LABOUR

Having suggested that different foods themselves are representationally embedded in discourses which are both natured, and related to the construction of gender in texts of popular culture, this section examines the preparation of food in relation to gender. It looks at the kinds of food men and

wimmin are expected to prepare, and cultural notions of skill and competence. The section involves examples which illustrate five of the seven discourses: violence, objectification, fragmentation, deception and the construction of the Other. Gender, domesticity and food preparation is discussed at a later juncture in this chapter, suffice to say here that gendered notions of food provision and the gendered division of labour remain generally firm in the 1990s, with wimmin expected to be competent and men, in most contexts, incompetent. Female skill in cooking tends to be assumed in the deployment of conceptions of traditional gender roles. Advertising for cookery products assumes female competence to be acquired young, as suggested by the television adverts for 'Coleman's' sauces for chicken (1995-6). These adverts featured a little girl who decides chicken is on the menu for her 'family' of dolls and soft toys. She places two plastic 'bath' ducks in a bowl in her toy oven, having shaken the imaginary contents of a sauce packet over them. She serves the 'cooked' ducks with an assortment of plastic shapes for 'vegetables' and announces this is 'chicken'. Such an advertisement is illustrative of gendered discourse of female domesticity, within which femininity is constructed as involving wimmin in servicing their families via the provision of meat dishes as an expression of 'care'.

In the 1990s, gendered and natured discourses of popular food culture still assume men are incapable of cooking, and most wimmin prepare food for them. In the early 1990s, Britain's most popular food magazine (*BBC Good Food*, (GF)), ran a weekly feature attempting to educate ignorant men in culinary knowledge, 'Male Orders' - for the 'wannabe male cook' (GF, March 1994, p.40). None of the men featured (over two years) were vegetarian, and most chose to cook meat (GF, March 1993, p.108). Occasionally such publications produce articles about groups of male culinary incompetents with titles such as 'Men in the Kitchen', confirming the majority of men are out of place in such contexts (GF, Nov 1990, p.37). Whilst the purpose of such articles is apparently to encourage men to gain culinary confidence and learn that food does not magically appear but is the product of another's (a womun's) labour, the articles tend to reinforce the status quo by emphasizing the difficulties men of all ages have when it comes to food preparation. For example, men are tested to gauge their level of (in)competence, and found to be sorely lacking:

'(the men) were asked to cook a simple omelette....we were right, they were total novices. Their so-called omelettes ranged from scrambled eggs to barbeque-style burnt offerings.' (GF, Nov, 90, p.37)

This lack of male ability indicates by default an assumption of female competence, and the insinuation men require an individual womun provider or a local Marks and Spencer's. The men 'attempting' to cook are patronized by the female 'experts' writing the articles:

'Marcus...was wary of trying something tricky without guidance. We suggested salmon in puff pastry as it looks stunning but is easy to make, and is sure to impress his girlfriend.'(GF, May 1993, p.88)

Despite (or perhaps inspite) of patronizing tuition, the male cooks are always successful and their ego duly enhanced (GF, May, 1993, p.89), and the literature assumes that when men do cook, they bring a different set of gendered aptitudes and ideas to the task than wimmin:

‘Cooking is just like engineering’, claimed retired engineer Doug Cammack, as he beat the choux pastry for his profiteroles from a lumpy nightmare into a smooth paste...security consultant Bob Penrice gripped his swivel vegetable peeler, applying both logic and science to the art of peeling a carrot’ (GF, Nov 1990, p.37)

Lack of male culinary experience is described as a product of ‘lack of opportunity’ (p.38), absolving men who do not cook from responsibility for their lack of competence, and implying any ‘blame’ lies at the feet of wimmin as mothers and partners. In the final analysis, female kitchen competence is not surrendered easily, and the traditional role stereotype reinforces itself through such articles: ‘they (men) actually looked at ease in the kitchen - it was almost as if they belonged!’ (GF, Nov, 1990 p.38). Whilst men apply ‘masculine skills’ in the kitchen, it is implied that wimmin cook by intuition:

‘His engineering skills had taught him that flow charts were necessary if he was to get a three-course dinner on the table by a certain time. To us, his charts looked like culinary common-sense - and probably something his wife and countless other women do automatically.’ (GF, Nov, 1990, p.38).

Unless single or gay, cooking is something most men do not engage in on a daily basis, but is routine for most wimmin in heterosexual relationships, whether or not they enjoy it (Kerr and Charles, 1986). Despite household changes since the 1970s, the expectation of female culinary competence retains its influence in texts of popular culture in which food and eating is represented. The gendered division of labour in food provision is part of the discursive construction of the Other. Relations of dominance and submission are established wherein gendered and natured food such as meat (feminized dead animal flesh) is appropriate for male consumption, prepared by wimmin as part of gender role expectations. Wimmin as labourers and animals as meat become Other therefore, in the cooking of food.

There are however, some instances in which men are patriarchally and anthroparchally constructed as competent in food preparation: butchering, carving and barbecuing. Butchering requires male skill and expertise, or so cookery books and magazines suggest (Mossiman, 1993; Smith, 1994). Such a discourse of male competence in the more arguably ‘aggressive’ aspects of food preparation is also reflected in meat advertising. For example, an advert for Tesco beef has the caption: ‘The art of tenderness. An expert speaks.’, and depicts a burly man holding a scabbard across his chest, framed by weighing scales, meat hooks, a saw and a cleaver (*Family Circle* (FC), Oct, 1994). The violence of the act of butchering is displaced by the contradictory associations of image and text. Whilst the caption suggests the butcher is expert in ‘tenderness’, the image

indicates butchering is a bloody affair. The butcher, whilst violent, creates via deception and fragmentation, 'tenderness' in that which he produces. In the accompanying text, violence is obscured by objectification, the animal is the anthroparchal absent referent: 'We're tough on what we choose. It has to be the right age, weight and shape.' (FC, Oct, 1994). The dead animal is replaced by a disembodied object (a 'what', an 'it'). Whilst the animal is absent, its dead flesh takes on qualities of a living thing: 'chill it down gently, so its more relaxed.' (FC, Oct, 1994). Meat is created by male skill and cooking facilitated and de-skilled by butchering: 'There may be nothing faster or easier to cook than a steak but a really succulent one takes old fashioned time and effort to prepare.... We need sharp knives. You won't.'. Thus in the preparation of meat food, there is a gendered discourse of dominance and subordination. Men as butchers are those skilled in preparation of meat. Wimmin who cook the butchered flesh however, are not skilled, but undertake a service for others.

Men are also competent when carving a joint of meat. In cookery literature, carving is regarded as a skill, and is often surrounded by ceremony, particularly if performed at the dinner table. Delia Smith mystifies the process with minute detail on the direction of the cut and the thinness of slicing (Smith, 1994, p.6). The assumption of technical competence in the carving of meat often implies the carver should be male (Floyd, 1982, p.7), and functions similarly in the association of men with outdoor cookery. Television chef and cookery writer Floyd, does not usually explicitly assume food preparers are female, and his work is de-gendered in this sense. However, for certain types of cookery, he assumes the sex of the cook will differ. Barbecuing meat and fish is a male affair, with preparation of the accompanying vegetables and salad, the prerogative of wimmin and children (1986, p.26). Thus most men rarely prepare food unless it enhances their status via undertaking a 'skill' (carving, butchering, barbecuing) involving the preparation of meat. Meat is a feminized product, produced by male skill, yet female labour, for male gratification.

This section has suggested that cooking and other preparation of food is characterized by a gendered division of labour. Wimmin are discursively constructed as the gendered Other, one who undertakes menial labour in the service of others (largely expected to be men). Cookery literature generally assumes gender dichotomous characteristics and aptitudes apply when people cook, and that wimmin have an 'intuitive' relation to cooking, and men a 'technical' one. In terms of skill, wimmin as cooks are represented in submissive relation to men as butchers and carvers of meat. Discourses of deception can also be discerned in the symbolization of food preparation. The gendered division of labour is obscured by deceptive discourse which normalizes wimmin's labour in food preparation. Natured discourse of deception and objectification also obscures the origins of meat by constructing meat as an object to be transformed into food by male technical skill in butchering. Images of men as butchers deploy the discourses of violence and fragmentation by representing for example, knives and meat cleavers. However, although violence and fragmentation

are recalled by such imagery, these discourses mask their role in structuring domination, for violence and fragmentation are construed as practices carried out upon the inert object of meat.

MEAT, GENDER AND SEXUALITY

This section examines the possible ways certain foods may be symbolized via the deployment of gendered and natured discourses of sexualization. It focuses on the discourse of sexualized consumption, although material examined in this section will also be seen as illustrative of most of the seven discourses: the Other, fragmentation, objectification, violence and deception. It will be contended that certain foods are sexualized: constructed as sexually appealing to look at, or presented in a sexualized context. Alternatively, the consumer or cook may be sexualized via consumption or preparation of food. Cookery literature and food advertising carry discourses within which certain food products and eating contexts are gendered, and the sexualization of food alters according to the gender of the preparer and consumer. This section and that which follows, refer to discourses that permeate women's magazines and, in more subtle form, the food literature.

A survey of women's magazines (summer 1993) indicated two key strands were apparent in the discursive construction of the Other in the representation of femininity. According to one strand, 'femininity' is represented in terms of the sexualized body of economically independent wimmin. An early example of this genre is *Cosmopolitan*, but there are now a plethora of publications promoting this definition of womanhood (*Marie-Claire*, *New Woman*, *Options* etc), suggesting wimmin realize their potential via careers, and expression of their (hetero)sexuality. Such magazines contain advice for wimmin on how to have more and better sex, be 'attractive' to men, and retain a male partner. It is this strand of the discourse of the feminine Other to which this section refers in looking at the gendered sexualization of food. A second strand of gendered discourse represents femininity in relation to woman's domestic role in the 'family'. A variety of publications, particularly those targeted at 'older' wimmin: *Woman and Home*, *Family Circle*, *Woman's Weekly*, *Woman's Own*, *Good Housekeeping* are centred on this theme, although publications such as *Bella* attempt to appeal to wimmin with young families. The relation of this theme to the consumption of food will be the subject of the next section.

Masculinity and the sexualization and feminization of meat

Food itself is sometimes depicted in a sense which can be seen as pornographic. Certain images of food seem to target male consumers, and sometimes recall sexual pornography in which wimmin are displayed for male viewers. In one example, an advertisement for Sainsbury's beef, there is a photograph of a beef joint carved on a pewter platter. In the centre of the image is the joint, browned on the outside, shades of pink and red as we move inward. This bloody, juicy centre is the

focus of the picture, accentuated by its size and by lighting, and it would seem this is constructed as the key to the meat's appeal. The bloody meat is designed I feel, to appeal to men due to the patriarchal construction of masculine virility in which male potency and the eating of red meat is linked in a discourse of sexualized consumption. The meat itself is a feminized object - sliced into two pieces lying either side of the knife. In pornographic natured discourse of sexualized consumption, vaginal lips may be described as 'beef curtains' - slices of raw or semi-raw meat. The meat is constructed as patriarchal and anthroparchal Other, as objectified, fragmented animal flesh, feminized and sexualized for male consumption. The meat is offered to the consumer by its proximity, and the fact it is opened up by carving, and its sexualization is confirmed by the text:

'Thanks to Sainsbury's, the juiciest bits are in the Sunday roast, not the Sunday papers. If you want something really juicy this Sunday...You'll find that our Traditional Beef is deliciously succulent and tender...ready to be cooked, served and sliced. But then,...Sunday has always been a day for getting the knives out.' (*Good Housekeeping*, March, 1994, pp.41-2)

The gender of the consumer is established by references to tabloid newspapers providing men with sexual stimulation via pornographic representations of wimmin, and 'titillating' stories. It is insinuated that men may gain sexual stimulation from eating roasted flesh as an alternative to such pornography, and further, that Sainsbury's beef is likely to be more sexy than sexual pornography, as a sexualized object which is apparently 'really juicy'. A discourse of violence can also be seen to make its presence felt, for domestic battery and femicide is implied by the comment about the knives, which associates carving, consuming meat and domestic violence.

Food pornography may be also seen in 'Bisto' gravy adverts depicting gleaming chicken drumsticks or 'luscious' pasta with beef, which are intended to appeal to the appetite of the potential consumer. In the case of the drumsticks, the caption informs us 'It wasn't the first time Mrs.Davies had been complimented on her legs'. The text insinuates the woman who cooks sexually seeks male approval, for the text recalls the sexual appraisal of wimmin by patriarchal men, juxtaposed with an image which supposedly reflects her culinary skill (GF Feb. 1993, p.9: *Sainsbury's*..., May, 1993, p.7). Both Mrs.Davies' cooking, and her pornographically fragmented body require male approval, and exist for male consumption. A more recent advert for 'Bisto gravy mates', involves the sexualized fragmentation of the male body: 'My neighbour said it turns her Bisto Granules into a sauce that's perfect for pouring over your drumstick...My husband likes a bit of excitement.' (GF, April, 1997, p.53). In both cases however, the preparer of meat is female, and the consumer, male. Alongside a recipe for 'Pasta Beef Italienne', we are informed: 'Mr.Phillips came home unexpectedly and found his wife with an Italian' (GF, Nov. 1993, pp.94-5). A wife's 'flirtation' with 'Italian' cookery is sexualized by the reference to sexual infidelity. Much advertising claims food can be made more sexy by the addition of meat, as is implied for example, in an advert for 'Bernard Matthew's' turkey breast stir fry (GF, March, 1994, p.56). In this kind of

food symbolism, men are discursively constructed as sexually aroused by the service of the female Other who cooks feminized food, made from objectified animals, for their consumption.

Feminine sexuality and sexualized food

In other instances, the context of the preparation and consumption of food may be sexualized, rather than the food itself. I think there is a case to be made for arguing that the sexualization of meat has increased during the 1990s. The MLC campaign in the early 1990s was based on the 'Meat to Live' theme, targeting young men and deploying patriarchal discourses of masculine 'virility'. From mid 1995 however, the MLC changed its target market and strategy, launching a campaign directly focused on sexualizing meat: 'The Recipe for Love' (correspondence, the Vegetarian Society, Sept, 1995). A series of television adverts promoted meat consumption by both sexes, deploying gendered discourses of sexualized consumption which imply eating meat will enhance heterosexual attractiveness and help cement heterosexual relationships. The working title of the campaign was 'Meat and Sex', confirming the intention of the meat industry to explicitly draw upon cultural beliefs in which meat is sexualized (correspondence, MLC, Oct. 1995).

These advertisements portray young people (in their twenties and thirties) consuming meat throughout the week: in-laws fed on a Sunday, romantic meals for two, dinner parties for partnering apparently problematically single friends. Cooking meat serves both a romantic and a physical sexual purpose: it demonstrates care, and is constructed as sexually stimulating - eating meat often being depicted as a prelude to sex. According to both the Vegetarian Society and the MLC, young single wimmin are most likely to be vegetarian (correspondence, 1995). The Society allege this is due to concern for animal welfare, the MLC, due to concern with weight. The MLC argue abstinence from meat eating is temporary and re-established when wimmin 'settle down with a male partner' (correspondence, MLC, 1995). MLC adverts deploy sexualized discourses of femininity, which they presume will exert more influence upon young wimmin than those of domesticity. Within such heteropatriarchal discourse, wimmin are expected to desire and seek a male partner. As meat is held to enhance male virility, feeding men meat, or eating it with them may enhance a man's desire for the woman who prepares and eats meat with him.

The sexualization of meat tends to be based around the presumption of a male consumer but there are exceptions when we consider other foods. For example, confectionery and dairy products are sexualized for female consumption. Food for both female and male consumption may be sexualized: wimmin may prepare female food in order to stimulate a male partner's passion, such as fish. The sexualization of fish is linked to the processes through which meat is sexualized, and this is rather unsurprising considering that both foods are dead flesh. Pieces of fish which resemble meat, are photographed in similar fashion (*Sainsbury's...*, Feb. 1994, p.64). The sexualization of

fish is connected to the extent of rawness and thus proximity to the kill, raw, smoked and pickled fish tends to be symbolized as the most erotic. The sexualization of anthroparchally named 'sea food' can be illustrated by the example of a magazine advert for 'Birds Eye' ready meals, where the image focuses on a prawn wearing tiara, lipstick, and false eyelashes, holding a bouquet in one leg, a red rose in another (where the remaining legs have got to is a mystery), reclining on a chaise longue. Three equally feminized prawns look jealously on, because: 'Only the best looking prawns go into our Louisiana Prawn Gumbo' (*Sainsbury's...*, Oct, 1994). Feminized and eroticized, 'sea-food' is marketed with specific reference to its status as such. The prawn is feminized by its attire and sexualized by its pose, passive yet alluring.

Other feminized foods are also sexualized in a gendered fashion. The advert for the Panasonic 'micro and browner' urges the consumer to 'meet the grill of your dreams'. Under the caption: 'What's a nice grill like you doing in a microwave like this?', is an image of a piece of cheese on toast, atop which lies a toast shape of a woman in red leicester swimsuit with mozzarella hair, nicely browned. In this example, a feminized food presents itself in a sexualized and feminine manner. 'Walls Magnum' ice-creams have been marketed for adult buyers by deploying a discourse of sexual consumption. Although men feature in some of these adverts, most are populated with young wimmin claiming to eat ice-creams in private, accompanied by images of phallic ice-lollies sucked and bitten (ITV/Channel 4, Summer, 1995, 1996). Although dairy products and confectionery are feminized, in this example, they adopt masculine form for female consumption. Unlike the celebration of male sexualized consumption of meat, female food gratification is secretive and constructed via pornographic guilt. The sexualization of ice-cream began with the 'Haagen Daz' campaign (*Sainsbury's...*, June 1993, p.66, ITV/ Channel 4 1992-4), where female models portray eating ice-cream as an orgasmic experience. The message is that confectionery is an appropriate sexual gratification for wimmin. The adverts were alleged pornographic for their portrayal of naked wimmin faking orgasm, but it can be argued they merely constitute a more obvious use of pornographic discourse in food advertising than most others.

The above examples suggest a variety of different foods are sexualized, but that sexualization differs according to the supposed gender of the consumer. Meat is a gendered female, often advertised as food pornography for men, and assumed to contribute to male potency. Fish is also feminized, but its sexualization appeals to both sexes in order to enhance heterosex. Feminized protein is sexualized for female consumption, but food pornography for wimmin does not necessarily enhance female pleasure, as it is tied to guilt - cream cakes, cream cheese and ice cream are all constructed as somehow 'naughty' when consumed by wimmin.

Sexualization and violence

The cooking of 'seafood' sometimes places wimmin in a relatively rare position - that of slaughterer and butcher, killing and dismembering animals. Discourses of sexualized violence can be seen in texts of cooking, and I would assert gendered and natured discourses of sexualized consumption operate to obscure and legitimate the use of physical and symbolic violence by wimmin in food preparation.

For example, in recipes involving lobster, Floyd bombastically announces 'the beast really must be live' and recommends that to kill it 'grab the animal by the head and thrust a skewer firmly in the back of its neck - where the head meets the neck. Do not be alarmed at this stage, it won't be able to thrash for long!' (*Floyd on Fish*, 1986). Other texts deploy banal terms of anthroparchal deception to describe killing. *The Sunday Times Cook's Companion* recommends it is least painful for lobster to be boiled alive ('immerse it for two minutes in boiling salted water or court bouillon', 1993, p.232). Crabs are also to be killed just prior to cooking (Black, in *Sainsbury's...*, Jun. 1994, p.81), described by *The Sunday Times* through a discourse of deception:

'To humanely kill a crab, use a large awl... Killing crabs by drowning them in fresh water is not thought to be humane. Plunging them in boiling water is not thought to be unkind but causes them to shed their claws, allowing water into the main cavity and spoiling the meat.' (p.232)

The language is banal, crabs and lobsters are objectified, their fragmented flesh more significant than their lives as sentient beings. Arthropods (such as crustacea) have developed nervous systems and are able to suffer considerable pain (Singer, 1990, ch.4) yet they are anthroparchally objectified for slaughter at female hands. Black is unconcerned crabs shed limbs as an escape mechanism in severe duress, but advocates 'leaving the beast in lukewarm water for about five minutes, where it will expire in a gentler and less brutal manner' (*Sainsburys...*, Jun. 1994, p.82). One is left to ponder for whom this lingering death by drowning is more 'gentle'. The removal of limbs and severing of bodies distances those who consume flesh from the violence of the kill and helps objectify the animal. Thus in preparation of whole small shore crabs (having soft 'edible' shells) the cook is told to cut off their faces, coat them in flour, and fry them (p.232). The language used in describing the killing of crustacea tends to be aggressive (boiling 'beasts' alive, drowning and stabbing them) and at odds with prescribed norms of feminine behaviour. However, the 'sexiness' of crab and lobster flesh, and anthroparchal 'insignificance' of these animals, is justification for such female violence. Within cookery literature on the killing and preparation of crustacea, these animals are regarded as having negligible ability to feel pain, and are objectified similarly to vegetables in their description. The recipes requiring the killing and eating of crustacea have a marked tendency to form part of menus regarded as somehow special due to the imputation of aphrodisiac properties to the flesh of such animals.

Oysters, unlike other fish and shellfish, are often eaten live:

'insert a strong knife between the shells next to the hinge. Twist the knife until the hinge breaks. Sever the muscle from the shell. Serve in a half shell with lemon juice and cayenne.' (GF, 'Shellfish', Oct, 1990, p.2)

Oysters are considered aphrodisiac food par excellence (GF, Oct 1990, p.1). I would suggest the reason for this may be that these animals are killed the moment they are eaten. The 'delicacy' of live oysters is premised on the patriarchal and anthroparchal assumption that killing is erotic and that to kill as we eat boosts sexual potency. The oyster itself is feminized, and is often symbolized as akin to female genitalia. In consuming live oysters, it may be that we symbolically consume wimmin sexually (as objectified and fragmented body parts) as we kill sea creatures.

The 'preparation' of 'sea-food' is constructed in texts of cookery literature through discourses of natured deception and violence. Large crustacea require 'dressing', which involves the reverse – dismemberment (2). Female hands in cookery books and magazines are pictured pulling apart crabs and lobsters and inserting knives into oysters and scallops (GF, 'Shellfish', Oct, 1990, pp.1-4). Such texts assume a female preparer of such food who is provided with dismemberment instructions: how to twist off limbs, smash them to extract the flesh etc. (GF, Aug, 1994, p.80). 'Dressed crab' must look nothing like a crab at all, its feminized and sexualized flesh reconstructed amongst egg, mayonnaise and parsley, and arranged in a series of differently coloured stripes. The violence involved in the preparation of this food by wimmin is justified within cookery texts by the descriptive objectification of the animals involved, and the sexualization and feminization of the flesh of these animals.

To enhance their sex drive, humans may consume feminized fish and 'sea-food', raw or semi-cooked, which are symbolically close to the kill, discursively sexualized as aphrodisiac, and prepared in ways which sometimes involve violence. Such food is not a substitute for meat however, and tends not to be seen as the substance of a meal, particularly not if the consumer is presumed to be male (GF, 'Secrets of Success', part 7 'Shellfish', Oct 1990; part 29 'Fish', Sept. 1992). The cookery literature deploys the anthroparchal discourse of deception which denies the slaughter of 'meat animals' who are an absent referent, and objectifies sea animals in order they may be killed by the cook, their suffering anthroparchally denied. There are gender implications here. The killing of most animals is associated with men and machismo as will be illustrated in research undertaken into the slaughter process (see Chapter 7). However, the killing of fish, molluscs and crustacea may be undertaken by wimmin, and tends not to be regarded as macho, due to the level of the objectification of these animals.

The sexualization and fetishization of the wild and exotic

'Exotic' food is usually derived from wild animals. This is expensive because the animals must usually be hunted or trapped. This 'exotic' food can also be seen to be sexualized in ways both gendered and natured. In anthroparchal society, 'wilderness' tends to be represented as an Other requiring human domestication, and 'game' is constructed as exotic as it symbolizes the control of the wild by the slaughter and eating of wild animals. The male dominated institution of the hunt is also implied within the notion of 'game', an institution in which feminized animals are terrorized and killed for human enjoyment. Game can be seen to be fetishized, prioritized amongst other meat foods, and seen as particularly appropriate for consumption on 'special occasions'. For example, smoked salmon tends to be constructed as 'erotic' (GF, Dec, 1994, p.96), and despite the advent of farmed salmon in the 1980s, symbolic configurations surrounding smoked salmon as 'wild' remain strong. Menus for 'special occasions' particularly those attempting to impress or seduce, commonly include it (*Woman and Home*, Dec, 1994, p.26), and its usage increases in recipes for 'romantic' Valentines' day meals (food and women's magazines, February, 1991-5).

'Game' refers to wild animals which have been hunted, trapped or shot. In some cases, wild animals may be farmed but are not domesticated, and their flesh is still considered 'wild'. As with other meat, there is a distinction based on some notion of the 'value' of various animal species, in which some meat is named to obscure its animal origin. Birds, regarded of little value require no obfuscation, their flesh is synonymous with themselves, for example, duck and pheasant. With deer there is linguistic distinction between animal and flesh - venison. Venison is currently fashionable (GF, March, 1993; Smith, Sainsbury's., Nov. 1993, p.72) and in 1994 and 1995, for example, it featured strongly in menus designed to 'impress' (*Woman and Home*, 'A dinner party to remember' Nov, 1994, p.119), or to provide familial luxury (*Woman's Weekly*, Dec, 1994, p.49), as 'very special comfort food' (Dimpleby, GF, Dec, 1994, p.152). Whereas roast beef is symbolized as atop the food hierarchy in terms of weekly eating, for 'special occasions' venison sometimes takes precedence. Venison is bloody and rich, and like beef, can be seen as symbolically associated with male virility. However, venison is also exotic, as the domination of the wilderness is symbolized in consumption of deer. More lowly 'game' animals such as birds, rabbits and hares are also in some way 'special' (*Woman and Home*, Jan, 1994, p.26; *Sainsbury's.*, Oct, 1993, p.93; *Woman's Weekly*, Sept, 1994, p.46). The meat from these animals is luxurious and exotic, I would suggest, because of its association with control of the wilderness.

This section has investigated different ways in which the representation of food embodies gendered and natured discourses of sexuality, and has a tendency to sexualize certain foods, and certain contexts of food preparation. It has suggested that certain food products, particularly meat, fish and 'sea-food' are themselves often sexualized and feminized, and are represented in ways

which may be seen as similar to the pornographic representation of wimmin's bodies, when the consumer of such food is presumed to be male. Certain foods which are most heavily sexualized also involve the symbolic deployment of gendered and natured discourses of violence carried out against an objectified Other, as is illustrated by the preparation of 'sea-food' and 'game'.

MEAT, GENDER AND DOMESTICITY

This section examines the second strand within contemporary discourses of femininity, that of feminine domesticity, and investigates ways in which gendered discourses may interrelate with natured discourses constructing anthroparchal food (meat, fish, dairy products). There are two related themes suggested by the material in this section: meat eating and romance (meat as a means of securing long term male affection), and meat cookery as a means of winning maternal affection. This material can be seen to deploy three of our seven discourses: deception, the construction of the Other (where wimmin perform service for male partners and children), and ownership (material and emotional dependency of domesticated wimmin).

Meat cookery and romance

Much food advertising deploys gendered discourses of the Other in which femininity is represented as involving domesticity. Here, providing food is not necessarily sexualized explicitly, rather, food provision is represented as a means by which wimmin may obtain male affection and 'love'. The February 1995 edition of the *Sainsbury's Magazine* contains a typical example of such discourse of the feminine Other in an advert for the fake cheese 'Flora Alternative to Cheddar' which encourages wimmin to:

'Cook up an enchanting evening of romance and intimacy that will appeal to your Valentine's heart and soul...(or) even make an unsuspecting beau fall wildly in love. A lovingly prepared meal of subtly seasoned foods can have a dramatic effect in creating a romantic and alluring ambience. The combination of the various sensuous reactions - the softly lit room and soothing music, the beautifully arranged table, and the enticing aromas and glorious taste of rich, flavourful dishes - can all culminate in an environment of romance and intimacy.' (Feb., 1995, p.50)

This advert is clearly targeted at wimmin, the caption being: 'The way to a man's heart', and female domesticity in the form of 'good' cooking is seen as a strategy to obtain/retain a male partner. There is the presumption in the text that whereas wimmin are naturally romantic, they must plan ahead in order to create such a disposition in their chosen man. The use of this product is significant, indicating a woman is concerned about male health by choosing cheese lower in saturated fat so wimmin will 'know that (they're) taking care of (their) beloved's heart as well as stealing it.' (*Sainsbury's*, Feb., 1995, p.50). It is also implied wimmin must prepare extravagant

meals to ensure continued affection, and should wimmin fail to engage in such activities that they are likely to be less loved.

The MLC 'Recipe for Love' campaign, whilst focussed on sex, has a sub-text of feminine domesticity, wherein meat is a method of securing the affection of men and children. Some examples of adverts from this campaign suggest wimmin win 'affection' of husbands in the context of the nuclear family by preparing meat based meals. In one case, the caption contends meat is a mother's guarantee of a 'successful Christmas' and pictures two children, open mouthed with awe, sitting at a table on which there are four roasted joints with trimmings. Bland, unappetizing dishes of vegetables are present at the periphery of the table and of the photograph. Meat cookery is represented in such images and texts as necessary to ensure that 'Christmas for you and your family is just perfect' (*Sainsbury's*..., Dec, 1994, pp.136-7). Meat is here discursively constructed as a natured object assumed to provide gratification for a woman's family thereby ensuring mothers are gratified by their children's affection.

This series also appeals to a woman's 'need' for romance, and the following example implies meat preparation can provide this: 'Serve (devilled steak) with a touch of butter, a sprinkle of thyme, and a hint of romance.' (GF, Feb, 1995, p.8). Another example from the MLC has a caption which urges wimmin to 'Create many a tender moment with British Lamb'. Woman within such gendered and natured discourse of femininity, is expected to satisfy 'Lots of hungry (children's) mouths', in addition to 'dazzling' dinner party guests, providing television dinners and a roast every Sunday (*Sainsbury's*..., Sept, 1993, p.45). In each case, children, husband or male partner, or friends, a woman cooks meat for the satisfaction of others who are discursively constructed as Subjects. Woman, as domestically feminine Others, do not seek self gratification, but are expected to derive pleasure from giving the 'gift' of meat food and thereby securing affection. Such images and texts also suggest a discourse of patriarchal ownership in which woman in the context of the 'family', are constructed as emotionally dependent on securing satisfaction and emotional security by the gratification of others via cooking anthroparchally commodified food - meat.

Meat cookery and the 'family'

The discursive construction of the feminine domestic Other as a provider of meat for the consumption of male partners and children is particularly prevalent in certain kinds of women's magazines which have been concerned about changing gender roles and the decline of the 'traditional' family. *Good Housekeeping* for example, undertook a food survey of their own readers, and found unsurprisingly: '84% of respondents are married or living together with a partner and nearly half have children living at home. 65% eat together as a family' (GH, March, 1994). The theme of the article based on the survey was that 'the family that eats together stay(s)

together". Family meals proved to be the priority for most respondents as a means of cementing familial ties, and a task to which wimmin felt they were best suited (86% claiming wimmin were better cooks, p.28). Cookery as a mechanism which functions to preserve the family is also popular with food magazines. *Good Food* ran a monthly feature in 1994 involving chefs taking families shopping and instructing them on cooking from the ingredients purchased and the contents of their kitchens (eg. GF, Nov, 1994, p.133). In all examples, two families feature, one is usually middle class, and the other working class. Families receive menus appropriate to their class background (for example, the former, sole stuffed with smoked salmon, the latter, braised beef). Despite this difference, such articles emphasize the importance of familial cementation via food.

In another example, *Woman's Weekly* ran a series of articles in 1994 on 'Cooking with Confidence' for wimmin setting out on the route to feminine domestic success ('keeping' a man and raising a family). The intention of the series was to: 'explain basic recipes and cooking methods and show how they can be applied in various ways to produce...recipes suitable for family meals and entertaining..' (Oct 1994, pp.32-8). The mainstay of recipes in each issue was meat. In the above example, one page was devoted to fish (a 'change' from 'meat as a main course', Oct, 1994, p.32), and another to vegetables ('accompaniments for fish, meat and chicken' which can be 'swapped around and used with any meat you fancy', p.38). Five pages are devoted to meat, roast ('one of the easiest meals to cook', p.33) braised, casseroled, grilled and fried. Family Sunday lunch has always been popular within women's magazines, with a plethora of articles on the manufacture of roast meats and trimmings (eg. GH, 'Making Sunday Special', Nov, 1994, p.194), but there has been increased emphasis that Sunday lunch should be a family affair, whereas in the early 1990s this was already assumed (GF, 1991-2).

If wimmin cook less prestigious animal protein such as fish, or animal products such as eggs, these are a change from the norm, constructed within discourses of domestic femininity as 'nurturant'. Fish preparation may be adopted by wimmin in an attempt to preserve their husbands, 'the tasty way to maintain a healthy heart' (GF, 1994) and the 'convenient way of feeding all the family' which 'has health advantages too' (WH, March, 1994, p.20). Eggs and milk are seen as family foods in the context of woman's role as healer within the family. Poached, coddled and baked eggs along with hot milk and milk based puddings are seen as nourishing food for those convalescing (GF, April, 1995, p.95), although they are not presumed to constitute an everyday feature of the family diet in the same way as meat.

The preparation of food is an important aspect of the discourses of domesticated femininity. It is the means by which woman as patriarchal Other, gains affection from partner and children, which is the key to her own gratification. Such discourse is also natured, for the key food which is to be cooked is meat - anthroparchally defined by the objectification of animals. The provision by

wimmin, of meat for men, is discursively constructed within gendered and natured discourses in which meat is represented in terms of male empowerment. The representation of food provision in women's magazines and the cookery literature is also characterized by the deployment of discourses of deception which encourage wimmin not to perceive a need to satisfy themselves but to satisfy the needs of others. Within such texts of food preparation, wimmin are represented as emotionally dependent within discourses of gendered ownership wherein they are expected to provide familial service in cooking. Deception here is a gendered discourse which denies female labour within the home, which is obscured by the ideas of romantic love and maternal affection.

GENDER, NATURE AND THE COOKING OF MEAT

This section examines the ways gendered and natured discourses may be deployed in the preparation of meat food. It has been suggested that meat is a feminized and sexualized food largely prepared for men, by wimmin. However, the specific discourses relating to different types of meat food differ as to whether the meat is boiled or roasted. In Chapter 3, we noted Levi-Strauss' (1970) contention that boiled food was associated with the feminine and roasted food with the masculine. I would dispute that this^{is} always so in the case of meat, for although meat specifically cooked for female consumption is more likely to be boiled than roast^{ed}, meat consumption per se is generally masculinized, in both boiled or roasted form. The discursive construction of meat involves the deployment of different gendered discourses however. It will be suggested in this section that boiled meat is a means by which wimmin nourish and provide food for others focussed around the family, whereas roasted meat tends to be more symbolic of machismo - exaggerated masculinity and involving aggression, male virility, and explicit domination of wimmin.

Boiled flesh and familial 'comfort'

Many 'traditional' British recipes reflect their origins as peasant cookery designed to tenderize poor meat or bulk it out, and are often described as 'comfort food'. The production of such food is contextualized by the discourses of the Other: gendered discourses of domesticated femininity, and by the natured discourse of meat within which animals are the absent referent. The origin of the meat is denied by natured deception, and the food it becomes is presumed cooked by a woman catering for the needs of a 'family':

'Braises and stews are the quintessence of good home cooking. They are the hot pots...casseroles, pot roasts, ragouts and jugged game of our grandmother's kitchens - substantial, comforting dishes with complex flavours. Some are made with the cheapest cuts, cooked slowly and carefully to create memorable meals which are also economical.'*(The Sunday Times Cooks Companion, p.67)*

This 'feel-good food' (Smith, 1994, p.14) in the form of casseroles, stews and pies, is made from hard working parts of animals: the forequarters of pigs, sheep and cattle, muscle from the neck, shoulder and front legs. Slow cooking, or mincing breaks down connective tissue that builds up in a mature animal (*Sunday Times*, p.67). Animals are the absent referent in texts such as these which deploy the discourse of natured fragmentation for the source of those 'cuts', the animal body, is omitted from such narrative. Animals are anthroparchally constructed as potential meat, their bodies fragmented and objectified for human consumption. For example, for Smith 'a marbling of fat between the meat fibres, seems happily to be tailor made for slow cooking' (Smith, 1994, p.14). The connective tissue is the key to stews, for as it melts into gelatine this 'does a splendid job of permeating the meat fibres, keeping them succulent and at the same time adding body, substance and, most important of all, flavour' (Smith, p.14), or put more effusively: 'gives these dishes a luxurious unctuousness that can be produced no other way' (*Sunday Times*, 1993, p.67). Cookery writers deploy the discourse of natured objectification in describing meat in terms of texture and taste. Tissue, muscle, bone, and blood are recipe ingredients occupying the same object status as a parsnip, although the former are superior objects, or 'magic ingredients' (Smith, 1994, p.14).

Smith's (1994) *Guide to Meat Cookery*, contains a slightly different kind of food pornography to that referred to earlier in this chapter. Alongside the usual forms of food pornography, 'appetizing' photographs of cooked meat, there are close up shots of various 'cuts' of raw meat from different animals, accompanied by a descriptive comment ('carves like a dream', 'now has all the awkward bones taken out' etc.). The meat is photographed to look moist, and is arranged 'decoratively'. 'Meat' animals rarely exist in cookery literature. The pictures of the raw flesh serve as an indicator of the origin of the meat, the meat is seen raw, and on consecutive pages cooked, ready for consumption (pp.20-9). Such images represent meat through discourses of objectification, fragmentation sexual consumption and deception. The images are of attractive 'pieces', objectified fragments of an animal whose suffering in the processes of meat production is thereby erased.

Boiled meat forms part of different kinds of recipes within British cookery, including stews, braises and pies. Versions of meat pies are made all over Britain (Barry, 1992), and meat, although limited in quantity, is the focus of this cooking (Hopkinson, 1994). In cookery magazines, pies are promoted as 'comfort food' (*Sainsbury's...*, Feb, 1995, p.90), and are seen likewise in women's magazines and assumed to be prepared in the context of the nuclear family (*Bella*, issue 5, pp.40-1). Such food is supposed to provide compensation for the harshness of daily life, often defined in terms of the climate, for example, in the words of Dimpleby: 'to lift the spirits during the wintry weather' (*Sainsbury's...*, Nov. 1993, p.150). Within the discourse of the gendered Other as domestically feminine, wimmin are expected to provide emotional support for family and friends by cooking meat, and derive pleasure from cooking for to quote Dimpleby: 'the best escape from a cold grey day is to produce wonderful aromas and flavours in the soothing warmth of your kitchen'

(*Sainsbury's*.., Nov., 1993, p.150). Problematically, kitchens are often far from warm and soothing, and cooking is perceived by many wimmin as undesirable work. This idealization of middle class domesticity denies wimmin's domestic labour by representing it as recreation. As such, this symbolization can be seen as an expression of a gendered discourse of ownership within which wimmin derive pleasure from serving others. Cakes and puddings occupy a similar niche, but meat food is assumed most significant.

The cookery literature often deploys a discursive combination of gendered ownership (in which wimmin's labour is appropriated by men) and deception (obscuring the domestic labour of cooking). Cookery magazines assume a predominantly female readership as can be gauged by the subjects of their advertising, which apart from those adverts for food products, involves for example, tampons, perfume, make-up, wimmin's fashion. The presumed female reader tends to be encouraged to see intensive domestic labour as minimal. For example, Smith informs her readers braised dishes place 'no great demands on (their) time, no pressure' because in such dishes the vegetables are included, so the cook 'wont be bobbing up and down having to cook them separately' (Smith, *Sainsbury's*..., Oct, 1994, pp.80-2). This 'peasant food' forms part of elaborate and expensive dinner menus - 'straightforward' coq au vin (GF, April, 1994, p.110), involves dismemberment of a chicken, followed by an hour at a stove, and takes an hour and a half to cook, wherein it must be attended. Smith's 'effortless' braised lamb, which is 'fun' and can be produced in a 'relaxed way' (*Sainsbury's*, Oct, 1994, p.80), strains credulity even further. This dish forms part of a menu involving preparation 48 hours in advance, two and a half hours work the day before, five hours on the day of the dinner. This is not an insignificant demand on time, nor effortless. Articles such as these provide 'timed and tested' menus so the final result appears 'effortless', a patriarchal deception in which wimmin's domestic labour is denied.

Roasted flesh and the celebration of machismo

The eating of roasted meat forms part of contemporary discourses on aggressive and exaggerated masculinity, or machismo. The representation of roast meat in the material examined here illustrates a number of discourses including the gendered, natured, and in this case, ethnically defined Other, sexualized consumption, and violence. Roast meat itself is usually feminized as an object imbued with feminine characteristics, and is typically consumed in a sexualized manner which may be suggestive of violence. In discursively constructing the ethnically dominant Subject, roast meat may be seen to symbolize British identity, represented as a cultural norm within a discourse of patriarchal nationalism, associated with male physical superiority. It is often assumed that 'nick-names' for particular nationalities stem from culinary preferences, such as the attribution 'kraut' for German or 'frogs' for French people. Similarly, the French refer to the British as 'le rosibif', and British cookery literature assumes roasted meat the 'national dish': 'whatever fervor

the French have for frogs legs is more than matched by the longing of all British meat eaters for good old-fashioned English roast beef.' (Smith, *Sainsbury's*, Nov 1993, p.86)

The abundant recipes for roast meat form part of a discourse of specifically English nationalism where things 'traditional' are valued as symbolizing English culture and history. Smith extols the virtues of 'Traditional Beef' which she claims is 'matured for the old-fashioned beef flavour' (*Sainsbury's*, Nov, 1993, p.89). Occasionally, there is an appeal to history to render meat 'traditional': 'herds graze the summer grass just as they did in Tudor times' (*Sainsbury's*, Dec, 1994, p.81). In this example, authenticity is emphasized in a photograph of a joint of beef on a pewter platter surrounded by 'Tudor' decor and trimmings. This appeal to tradition is a means of legitimating meat culture, making it normative. The 'roast meat of Old England' (Smith, 1994, p.3) both constructs, and is constructed by, nationalism, part of specifically English culinary tradition. In cookery books and magazines and recipe pages of women's magazines, recipes are rarely Scottish, Welsh or Irish, reflecting English cultural hegemony.

The popular culture of food is also white and Christian. Christmas dinner in the range of cookery literature is: 'the grandest, most important meal of the year' (*Woman and Home*, Dec, 1994, p.8; *Living*, Dec, 1994, p.86; *Woman's Weekly*, Dec, 1992). Women are expected to prepare excessive amounts of food in the context of the nuclear family as: 'Christmas is a special time for food, family and friends' (*Sainsbury's*., Dec, 1994, p.108). Out of almost one hundred and twenty menus for Christmas day main courses (from a range of magazines, Dec, 1992, 1993, 1994), all involved roasted meat bar five. The traditional British meal is beef (GF, Dec, 1992) or goose (*Woman and Home*, Dec, 1994, p.10). In the twentieth century however, the goose and the steer have been usurped by the turkey of American cultural imperialism (e.g. *Sainsbury's*., Dec, 1994, p.103); *Woman and Home*, Nov, 1993, p.22; GF, 'Simply the Best Christmas', Dec, 1994, p.51-66; *Woman and Home*, 'The Christmas Feast', Dec, 1994 p.12-16; *Living*, 'The Ultimate Christmas Lunch', Dec, 1994; GF, 'Festive Feast', Dec, 1993; GF, 'Custom-made Christmas', Dec, 1992, p.44-6). Roasted meat features almost without exception in menus for the most significant 'feast' in the British calendar. Thus despite the influence of 'world food' and cultural diversity, the popular culture of food reflects a society based on ethnic hierarchy, and prevalence of roast meat (itself embedded within discourses of the gendered and natured Other, as anthroparchally defined food for primarily male consumption) for festivities, confirms the subordination of non-white/English peoples and cultures as Other.

The feminized/animalized Other

I have already suggested that meat is often feminized in its representation in popular food culture, but this feminization can be seen to be particularly evident in the representation of meat for

roasting, grilling and frying. Recipe books assert meat suited for such cooking should be from young animals, and/or from muscles that do little work in order to be palatable (*Sunday Times...*, 1993, p.30; Smith, 1994, p.30). Most animals bred for roasting quality meat are slaughtered very young, below two years of age. Boiled meat is generally cheap and from slightly older animals, for example, meat from dairy cattle, breeding sows and laying hens is considered too 'tough' for roasting, and is minced in prepared foods (Vegetarian Society, 1990). Roast, fried and grilled meat however, involves consumption of young animals that have led passive existences.

There are gendered and natured discourses which may be seen in the representation of such meat in cookery texts. An apt illustration is an article on lamb cutlets, deemed suitable for grilling, and entitled 'Sweet Young Things'. Lumps of meat are described as 'sweetly pink within, and trimmed with a thin, crisp frill of bursting juicy fat' (Simon Hopkinson in *Sainsbury's...*, Aug. 1994, p.96, and also recipes for fillet steaks with similar dialogue eg. *Sainsbury's...*, March 1995, p.136; *Woman and Home*, April 1993, p.31). Another illustration can be found in a recipe for roast poussin (very young chicken, considering supposedly mature birds are slaughtered at seven weeks), entitled 'Love me tender' which advocates consumption of these baby birds by virtue of the 'softness' of their flesh, and delicate flavour (*Sainsbury's...*, Sept, 1994, p.88). Characteristics such as youth and passivity feminize such food, which in turn is seen as appropriate for male consumption, enhancing masculinity. This recalls the way femininity is arguably 'served up' for male (hetero)sexual consumption in pornography, as youthful and passive (see Chapter 6).

Roasted, fried and grilled meat is cooked for a short time, seared on the outside 'tender and juicy within' (Smith, 1994, p.30). Exceptions occur where meat may poison the consumer or tastes rank, such as is the case with pork and veal respectively (*Sunday Times...*, 1993, p.33). What gives roast meat its status in the food hierarchy I feel, is the purity of its unadulterated form. The rules of grilling and roasting are to ensure 'juices' (i.e. blood and water retained in the muscles at the time of slaughter) are preserved, and meat should be basted and 'relaxed' before carving so these do not 'escape' (Smith, 1994, p.3). Accompaniments to roast meat are designed to enhance its flavour (Smith, 1994, p.35). The intention is to 'capture the real taste' of the flesh, 'instead of it being a mere backdrop for other flavours' (Smith, *Sainsbury's...*, June, 1993, p.86). This is a celebration of the 'meatiness' of meat cooked in a manner symbolically closer to the kill, and advertisements for meat to be roasted picture raw lumps of bloody flesh (e.g. *Sainsbury's* series with the caption 'a meat ad with a bit of meat', *Woman and Home*, April, 1995, p.12). The status and appeal of semi-raw flesh demonstrates anthropocentric disregard for other species in that the violence of the killing is denied, and all that is of significance is the taste, texture of dead flesh, and the appreciation of melted fat combined with blood and water.

In the representation of roast meat, discourses of the gendered and natured Other can be seen in the designation of such meat as young flesh from (forcibly) passive animals, which is described with feminine metaphors. The discourses of gendered and natured Otherness interrelate with those of sexualization, as the appeal of such meat is constructed within a sexualized discourse which represents meat as sensual due to the extent to which it is (relatively) raw, succulent and bloody.

Fragmentation, sexualization and the representation of roasted bodies

In addition to the gendering and natureing of roasted meat as an object, cookery magazines and cookery pages of wimmin's magazines, at least one third (43% on average, Oct 1993 - Dec 1994) of the space is devoted to the representation of animals (as whole roasted bodies, or body parts) within discourses of sexual consumption and fragmentation that can be seen as both gendered and natured. In winter months in particular, cookery magazines have a strong tendency to contain special features on versions of 'classic' roast meat dishes (GF, 'Secrets of Success: Meat', Oct. 1990; GF, 'The Golden Goose', Dec. 1993, p.55; GF, 'Best of British' Oct. 1994; GF, 'Simply the Best Roasts', Nov. 1994; GF, Jan. 1995, p.38-40; GF 'Simply the Best Chicken', Feb. 1995; *Sainsbury's...*, 'Games up!' Dec. 1993, p.112; GF, Oct. 1994, p.134, Dec. 1994, p.150; *Woman's Weekly* 'Cooks Classics' series, Winter issues 1993-5; GF, Oct, 1992, p.32; *Good Housekeeping*, Dec. 1994, p.28). I have already suggested that the flesh of the animals is feminized in terms of its representation in cookery texts which describe its texture and taste, and its appearance in advertising and cookery book photographs. The representation of roasted meat is however, particularly strongly feminized and sexualized, and deserves discussion in some depth.

Birds are popular roasted and served as whole carcasses, and images of the latter can be seen in abundance in cookery literature and meat advertising (e.g. adverts for 'Cherry Valley Duckling' feature whole roasted birds, GF, Oct 1990; *Sainsbury's...*, Dec 1993, p.112). The serving of whole birds is often seen as a sign of wealth or extravagance, for example: 'Wood pigeons...look lavish served as a whole bird per head.' (*Sainsbury's...*, Feb, 1995, pp.79-81). Roasted whole animals retain much of the form they had once alive, they are clearly identifiable as a grouse, pigeon, goose or chicken, as opposed to a part of an animal or as an unidentifiable muscle. This is particularly true of birds, who occupy a most lowly status. In some cases, birds joints may be fragmented into legs, wings and breasts, and this process can be seen to recall the fragmentation of wimmin's bodies in pornographic images (see Chapter 6). In pornographic representation wimmin's fragmented body parts are objectified and fetishized, particularly the legs, breasts and arse. In cookery texts and images, birds prepared for roasting are portrayed in manner similar to the pornographic model: always naked (featherless), usually headless (unless kosher or halal), sometimes trussed (wings and legs tied close to its body) (e.g. GF, Feb, 1995, 'Simply the Best Chicken'). Baldness and headlessness objectify the bird, as does its passivity in death. The roast

flesh is expected to appeal to consumers through the appearance of succulence and a 'pleasing shape', and numerous photographs feature 'decoratively' arranged carcasses or legs (eg. *Sainsbury's...*, April, 1995; *Good Housekeeping*, Feb.28th 1994, p.49).

In cookery texts, the 'boning' of parts or the whole of a dead animal's body is discursively constructed in terms of symbolic sexualization and violence. With most meats, boning is performed by butchers, but in certain cases, such as preparation of dinner party dishes, wimmin may bone low status birds (e.g. as can be seen in the case of a recipe for 'Galantine of Chicken', *Woman's Weekly*, 9th Sept.1993, p.31; and advice on jointing, trussing and boning: GF, 'Secrets of Success, Part four, Poultry, Jul. 1990; GF 'Simply the Best: Chicken', Feb. 1995). Discourses of natured violence can be seen in images of female hands dismembering birds: tearing flesh and breaking bones, pulling and snapping joints from sockets, flattening flesh with rolling pins. Joints of meat from larger animals, are boned by butchers and stuffed by wimmin, such as shoulder of lamb made into a ballotine - a 'pumpkin-shaped ball....most eye catching' (*Sunday Times...*, p.215; GF, May 1992, p.88; also GF 'Secrets of Success', part eight: Meat, Oct. 1990). The gendered discourse of the Other may be illustrated by the feminization of such food, as can natured discourses of the fragmented, objectified Other, for animals are an absent referent in the reconstruction of their dead flesh which, like the bodies of pornographic models, can be manipulated to appear 'attractive' to the consumer.

The roasted whole body of birds tends to be sexualized in gendered fashion. When eating poultry, the consumer is often required to remove the flesh from the carcass themselves, in effect, when eating, 'boning' the bird. 'Boning' perhaps not coincidentally, is one of the many slang expressions for heterosex, conceptualizing intercourse in patriarchal terms of female passivity and male action. In addition, the term 'bird' in England, and 'hen' in Scotland are popular slang to describe wimmin, usually in context of the evaluation of wimmin's bodies as objects for sexual consumption. Although pornographic images tend to represent female (hetero)sexuality as passive and submissive, there is an important difference in the representation of the female human body in pornography, and that of the animal body in the representation of meat. Humans may be symbolized within pornographic discourses as passive, but whilst this may involve objectification of bodies into images, such objectification is not premised on the extreme violence of slaughter. In the symbolization of the roasted bird, human power is celebrated in the obvious image of the carcass, the 'attractiveness' of which is a sexualized expression of human dominance. These animals are young, tender, juicy, appealing and 'keep their shape' (GF, Sept, 1992, p.22) and it is perhaps unsurprising that patriarchal men may name wimmin after them.

The bodies of larger 'meat' animals are rarely roasted whole, but divided into 'joints' by a butcher or meat cutter. The fragmented image of a headless, footless outline of a cow, calf, sheep

or pig, divided into different 'cuts' by a series of dotted lines is a common one, and can be evidenced in butchers shops, supermarket meat counters and magazines and traditional cookery books. Cattle are divided into fifteen parts; calves, eleven; sheep, seven; pigs ten (*Sunday Times...*, pp.210-218). The choice of 'cuts' for roasting is sexualized. The most expensive meat from cattle, sheep and pigs is the fillet, part of the loin or pelvic region (interview, London butcher, Jan, 1992). The prioritizing of an animals flesh in the vicinity of its sexual and reproductive organs may not be accidental, but can arguably associate the eating of such cuts with consumption of the animal's sexuality. The next most prestigious 'cut' is the upper back leg (thigh) and rump (arse) (*Sunday Times...*, 1992, p.212-217). On birds, the most expensive cut is the breast. This fragmentation of animals into various 'cuts' or 'joints' and the valuation of those body parts, is a sexualized and gendered process. The symbolization of the body in pornography involves the valuation and fragmentation of (usually) female bodies. Within pornographic discourses, wimmin are seen as fragmented Others for sexual consumption, the fragments most commonly fetishized being the legs, arse and breasts, as well as genitals. In addition, wimmin are sometimes referred to in in pornographic narratives as 'pieces' of flesh/meat for male sexual consumption.

The processes of sexualized consumption and fragmentation in the symbolization of female pornographic bodies and animal bodies as meat, contains a number of parallels. In both cases, parts of wimmin and animals are fragmented and displayed primarily for male consumption, and there is sexualized fetishization of particular parts of female and animal bodies. However animals become fragmented via the violence of killing. As sexual pornography symbolically denies that wimmin have value other than their fragmented bodies, the pornography of roasted meat denies animals any value except their flesh. Anthroparchy makes a significant distinction between types of consumable flesh: whereas human flesh can be metaphorically meat for sexual consumption, animal flesh becomes in reality, meat for human consumption. Wimmin can be objectified, their bodies fetishized and fragmented by pornographic representation, but they remain flesh, they cannot become meat at a physical level, only a symbolic one.

This section has examined the different ways gendered and natured discourses may be expressed in the symbolic regimes surrounding meat cookery. It has been suggested that all seven discourses can be seen in such representation. Meat is represented as a natured object the origin of which, as the flesh of a sentient animal, is obscured. The object of meat is also gendered, but different discourses of gender constitute different forms of cooking. The boiling of meat involves discourses of the gendered Other via the association of boiled meat with feminine domesticity. Occasionally such discourses may involve sexual consumption, as was illustrated by the association of meat cookery with romantic love. Primarily however, boiled meat is associated with discourses of gendered ownership, in which wimmin provide service for their families by preparing nurturing and 'comforting food'. The cooking of boiled meat also involves both gendered and natured

deception, as meat for boiling tends to be fragments of animal flesh which are evaluated by natured criteria - according to their taste and texture as products for human consumption and enjoyment. In addition, deception operates in a gendered manner by the obscuring of female labour in cooking boiled meat within the context of the family.

This section has contended that discourses of gender and nature construct roasted meat cookery in slightly different ways. Roasted meat is natured as an object alienated from its origin, and evaluated in terms of pleasure of taste for human beings. In addition, it is also gendered, but the discourses of gender surrounding roast meat cookery are more heavily sexualized. Roast meat is often symbolized through feminine imagery and texts of cookery literature deploy the gendered discourse of feminine youth and passivity in describing roast meat. The symbolization of roasted meat within the food literature is also part of the cultural construction of the Other in terms of ethnicity, for the symbolic regime of roasted meat, particularly beef, is a discourse of Otherness which defines English cuisine as central. The symbolization of the animal body in roasted meat is constructed by discourses of fragmentation and fetishism. Animal bodies are divided and ranked according to anthropocentric criteria which are also gendered and reflect the symbolic fragmentation of the pornographic body, and the fetishization of certain body parts. The final section of this chapter attempts to investigate whether some recent developments in British food culture are altering the ways in which and degrees to which, the discourses of gendered and natured power suggested thus far, continue to operate.

CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SYMBOLIZATION OF MEAT

This section examines some contemporary developments in British food culture: the increased consumption of 'deconstructed' meat, the development of vegetarian food sub-culture, and the attempts to promote 'green meat' (organic and/or 'cruelty-free'). These changes are examined in order to investigate the extent to which the discourses of gender and nature are present in the symbolic regimes surrounding some recent developments in food and eating.

The deconstruction of modern meat

In the last decade, there has been increased consumption of what I will call 'deconstructed meat' i.e. meat in reconstituted processed form, as mince, ready prepared foods, burgers etc. (interview, London butcher, Jan. 1992). Here, the symbolic regime of meat may be less significant - deconstructed meat does not have such apparent association with masculinity, and may be less gendered, sexualized and natured than other forms. Much deconstructed meat is MRM, mechanically reclaimed meat, composed of fat, skin, rind, gristle, sinew, bone slurry, and head tissue, which food producers try to obscure in meat advertising (interview, London butcher, Jan,

1992; GF, Oct 1990, p.86; GF, April, 1994, p.69). I feel it can be contended that meat industry attempts to obscure sources of processed meat products, by deploying natured discourses of deception in the imagery associated with such products, and butchers (interview, Jan, 1992) attest to a perceived need to deceive consumers in order to increase sales and thus profit margins in such 'value added' products. In addition, it may be the meat-eater practices self deception, as the 'product' enables further distancing from eating animals. Processed meat I would suggest however, still constructs the Other in terms of the natured denial of its origin and gendering of its appeal.

Processed meat products are usually targeted at single young men who are seen by meat producers as having a need for convenience food ('if unmarried and living away from Mum', London butcher, Jan. 1992), or attract women consumers buying for their family. Processed meat often attempts to deceive the potential consumer by aping conventional cuts of meat. In one example, 'Dalepak' 'Chicago Ribs' are shaped like cutlets and named after the famous slaughterhouse, Chicago Meat Packers. These chopped and shaped bits of minced pig are entirely false, with imprints upon them for rib-like effect, and fake flavourings ('marinade style coatings', *Sainsbury's...*, Sept. 1993 p.13). Processed meat has become the most popular form of convenience food, which women are generally expected to prepare and purchase for others. Ready meals are portrayed as necessary to fit busy work schedules and social lives, and often, as illustrated by the 'Findus' campaign between 1991-3, were targeted at women as a means of liberation from domestic labour. In addition, such products can be seen to be natured. Animal flesh is not merely disassembled, but reconstituted into objects far removed from the sentient creatures from which they are derived. Reformed and restructured meat products enhance profits (conversation, meat cutter, Romford, Feb. 1992). Whilst some find the sight of flesh attractive and appetizing, others may prefer the deception of a reshaped alternative. The hamburger is the ultimate deconstruction of modern meat, not wrapped in a skin or shaped to resemble meat, but indistinguishable matter.

Meat eating culture has the flexibility to maintain itself, whether people openly celebrate the machismo of meat, or choose the obfuscation of reconstituted products. Deconstructed meat is symbolized within gendered and natured discourses of deception, fragmentation, objectification and the Other. Animals are objectified and fragmented into such meat products, and are absent referents in their symbolization. Such products are not themselves sexualized or gendered in the explicit ways I have suggested pertain to regular meat, but the products are represented within gendered discourses as appropriate for consumption by particular groups, such as single men, or a woman's children within the context of the family.

In the absence of meat

The vegetarian food literature is not characterized by the presence of the anthroparchal Other in terms of animal flesh, for no meat is present, although this does not necessarily mean that natured discourses are absent. Unlike the cookery pages of women's magazines, vegetables are not regarded as an 'accompaniment' to a meal, but as its substance. This marginalization of vegetable food is less common within the cookery literature, with vegetable recipes far more innovative (GF, *Sainsbury's...*, 1992-1996). This is largely because some of this literature draws upon culinary traditions other than British, where cooking is less meat orientated (Crawley, *Sainsbury's*, June, 1994, p.106; *Sainsbury's...*, Dec, 1993, p.89; Harris, *The Sunday Times...*, 1992). The food literature still sees an all-vegetable menu as occasional however. 'Unrepentant carnivore' Smith, who rarely features vegetarian cooking, sees the preparation of a vegetarian meal as an oddity (*Sainsbury's...*, Sept, 1993, pp.69-73). Similarly, according to Dimpleby, 'vegetarian friends can pose a problem' (*Sainsbury's...*, Sept, 1994, p.76). Many chefs are surprisingly ignorant concerning vegetarian cooking. Smith includes gelatine in vegetarian menus (*Sainsbury's...*, Sept, 1993 p.73), Carrier, prawns in a 'vegetarian Christmas' (GF, Dec, 1993).

In early 1994, *BBC Good Food*, began the first vegetarian food publication from the mainstream press. *Vegetarian Good Food* draws on a variety of culinary traditions (e.g. Japanese, Chinese, Indian, Malaysian, Mexican, Spanish, Italian, North African; *Vegetarian Good Food* (VGF), Dec 1994 - June 1996). The publication does contain a large number of recipes (over 65%, Dec 1994-Dec 1996; also Canter et al, 1982; Gwynn, 1995a, 1995b) that use animal products, although they are vegetarian (free-range eggs, vegetarian cheeses, milk, cream, butter). Research for Chapter 7 on the meat industry indicates such products involve considerable animal suffering, and that their production is closely related to the meat industry. As such, it cannot be claimed that this literature is free of the presence of the natured Other, for the suffering of cows and chickens as reproductive machines is absent. However, such literature is clearly less natured than its mainstream equivalent, and certainly is less ethnocentric.

The literature does involve the discourse of sexualized consumption, but again, this operates in a limited context and to a far lesser degree than within the mainstream food literature. Vegetable foods are sexualized, not in their appearance as is the case for meat, but in their supposed aphrodisiac effect on the consumer. Thus *Vegetarian Good Food* produces meat free 'Valentines Day' meals, sexualizing foods other than meat and fish: 'Onions...are an aphrodisiac vegetable and so make an ideal romantic starter' (Feb, 1995, p. 44). Many vegetable foods are sexualized in this way: 'From asparagus to avocados, and apples to figs' (p.69). There is a difference between mainstream and vegetarian forms of sexualization. The sexualization of vegetable foods is intended to enhance fertility as well as sex drive, whereas the meat literature focuses on the

consumption of fish and meat as enhancing the latter alone, and primarily that of men. The process of sexualization itself is not by definition patriarchal. Vegetable foods are aphrodisiac no matter who consumes them, whereas meat food is targeted specifically towards men and associated with male sexual potency. In the vegetarian literature, sexualization does not necessarily take gendered form, neither is it natured, for animal products are not considered 'sexy'.

The vegetarian cookery literature does not construct animals and their flesh as the gendered Other, and in this sense it is less gendered than the mainstream literature. However, it does appeal to wimmin as preparers of food invoking the discourse of the feminine domesticated Other, although it does not assume wimmin cook for a family. There are, for example, articles on preparing for a children's party (VGF, May, 1995), but are also supplements on 'Cooking for One', encouraging the reader to 'Enjoy the single life with great recipes' (March, 1995) whether they 'live alone, are making the most of a night in alone, or are the lone veggie in a household of meat eaters' (March, 1995, supplement, p.3). Such recipes, and those within vegetarian cookery books, emphasize speed and convenience of preparation (between 10 and 30 minutes, Mary Gwynn, 1995a), encourage the reader to consume 'healthy and delicious' food to 'pamper' themselves (VGF, March, 1995, p.16), and there are recipes for those on a low budget. This acceptance of a variety of household structures is a contrast to the assumption made by the mainstream food press that families remain nuclear. The literature also encourages children to prepare and cook food (as do some vegetarian cookery books, see McCartney, 1989), and is disparaging of 'children's food' which is seen as unhealthy, and means more labour for mothers (March, 1995, p.36).

There are occasional editorial comments such as those disparaging 'the theory (that) real men don't eat quiche' (VGF, May, 1995, p.5), and the target market can be seen from adverts the publication carries, and the subject matter of some articles. Features on wimmin's health are common (March, 1995, p.58; May, 1995, p.32), on female 'beauty' products (Feb, 1995, p.17, Dec 1994, p.16), and in articles on 'treating yourself', the focus is female, with facials, manicures, and hair care (Dec, 1994; Feb, 1995; May, 1995). Advertisements also focus on female beauty. The targeting of the publication towards wimmin may simply be that wimmin are still presumed to undertake most cooking, or reflect the greater numbers of female vegetarians (The Vegetarian Society, 1993). A key difference however between this and other food publications, is that wimmin are encouraged in this magazine, and in many vegetarian cookery books, to cook interesting vegetable food for their own gratification, rather than prepare meat for men.

There are both similarities and differences between the mainstream and the vegetarian food literature in terms of the discourses such texts deploy. There is evidence of discourses of the Other, sexualized consumption and ownership/commodification in terms of the assumption of a gendered

division of domestic labour. However, such discourses are not deployed so extensively, nor to such a degree of severity. There remains an assumption the nuclear family constitutes the norm, but yet there is greater tolerance of diversity, as exemplified by articles on recipes for one. These are not gendered, and promote the gratification of the cook themselves, rather than the gratification of others. Being a vegetarian publication, naturing is an issue of less significance, as there is a subtle suggestion meat eating is 'wrong', and animal rights and welfare are the primary motivation in the adoption of a vegetarian diet; although the promotion of consumption of dairy products and eggs remains problematically natured. Whilst gendering can be evidenced, it is far less clear, and its presence is indirect i.e. the assumption of a female readership does not often present itself through the recipes, but in advertizing carried by the publication.

The greening of meat

The increase in vegetarianism (however small) and fall in red meat consumption seem to have encouraged food companies and supermarkets to promote an increasingly 'environmentally friendly' symbolization of meat in popular culture. However, I will suggest meat consumption cannot be 'green' as it is impossible to remove meat from its anthroparchal context (see Chapter 7). In the representation of 'green' meat, most of our discourses remain: deception, the Other, fragmentation, objectification, ownership/commodification, and sexualized consumption.

Public concern about food produced by modern intensive methods has increased markedly over the past fifteen years (interview, lecturer, Smithfield, Feb. 1992). The food literature, and articles in women's magazines have featured a range of issues of concern including: food labeling (*Bella*, Jul. 1993, p.53), packaging (*Sainsbury's*, May 1993, p.56), carcass damage (GF, Aug. 1993, p.93), lactose intolerance (*Woman's Weekly*, Jan. 1994, p.38), genetically engineered foods (*Bella*, Feb. 1994, p.52), declining fish stocks (GF Jul. 1994, p.70), hormones in milk production (GF, Oct. 1994, p.103), the dangers of both pasteurizing and not pasteurizing milk (*Sainsbury's*... Jul. 1994). This concern is voiced also by the meat hygiene industry, and the meat inspectors journal *The Meat Hygienist*, has carried articles on: hormone usage (Blamire, TMH, Jun. 1987, no.54, p.3), salmonella (Charles, TMH, Jun. 1987, no.54, p.5), BSE (TMH, Mar. 1989, no.61, p.19). Some claim there is a large potential market for 'green meat' (TMH, Dec. 1986, no.52, p.5), particularly in the wake of the BSE crisis, which has dented consumer confidence and raised questions about intensive animal farming. The response of the industry and some animal welfare organizations has been the promotion of 'green meat'.

The two main reasons why people become vegetarian are health and animals welfare. The latter is predominant (interview, Sept. 1995, The Vegetarian Society), but is not usually the focus of attempts to promote 'green meat' i.e. produced via free range and organic farming. The promotion

of consumption of green meat is largely based on anthroparchal criteria - improvement in the taste of the meat (GF, Feb, 1992, p.26; *Sainsburys*., March 1994; GF, Dec, 1994, p.130). Sometimes animal welfare is also invoked: 'pig farming was so intensive that pigs were leading an utterly miserable life, the meat had no flavour' (GF, Mar. 1993, p.28). In a few cases, animal welfare is justification for increased expense: 'You can pig out with a clear conscience on the free-range, oak-smoked sweetcure bacon' (GF, Apr. 1992, p.11). Tesco's 'Nature's Choice' brand pork bases its advertising on the lifestyle of the pigs: 'we insist that pigs live like pigs' (GF, Jan. 1993). This welfarist focus is the basis of the RSPCA's 'Freedom Food' campaign (launched April 1993, GF, Jan. 1993, p.80) which approves meat from producers who guarantee provision of 'basic freedoms' for farm animals (the RSPCA do not endorse vegetarianism for fear it would alienate public support, interview, RSPCA, Nov. 1994). In terms of animal welfare and food quality, such measures improve upon current mainstream practice. However, I would suggest that being environmentalist in conception, such measures have a limited impact on anthroparchal relations.

Animal welfarist discourse could be seen to challenge anthroparchy, but I would argue it can be seen as part of a discourse of deception which enables meat eating to be seen as having benign impact on meat animals. As suggested in Chapter 1, the assumption animals exist only for human appetites is anthroparchal - premised on a conception of nature as biological rather than a social construction within which human 'superiority' enables us to eat animals. The breeding of animals for human food is thus anthropocentric. The contention meat eating is acceptable to the degree it can minimalise exploitation is questionable, for animal farming involves manipulation of animals fertility, artificial shortening of their lives, and the inevitable horror of the slaughterhouse. The assumption the key purpose of 'domestic' animals is to become human food reduces sentient creatures to anthroparchal Other. In addition, hierarchies established around food relate to those around gender. The gendering of meat involves: the association of the preparation of food with wimmin; the preparation of meat by wimmin for men in the context of the family, or patriarchal notions of gendered sexuality; the association of meat per se and often more specifically certain types of meat with powerful expressions of masculinity; the objectification, fragmentation and sexualization of sentient beings to satisfy male consumption.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined a range of texts of British food culture, food magazines and cookery books, and the cookery sections of women's magazines, analyzing both recipes and articles, and food advertising (including some television adverts). It has argued that within these texts food preparation and consumption is constructed through gendered and natured discourses, and that all seven of the discourses outlined in chapter three of this thesis can be seen to be illustrated to some degree by the material reviewed here.

Representations of meat and animal products as food deploy both patriarchal and anthroparchal discourses. In the case of women's magazines, many form part of the construction of domestic femininity, and clearly assume wimmin cook for others, primarily family and male partners. The food literature is more ambiguous, with male cooks and writers featured, and texts which are sometimes gendered and at other junctures not. However, such literature can be seen to target wimmin as preparers of food due to the gendered nature of the advertising such publications carry. This chapter cannot claim meat food is exclusively male, it is not. It does suggest there is a gendered food hierarchy which associates certain anthroparchally defined food products with dominant conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Contemporary British food culture, focussing on the significance of meat and other animal products, deploys all seven of our discourses in both patriarchal and anthroparchal form.

The cultural symbolization of meat involves the construction of the gendered and natured Other. Animals are rendered Other by being killed and reduced to the status of food, or being abused so that they produce substances regarded as food. This natured food can be seen to be constructed in reference to gender. As a product, meat is feminized by its association with feminine qualities such as passivity, sensuality, animal sexuality, receptiveness etc. Other animal products such as dairy and eggs are also feminized, but are not connected with male virility and physical strength, and are seen as appropriate for consumption by wimmin, children and elders. Within contemporary discourses in the popular culture of food and eating, there is a marked tendency to assume meat will be consumed by men and prepared by wimmin. Wimmin tend to be represented as preparing meat according to the discourse of domestic femininity, and men tend to be represented as the rightful consumers due to the symbolic association of meat eating with masculinity. The gendered division of labour in natured food provision constructs wimmin as Other, and is also evidence of the patriarchal deployment of the discourse of ownership. Wimmin are usually not encouraged to prepare food for their own pleasure, with female cooks often represented as preparing food for male partners and children, in order to secure both emotional affection and sexual attention.

The discourse of sexualized consumption may also be apparent in the symbolization of meat. Meat consumption is closely associated with male virility, and fish consumption with female sexuality. Violence against animals in food production, is in part, legitimated by the sexualization of dead flesh. Meat is often represented as a form of food pornography for men, and wimmin are encouraged to prepare meat for men in order to appear sexually attractive. Representations of meat, and the texts of meat eating, may also be sexualized for male consumption. Metaphorically, the boundaries between male consumption of wimmin and meat sexually, overlap. There is anthroparchal distinction here however, for although representations of meat may be strongly gendered, wimmin cannot become meat literally. The symbolization of meat in popular culture can also be seen to be based upon natured and gendered deception. Meat is represented as an object,

rather than the dead flesh of once living animals which is enabled by the violences of their slaughter. Whilst meat culture obscures the violences of the production of meat however, implementational violence is suggested in carving and representations of butchery, and can be evidenced in the limited instances in which predominantly female cooks are encouraged to kill and dismember animals, such as the preparation of 'sea-food'.

The symbolic regime of meat in popular culture is natured through the constructions of animals as absent referents: discursively objectified, fetishized and fragmented for human consumption. These natured, fragmented objects, representations of meat, are gendered by being described in the texts of meat culture as feminine. The fragmentation of animal bodies, and the prioritization of 'cuts' of meat, reflects the pornographic fragmentation and fetishization of human bodies. However, the human body is protected by anthroparchal barriers from becoming meat, and only fragmented and fetishized at the metaphorical level, as will be seen in the following chapter. The celebration of meat in the symbolization of British food may be evidenced in the prioritization of roast meat, which is gendered in its representation.

The symbolization of meat in texts of popular culture, involves the deployment of discourses that construct and are constitutive of both patriarchal and anthroparchal dominations. Such gendered and natured discourses however, although they interact and interrelate, are by no means synonymous in the form or degree of oppressive relations they constitute. Whilst wimmin are often referents in the representations of food culture, there are anthroparchal barriers which prevent wimmin becoming meat. Meat cookery is not, however, only a construction of a natured ideology of anthroparchal oppression, as some green theorists have suggested. The symbolization of meat can also be seen to be gendered.

Notes:

- (1) Such correspondence involved either or both letters and/or telephone conversations with the following people: Kathleen Jannaway (The Movement for Compassionate Living); Julie Roxburgh (British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection); Susan Pike (Compassion in World Farming); Gillian Egan (Animal Aid); Keith (The Vegan Society); Kim (Hunt Saboteurs Association); Suzanna Plant (Lynx).
- (2) The term 'dressing' is identical to that used within the slaughter process to describe the dismemberment of the carcasses of cattle, sheep, deer, goats, pigs and 'poultry'.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SYMBOLIZATION OF BODIES AND SEXUALITIES IN PORNOGRAPHY

'...the reader, the consumer, enters the picture; reflecting the social dominance which affords him the opportunity to purchase the flesh of other people as if it were meat.'

Carter: *The Sadeian Woman* (1979, p.14)

Introduction

This chapter investigates the extent to which a range of contemporary pornographies may be gendered and natured and can be seen to deploy discourses of patriarchy and anthroparchy. The chapter focuses on pornography as a regime of representations within contemporary popular culture, examining a variety of pornographic genres in both of the two categories into which pornographic materials are commonly seen (by both the pornography industry and its regulatory institutions) to fall: 'soft core' (generally legal) and 'hard core' (generally illegal).

Chapter 2 found radical feminists have tended to object to pornography as a form of patriarchal sexual violence, usually ignoring the possibility pornographic imagery may also deploy discourses constitutive of other systems of domination. Whilst some critiques allude to the naturing of pornography, this is usually seen as a construction of patriarchy, rather than a consequence of the operation of a separate system of oppression which cross-cuts gender, such as anthroparchy. This chapter examines possible interrelation of gendered and natured discourses in pornographies. Whilst it will be argued the sexualization of gendered and natured domination in pornography constitutes an important arena where these systems of domination link, there are differences in discursive content of material which suggest that the naturing of pornographies should not be reduced to an analyses of patriarchal relations alone.

This chapter attempts to take account of the recent changes in the content of pornographic imagery. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Britain witnessed diversification of pornographic market and genre with the advent of pornographies for lesbians, gay men and heterosexual women, and an increase in sado-masochist (s/m) material. As we saw in Chapter 2, some liberal, postmodern and socialist feminism views this diversification positively, on ^{the} grounds ^{that} 'new' pornographies are no longer sexist, but 'bend' and thereby undermine, gender stereotypes (Segal and McIntosh, 1992). Gay pornography particularly, is seen as an act of 'defiance' against gendered norms (Segal, 1994, p.177), for through sexual polyversity/perversity, such as gay men in drag, or lesbian s/m, new pornographies question dominant norms and values around sex and gender (Butler, 1990, p.viii; Weeks, 1989). However, in Chapter 2, I generally concurred with

radical feminist arguments that these 'new' pornographies remain patriarchal (Jeffreys, 1994), and such a position will be further elaborated through the empirical research for this chapter.

This chapter looks in detail at one example of 'new' pornography, lesbian soft-core s/m, to examine whether this represents gender and nature in qualitatively different ways to mainstream material. In the discussion of the sexualization of vegetarian food in the previous chapter, I argued sexuality can operate outside gendered and natured discourses of power. With respect to pornography, it has been contended 'erotica' (sexual imagery reflecting equality) facilitates 'democracy of the gaze' (Bonner et al, 1992, p.275). Many of those engaged in the production of lesbian soft core feel their material is erotica not 'pornography', others would not eschew a pornographic designation for their work, but assert their material reflects a 'female gaze' (Gamman and Marshment, 1988) which contests dominant power relations (Califia, 1988). This chapter will argue however, that despite some changes in the content of pornographies, the material analyzed in this research deploys gendered and natured discourses of domination. It will suggest pornographies both traditional and 'new', remain embedded in and constituted through discourses of domination, although different genres deploy such discourses in various forms and to differing degrees.

The analysis for this chapter is based on a wide ranging sample of contemporary pornographic material. Images and text across a variety of soft core pornographic magazines were analyzed, including mainstream material for heterosexual men, magazines for heterosexual women, and those for gay men and lesbians. A soft core lesbian pornographic novel was analyzed to ascertain whether 'new' pornography in a different media would exemplify similar or different themes to more mainstream material. Hard core pornographic videos were observed via the Obscene Publications Department (OPD) at New Scotland Yard (NSY), and photographs and magazines were viewed with the assistance of H.M. Customs and Excise at Heathrow airport. This sample was felt sufficiently representative of contemporary pornographies, for most genres available in Britain were subjected to analysis in some medium. Certain pornographies are excluded from the sample (1), and this chapter is inevitably not an exhaustive account of pornographic imagery, yet I feel the evidence provided by the sample is sufficient to suggest consistency with the theoretical approach outlined in the first three chapters. This chapter investigates whether the seven discourses outlined in Chapter 3: the Other, sexualized consumption, ownership, deception, objectification, fragmentation and violence, may be deployed by the texts examined here, and whether such deployment may take both gendered and natured form.

Thus this chapter examines whether pornography constructs women/feminized men and animals as patriarchal and anthroparchal Others by defining sexuality in terms of power relationships of dominance and subordination; and whether pornography may express a particular construction of sexuality, based not on a pleasure principle, but a power principle structured around

dichotomous sexual roles of dominance and subordination. A number of themes could possibly demonstrate interrelations between gender and nature in the pornographic Other. First is the metaphorical discursive construction of woman-as-animal, where submissive sexual characters may be represented as gendered female (feminized) and natured animal (animalized). When the term 'animal' refers to humans it implies a number of characteristics which human dominated society views negatively, and assumes pertain to animals: insatiable sex drive, lack of physical control, irrationality. If pornographic discourse associates feminized human Others with 'animal' sexuality, this may be seen as a mechanism of subordination, both of such Others, and of animals as absent referents whose abuses are obscured. Second, woman/feminized men may be animalized by being discursively constructed as behaving like animals, for example, by being sexually aroused by animals or dead parts of animals, or being treated in similar ways to animals in anthroparchal society: caged, tethered, bound, beaten, muzzled, shackled, and (very occasionally) butchered. A third possible theme is the representation of woman as meat. Carter suggests pornography reduces the people it depicts to their genitalia, and by metaphor to meat (1979, p.13), and notes the preponderance of food, particularly meat metaphors, applied to woman in Sadeian pornography (p.138). This chapter investigates the extent to which food and meat metaphors can be seen in pornographies, and whether these are natured and gendered.

The chapter examines the construction of the Other in s/m pornography in particular. Griffin argues sadism and masochism are terms inseparable from their derivation from male pornography (1988, p.47). 'Sadism' (derived from the writings of the Marquis de Sade) describes the desire to inflict pain and suffering as punishment, 'masochism' (from Leopold Sacher-Masoch), the desire for infliction of the latter. I would define s/m as the manifest eroticism of power difference via dichotomous role play involving pain, suffering and humiliation. This chapter will suggest the representation of s/m role play constructs the Other in ways which are particularly clearly gendered and natured.

This research also investigates the extent to which discourses of objectification, fragmentation and fetish can be seen to be deployed within various pornographies. Objectification involves the devaluation of living beings to the status of inanimate object. The pornographic model becomes an image, an object to be acted upon (masturbated over) by subjects (consumers). We examine whether this objectification may be gendered and natured (i.e. the extent to which the pornographic object can be seen as masculinized/feminized and humanized/animalized). Once objectified, the pornographic body may be fragmented, divided into parts with differing levels of sexualization. We investigate the various forms of fragmentation and consider whether there are similarities between pornographic fragmentation and the fragmentation of animals in meat culture. Fetishism involves the sexualization of particular objects, or parts of objects. A fetish is a symbolic object which appears endowed with powers of sexual arousal, and we examine the extent to which

patriarchal and anthroparchal conceptions are embedded in forms of fetish that may be observed in the symbolization of the body in pornographic images. Finally, we analyze pornographies for the possible deployment of discourses of violence. Anti-pornography feminism has tended to argue contemporary pornography is increasingly physically violent (e.g. Itzin, 1992), whereas those endorsing a liberal perspective on pornography tend to argue the opposite (e.g. Thompson, 1994). In Chapter 3, I defined violence as both physical and symbolic (representational, metaphorical). This chapter investigates the possibility of various discursive forms and degrees of violence in a range of images and texts, and the extent to which these may be gendered and/or natured in terms of selection and treatment of victims.

The chapter is divided into three sections. Each examines a different type of pornography. The first examines a range of contemporary 'soft core' genres: heterosexual, gay male, and lesbian. The second looks at 'hard core' pornographies: sado-masochist, child, bestiality, 'video-nasties', and other genres such as 'scat' and 'watersports' (involving sexualization of defecation and urination respectively). The final section focuses on the soft core pornography of lesbian sado-masochist author, Califia. In each section, a number of the seven discourses will be identified and illustrated by one or two examples. In most cases, there are a range of examples which could be chosen to illustrate the deployment of each discourse in each genre, however, necessity to limit the length of this thesis necessitates discussion of only a small selection. In addition, pornographic imagery is incredibly repetitive, and there was often minimal (usually no) difference in for example, the images represented in successive volumes of the same publication, or the 'stories' of the text. The examples given are, I feel, sufficiently representative across particular genres. It will be argued different kinds of pornography exemplify different discursive themes and to varied extent and degree. Not every genre exemplifies all seven discourses, but it will be contended that collectively pornographies do, and the extent to which the seven discourses can be seen to be deployed across the range of pornographies in both gendered and natured form is sufficiently consistent for it to be argued pornography can be seen as both patriarchal and anthroparchal.

SOFT CORE PORNOGRAPHIES

Pornography is usually seen by the media, and by those who make, distribute and regulate pornography, as divided into two categories: 'soft core' and 'hard core'. In Britain, 'soft core' consists of 'pin-up' style pictures of semi-naked wimmin, or (less usually) men, close up shots of female genitalia, and couples or groups simulating sexual contact, which can be purchased in specialist sex shops or by mail order. Soft core video material is purchased from outlets ranging from sex shops to high street video rental hypermarkets (interview, Chief Inspector (C.I.), NSY, Nov, 1991). Such material involves wimmin posing in underwear and taking their clothes off. The British call magazines and videos which show heterosex 'hard core' (2). Gay material is difficult to

categorize, but male pin-ups are generally seen as soft core, unless they involve erections or penetrative sex (contravening legislation). There is little difference between hard and soft core in terms of themes, bar explicitness (i.e. showing or suggesting sex), and their relation to mainstream (heterosexual, male dominant) notions of sexuality. However, there is difference in the degree and extent to which they deploy the seven discourses, as will hopefully be illustrated by the analysis of pornographic material which follows.

A selection of 'soft-core' material was sampled for this research. *Penthouse*, an established magazine for the heterosexual male market, has a wide readership and is an up-market publication, with articles on current affairs as well as pornographic text and 'pin-ups'. *Men Only* is also intended for the heterosexual male market, but is cheaper to buy and has quantitatively more explicit lower quality photography. Some publishers have produced equivalent magazines for a heterosexual female audience, such as *Playgirl* and *Women Only* which were abandoned due to poor sales (interview, London Soho, June, 1995). *For Woman*, the magazine analyzed in this research, has proved more successful. *Prowl* is produced for gay men, and is less explicit than that designed for the heterosexual market. In addition to 'fantasy text' and 'pin-ups', it contains articles on fashion and entertainment. *Quim*, intending to cater for 'dykes of all persuasions', is a quality publication, containing interviews and articles on 'lesbian issues'. Soft core increasingly reflects sexual diversity, yet its content, I will suggest, is thematically similar to mainstream material.

Constructing the Other I: masculinities and nature

Men are rarely portrayed in soft core pornography, as the overwhelming majority of material produced is intended for sale to male heterosexuals (98%, interview, C.I., NSY, Jan 1991) and thus consists of images of wimmin and 'fantasy' text which focuses on female sexuality. The construction of masculinities in both gay and straight pornography however, is constituted by discourses of gender and nature. In the material analyzed for this research, four of our seven discourses can be seen to be present: the Other, sexual consumption, objectification and fragmentation; but they assume different forms in heterosexual and homosexual material. Whilst pornographic images involve sexual commodification and objectification of men, there is difference in the naturing of male images. As will be seen, wimmin in pornography are natured as animal as well as gendered as feminine. Pornographic representations of men may be gendered as masculine or feminine, but they are less likely, certainly in straight material, to be animalized. Although constructed by natured pornographic discourses, men are represented in ways which tend to retain their humanity, thus they are most usually natured as human rather than animal.

In most cases, representations of men in pornography are gendered masculine with men epitomizing certain masculine qualities. For example, physical strength is demonstrated by

depiction of men in 'sporty' situations such as playing volley ball (*For Women*, vol.1, no.6), semi-clad in football kit, riding a motorbike, or pictured in (bizarre) situations facilitating the flexing of muscles, for example hanging from a portcullis, or smashing rocks with a metal mallet (*Prowl*, vol.1, no.2). Heterosexual pornography for wimmin, akin to its male counterpart, tends to personalize models by a brief description which categorizes by type. For example 'Shaun' is described as a 'boy racer' and photographed atop a car (*For Women*, vol.1, no.6, pp.52-5), in another, 'Mark' is 'classically' attractive and shown amongst 'Roman' pillars:

'There's something a little special about Mark's classic looks. Is it the tanned and taut body? His noble stature? The finely chiseled features of his marble column?' (*For Women*, vol. 2, no.11, p.83)

In heterosexual pornography for wimmin, models are most usually shown active. In the above examples, we see 'Shaun' wash his car, and 'Mark' wander around carrying 'temple pillars'. Some shots do not adhere to typically masculine associations, but the men depicted are still most usually shown as active: walking, standing, rock-climbing. Even when they are shown in passive poses, these tend to be contextualized, for example, a man may be shown naked, on a towel, lying on a rock and apparently sunbathing, rather than seemingly involved in nothing but display for the female viewer (*For Women*, vol. 1, no.6, pp.20-27).

Although male models in heterosexual pornography are objectified and sexually commodified, they are not constructed as whore-like/animal-like. The models do not appear to be passively displaying their bodies for female sexual consumption, and in none of the images examined do the men appear to be sexually aroused. It could be contended this is in order the publication avoid transgressing British obscenity legislation in which the erect penis is censored, but I feel this is unlikely to prove the only explanation. In heterosexual pornography produced for consumption by men, female models assume facial expressions which give the appearance of sexual arousal. In heterosexual pornography produced for a female consumer however, none of the models in any of the images analyzed in this research had facial expressions expressing sexual desire. Research for Chapter 8 suggested that from the photographers point of view, it was important (female) models expressed desire facially, as this was what made photographs 'sexy'. I would suggest one of the reasons why straight pornography for wimmin has such a limited market, is that the men in the images simply do not look 'sexy' for they make no attempt to seduce the consumer.

The construction of gender in material for gay men in *Prowl* is very different from that for straight wimmin in *For Women*, and shows closer similarity to that within heterosexual pornography for men, such as *Penthouse*. In gay pornography, men are likely to be depicted as passive, and in many cases are shown sleeping, a convention uncommon in the depiction of wimmin in contemporary pornography, although the sleeping naked or semi-clad body was a

common theme in the genre of the female nude in eighteenth and nineteenth century art (Berger, 1973; Saunders, 1990). In *Prowl*, men are often shown partially clothed (genitals usually covered) and only occasionally naked, usually oblivious of the viewer (*Prowl*, vol.1, no.4, p.16). There is a difference in the facial expressions of men depicted in gay and straight material. In gay pornography, when models do look into camera, they assume expressions of desire (*Prowl*, vol. 1, no.2, p.32), as is common with female models in straight pornography. On occasion models touch their genitals, and may appear sexually aroused by virtue of bulging underwear, or semi-erect penises (*Prowl*, vol.1, no.2, p.8, 32).

The model of gay male pornography, akin to the woman of straight pornography is likely to be portrayed as possessing animal sexuality. The name of the publication, *Prowl*, suggests a predatory animal sexuality, and models are often described as meat - 'beefcakes'. Thus in the gay male material, many of the established conventions of heterosexual male pornography pertain, with models seen as sexual 'meat' for male consumption. Male models in gay pornography are more likely than those in straight pornography to be natured as animal and are more likely to be gendered feminine. Material produced for straight women differs markedly from that produced for gay men. The facial expressions of the male models is generally disinterested. They avert their gaze and do not assume sexually provocative expressions nor stances. They do not touch themselves sexually, and penises are flaccid (e.g. throughout *For Women*, vol. 2, no.9). In contradistinction to female models in straight pornography and male models in gay pornography, male models in straight pornography do not appear aroused, or attempting to arouse viewers, and are not animalized by their depiction as having animal-like, uncontrolled sexuality.

The representation of men in pornography is constituted through the discourse of fragmentation. Pictures often focus on genitals, but these are not fetishized and fragmented to such an extent as is the case when women are photographed for consumption by male consumers. Images of men tend to be of whole bodies, not body parts. Women in *Penthouse* and *Men Only* are pictured as body parts as well as whole bodies, as there are images which isolate their breasts and genitals.

It can be suggested that the symbolization of the male body in pornography illustrates a number of our seven discourses. The male body in both straight and gay pornography is symbolized through discourses of objectification and fragmentation. Parts of bodies may be shown, and men become images for sexual consumption. The extent of fragmentation differs however, for example, there is a greater concentration on body parts in the images produced for gay male consumers, particularly on the chest and the crotch. In neither case however, is the extent of the fragmentation of the male body as extensive as that of the female body in male pornography, as will be discussed later in this section. The male body is pornographically represented through the discourses of the Other, but the form in which and extent to which these discourses are gendered and natured differs.

In *For Women*, the male body is objectified, but is not constructed as Other for it is humanized and masculinized. In *Prowl*, the male body is feminized and animalized for its representation is discursively similar to the representation of the female body in straight pornography, characterized by both passivity and animal sexuality.

Constructing the Other II: heterosexual femininity and nature

Penthouse and *Men Only* are examples of the most prolific form of pornography in Britain, soft core 'pin-up' magazines for heterosexual men. Discourses represented within these texts are the same, the difference between publications being in the quality of photography. These texts deploy six of the seven discourses. Thus the representation of the female body is constructed through discourses of the gendered and natured Other, sexualized consumption, ownership, objectification, fragmentation, and deception. The discourse of violence, which is absent in this discussion, may be present in the production of this material (see Chapter 8), but not in its imagery.

Models in pornography for straight men, are often constructed as Other by discourses of gender, nature and race. Photographic contexts have ideological content. If models are pictured on a bed, the bedclothes tend to be animal skins (real or synthetic, *Men Only*, vol. 58, no.3), 'silk', or with an oriental, Latin American, or African pattern suggesting the 'exotic' (*Men Only*, vol. 56, no.2). In racist patriarchy, people of colour are seen as highly or overly sexed, rendering them animal-like. Although wimmin in photographs in such magazines are overwhelmingly white (3), the placing of white wimmin with olive skins in 'ethnic' contexts further sexualizes them via dubiously attributed ethnicity, and crass racism, for example:

'Janette (35-23-35)...is most definitely the 'sultry' type. You know the ones: all flashing eyes and a penchant for stabbing their menfolk with carving knives. Yes, the Latin Lady, conjuring up visions of hot nights in exotic climes where the food gives you bizarre gastric complaints and mosquitoes bite your bum while you're on the job. She's the kind of Lady who urges you on with cries of: 'Buena, buena.'" (*Men Only*, vol. 56, no.2, p.44)

The 'foreign' woman is exotic due to an additional form of 'Otherness'. As a consequence, she has a greater sexual availability. It is common for such magazines to carry a 'profile' of a supposedly 'foreign' woman (southern European, Latin American or Scandinavian (eg. *Men Only*, vol. 58, no.3; vol. 62, no.1, pp.43-50; vol. 62, no.3, pp.66-71) in each issue (1991-2, 1993-4).

The preponderance of fur (as bedding, floor rugs and coats) further sexualizes the wimmin depicted, suggesting their sexuality is animal-like. The construction of wimmin as natured Others involves the absent referent of the once live animal whose suffering is denied (as these 'Others' do not feature in the text) but recalled by certain items such a fur coat, (*Penthouse*, vol. 26, no.4, p.56) or leather wear (*Penthouse*, vol. 28, no.9, p.54). The sexualization of objects connoting abuse

operates to negate the significance of that abuse. In addition, the wimmin are often described as animals, for example: 'I enjoy getting down to it, she purrs' (*Penthouse*, vol. 28, no.9, p.41), as an alternative method of constructing their sexuality as animal-like. Each edition of *Penthouse* has a 'Pet of the Month' feature, involving popular regular models or newcomers editors wish to promote. Such wimmin are usually described with animal-like metaphors such as 'purr', 'growl' and 'slink', and are referred to as 'Penthouse Pets' (1991-2, 1993-4). Such terminology forms part of the deployment of the discourse of the natured Other, and also involves the discourse of gendered ownership, suggesting the 'pet' is the property of the publication. The concept of the animal as absent referent is pertinent here, for although wimmin can be referred to as pets, their status differs. Models for pornographic magazines are paid for their work, and are not dependent on employers to the extent animals kept as 'pets' are upon their owners. In addition to being described as animals, wimmin are sometimes described as food. This is common in every edition of *Men Only* and *Penthouse* reviewed for this research, and such terminology is illustrated by a photo shoot in *Penthouse* where a woman is described as 'scrumptious', 'delectable', 'delicious' (vol. 27, no.6, p.82). Such language forms part of a discourse of sexual consumption which suggests the consumption of a woman's image and the satisfaction of sexual appetite via masturbating over that image, is analogous to the consumption of food. What food precisely is often unclear, but considering the metaphorical construction of the wimmin as animal, I would suggest 'meat' may be a likely assumption.

The representation of the female body in straight pornography for consumption by men deploys the discourse of the gendered, natured and ethnically constituted Other. Wimmin depicted are natured by their association with animal products and by being described as animal-like through metaphor. In some cases, wimmin in this pornography are also discursively constructed as ethnically Other within written texts, or contexts of the images. The representation of the female body in this kind of pornography is certainly constitutive of the feminine Other. The models are passive, displaying themselves for a male observer/consumer, and they present their bodies in a way that is clearly stereotypically feminine, as will be discussed below.

Sexualized consumption - animal sexuality and wimmin as whores

Wimmin in straight pornography are constructed as passive yet are also characterized as whores (sexually available for all men) and as animals (sexually rapacious, uncivilized, uncontrollable). The photographing of wimmin in ordinary surroundings such as their bedrooms (common in *Men Only*), assists production economy and suggests any and every woman can choose and may enjoy, pornographic modeling. Accompanying texts suggest wimmin choose to model as an expression of uncontrollable animal sexuality, rather than for money, as illustrated by the following example:

'Louisa's (supposedly from the local pizzeria) one of those girls who goes crazy for her man. Anywhere...there she was, all over him. Bottom wriggling in his lap, skirt riding up, no knickers on....What a way to run a restaurant (33-22-36).' (*Men Only*, vol. 56, no. 2, p.36)

'Nicole is the kind of sweet, innocent young thing who's far too classy to be shown revealing her charms...Thing is, we just couldn't stop her!...she couldn't restrain herself and this once demure 23 year old (36-23-36) had to be forcefully restrained from an orgy of dishabile.' (*Men Only*, vol. 56, no.2, p.54)

Wimmin with 'names', details supposedly about them and a notation of their bust, waist and hip measurements, are pictured in progressive states of undress and sexual display. There is no equivalent in gay pornography or pornography for wimmin of the measurements given for wimmin in this kind of material. The measurements seem to function almost as a means of marketing the wimmin, as if men may choose the wimmin they desire by evaluating their bodily proportions.

The symbolization of wimmin's bodies in this pornography deploys a discourse of the gendered Other which is closely intertwined with that of gendered sexualized consumption. Wimmin in the images wear what can be regarded as a 'uniform': underwired lace bra, knickers or thongs, stockings, camisoles (accentuating the breasts), and stiletto heels. In up-market publications such as *Penthouse*, this is the norm for most wimmin profiled each month, but there are also profiles of wimmin in revealing dresses, or completely naked. All models have painted fingernails, heavy make-up, most are tanned, and have long hair (1991-2; 1992-3). This corresponds to stereotypes about 'sexy' attire for both feminine wimmin and prostitutes. This is an established form of dress for sexually commodified wimmin, recalling Dworkin's assertion pornography represents wimmin as whores (1981, p.136). In addition, models tend to be represented as constantly available for sex by seeming continuously sexually aroused, which can be seen to animalize them, as their sexuality is represented as uncontrolled and biologically driven. Wimmin look into camera with provocative expressions, erect nipples, and moist vaginal lips, or when diverting their gaze, are usually shown in a semi 'orgasmic' state (pinching their nipples, or with their hands on or near their crutches as if about to masturbate). This contrasts with the depiction of men in *For Women*, in which models make little (if any) appearance of sexual arousal or engagement with the viewer. In the fantasy texts of *Penthouse* and *Men Only*, female sexuality is portrayed as whorish and insatiable:

'I threw myself on the bed, begging them (two men) to pleasure me in any way they wanted...'You want it?' he inquired 'You want it now?' 'God yes!' I groaned...'You big fucking stud, fill my cunt with your massive cock'...At last, my fantasy fulfilled. Me the tart, in stockings and suspenders, down on all fours and fucking and sucking like crazy.' (*Men Only*, vol. 56, no.2, p.75)

'It was shameful, wicked and sluttish, but I loved every second of it and couldn't wait to do it all over again....' (*Men Only*, vol. 58, no.3, p.81)

'I made it so easy for him I felt ashamed. But...I was plain desperate for a hard fuck. So desperate, even a big blonde thicko like Tony fitted the bill.' (*Men Only*, vol. 62, no.1 p.68)

'I was high as a kite and itching for that colossal hard-on which he so vulgarly exposed....How the heck I'd find room for it all in my pussy I hadn't a clue - but...God how I wanted it.' (*Men Only*, vol. 62, no.4, p.70)

'once I'd recovered from the shock (of finding her husband was having an affair with his secretary!) I figured there was only one thing to do - take him upstairs and prove...I wasn't such a prudish uptight cow after all!' (*Men Only*, vol. 62, no.4, p.72)

Within these fantasies 'wimmin' describe themselves as patriarchal men would have them, as 'whores' who enjoy unlimited sex. The uncontrollable nature of female sexuality is what connects wimmin to animals. Not only do wimmin engage in sexual behaviour which is seen to be animal-like, but often describe bodies and genitalia as food, particularly 'meat', from which we are led to believe cocks, arses, cunts and breasts are made. Gendered bodies are constructed as meat within pornographic discourses of gendered and natured sexualized consumption, and images of bodies can be sexually consumed by a male gaze via masturbation. However, such bodies are texts (images, stories) and not physical bodies literally consumed. In describing human sexualized bodies as meat, physical violence against animals is both recalled and denied. Wimmin's bodies are represented in this material through a gendered and natured discourse of sexualized consumption in which wimmin are pornographically constructed as whore-like and animal-like, for in the images and texts cited above, wimmin are depicted as sexually insatiable and available.

Deception - heteropatriarchal fantasy

Penthouse and *Men Only* carry letters pages of 'readers fantasies', which illustrate a gendered discourse of deception. Linzi Drew (star of her husband's pornography business, enacting callers fantasies on cable television) runs the *Penthouse* letters column, printing and replying to readers' fantasies (1991-2, 1993-4). The content of fantasies confirm the patriarchal construction of sexuality wherein men have unlimited access to certain types of wimmin who find them irresistible. These ideal females are: young, tall, slim, big-breasted, long-legged, blonde, have large hips and arse, 'permanently erect' nipples, a 'tight' cunt, a big mouth which 'loves to suck cock' (*Penthouse*, vol. 28, no.9, p.73), insatiable sex drive, and are multi-orgasmic when fucked by *Penthouse* readers. This woman of patriarchal fantasy conforms to a range of gender stereotypes, and to the natured (animal-like) construction of female sexuality.

Letters reveal the extent men fantasize their own sexuality. In their fantasies, men have great sexual prowess and induce amazing numbers of orgasms in wimmin. They also possess penises which belong to phallographic legend: 'I've got a big cock, rising every second!', 'My prick is about ten inches of hard dickmeat, and I can screw all night.' (*Penthouse*, vol. 26, no.4, p.93). Male fantasies revolve around sexual action in which men act upon the bodies of wimmin, corresponding to stereotypes of female passivity and male accomplishment. Such letters constitute discursive deceptions not only because they indicate male self-deceit, but because they are not written by

readers but 'journalists' paid by the publication (interview, Soho, Jul. 1995). Similarly, *Penthouse* and *Men Only* contain a regular feature of readers' 'experiences' in the form of stories, such as the regular features of 'Private Parts' and 'My Confession' in *Men Only*. Whereas male fantasy letters are supposedly written by men, the 'confessional' story article is supposedly written by female readers. These fake 'confessions' assure male readers in a different form of text, that wimmin are sexually insatiable and desire almost every man they meet. These articles are constructed through a natured and gendered discourse of deception, for they construct wimmin anthroparchally as possessing animalized sexuality, and patriarchally as whores.

Ownership and objectification

Wimmin in straight pornography are represented through discourses of objectification and ownership as objects which can be bought as images and thereby 'owned' by the consumer. By purchasing representations of wimmin objectified as images or texts, the reader of pornographic magazines is able to some degree to own a glimpse of the lifestyle to which these magazines allude.

The *Penthouse* pin-up is usually depicted in scenarios which connote wealth and social privilege. In summer, outdoor scenes, particularly outdoors of large period houses are popular (eg. *Penthouse*, vol.26, no.7), but the usual winter scenario is a room full of 'antique' furniture (eg. vol. 27, no.10), rugs in front of open fires, or expensive cars (such contexts are incredibly common as illustrated by *Penthouse* issues between 1991-2, and 1993-4). Scenarios seem to suggest that the wimmin who model, and the men who masturbate over them, have taste. The wimmin appear sexually aroused, or they should, and readers may fantasize that as the woman in the picture seems to desire the viewer, he can 'have' her, and at least masturbate over her image. By consuming the woman in his sexual imagination, it is suggested that the viewer may consume the context in which she is set, and assume the lifestyle of a wealthy 'playboy'. The 'classy' appeal of *Penthouse*, to which editors and readers subscribe (evidenced from editorial columns, letters pages, and profiles of models) is accentuated by soft-focus photography and sophisticated lighting:

"The idea of doing nude modeling came from my boyfriend", says Alex. 'We've always thought of *Penthouse* as a magazine with lots of class, so it seemed like a logical choice...' (*Penthouse*, vol. 26, no.4, p.88)

Men Only pictures models in very different scenarios, often their own homes. This saves significant production costs, and gives the impression that many of the wimmin photographed are not models, but pose spontaneously, suggesting all wimmin may similarly be available for sexual consumption by the readership. This presumption is undermined by adherence to the norms of attire and pose for soft core pornography. In the editorial columns at the beginning of each publication of *Penthouse* and *Men Only*, the reader is encouraged to conceptualize the wimmin

whose images they masturbate over as their own. The wimmin, according to the editorials display their bodies 'for you', 'your pleasure', 'just as you like them' (*Men Only*, vol. 56. no.5, p.1; *Penthouse*, vol.26, no.6, p.2). It can be suggested that a discourse of gendered ownership is embedded within the images and texts of such magazines, encouraging male consumers to see themselves as having some part in a life of wealth, and limitless sex with 'desirable' wimmin, even if this extends only to the literal ownership of a glossy image.

Fragmentation and fetish

As already suggested, images in which the male body is represented tend to show the whole body rather than fragments or parts. Whilst in gay male pornography there is a tendency to emphasize the crotch and chest, these parts of the body are not usually shown as fragments in images. In straight pornography for men however, wimmin's bodies are fragmented as a matter of course, with shots emphasizing certain parts in standard poses. Some shots show torso, or face, arms and breasts, others legs, cunt and arse etc. Wimmin's bodies are fragmented and fetishized through such representation, divided and graded according to sexual appeal.

This fragmentation is both gendered (applying mainly to wimmin) and natured (recalling the animal carcass divided into desirable parts for consumption, as discussed in Chapter 5). When men write to publications such as *Penthouse* and *Men Only*, they inform the magazine of models they favour by referring to their breasts and genitals, for example, 'She has such a lovely dangling clitoris!' (*Penthouse*, vol. 28, no.5, p.92) and less often, arse and legs, via which wimmin in pornography are evaluated. Genitals and breasts are almost always the focus of the photographs being central and/or emphasized by the pose: wimmin closing their arms under their breasts to ensure a cleavage, putting their legs over their shoulders, splaying their legs, on their backs with legs in the air, holding and raising their breasts, parting their labia, removing (limited) clothing etc. Models in *Men Only* and *Penthouse* shave their body hair, armpits, legs, and genitals, leaving a small triangle of clipped pubic hair (1991-2, 1993-4), revealing the labia and clitoris. To further accentuate the genitals, they may be artificially reddened or lubricated to suggest models are sexually aroused (see Chapter 8). Parts of the fragmented bodies of wimmin are the crux of these images. These are not pictures of flesh alone, but of flesh laid bare, opened out for the male gaze. Pornographic parlance reveals the extent to which fragmentation is natured, for the open crotch shot may be described within such magazines as: a split (dead) beaver, a salmon sandwich, beef curtains. Wimmin possess the uncontrolled sexuality attributed to animals, and their sexuality is reduced to their genitals which are often characterized as meat.

In most heterosexual male pornography, I would suggest six of our discourses may be seen to be deployed, often in both gendered and natured form. The female body is symbolized in this material

through discourses of the gendered and natured Other. The appearance of the model and the metaphorical construction of wimmin in the texts of such publications concurs with established norms of patriarchal femininity and thus the representation of the body is gendered. The female body is also symbolized through natured discourses, for example in the wearing and use of anthroparchal apparel such as leather and fur, and the metaphorical construction of wimmin as animal-like and as food (often meat) in text. Gendered and natured discourses of sexual consumption can also be seen to be deployed. Wimmin are symbolized as possessing insatiable, uncontrolled, animal-like sexuality which is gendered, as wimmin must appear continually sexually aroused and desiring of the male consumers of their images. These images and texts are also constituted through a gendered discourse of deception, as wimmin are discursively constructed as the fantasy of patriarchal men. In addition, wimmin are objectified and commodified in such publications, their bodies become objects for purchase by a male consumer, and the publications encourage the consumer to see themselves as establishing some form of ownership over the bodies of the wimmin represented via their purchase of the magazine. Finally, the female body is represented in such texts through discourses of fragmentation and fetish which are gendered and natured. These female bodies are fragmented into sexually evaluated pieces, in particular the breasts and genitals upon which texts and images fetishistically focus. The fragmentation and grading of the sexualized female body is natured in recalling the fragmentation of animal bodies in the cultural texts of meat.

Lesbian pornography - a female gaze?

This section examines lesbian soft-core pornography in order to compare pornography which has been produced outside the heterosexual norm, with the heterosexual male pornography discussed above, and evaluate the possible differences in the representation of the female body. *Quim* is written and produced by and for lesbians:

‘a magazine by DYKES for DYKES, with an in-your-face, positive approach to SEX and sexuality! We don’t care what you call yourself - lesbian, dyke, womyn, wimmin, queer, separatist, lessie, butch, femme, feminist etc. *Quim* just wants you to use us to have your say.’ (editors, *Quim*, Winter, 1991, issue 3, p.1)

Quim is the most sophisticated publication reviewed in this research, demonstrating quite a high degree of concern over aesthetic values. It is also by far the least explicit - there are no open crotch shots, few fragmented shots of bodies, nearly all images are of two or more wimmin, a minority depicting wimmin masturbating, as opposed to the norm of heterosexual pornography for men where images involve a woman displaying herself for the reader alone. Pictures and fantasy text are sent in by the readership who receive no payment. Unlike the paid models for *Men Only* or *Penthouse*, these wimmin have significant control over how they represent themselves and their sexuality. A variety of sexual possibilities and relationships are portrayed. Fantasies and stories

involve the pleasure of the other as well as the narrator, and do not involve improbable sexual feats. The argument that there are no differences between lesbian and other soft-core pornographies is not sustainable. This is pornography produced by and for lesbians, in which wimmin are portrayed as sexually desiring and active in mutually pleasuring contexts of safe sex. Despite differences, however, it will be argued there are strong similarities between *Quim* and other forms of pornography discussed in this section. I would suggest *Quim* exemplifies a number of our seven discourses: the gendered and natured Other, objectification and fetishism. In addition, in this case, violence is present, a discourse absent from the other forms of soft core in this research sample.

In the majority of features, the discourses of the gendered and natured Other may be seen. The sexual relations symbolized in this publication tend to be premised on dominance and subordination, often on the rigid dichotomies of scenarios of s/m, or role plays of butch/femme, which are gendered in terms of masculinized dominance and feminized submission. The naturing of this material takes a different form to the established association of heterosexual porn of feminized sexuality as animal. Here, animal sexualization can usually be evidenced in the use of leather and animal restraints within s/m practice and fantasy.

Wimmin who are constructed in dominant roles within this pornography are masculinized both by characterization, and their use of dildos and strap-ons (a dildo worn strapped to the body for use as an erect penis). It has been argued by some postmodern feminists that wimmin with dildos do not attempt to be symbolic men, and dildos are symbolic of gender-bending empowerment rather than patriarchal phallocentrism (Butler, 1990; Wilson, 1992). However, some examples from *Quim* such as those below may illustrate the possibility that wimmin with strap-on dildos who fuck other wimmin may fantasize that they are men, and further, may on occasion act with machismo, an exaggerated and aggressive expression of patriarchal masculinity:

'When I put a strap on I feel male, I feel my dick as real...I have 'male' type orgasms...I feel like I'm ejaculating when I come.' (*Quim*, Winter, 1991, p.16)

'Your reply is a command, 'suck me'. My eyes water as you go deeper and I try not to gag... 'Kneel, Neil. What an appropriate name for a little gay boy'... 'Fuck me Master, fuck your boy.'" (*Quim*, Winter, 1991, p.13)

It is difficult to see how this 'new' pornographic representation empowers wimmin, unless, it would appear, that they fantasize their occupation of patriarchally defined masculine roles and sexuality.

Wimmin are often represented in *Quim* in terms of masculinized and feminized roles and power dichotomous relationships. A series of images lesbian photographer Della Grace provide an illustration of such representation. The photographs show two wimmin, dressed in jeans, leather

chaps, and a combination of leather and denim jackets and waistcoats. One wears a leather policeman's cap, the other, sunglasses and fingerless leather gloves. The dyke with the glasses has a strap-on underneath her leather trousers, the dildo of which protrudes from the open fly, she has a set of handcuffs attached to her belt. Both have fake moustaches and short cropped hair, and although they are both masculinized, relations of dominance and submission pertain. The woman with the cap has no shirt on, her breasts are bare with nipples pierced. She is represented as submissive, in one shot she sucks the dildo, in the other, her back is turned, and the woman with the dick is touching her arse (*Quim*, Winter, 1991, p.34). In the final series, the dyke with the dick tears the other woman's jeans revealing her bare arse, before we see the bare arsed dyke against a wall, being fucked from behind by the dyke with the dick (p.36).

These images, I would suggest, represent a patriarchal sexuality in which the one who possesses the phallus has power over a feminized and subordinate Other. The sexual submissive is the more feminine despite her moustache, she is passive, the one who is fucked, and she wears less clothing. These women appear as gay 'clones' and the images suggest lesbians really desire to be fucked and to fuck like submissive and macho gay men. Butler (1990, 1993) would argue these images question gender stereotypes by throwing into relief the instability and ambiguity of gender roles. However, I would argue that when imagery revolves around phallic penetration by a masculinized dominatrix upon a feminized submissive, it confirms rather than subverts the dichotomous gender roles it adopts. As contended in Chapter 2, Butler's notion of parody suggests imitation of something that already exists - patriarchal gender roles. Earlier in this thesis I concurred with Jeffreys (1990, 1994) that patriarchal structures of systemic power are not undermined by a cross-dressing or liberal postmodern androgyny wherein we are all free to choose identities and may swap them at whim. There may be no dispute as to the naturing of such imagery, for I would suggest the sexualization of animal skins as apparel recalls the absent referent: cattle, whose slaughter is recalled yet their abuse denied, by the sexualization of their hides.

The Other may sometimes be constructed as a child, and/or as a highly feminized subordinate. Some fantasies and role plays in *Quim* represent relations of domination recalling child sex abuse:

"You can be my little girl...Come and sit next to me,...you are Daddy's favourite you know...I won't hurt you baby, it's nice, enjoy it.' I lift your skirt and slip down your navy blue knickers, your shaved pussy making the game even more believable...you hide your face, feigning shame.. 'You must never tell anyone" (*Quim*, Winter 1992, p.7)

Such sexual role play is portrayed as a means of two women dealing with their abuse, but such texts confirm rather than question the power relations of child sexual abuse. By re-enacting such dynamics, women attempt to place their abuse within a context of their own consent and control. However, by recalling the language and power dichotomies of abuse, I would argue they reinforce an association between abusive power and the expression of their sexuality.

The gendered eroticization of subordination and dominance can also be illustrated in the representation of butch/femme role play in stories and readers 'fantasy' pages:

'My femme is a tarty, filthy-minded little whore, who does the shopping. This butch is a classy gentleman, courtesy Cary Grant, who can dig over a 50 ft garden...It is easier to be femme because I'm more socially acceptable this way. Butches tend to get derogatory comments...Femmes tend to get sexual harassment. Butch is not crying, being able to take the tops off bottles with your teeth...Being femme means being able to create a drama at any moment, crying if you don't get your own way.' (*Quim*, Spring, 1991, p.16)

It is difficult to see what can be 'disruptive' of the status quo with regards to femme role play which involves wimmin acting according to the patriarchal construction of femininity in terms of dress and behaviour. The only exception to the patriarchal construction of the feminine woman, is that femme lesbians have sexual relations with wimmin who act like men. This 'bending' of gender stereotypes is problematic as stereotyped gender roles themselves remain firm. A similar analysis can apply to s/m fantasy and role play, but in this case, the Other is also animalized. The dominant 'top' is masculinized and humanized, demanding the compliance and service of the feminized and natured submissive or 'bottom'. The bottom exhibits feminine attributes and is animalized as possessing uncontrolled sexuality that requires discipline by the masculinized top. In this lesbian pornography, the Other is constructed through a variety of differing discourses in ways reflective of gendered and natured relations of dominance and subordination.

Both butch/femme and s/m pornography deploys another of our discourses, violence. For example:

'I wanna hurt you so much', you tell me, forcing my arm behind my back...I am told to crawl across the floor to you... 'Fuck me please Master...I can take it, it doesn't hurt'... 'I own you within these four walls. You are mine.'" (*Quim*, Winter, 1992, p.14)

'I fantasize about being raped and raping...' (*Quim*, Winter, 1991, p.4)

Some fantasy text contains descriptions of physical violence, but this is relatively rare. Most text and some images suggest violence in the form of verbal threats aimed at femme/submissive characters, the plethora of s/m suggesting the control/abuse of animals (whips, harnesses, collars and leads), and fantasies of sexual violence. Suggestions of violence are both gendered and natured, for victims are feminized and animalized. *Quim* does involve the discourse of objectification as wimmin's bodies are made into texts for purchase, although this discourse is deployed to a lesser degree than in straight pornography for men, because wimmin are not depicted in fragmented form for the viewers consumption. This said, certain objects in such representations are fetishized. In most cases, this has little to do with the fetishization of wimmin's bodies as in straight pornography, for the main fetish object here is the phallus - the strap-on dildo.

Quim is pornography made by and for wimmin, and there is some discomfort in criticizing this sexual imagery in relation to its 'burden of scarcity' (Grover, 1991) as it is part of the lesbian struggle for ownership of the representation of the lesbian body and sexuality. However, I have suggested many of the images in *Quim* are shaped by patriarchal and anthroparchal constructions of sexuality which renders this 'new' pornography a construction of patriarchal representation, rather than a subversion of it. The material above deploys I would suggest, three of our discourses. Images are constructed by discourses of the gendered and natured Other. S/m is evident in a large proportion of these images, and wimmin are represented in terms of dichotomous and strongly gendered masculine and feminine roles of domination and subordination. The discourse of the natured Other can be seen in the prevalence of sexualized natured materials, such as the wearing of leather, and the prevalence of instruments most commonly used in the control of animals (e.g. collars, harnesses). In this instance, animals are the absent referent in these images which recall animal abuse, but effectively deny violence against animals in an anthroparchal society. Whilst I argued elsewhere in this chapter that soft core pornography is not constituted through discourses of patriarchal and/or anthroparchal violence, this is not the case with this lesbian material, as some of the texts refer to 'fantasies' around rape and physical violence, and some of the images are suggestive of the latter. Finally, these images do objectify the female body for sexual consumption, and fetishize certain sexual objects. As indicated above, one of the most significant fetishes is the patriarchal phallus, emphasized in the representation of dildos.

Through an examination of pornographic soft core texts *Penthouse*, *Prowl*, *Men Only* and *Quim*, representing a range of sexualities, this section has argued that collectively, this material is illustrative of all of the seven discourses, and that in many cases, these can be seen to be deployed in both gendered and natured form. The section which follows examines material that is classified as hard core, in order to see whether the form and degree of the possible deployment of these discourses may alter in a different kind of pornographic material.

HARD CORE PORNOGRAPHY

Hard core pornography is legally distinguished via a greater degree of explicitness and/or the depiction of physical violence (interview, C.I., NSY, Dec 1991). The overwhelming majority of this material is heterosexual, involving couples or group sex. Although it demonstrates patriarchal constructions of sexuality, it can be seen as less sexist in that it usually involves both sexes, unlike its soft core equivalent. Most material is in video form as its purpose is not sexual display, but sexual action, usually intercourse between a heterosexual couple in which both parties appear to orgasm. This section reviews a range of hard core pornographies and argues this material is both gendered and natured, and is constituted through four of our discourses: the Other, fragmentation, fetishism and violence.

The gendering of the Other

Hard core pornographies represent sexual relations through discourses of dominance and submission in which gender stereotypes pertain. Men are depicted in these videos as strong, muscular, virile, and phallic (possessing ever-erect cocks). Wimmin are for the most part, slim, large breasted and long-haired. Most 'actresses' shave their pubic hair to reveal their genitals and appear continually desperate for sex (observation, OPD, NSY). On occasion, female characters direct sexual activities, being negatively characterized as 'dominatrices', whilst adhering to the norm of pornographic femininity that wimmin possess insatiable and animal-like sexuality. Most videos are highly phallogentric, and the size of the male member and its readiness for sex is a key concern, as films focus on penile penetration with close-up shots of vaginal and anal intercourse. In this imagery, the erect penis becomes the key symbol of sexual satisfaction for both sexes. In some cases, both sexes are animalized via their sexuality (both seen as insatiable) but this characterization is most often reserved for wimmin. Thus it can be suggested that hard core heterosexual pornography may share much of the gendering and naturing of its' soft core equivalent. Similarly, although most material depicts couples, it is designed for heterosexual men, and 'overwhelmingly' men purchase it (interview, CI, NSY, Nov 1990).

If couples and groups are not shown, the usual alternative is images of wimmin masturbating. This is not authentic female self-pleasure, but is staged to appeal to male viewers. As the wimmin appear aroused, the masturbating man can fantasize he has aroused the woman before him, and pleases her via the attainment of his own pleasure. In films, wimmin often appear to 'arouse' themselves with various sexual aids, including household objects which are a staple feature of this material (observation, NSY, March, 1991), but usual 'assistance' is provided by vibrators and dildos of proportions more reminiscent of forearms than anything dangling between the legs of most men. Extended masturbation scenes portray wimmin as sexually insatiable, satisfied temporarily by the disembodied phallus. Such phallogentricism is evident also in gay hard core material, which focuses on erection, penile penetration of anus and throat, fist-fucking, and use of large dildos. Dichotomous sex role stereotypes are adopted, with masculinized characters fucking, and feminized men penetrated and submissive (observation, NSY, March, 1991).

Whilst most hard core material involves adult men and wimmin, there are genres where children are constructed as the Other. Child pornography is material involving scenarios where adults have sex with children (most usually aged between six and twelve according to police, interview, D.I., NSY, Mar. 1991) often employing force and/or using drugs. The vast majority of these children are female (observation, NSY, Mar. 1991). Whereas it is often the case that pornographic models look bored or miserable with strained smiles, children's expressions are telling of abuse (they look frightened, in most cases they are crying, observation, NSY, Mar. 1991). The sexualization of

children is an aspect of most pornographic genres, wherein female bodies are valued for apparent youth, and popular shaving or part-shaving of female genitals is symbolic of pre-pubescence. Child pornography is referred to within the industry as 'kitty porn' (Talese, 1980, p.535), indicating children can be viewed as pets, subject to human will, and as such pets are cats, female heterosexual pornography with its 'pussy' is recalled.

Hard core pornographies are thus based upon gender dichotomous power relations that construct wimmin, sometimes (overwhelmingly) female children and some men (in material produced for gay men), as sexually submissive and subordinate Others. Most men depicted in these images are represented as dominant, conforming to stereotypes of patriarchal masculinity as strong and virile.

The naturing of the Other

This generally gendered Other in hard core pornographies, is also occasionally natured. The most direct form of naturing can be seen in the pornography of bestiality, a genre which has a committed audience, albeit that it seems generally less popular in the 1990s than it was in the late 1970s and early 1980s (interview, D.I., NSY Mar. 1991). In this pornography, wimmin are depicted in coitus with animals, most popular being horses, donkeys, and dogs, due to the relatively large size of the penis, and eels and snakes which can be used as dildos. The animals in such films are masculinized as strong, sexually insatiable and possessors of erect penises. Horses and dogs are sexually stimulated by female actresses (observation, NSY, Mar. 1991). These animals are victims of anthroparchal manipulation, abused by wimmin, although it is clear that men assist models in making these films which are overwhelmingly viewed by men (interview, DI, NSY, Mar. 1991). I would suggest such material deploys gendered and natured discourses in representing wimmin as animal-like through their apparent desire to fuck animals. By forcing animals to engage in 'sex' with wimmin, it appears animals 'like' this experience, for being sexually insatiable according to anthroparchal ideology, they will fuck anything, even those not of their own species, like wimmin in male pornography. Wimmin and animals have the same sexuality this material suggests, because they 'fuck' each other.

Female animals in bestiality are less commonly found, but when they are, tend to be pigs and chickens, with sows being raped by men, and hens raped and killed simultaneously by being disemboweled by a penis. Pigs particularly are often feminized by female clothing/accessories, and portrayed through soundtracks in similar fashion to female models, as eager for sex with men (observation, NSY, March, 1991). Bestiality indicates the extent to which wimmin are animalized in pornography, for in this case wimmin and feminized female animals can actually be exchanged.

In the making of this pornography, the Other is clearly both natured (being an animal subordinated by a human), and gendered (being overtly feminized, or masculinized by human manipulation). In addition, the animal Other is subjected to extreme physical violence in these images, as observed for example the disemboweling of hens and the rape (forced penetration by the human male penis) of sows.

Violence

There is clearly physical violence involved in forcing animals and children to have sex with adult humans, but the most common violences in hard core material involve adult 'models' in s/m pornography, which usually involves the infliction of actual pain, rather than symbolic acts suggesting pain. The images of hard core s/m pornography involve: whipping, canning, fist-fucking, hanging, piercing sensitive body parts without anaesthetic, burning skin with wax, flames, cigarettes etc, tying up, branding etc. (observation, NSY, March, 1991).

An example of such material is a video which was the subject of police investigation wherein five gay sado-masochists were successfully prosecuted (RvBrown, 1991) for producing and circulating their own pornographic videos. When the Obscene Publications Squad viewed the material, they initially felt this was a murder case (interview, DI, NSY, Jan, 1991). The content of the video involves acts common to s/m, but the video was distinctive in involving a wide range of practices: cock piercing, beating, nailing foreskins to a tabletop, hanging combined with oral sex (the man is cut down before his neck breaks), masturbation with instruments designed to cut the foreskin, simulated removal of the foreskin with razor blades, scat and watersports, fist fucking (observation, NSY, Nov. 1990). The video is characterized by feminization and animalization of the submissive 'victims'. Submissives are often treated like animals: whipped with bullwhips, placed in harnesses, shackles and cages, led around on collar and lead. The absent referent makes its presence felt with the sexualization of leather and devices associated with control and punishment of animals. Whether violence is suggested in fantasy text or is portrayed in reality as in this video, it is clearly gendered and natured. The 'masochist' is both feminized as passive and fucked by masculinized men, and is animalized by being treated physically in ways in which animals are abused. The master is masculinized and 'humanized' controlling the animal Other.

This video encapsulates the range of violences within s/m pornography. In such violences, human beings, as submissives in power dichotomous sexual relations, are treated and are represented, as animal-like. Thus I would suggest that in this pornography, humans are not only discursively animalized via representation, but in terms of their physical treatment. In this pornography the symbolization of violences attaches to its physical practice, as the violence represented in film has clearly taken place in the making of such material.

Fragmentation - the butchering of wimmin

So-called video 'nasty' material was placed under increased legislative control in the late 1980's, and according to the police, has consequently fallen dramatically in circulation (interview, Nov 1990). The content of video 'nasties' tended to represent extreme levels of violence rather than film its actuality, rather like a strongly sexualized low budget horror film. The level of realism in such films is low (observation, NSY, Mar. 1991), but the material does suggest at the symbolic level, the presence of the discourse of gendered and natured fragmentation.

Within this kind of pornography, wimmin, or feminized men may be depicted or symbolized as animals. They may be represented as sexual animals and occasionally as sexual meat, but are not transformed into meat, the fate awaiting many domestic animals. Perhaps one of the most popular themes or 'storylines' of such material is that of a group of young white men and wimmin often holiday-makers who stumble across cannibalistic 'primitive' tribes and are consequently tortured, often dismembered and boiled alive (interview, DI and observation, NSY, March, 1991). Such imagery obviously recalls the killing of animals for meat, and within this material, violence is clearly sexualized, for example, in one film, three wimmin are hung on a pole with meat hooks through each of their breasts (observation, NSY, Mar. 1991). Due to the low level of realism however, I would suggest the animal as absent referent makes its presence felt, for whilst this imagery supposedly depicts the butchery of human bodies for food, we know this is an unrealistic scenario (and it certainly appears to be so) and it is the abuse of animal bodies in slaughter and butchery which is recalled and denied in this instance.

In one genre of pornography, the 'snuff' film, wimmin are supposedly actually killed and butchered. New Scotland Yard argue there is no such thing as a genuine snuff film, where a female model is fucked and then killed, but there is a genre attempting to reproduce these films (interview, NSY, Nov 1990). The film *Snuff*, produced and circulated in the late 1970s, has been seen by some feminists as the 'real thing' (Beverly La Belle, 1982). However, observation indicates the film is, as police suggest, image not reality, a form of 'video nasty'. This said, the imagery is disturbing. In the film, a woman is fucked in a pornographic photographic shoot. Afterwards, the producer comes towards her suggesting she wants more sex. He begins to fuck her, then sticks a knife up her cunt, cuts off each of her fingers to the accompaniment of her screams and much blood. He plunges the knife repeatedly into her neck and abdomen, cuts her open, tears out her intestines and holds them above his head with apparent orgasmic delight (observation, NSY, March, 1991). In this scenario, sexual woman is not only metaphorically animal, but is physically symbolized as animal, reduced to meat, by being slaughtered and butchered in a ritual of sexual machismo. This is fantasy, but I feel it belies the possible extremity of pornographic symbolism in which the feminized and animalized are not merely flesh/sex, but meat/sex.

Within the examples of hard core pornographic material discussed above I have contended four of our seven discourses may be seen to be deployed. This material is constituted through the discourses of the gendered and natured Other, for the sexual relations represented here are premised upon relations of dominance and subordination within which those who are constructed as submissive tend to be gendered female and natured animal. Whereas discourses of violence are rare in soft core, they are common in hard core material. Violence is symbolized in gendered and natured ways, the victim of violence is usually feminized and/or animalized, and the means of violence (e.g. whipping, caging) sometimes recalls the human abuse of animals. Discourses of violence operate in this material as symbolic regimes, and also may involve the representation of physical violence. In addition, the discourses of gendered and natured fragmentation can be seen in certain types of violent hard core material in which the human (usually female) body is represented as an object to be butchered. Finally, fetishism is evident in much of hard core material for images tend to focus on the phallus. Hard core material deploys fewer of our seven discourses than does soft core material, but I would contend that where these discourses can be seen to be deployed, they operate to a more extreme degree. In part, I think this extremity is linked to the prevalence of violent s/m imagery in hard core material. The final section of this chapter examines a particular example of soft core s/m material and develops the argument that it is in the role plays of s/m that anthroparchal discourses are particularly clearly illustrated.

LESBIAN S/M PORNOGRAPHY: CALIFIA'S SADEIAN WOMUN

S/m pornography is unavoidably characterized by dichotomous power relationships, for it involves the representation of sadism and masochism, categories which, as suggested previously, can be seen to be gendered and natured. Whilst I have already contended gendering and natured are common to a range of pornographic genres, I feel such processes are accentuated in s/m. In examining an example of 'new' pornography, a collection of lesbian s/m short stories, *Macho Sluts* by the American author Pat Califia, will be the subject of this section, and I will argue this material deploys all our seven discourses.

It will be suggested that s/m role play which is a key feature of Califia's writing, constructs the dominated Other in clearly gendered and natured ways. The roles of sadist and masochist construct a rigid gender dichotomy via metaphorical reference and practical treatment, and it will be argued that the masculine/feminine dichotomy also refers to human/animal, master/slave power relations. The submissive Other is also animalized in metaphor and often treated like animals via sexualized use of devices commonly associated with animal control and abuse (e.g. cattle prods, nooses, dog collars and leads, cages, whips etc.). The animal Other as an absent referent can also be seen, it is suggested, via sexualization of animal products particularly leather, often worn by both parties in s/m scenarios. In addition, when human Others are victims of violence, the treatment of animals is

recalled, and such images rely on knowledge of the treatment of animals, particularly of how they are butchered and eaten. In s/m sex and pornographic representation however, barriers to action exist, and the consent of victims is established. In the case of animal abuse, there are no barriers on violence and animals cannot 'consent' to their treatment. Animals are absent referents in s/m pornography which both obscures and recalls oppression by incorporating the confinement, terrorization and torture of animals within human sexual practice. It will be argued this pornography also deploys discourses of deception in constructing abusive relationships in terms of freedom of sexual choice. The relationship between sadists and masochists in this material can also be seen as deploying discourses of ownership and commodification, as submissives are often represented by metaphor and treatment as gendered and natured chattel property, and as feminized and animalized sexual objects to be consumed by both the dominatrix, and the reader of the material. Fetishism may also be seen in the fixation on genitalia which characterizes this material. Finally, it will be argued that discourses of violence are a key component of the symbolic regime of s/m pornography such as this.

Dominance and submission - the construction of the Other

S/m pornography constructs sexuality in terms of relations of dominance and submission. This is illustrated in the first of Califia's short stories wherein dominatrix 'Jessie', guitarist for a band named 'The Bitch', has the 'reputation of a rapist' (Califia, 1988, p.39), whereas submissive Liz loves to be 'flattered into bed and ordered around'. In this example, the wimmin dance and kiss, a situation in which Jessie assumes dominance:

"You're so turned on, I think I could make you come right now, in front of everybody.'
She began to call me names - slut, bitch, whore, cunt - and they were rich and resonant in my ear, like an incantation.' (p.37)

Jessie 'instructs' Liz to masturbate whilst she drives them home from a party (p.47). Liz is led from the car by a scarf tied to her leather collar, in a manner recalling the domination of humans over 'pet' dogs in anthroparchal society. The dominatrix or 'top' controls the sexual action, the 'bottom' is controlled and defined by the top. Thus Jessie ties Liz up, slaps her, then leads her shackled and hobbling to the bathroom, and slaps her again (p.48). Liz has her hair pulled, is called stupid, and 'sneered' at. Jessie threatens to leave her, fuck other wimmin, push her down a flight of stairs. She constructs Liz as metaphorically animal: 'Whimper for it, bitch.' (p.49); and also as a child - Jessie takes her to the toilet, patronizes her, baths her, dries her (p.50). Liz is led by a leash to the bedroom and tied up with a chain ('You make a fetching slave'). These actions express a further dimension to Liz's status as 'Other' - racial inferior. The allusion to 'race' involves the absent referent, in this case, the oppression of African people via slavery, and as with animals and meat, that oppression is obscured.

Jessie tells Liz how helpless she is, looks 'cruel', teases, fucks Liz with her fingers - warning Liz not to come or she will be punished. Jessie drips molten candle wax on Liz's belly, thighs and breasts. Liz screams in pain and come. Liz is completely compliant: 'No whim of my own will moved me.' (p.58). Liz represents the sexualized feminine woman of male pornographic fantasy: submissive and overpowered by the combination of fear, lust and shame. Jessie is the sadist, the masculinized hero of male pornographic fantasy, dominant, controlling, unemotional. Her role resonates with the machismo of a Sadeian hero - she dominates the 'Other' the submissive Liz who is metaphorically constructed as feminine, animal, child-like and racially inferior.

The gendering and naturing of the Other

Despite 'masculine' clothing, Liz behaves in a stereotypically feminine manner. Roxanne, submissive in 'The Calyx of Isis' is highly feminized in stiletto heels and silk slip with long blonde hair. Iduna, victim in 'The Vampire' wears a low cut black dress to emphasize her 'alabaster breasts', has a tiny waist, wide hips and again, long blonde hair.

The subordinate and gendered Other may also be a child. 'The Finishing School' for example, involves an incestuous Victorian love triangle, wherein sisters, Berenice and Elise, share home with Clarissa, daughter of the former. Berenice is a dressy dominatrix, Elise is submissive, dresses as a servant-come-bunny-girl, and assumes the appropriate role. Clarissa is pre-pubescent ('her breasts, which were just beginning to bud', p.63), and described as an immature horse - a 'young filly' with 'coltish legs'. Berenice is also her daughter's 'lover'. Clarissa is characterized as highly sexual and happy to please Mother, a characterization of children which is similar to that of other forms of child pornography wherein the implication is that if children comply with sexual abuse they probably seek it and enjoy it. Like adult submissives, Clarissa is feminized in silk dresses, stiletto heels and with long hair.

The construction of the submissive gendered Other in Califia's work is also closely interrelated with their naturing. The feminized submissives are described as animal-like, and often treated like animals. The discipline chamber in the 'Finishing School' contains a plethora of devices associated with animal abuse: 'an ivory and gold umbrella stand held an assortment of canes, switches, riding crops, dog whips..' (p.66). Clarissa is chained to a leather-covered sawhorse, feet in stirrups, legs splayed, blindfolded with a 'mink-lined sleeping shade'. She is subjected to the infliction of pain and pleasure from a carriage whip, a comb for grooming horses, a fur glove, and an ostrich feather. Objects composed of fragmented parts of animals (skin, fur, feathers), or used in their control (stirrups, whips) are sexualized. In 'The Surprise Party', the submissive is placed in a cage and chained to its bars. In 'The Vampire' and 'The Spoiler' submissives are whipped with riding crops, switches and bullwhips. This recalls the beating of animals, but the severity of the whipping also

recalls the slaughter of animals and removal of their hides, for example: 'flaying someone with your cat-o'-nine-tails until the walls and innocent bystanders are splattered with blood' (p.252). Here, gender and nature have both connection and difference, for sexualization obscures the suffering to which animals are subjected in the manufacture of sex-toys.

In addition, the pornographic victim is metaphorically animal described in terms denoting animal behavior. Clarissa 'whimpers', is a 'monkey' or 'pet', and is petted 'as one would a frightened animal'. She is a 'lusty mare', possessing a 'pubic fleece' and 'hindquarters', who 'snorts' and 'snuffles'. The submissive in 'The Hustler' follows the narrator around 'on all fours' 'whining like an animal', pants, wears a collar, 'nuzzles' and 'laps' (p.202). Submissive Roxanne in 'The Calyx of Isis' is constructed as non-human, animal, and prey. At one stage she is patted on the head like a dog and tied by collar and lead whilst humanized dominatrices eat. In her initial appearance she is a 'mummified form' in a body bag, revealed wearing a hood, ear plugs, manacles, and gag, hands chained behind her. She is depersonified and unable to move, hear, see, or answer back. In this pornography, such a combination of animal and non-person is sexy, for example:

'The hood was an alien face, insect-like, fish-like, sitting atop the body of a beautiful young woman. It depersonalized her, made her even more sexy, removed any inhibitions the assembled dominatrices might have had about getting their hands on her.' (p.118)

The dominating Subject in Califia's work is sometimes also characterized as animal, despite their control over the Other. This is a means of sexualizing the Subject, when engaging in sex they become animal-like. However, animalization of 'tops' tends to be deployed as a means of suggesting strength rather than vulnerability. Whereas submissive Clarissa is a horse and Roxanne a domestic pet, 'The Spoiler' is a wolf who can 'prowl and sniff for the men who made him hungry, carefully laying plans which would enable him to pounce and feast' (p.263). In 'The Calyx of Isis', the dominatrices are all leather-clad (p.110). The sexualized use of animal skin serves to nature the dominatrices as animal, but there is also an element of human control implied: they wear the skin of an Other, and use devices suggesting the control of animals. Animal metaphors describe both the practices and the practitioners of s/m. The top wimmin bond in common purpose becoming a 'pack' of sexual predators via a spontaneous process of uttering animal sounds:

'EZ yipped like a coyote, and Joy hiss-snarled back like a cougar. The background hum rose and fell, but persisted as each of them found herself making animal noises.' (p.48)

I would suggest naturing pervades the construction of Califia's sadists and masochists. Both are animalized, but whereas animalization of submissives is a means of suggesting vulnerability, animalization of dominators suggests power. Submissives are more strongly animalized, for their dominators retain physical and emotional control.

Deception - feminism, ecology and intolerance

There are a number of illustrations of discourses of deception in this pornography, such as the enthusiasm portrayed by children for sexual abuse. Another discourse of deception which runs through a number of Califia's short stories, is the characterization of radical and eco-feminists as intolerant, and politically totalitarian, as may be illustrated by the following two examples.

'The Calyx of Isis' is a wimmin-only night club, owned by Tyre a 'feminist, albeit the fun kind' (p.93). The club encounters opposition from feminist groups such as WIFE (Women for Images of Female Equality) which is violent in damaging property of pornographic organizations. This is abhorrent for capitalist entrepreneurs such as Tyre, for whom property is sacrosanct, particularly if utilized in providing 'anonymous sex' for wimmin 'on a commercial basis' (p.93). Califia's depiction of anti-pornography groups as violent is arguably deception. Feminists are named 'intolerant' when they protest and will not tolerate, what they perceive as the oppression of wimmin, thus feminist opposition to pornography can be labeled by pornographers as itself 'violence' or 'harassment'.

When Tyre is visited by macho 'top' Alex, they endorse meat eating culture: "Are you a vegetarian?" 'I am a confirmed carnivore.' 'Excellent.'" (p.91), but Califia's strongest opposition to ecology, or more specifically eco-feminism can be seen in 'The Hustler', set in a future post nuclear society organized on 'eco-feminist' premises. Revolution has resulted in men no longer running the show, but cleaning up the stage (the environment). The narrator has not benefited from the changes being the 'wrong sort of woman' - arrested for pornographic sexual activity, now against the law. Meat is not eaten, and most people dress vegan. Sado-masochist, meat eater and leather wearer, Califia's heroine is mocked on the street for being a man. Califia seems to posit a continuum here from eating meat, being macho, and wearing leather, to enjoying violent sex. Sex post-revolution must occur within equal, loving and caring relationships - no anonymous sex, or sex involving violence and degradation. This society premised upon supposed eco-feminist principles is highly repressive, and 'politically incorrect' behaviour policed by a draconian state.

I would suggest these examples illustrate the deployment of discourses of gendered and natured deception in which patriarchal and anthroparchal oppression of wimmin and animals is denied and reversed: thus the eroticization of gendered power and the consumption of animal flesh become in Califia's pornography, symbols of a free society, rather than instances of patriarchal and anthroparchal oppression.

Ownership

The relationship between dominator and submissive can also be seen to be constructed through discourses of gendered and natured ownership. Dominators metaphorically refer to, and sometimes treat submissives as, chattel property, objects which are sexually commodified and owned by those in dominatory power positions. Such discourses of ownership may be suggested by the following examples from two of Califia's short stories.

In 'The Finishing School', young Clarissa is characterized as a captive animal, and within the home wears shackles, stilettos attached with a small silver chain forcing her to take tiny steps. Although wimmin do not now occupy chattel status in law, and children have some independence from parents and guardians, most animals (the majority being farmed) are legally property of human owners. The construction of submissives as chattel recalls the captive status of animals in anthroparchal society whilst also denying their abuse. In addition, the chattel status of farm animals is based on their designation as a commodity, as potential meat. Whilst human beings can be sexually commodified by lack of control over their bodies, animals can be literally turned into a commodity. Submissives may however, often be treated like owned animals. For example, Clarissa is branded with a series of welts from a caning, lest she forget who owns her, before she leaves home to attend a boarding school. Similarly, sheep, cattle, and pigs, are branded as an indication of ownership. Clarissa's ownership however, may be temporary, ending as she matures. A branded animal reaching maturity will be killed, there is no possibility of freedom. In the sexualized branding of humans therefore, we may see the absent referent of animal abuse.

In 'The Calyx of Isis', Alex feels the need to test her 'slave' Roxanne, as she wants secure knowledge she possesses the Other. She wants Roxanne 'worked over' by 'a pack' of experienced top wimmin to ensure she would not fall for any other woman who can dominate her. Alex describes Roxanne as her sexual property: 'the real test of property is, can you give it away? And if you loan it out, can you get it back?' (p.97). Alex regards Roxanne rather like the traditional wife of patriarchal marriage, as a commodity for the gratification of the Subject: 'I want somebody I can perfect with hard, constant training. A living work of art I can take out and show off.' (p.97). Alex decides her ownership has been confirmed by the staging of the 'fantasy' test, and Roxanne is pierced. Similarly to the symbolization of the rings exchanged in marriage, the pierced ears of the slave, and the piercing of the noses of bulls, Alex declares the rings symbols of her ownership. Tyre shaves Roxanne's crotch to remove her 'fur', then her legs, armpits, thighs and buttocks. Her ears are pierced, then her nipples, labia and outer lips of her vagina. The shaving of Roxanne's body hair negates her status as animal, and transfers her conception as chattel to that of a child. The symbols of Roxanne's animal nature are removed, and the public ritual of piercing serves as a demonstration of obedience, ownership, and supposedly - love.

These examples suggest the submissive characters of this pornography are constructed through discourses of ownership which can be seen to be gendered (feminized submissives are 'owned') and natured (recalling animals as chattel). In this imagery, the absent referent of the chattel animal is apparent. Human beings engaging in sex may place themselves in the position of owned object, but animals in anthroparchal society, as 'pets' or as potential meat, have no self-determination.

Fetishism and fragmentation

Califia's pornography demonstrates a fixation upon, and thus fetishism of, genitalia, which can be seen as similar to mainstream pornography. In her work, the human body is fragmented and evaluated sexually. Thus for example in 'Jessie', submissive Liz is made to view her own genitals, which are 'ruddy and wanton' (p.52). The provision of genitalia with lusts, is an established theme of male pornography; indicating genital fetishism with pre-requisite objectification, and the fragmentation of both experience and the physical body.

Perhaps the clearest fetishism in Califia's work, however, is her phallocentrism. For example, in 'The Calyx of Isis' Michael is dressed in marine uniform, and wears a strap-on dildo. 'Gonna fuck that slut right offa those high-heeled shoes', she declares in reference to submissive Roxanne 'drawing the girl smoothly and relentlessly back and forth on her thick shaft' (p.120). Phallocentrism is possible in lesbian pornography because the fact wimmin do not possess penises is irrelevant. Male pornography is rarely concerned with the penis, but with the phallus. Unlike the multi-functional penis, the phallus of pornographic representation is omnifunctional - it fucks. It is a symbol for male sexual power, ever-erect and ready for action. It matters little that lesbians do not physically possess the phallus, men don't either, and as the above example may suggest, a lump of rubber and a touch of machismo will suffice. The lesbian with the dildo is represented here as the one who fucks, the symbolic male. Although it must be conceded the dildo is a temporary symbol, and roles in s/m can change, I would argue the roles themselves and their symbolic configuration remain rooted in a patriarchal sexuality in which the phallus, is fetishized.

Sexualized consumption

In this material, submissives are represented as objects for sexualized consumption, characterized as possessing unlimited 'animal' sexuality, and being 'whores'. Thus for example, Clarissa is derided by her Mistress as: a 'salacious little slut', 'common street-walker', 'overwhelmed by carnal impulses' (p.68-9). Like the characterization of wimmin as whore-like in the heterosexual male soft core pornography discussed in the first section of this chapter, Clarissa is reduced to her genitalia and her supposedly insatiable sexuality: 'I'm nothing but wetness, nothing but the thing between my legs' (p.70). Elsewhere in Califia's work, submissive Roxanne is a

These examples suggest the submissive characters of this pornography are constructed through discourses of ownership which can be seen to be gendered (feminized submissives are 'owned') and natured (recalling animals as chattel). In this imagery, the absent referent of the chattel animal is apparent. Human beings engaging in sex may place themselves in the position of owned object, but animals in anthroparchal society, as 'pets' or as potential meat, have no self-determination.

Fetishism and fragmentation

Califia's pornography demonstrates a fixation upon, and thus fetishism of, genitalia, which can be seen as similar to mainstream pornography. In her work, the human body is fragmented and evaluated sexually. Thus for example in 'Jessie', submissive Liz is made to view her own genitals, which are 'ruddy and wanton' (p.52). The provision of genitalia with lusts, is an established theme of male pornography; indicating genital fetishism with pre-requisite objectification, and the fragmentation of both experience and the physical body.

Perhaps the clearest fetishism in Califia's work, however, is her phallocentrism. For example, in 'The Calyx of Isis' Michael is dressed in marine uniform, and wears a strap-on dildo. 'Gonna fuck that slut right offa those high-heeled shoes', she declares in reference to submissive Roxanne 'drawing the girl smoothly and relentlessly back and forth on her thick shaft' (p.120). Phallocentrism is possible in lesbian pornography because the fact wimmin do not possess penises is irrelevant. Male pornography is rarely concerned with the penis, but with the phallus. Unlike the multi-functional penis, the phallus of pornographic representation is omnifunctional - it fucks. It is a symbol for male sexual power, ever-erect and ready for action. It matters little that lesbians do not physically possess the phallus, men don't either, and as the above example may suggest, a lump of rubber and a touch of machismo will suffice. The lesbian with the dildo is represented here as the one who fucks, the symbolic male. Although it must be conceded the dildo is a temporary symbol, and roles in s/m can change, I would argue the roles themselves and their symbolic configuration remain rooted in a patriarchal sexuality in which the phallus, is fetishized.

Sexualized consumption

In this material, submissives are represented as objects for sexualized consumption, characterized as possessing unlimited 'animal' sexuality, and being 'whores'. Thus for example, Clarissa is derided by her Mistress as: a 'salacious little slut', 'common street-walker', 'overwhelmed by carnal impulses' (p.68-9). Like the characterization of wimmin as whore-like in the heterosexual male soft core pornography discussed in the first section of this chapter, Clarissa is reduced to her genitalia and her supposedly insatiable sexuality: 'I'm nothing but wetness, nothing but the thing between my legs' (p.70). Elsewhere in Califia's work, submissive Roxanne is a

sexually insatiable available hole, described as a 'bottomless pit'. Being constructed as a symbolic whore, Roxanne gives Michael a 'blow job', 'tastes' Anne-Marie's cunt, kisses Kay's boots, rubs her face over EZ's crotch, performs oral sex on Joy, has Tyre's steel stiletto heel pushed up her vagina. Michael forces her dildo down Roxanne's throat, declaring: 'Don't think you got enough of this marine corps meat' (p.126). Roxanne is canned by Anne-Marie. Roxanne has her arse fucked by an oversized enema nozzle. Roxanne is canned by Tyre. Roxanne comes as a further enema is administered. Throughout, Roxanne is portrayed as desiring more.

Submissives are not only characterized as available for sexual consumption by being whore-like, but also by being consumable flesh, meat, as illustrated by the following example from the same story. At one point, Roxanne is placed on her back in a sling, with her feet in stirrups, musing that:

'It was humiliating, swinging in mid-air with her limbs strapped down, getting her arse stuffed with Crisco like a turkey getting stuffed with dressing.' (p.131)

Thus Roxanne even describes herself as an animal, a dead one prepared for consumption. Food metaphors are again used to describe her being fucked by Kay's arm - her arse becomes a snake devouring its meal. Roxanne is then roped to a large cross and covered with clothespins which are described as 'wooden birds that bit her breasts'. Black dominatrix Joy is particularly strongly animalized, growling at intervals, her facial scars described as 'lion whiskers'. The clothespins on Roxanne's body are removed by a bullwhip. Roxanne is reminded that she is a 'sacrifice', a 'victim', and also fruit ('so soft and ripe', p.149), according to the discourse of wimmin as confection and sweet food. Roxanne screams, sweats, and bleeds at the beating. This turns the pack on as they sexually consume her: 'They were nourished and awed by the sight of her'. (p.150).

'The Vampire' also involves the discourse of wimmin as consumable as food and particularly as meat. Kerry, is a vampire, who looks like a 'top-man', is attired throughout in leather 'the colour of dried blood', and described through animal metaphors: she drinks like a 'thirsty animal', uses a whip 'as quick as a cat'. Kerry enjoys inflicting severe pain, although she reserves this for men alone for: 'she could rarely be persuaded to treat women like sides of beef.' (p.250) - an admission that some s/m practices may degrade humans to the status of meat. In this instance, the connection of meat, animal and sex is almost fused: Kerry (as a symbolic male) pursues Iduna within a discourse in which womun-as-meat is the dominant metaphor and Iduna almost becomes meat as her blood is consumed in a sexually defined context. I would suggest that discourses of gendered sexualized consumption can be evidenced in this pornography via the portrayal of feminized submissives as whore-like and continually available for sex, and as food, particularly meat.

Violence

Discourses of gendered and natured violence can be seen throughout Califia's work in terms of metaphors used and the scenarios represented. Violence may be symbolized in a relatively straightforward manner such as the beating and whipping of submissives, or may be recalled by the use of metaphor such as that of rape, applied to the encounters Califia constructs and describes.

For example, in 'The Calyx of Isis', Roxanne's slip is removed by Tyre's knife, after which she is effectively gang-raped. All eight wimmin handle her whilst she 'shakes', and digitally penetrate her. In another case, 'The Surprise Party' revolves around a fantasy arranged by gay male friends of a lesbian whose fantasy is to be fucked by men in a context of dominance and submission. The woman is throat raped at gun-point by 'policemen', and characterized as thrilled to be 'used this way' (p.222). Her face is rubbed in the carpet, she is placed in hospital restraints, a dog training collar, and referred to as 'fur-pie', the absent referent of the abused animal confirming submissive status. She is fucked by two men, then put in a cage - chained to the bars by clamped nipples, and informed by a third: 'you are my prisoner,...Cop meat. And I'm going to fuck you. Guess where.' (p.236). In 'The Calyx of Isis', Roxanne is 'loosened up' to be fist-fucked by being forced to inhale amyl nitrate. When she wants the fist-fucking to stop, she is refused for according to Califia: 'It was rape and communion' (p.133). Alternatively, violence is symbolized in the beating and whipping of submissive characters in Califia's stories. For example, 'Jessie' hits Liz repeatedly: 'She struck out again. 'Get on your knees, damn you. Get down' I almost fell in my hurry to avoid any more blows.' (p.48). Later she beats Liz with a belt until the latter is at the 'almost out of (my) mind.' Vampire Kerry flays her victims until they pass out, or their flesh literally splits.

The level of physical violence described is extreme, but Califia implies it is acceptable as submissives 'consent' to the violence inflicted on them. This example of pornography is perhaps so clearly natured as the Other is not only metaphorically animal, but is represented as being treated like an animal. The physical violences of s/m such as beating, whipping, flaying, shackling, incarceration etc, are natured for they recall animal abuse. The feminized and animalized (adult) victim largely allows violences against their bodies in the context of sex. Animals in anthroparchal society do not 'consent' to violences against them. There is no mechanism via which any sense of 'consent' could be established, and animals are dominated by human beings to an extent (see Chapter 7) where they are overwhelmingly unable to affect the ways they are treated. Thus I would suggest that animals are the absent referent in many of these s/m violences. Califia refers to gendered and natured violence with reference to rape, again recalling the absent referent (wimmin and animals subjected to forced sex) and denying the material reality of abuse.

This section has suggested Califia's work illustrates this particular genre of pornography may be seen to be constructed through each of our seven discourses. In this material I have argued wimmin and animals are discursively represented as Other. Feminine submissives are attributed animal-like sexuality and are metaphorically animalized, and are often treated like an animal, usually via the sexualized use of equipment designed to control/mistreat animals. S/m role-play reflects not only a masculine/dominant, feminine/submissive dichotomy, it is also dichotomous in terms of species: masculine/human, feminine/animal. There are similarities in terms of woman's sexualization as animal, her physical treatment as animal, and her definition via metaphor as animal. Further, an overarching discursive construction, is the representation of sex as itself an animal pursuit, in which certain s/m practitioners are more deeply embedded than others.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined a range of texts of pornography, in various forms (films, videos, magazines, novels) and genres (heterosexual, gay male and lesbian soft core, violent heterosexual and homosexual hard core, s/m, bestiality etc.). The chapter has argued within the various texts reviewed for this research, the body and sexuality is constructed through gendered and natured discourses, and when all genres are considered, 'pornographies' collectively can be seen to deploy all of the seven discourses in either or often both, gendered or natured form, albeit that the degree of their deployment may differ with respect to specific genres. In pornographic representation, sexuality is symbolized as premised on dichotomous power relations of dominance and control and submission, passivity and lack of agency. This dichotomous relation of power in sexuality, I have suggested, is a symbolic regime deploying discourses of oppression based on gender and nature. In metaphor and in the descriptions of behaviour within this material, sexual dominance is structured in terms of masculinity and humanity, and submission in terms of femininity and animality.

The symbolization of bodies and sexualities in the texts of various genres of pornography deploy all our seven discourses in both gendered and natured form. Wimmin and animals are associated as Others, the embodiment of 'nature', via their sexualization as 'animal-like'. This is illustrated most clearly in the pornographies of bestiality and s/m, but I would suggest is present in all genres. The use of animal products as apparel (e.g. leather) or food in a sexual context, emphasizes the animalization of wimmin/feminized men. Closely related is the use of devices suggesting control or abuse of animals (e.g. whips). The pornographic representation of the Other can also be seen in the symbolization of human flesh as meat which is exemplified in hard core pornographic material such as 'video-nasties' and s/m, but it can be seen that all forms of porn are part of a discourse of sex-as-flesh, flesh that can be bought and consumed sexually.

Objectification in pornographies is both gendered and natured, as the pornographic object is overwhelmingly female/feminized, and/or animalized and occasionally animal (in bestiality). Fragmentation is discursively present, as the pornographic body is divided into parts seen as most desirable for consumption (e.g. breasts). As we saw in Chapter 5, images of fragmented bodies of animals as meat are often sexualized. However, there is a difference between the fragmentation of the body in meat and in pornography, for anthroparchal barriers prevent the human body becoming meat, and allow for metaphorical fragmentation only. Pornographic representation is also constructed through discourses of fetishism. The fragmentation of the body for sexual consumption involves fetishization of certain of its parts in the focus of images and texts. This reflects in some ways the fetishized fragmentation of animals to produce objects of desire such as meat, leather and fur. In the case of s/m, the ornamentation of the desired object itself may become a form of fetish, as illustrated by the piercing of sensitive body parts, or the wearing of leather. Discourses of violence may be seen to be present in some pornographies, although the form and degree differs across genres. Violence may be gendered in involving female or feminized victims, and may be natured via animalization - the treatment of pornographic objects as animal metaphorically and/or physically. Whilst the natured of pornographic violence recalls the abuse of animals as meat, the pornographic body (if human as is usual) cannot become meat, as anthroparchal barriers prevent extremes of violence against humans on a systematic basis.

I have suggested that s/m pornographic material illustrates our seven discourses particularly clearly in gendered and natured and also racialized ways. The representation of sexuality in s/m revolves around particularly rigid dichotomous roles of masculine/feminine, human/animal, master/slave, and involves the representation of natured violence in a direct way (e.g. masochists being described/shown as physically treated as animals). Again however, there are anthroparchal boundaries on humans abuse. Human masochists can step outside their animalization when outside the realm of sexuality, whereas the lives of Other animals are anthroparchally defined in every respect, as suggested by the material in the following chapter.

The deployment of patriarchal and anthroparchal discourses in pornographic material however, is not synonymous. Gendered Others in pornography become metaphorically animal: described as animals and as meat, having animal-like behaviour and sexuality. They also become consumable text as pornography and can be seen as similar to meat in this sense. However there are anthroparchal boundaries which differentiate humans and animals, and animal metaphors contain an absent referent of animals (as meat, as captive) that recalls yet denies their abuses. Whilst animals are referents for sexualized humans, they are rarely physically pornographic objects; and it is the bodies of wimmin (primarily) or feminized men who are made into pornographic texts. Although the objectification, fragmentation, fetish and violences of pornography recall the treatment of animals, it is generally human bodies which become pornography. In s/m material in

particular, animal bodies may be sexualized in the form of skin, and humans be treated sexually in ways which animals experience as abuse, in addition to serving as sexual metaphor.

The symbolization of the body and sexuality in pornographic cultural texts involves the deployment of discourses that are constructive and constitutive of patriarchal and anthroparchal oppression. Whilst such gendered and natured discourses interlink and overlap, they are not synonymous, and this analysis has attempted to account for divergence of the form and degree of oppressive relations constituted by particular discourses in specific genres. Pornography should not be seen exclusively as part of popular culture reflecting patriarchal ideology, and forming part of gendered structures of oppression as radical feminists have suggested. Rather, the symbolization of the body and sexuality in pornographies can also be seen as a natured phenomenon in which the abuse of animals, particularly as meat, is an absent referent within pornographic discourses.

Notes

- (1) The exclusion of computer pornography is discussed in Chapter 4. The material supposedly depicting 'readers wives' (i.e. not professional models) is mentioned only briefly in this chapter. Such material is soft core, and according to photographers sells well, but is regarded as very much the 'bottom end' of the market, with potentially greater scope for the exploitation of models (see Chapter 8). This material has not been subject to detailed analysis as the intention of this research was to examine forms of 'best practice' regarding pornography, and the material selected for analysis is a diverse sample of relatively high quality pornography.
- (2) This is not so in the rest of Europe and the USA, where 'soft core' describes material depicting oral and genital sex including ejaculation (interview, sex shop, London Soho, June, 1995). 'Hard core' elsewhere in Europe is reserved for 'minority' pornographies showing anal sex, child sex, bestiality, s/m, scat etc. (interview, Detective Inspector (DI), NSY, Nov, 1990).
- (3) There are 'specialist' magazines which exclusively depict black, Asian and South East Asian women, which tend to be poor quality and are generally within the genre of 'readers wives' (interview, London Soho, May, 1995). See (1) above.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE MEAT INDUSTRY

There are three pale honey coloured cows on the stand under the hot lights, with little room for themselves, some straw, a bucket of water and Paul, a farmer's assistant. The exhibition centre is crowded and noisy. Two cows lie down, the one in the middle stands and shuffles. Each cow has a chain around her neck with her name on it. The one in the middle is called 'Erica'. Above the stand is a banner: 'Most farmers prefer Blondes', the name given to this breed of cow.

Erika Cudworth: 'What's special about this breed? Why should farmers prefer them?'

Paul: 'Oh, they're easy to handle, docile really, they don't get the hump and decide to do their own thing. They also look nice, quite a nice shape, well proportioned. The colour's attractive too.'

EC: 'What do you have to do while you're here?'

P: 'Make sure they look alright really. Clear up after 'em, wash 'n brush 'em. Make sure that one (pokes 'Erica') don't kick anyone.'

EC: 'I thought you said they were docile.'

P: 'They are normally. She's abnormal that one, really bad tempered.'

EC: 'Perhaps she doesn't like the crowds and the lights?'

P: 'She certainly didn't like the lift yesterday.'

EC: 'I don't suppose she's had much experience in lifts.'

P: 'Nah, its not that, she's just a bitch that one.'

EC: 'Really? I thought she was a cow.'

The Royal Smithfield Show, Earl's Court, November 28th, 1994.

Introduction

This chapter investigates the extent to which the processes of meat production can be seen to be shaped by relations of patriarchy and anthroparchy. It examines the three key stages within meat production and the specific and interrelated industries of 'livestock' farming, slaughtering and butchering. The chapter analyzes both the symbolic regimes through which the meat industry is constructed (by examining texts produced by the industry and its regulators), and the material practices, procedures and behaviours that constitute the industry. The symbolic and material aspects of the industry are examined in order to ascertain the possible deployment of discourses which may be gendered and/or natured. It will be contended, as was the case in the previous two chapters, that if such discourses could be seen to be co-present and interrelated, that a relationship between anthroparchal and patriarchal relations of systemic power may be suggested.

In Chapter 1, we saw the green literature tends to attribute the violences of meat production to human relations of domination over other species and the animate environment. I concurred that meat production is anthroparchal, but also suggested it may be influenced by gendered power relations. This chapter empirically investigates such a possibility - it examines whether meat production reflects gendered relations of domination in addition to those constructed around nature.

In the light of this research, it will be argued the oppression of animals in meat production is both natured and gendered, although relations of natured power predominate. The oppressions of gender and nature are not seen as synonymous, as there are significant differences in the treatment of animals and humans. However, it will be suggested that interconnections between gendered and natured oppressions are strong, and meat production cannot be regarded as a product of anthroparchal relations alone, but may also be seen to be patriarchal.

The seven concepts outlined in Chapter 3: the Other, sexualized consumption, ownership, deception, objectification, fragmentation and violence, will be applied to the case of meat production to ascertain the extent of gendering and natured. Thus we investigate whether meat production constructs animals as the 'Other' in dichotomous power relations of dominance and subordination, and whether 'meat' animals may be constructed as Other in relation to gender as well as nature. It will examine whether meat animals are gendered in the production of meat, and I would suggest three ways in which this might be identified. First, meat animals may be disproportionately female, or bred for specifically gendered attributes which might correspond to patriarchal constructions of masculinities and femininities. Second, animals might be feminized metaphorically by workers within the industry. Third, both male and female animals may be treated like many wimmin (and some men) in patriarchal society, for example, they may be raped (forced to have sex). Rape of animals and wimmin is different however, for with animals, rape is likely to be linked to human control of reproduction and fertility, whereas with humans, rape is an instance of sexualized and gendered power usually distinct from reproduction. A further question of concern is the possible extent to which those working in the meat industry may be seen to be embedded in patriarchal constructions of gender.

The chapter also investigates the possible deployment of discourses of patriarchal and anthroparchal ownership and commodification. Wimmin are no longer defined in British law as male chattel, whereas domestic animals are human property as 'pets' or 'livestock'. I would suggest the definition of non-human animals as property is a means of anthroparchal distinction (in the West, it is no longer seen as appropriate to define human animals in this way). I will investigate the impact of relations of ownership on animals, and consider whether gender has an impact on the commodification of animals. We also look at the discursive deployment of deception in the meat industry, which may deny, obscure or reverse the appearance of instances of oppression. We examine whether the processes of butchering, and the language of scientific rationality which constructs meat animals as agricultural products, deploy discourses of deception, obscuring the violence of killing and the experience of the animals.

I have defined discourses of objectification as constructing living, animate beings as inanimate objects that can be used and consumed by those in structural positions of social power and having

the status of the subject. We investigate whether the meat industry involves such objectification, and if so, whether this assumes gendered and natured form. Fragmentation can be defined as the physical division of human or animal bodies, or the fragmentation of lived experience and denial of its organic nature. We look at the physical fragmentation of animals in slaughter and butchery, and examine whether these procedures might be gendered. In addition, we investigate the possible fragmentation of the experience of animals in the production of meat, which could be seen for example, in their segregation, separation and incarceration. Sexualized consumption involves the discursive construction of Others as available for physical consumption as sexualized food or sexualized bodies. This chapter investigates the extent to which meat production may be sexualized. It examines forms of human control of animal fertility, sexuality and reproduction in modern British farming practice and considers the extent to which such processes may be seen to be gendered. The chapter investigates the attitudes of farmers, butchers and slaughtermen towards live animals and the carcasses they become, to see if sexualization and gendering are present.

Patriarchal and anthroparchal violences vary in the forms they assume. For women, patriarchal violence may often involve non-physical acts (e.g. threats), as well as the possibility of physical violence (e.g. battery). Violence can also be present discursively, as a symbolic regime of representation which may or may not attach to specific practices of physical violence. Thus in the previous two chapters, I suggested violence may be conceptualized as a set of ideas incorporating relations of power which can be seen in forms of representation, although physical violence itself may not be involved in the material production of that representation. For example, a rape fantasy story in a pornographic magazine is suggestive of violence, but physical violence is not necessarily involved in the writing of an article. This chapter however, focuses on the material expression of physical violence, for as I suggested in Chapter 1, for animals in a human dominated society, violences are more likely to assume physical forms and intense degrees (1). Violence against animals in the production of meat could involve rape (forced sex for reproductive control), caging, castration, tethering or other physical restraint, battery, and killing. In addition, the production of meat may also involve the discursive symbolization of violence.

The methods employed in research for this chapter include: interviews, observation, discourse analysis of texts, and literature obtained from the meat trade, the meat inspectorate and pressure groups for animal welfare. Analysis was undertaken of texts produced by the meat industry (journals, reports, regulations, newspapers, magazines) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) (legislation, government regulations, circulars). A pornographic novel focusing on butchering was also analyzed as a potential illustration of possible sexualization, gendering and natured of this employment in popular culture. Animal welfare pressure groups provided information on farming and slaughter, giving a different perspective to literature provided by the central and local state and the meat industry. Such groups provided information that was often

corroborated by the empirical observation undertaken on farms and in abattoirs, or by information provided by sources within the meat industry itself. Interviews were carried out with local authority meat inspectors, butchers, meat cutters and packers, slaughterhouse staff, farmers, farm animal breeders, and company representatives of firms making agricultural products and equipment. Conversations and/or correspondence was undertaken with representatives of animal welfare pressure groups and the Meat and Livestock Commission (MLC). Observation of slaughter and butchering was carried out at abattoirs and cutting plants in the Borough of Havering (Essex). The material obtained constituted as representative a sample as I feel was possible, covering the key aspects (slaughter, butchering, farming) of the industry, and differing perspectives on them

This research is not an exhaustive account, and I would suggest that it is an account of best practices within the industry. The farms I visited and farmers I interviewed were mostly beef and dairy farmers. Most dairy farming remains free-range in Britain (CIWF, 1991), but all the farmers I interviewed allowed their animals to graze, and fed them a predominantly vegetarian diet (with the exception of 'fish meal'). I declined the opportunity to visit an intensive pig farm, but according to animal welfare pressure groups (Tyler, 1992) these involve some of the worst practice in animal farming. I observed the slaughter of cattle and sheep, but not of pigs or birds. Some may feel the picture of violence against meat animals painted by this account is extreme, but I feel it is more likely to be benign in terms of its possible inaccuracies. The levels of violence described here are regarded as typical and normative by those working in the industry who also endorse the claims of animal rights pressure groups that slaughter of pigs and birds exemplifies some of the worst practice in the industry. This was indicated for example, by the comments of one manager of an abattoir which 'processed' cattle, sheep and goats:

'Have you seen chickens yet? (EC. 'No.'). Well don't. It's dreadful – hardly any of 'em are ever stunned right, noise is unbelievable. (EC. 'The noise?'). Well chickens is fucking stupid in't they, but they know what's comin' up an' they screech, 'undreds of the fuckers screamin'.....Very grim wiv pigs and what wiv all the noise (the pigs 'screamin'), on top of that, the things keep 'avin' 'art attacks, strokes an' all that. (EC. 'Why, 'cause they're so overweight at slaughterpoint?') Yeah, all muscle and fat innit? That's whatcha want – big fat fuckers that can 'ardly breathe (laughs).' (interview, Jan. 1992) (2)

In analyzing the slaughter of pigs and chickens, I have relied on accounts provided by animal welfare groups that were largely corroborated by comments from those working in the industry, and also by MAFF appointed bodies which do not reflect an animal rights perspective such as the FAWC (Farm Animal Welfare Council). I am confident that my observations were of best practice, for in the abattoirs I visited, my access was facilitated by a Local Authority Meat Inspector, who admitted that what I observed was more considerate and careful work than would be the case on a daily basis (interview, Havering DC, Jan. 1992). This inspector for example, confirmed the claims of animal rights activists (e.g. CIWF, 1989) that the proper stunning, shackling and 'sticking' (slitting the throat) of animals is rare. He suggested throughput doubled when inspectors are absent,

and that legal restrictions on the numbers slaughtered per day, which are in place to secure some level of animal welfare by slowing the pace of the slaughter line, are broken as a matter of routine:

‘there shouldn’t be that number of animals in the lairage. They’ll do thirty nice and slow whilst we’re here then whack another thirty through when we’ve gone’ (Senior E.H.O.(Environmental Health Officer), Havering, Jan 1992).

I do not regard this reliance on best practice as necessarily problematic, for I felt that if the examples of best practice which were observed in this research could be seen to be oppressive for animals, then this was actually of more significance for the argument being developed.

This chapter is divided into three sections, based on each stage of the meat production process: slaughter, butchering and farming. Each of these three aspects of meat production do not necessarily involve the deployment of all seven discourses, but it will be contended that taken as a whole, meat production involves all these discourses in gendered and natured form, and that meat production is shaped by patriarchal as well as anthroparchal systems of oppression.

SLAUGHTER

This section examines the slaughter of ‘meat’ animals, and suggests the material in this section illustrates the deployment of all but one (ownership) of our seven discourses. The overwhelming majority of the animals killed for food in Britain are killed in slaughterhouses/abattoirs. There are approximately 900 of these in the UK, 90% of which are in private hands, the remainder being controlled by local authorities (interview, specialist advisor in Environmental Health, LB Hackney, Oct. 1991). The number of slaughterhouses has halved in the last decade as small operations have disappeared. Before 1992, only 93 of all UK slaughterhouses were export-approved (CIWF, 1989, p.1), although after 1995, all had to comply with EC standards (interview, Senior EHO, Havering DC, Jan. 1992). The impact of EU standardization has a limited impact on the key concerns of this research however. Such standardization has little (if any) effect upon issues of animal welfare, the main concern of EU regulations and directives are concerned to eliminate bad practice in the area of food hygiene (MAFF, Jul. 1991 (a)). The number of animals slaughtered per year in Britain is approximately: 3,343,000 cattle (this may have dropped since the export ban in 1996 due to EU concern re BSE infected beef); 35,000 calves; 15,780,000 pigs; 17,105,000 sheep; and over one million birds are estimated to be slaughtered daily (CIWF, 1988).

Objectification

Animals are treated as objects throughout their artificially short lives as suggested by the final section of this chapter which examines farming. This objectification is accentuated however, just

prior to slaughter, and the transport of animals from farm to slaughterhouse provides an example of the deployment of discourses of natured objectification. Pigs, sheep, cattle and goats are branded with paint to indicate they are 'ready' for slaughter, and collected from a number of farms, driven into vans with slaps, metal sheets and electric goads (Tyler, 1990). According to legislation governing the welfare of animals (the Slaughterhouses Act, 1974; the Slaughter of Animals (Humane Conditions) Regulations, 1990), animals during transportation should not be 'hit, prod(ed) or handle(d)' in any way that may cause 'unnecessary' (not defined) pain or distress (Reg.13 (1) (a)). Animal rights activist Tyler (1990), claimed that in his research he witnessed the routine use of electric goads and the hitting of animals. Whilst I did not observe animals in transport, I saw them hit by hand and electric goads used to hurry animals or amuse slaughtermen, within the abattoirs themselves (observation, Romford, Jan. and Feb. 1992).

Whilst it will be seen later that slaughter legislation deploys the discourse of natured objectification in constructing meat, it does not construct animals as objects prior to their deaths, but represents animals as sentient creatures which can be caused pain, fear and distress (eg.1990, Reg. 5; 1990, Reg. 21(d)). This perspective is unlikely to prevail amongst those working in the slaughter industry however, who tend to see the animals as objects requiring the quickest possible processing (conversations, Knights abattoir, Havering, Jan. 1992). Chickens are caught by 'gangs' working tight schedules, and according to animal welfare groups, are frightened by their hurried and rough 'collection' (RSPCA, 1988, p.6). Despite government directives (MAFF, 1988; MAFF, Jul, 1991, State Veterinary Service, Jun. 1989), animals are transported in conditions of extreme discomfort for long periods (CIWF, 1989) which increase as local slaughterhouses decline (interview, EHO, LB Hackney, Oct. 1991). Animals are tightly packed, and subject to overheating, suffocation and crushing. Sheep particularly, are considered by meat inspectors to be easily alarmed, and heart attacks resulting in death or paralysis are common (interview, Senior EHO, Havering, Jan. 1990). Animals arriving 'moribund' are sent to the knackers yard, those already dead are thrown in pet food bins. Either way, a low price is paid per animal if it is not killed in the usual manner in the slaughterhouse, and farmers have a vested interest in getting as many as possible of the animals who can 'still walk', to slaughter (interview, EHO, Hackney, Dec. 1991). Farm animals are routinely objectified as potential meat, but the closer they come to being meat it would seem, the stronger the tendency towards their natured objectification as an animal Other.

The gendering of the natured Other

In slaughter, animals are anthroparchally defined objects of subordination, Others, selected for mass killing on discriminatory grounds of species membership. I would suggest the construction of animals as Other may also be gendered. All animals, regardless of sex, are feminized metaphorically by slaughterhouse staff in terms of the use of gendered terms of abuse for wimmin

which are applied to animals (cunt, slag, bitch, dosy cow - even if the animal is a sheep! etc., observation, Havering, Jan. and Feb. 1992). The animals are overwhelmingly seen by slaughtermen as stupid, difficult, and stubborn (conversations, Romford, Jan. 1992), and physical violence toward them is usually sexualized, electric goads commonly applied to the genitals (observation, Romford, Jan. 1992). Feminized animals seem expected to adopt appropriately submissive behaviour, and may be beaten and shouted at should they not co-operate in their own deaths.

Those most likely to be injured in transit are previously breeding females (conversation, meat inspector, Havering D.C. Jan. 1992). For example, battery hens have fragile bones likely to crack under the stress of travel (RSPCA, 1988). These female animals suffer the most extreme cruelties, for damage resultant from continuous reproduction is already intense. Tyler found gruesome stories of the treatment of such animals, as illustrated by the following examples:

'a farmer who had dragged his cow, 'its insides literally hanging out from a bad birth', to slaughter by hooking a hangman's noose round her neck and tying the other end to a tractor. 'He had literally peeled the skin from the base of its neck up behind the ears'...an animal (sow) whose 'entrails were hanging out of its backside' when she was delivered one morning on the truck. 'It couldn't walk to the slaughter area, it was in so much pain...it was falling down and screaming. In the end, it lay down, it couldn't move. And we said, 'no way mate' and got the gun and shot it" (Tyler, 1990, p.4)

The claims and results of observational research undertaken by animal welfare groups regarding the ill-health of the 'older' breeder animals and their often appalling treatment is corroborated by leading figures working within the meat industry. Blamire, (then) Vice President of the Association of Meat Inspectors, writing in the association's journal demonstrates collective guilt: 'you all know the state of some animals arriving at the slaughterhouse' (in Comrie, *The Meat Hygienist* (TMH) Jun. 1987 p.2). This suggests the above examples are likely to be common rather than exceptional and extreme cases. Thus although there is a continuum of violence with which the animals are treated (all experience overcrowding, overheating and fear in transit), the most extreme violence is likely to be experienced by the most heavily feminized animals - breeding females.

The natured Other and the control of the wild

In Chapter 5, I contended that the eating and cooking of 'game' was considered to be gendered and sexualized in a certain way, as 'exotic' food. I suggested that eating wild animals could be seen as a particular symbol of human domination over animals and 'nature'. In seeking to control the 'wild' by consuming it, there may be particular cruelties towards certain animals. The overwhelming majority of the animals eaten in Britain are domesticated, already anthroparchally owned and commodified as 'livestock'. As such, it is usual for cattle, pigs, sheep and goats to have little fear of humans. Wild animals rarely suffer some of the anthroparchal violences which may be associated with farming, but some do encounter violences in slaughter. The two examples below

are both wild animals whose flesh is gendered and sexualized in popular food culture. In the case of deer, they are seen even by those in the industry as experiencing particularly cruel deaths in slaughterhouses due to the fact they are frightened of the presence of humans. In the case of fish, it tends to be animal rights activists alone who see their culling as cruel, and particularly so as these animals are seen as so insignificant, they are usually not afforded the 'privilege' of a quick death.

Deer are not covered by statute as mass consumption of their flesh is recent (Devon Group of Chief EHO's, n.d.). The latest FAWC Report was concerned there is no veterinary supervision of deer killing (Feb. 1990 p.3), although deer meat has been covered by statute since 1966 (Devon Group, n.d. p.2), suggesting meat is an object of care, but not animals. Deer are highly sensitive, and even some specialists in meat inspection, who are usually antagonistic to an animal rights perspective, feel these animals require specific consideration in slaughter as: 'it is completely inappropriate to send them through an abattoir' (interview, Hackney E.H.O. Dec. 1991). The FAWC recommended deer be killed by being shot by marksmen, which supermarkets oppose arguing it inflates price. Thus these timid creatures, who are afraid of humans, are captured, transported and abused in slaughter similarly to domestic animals. The meat industry must already adopt certain practices in order to kill these animals, such segregating animals by sex and herd, and slowing the slaughter line to minimize noise; but despite such concessions, deer are likely to experience far high levels of 'distress and fear' than other animals (interview, EHO, Hackney, Dec. 1991). I would suggest both the difficulties (and consequent expense) attending slaughter of deer, and the animal's distress may play a part in the construction of deer meat as exotic.

Ocean fish are caught by a variety of methods, some of which degrade the marine environment (Clover, 1991, p.42). Fish out of water take minutes to die by suffocation, and vertebrate physiologists claim they experience a burning sensation (Campaign for the Abolition of Angling, n.d.). The Medway (Cranbrook) Report (RSPCA, 1981) concluded there is evidence fish suffer pain, thus there are likely to be significant cruelties involved in killing fish, who have no welfare rights under law. I suggested earlier in this chapter that whilst animals may be objectified in their treatment prior to slaughter, they are not fully objectified in legal texts until they are dead. This is not so in the case of fish, which are legally defined as a commodity. The term 'fishing' itself can be seen to imply this. When cattle are slaughtered, this is not referred to as 'cattling' but slaughter. When fish are killed, it is as if they are gathered rather than killed by suffocation. Fish are part of a marine world over which humans seek to establish anthroparchal control, and oceans are divided up by world governments as resource pools. In this instance, it is the ocean, not fish as animals, that is feminized and dominated.

The killing of wild animals can be seen as the elimination of an exotic natured Other that is outside complete anthroparchal control. Wildness is a gap, increasingly small, in the totalizing

domination of 'nature' and 'wild' animals are increasingly controlled via anthroparchal domestication via farming, extinction (culling, destroying habitat) or hunting. The slaughter of deer and fish can illustrate particular kinds of cruelties against animals when humans exercise domination over animals that have remained to some degree outside the anthroparchal manipulation of animals daily lives.

The gendering of human dominance: the machismo of the Subject

The anthroparchally and patriarchally defined victim of violence in the meat industry, can be seen as the gendered and natured Other - feminized animals killed for human food. Human killers of such animals are also themselves gendered, being overwhelmingly male and highly masculinized. The meat industry can be seen to be patriarchal in terms of both the gender segregation of employment and the masculinization of its work culture.

The staffing of slaughterhouses is exclusively male, bar a single secretary and joint receptionist who may be present in some but not all businesses. Local authorities advertise for slaughtermen, rather than slaughterpeople (interview, lecturer, Smithfield Market, Feb. 1992). According to those who teach the skill, it takes a 'certain kind of person' to slaughter, who has 'a light regard for human life', a 'disregard for the lives of animals' and has 'got to be callous' (interview, lecturer, Smithfield Market, Feb. 1992). Slaughterhouses operate piece-rate systems paying staff by output (animals killed), encouraging time saving measures which contribute to animal suffering. Sheep, goats and pigs are inadequately stunned as electric tongs are often applied for less than half the proscribed time (RSPCA, 1988; CIWF, 1989; Tyler, 1990; observation, Jan. 1992). Aggressive language is used to urge fellow workers to quicken pace, and animals are treated more aggressively, hurried with goads and sticks, due to necessity for speed (observation, Jan. 1992).

Where women are present within slaughter and butchery other than as secretarial assistants, they are segregated in particular areas: in lightweight meat packing, or as local government EHO's in quality control and hygiene (observation, Jan. and Feb. 1992). Smithfield, the largest meat market in Britain is even described by men who work there as 'a bastion of male dominance' (interview, lecturer, Smithfield Market, Feb. 1992). Slaughtering and cutting at Smithfield is carried out by men, with a few wimmin present as office staff and buyers for catering firms. The market is run by a number of families according to 'labour laws of the 1930s' and no womun has ever been a partner (interview, lecturer, Smithfield Market, Feb. 1992). Constraints on wimmin's participation in the industry are not solely based on male networking and nepotism but on the heavily masculinized employment culture also. A womun slaughterer would be expected to have masculine attributes, and may be treated with hostility from male peers:

'I've trained a great many people to slaughter, but in all the years I've done it, I've only taught one woman. She really was very good, strong as an ox and hard as nails. Not much like a woman at all. Only lasted six months, she couldn't take any more. She must have felt ostracized. It's a hard job, the people match it.' (interview, lecturer, Smithfield Market, Feb. 1992)

Those within the industry bemoan a decline in the calibre of slaughtermen (TMH, Dec. 1987, no.56, p.6). Some blame the decline of the abattoir as a family business, and see this as the means of exclusion of female labour. For example, the manager and owner of a family run slaughterhouse claimed that the expanded scale and output of slaughterhouses in the twentieth century excluded wimmin who were not suited to increasingly heavy labour (interview, Romford, Jan. 1992). 'Family businesses' for this interviewee were idealized patriarchal structures with a strongly gendered division of labour, and no differences were apparent in the slaughterhouses I visited, whether family run or not (observation and interviews, Havering, Jan and Feb 1992). Like most all-male work environments, wimmin are referred to in a sexist manner ('You'll need your 3D glasses to see today's Page 3', Romford, Jan. 1992), and office calendars provide excuse for pornography.

Tyler (1990, 1991) had advantages undertaking his research into the meat industry. A woman in a slaughterhouse is very much 'matter out of place', but being a man, Tyler was able to talk at length with slaughtermen. He found their behaviour highly aggressive. According to those he spoke to, fights amongst them are common, and humiliation a form of recreation. In examples of such 'playfighting' the slaughtermen recounted, on one occasion a worker was dumped in a tank of water, hoisted fifteen feet in the air with power hoses trained on him, on another a man was penned in a cow crush, stripped, and dowsed in water whilst being prodded with electric tongs (1990, p.2). According to these men, 'amusing' incidents such as this are part of their enjoyment of the job, and it could be suggested that this aggressive treatment of each other may be in some way related to their often brutal and/or sexualized treatment of the animals. In both cases, I feel such behaviour can be seen as an expression of machismo. This sense of the work confirming masculinity is expressed by the slaughtermen themselves, as may be illustrated by the following examples:

"blokes working together and they're working fast and hard and you think 'Christ, I'd like to have a go at that because they all look so hard, like they can definately look after themselves. And they can because its a very, very tough job'...he would take his trick items along to the pub...an animals eyeballs or its penis. 'What seems to get into peoples heads', he says, 'is like I'd better watch him. He might start carving me up, because if he can open up a pig and rip the guts out of that, what's he going to do to me.'" (Tyler, 1990, p.2)

'In the past, being a slaughterman was like being in a family business, like being a dustman. Now people get into it 'cause its macho like. It appeals to young men 'cause of the macho-thing. It's a really manly job.' (abattoir owner, Romford, Jan. 1992)

Most slaughtermen have a muscular physique, which they are keen to reveal via sleeveless T-shirts. Some may dispense with the T-shirt, even in winter. They are all covered with blood, not

just on hands and arms, but splattered over clothing, faces, hair and eyelashes. Most carry scabbards of knives. Slaughtering animals is hard labour which requires strength particularly with pigs, themselves strong, and cattle due to their size and weight. Tattoos abound, the most popular seeming to be the Grim Reaper, along with depictions of naked wimmin (observation, Jan. 1992).

Animals are killed by men who are, I would suggest, caricatures of masculinity. Seeing how slaughtermen treat one another it is perhaps unsurprising they tend to abuse the animals they kill, both verbally and often physically, with what appears to be impunity. Some may regard these men as somehow monstrous, but they are simply rather ordinary working class men who are badly paid for doing dirty work. If they appear to enjoy such work, I feel it is likely to be because they see killing animals as a means of enhancing their machismo. Thus I would suggest that the slaughter industry can be seen to be patriarchal in terms of a highly dichotomous gendered division of labour, and a heavily masculinized culture of employment.

Violence

Physical violence permeates the processes of slaughter, and as suggested so far in this chapter, animals are regularly treated in an aggressive manner, for example they are shouted at, beaten with sticks and poles, prodded with goads which give them mild electric shocks. Such behaviour is routine, but is considered bad practice by the meat inspectorate (interview, Havering, Feb. 1992). The most obvious violences in meat production however, are endemic to the process, inevitable practice rather than possibly 'good' or 'bad': the stunning and killing ('sticking') of animals.

Cattle and calves are stunned by a captive bolt pistol administering a bullet which penetrates the brain (CIWF 1989 p.2). This is effective if used correctly, but often it is not (interview, EHO Hackney, Oct. 1991). If the animal moves its head, or the bolt is placed incorrectly, a second shot is used (observation, Romford, Jan. 1992). Cattle are inquisitive, and although they try and stick together, bundling up the ramp to the stunning pen, most enter quite willingly; surprisingly trusting of the men who shout at and goad them. I observed for example that they frequently nuzzle the arm of the stunner before he slams the pistol down on their forehead (3). This research found no compassion in the slaughtermen, but Tyler caught a glimpse:

'For the Hampshire man, it's young goats. 'They cry just like babies', for a veteran blood and guts disposal man...it is carrying three day old calves to the shooting box.' (Tyler, 1990, p.2)

Local authority inspectors often do not like to see the animals whose carcasses they inspect, killed: 'I can't watch them, I usually wait in the car 'till it's over' (Chief Meat Inspector, Havering DC Jan. 1992). Even a veteran meat inspector who at first had contended that 'none of it (slaughter)

ever bothers me', did concede that he 'can't be in the knackers yard when its horses, its the clattering of their hooves as they fall' (interview, EHO, Havering DC, Jan. 1992). Thus even people closely involved with killing, occasionally attempt to distance themselves from it out of a concern that they might have some form of emotive response to what should be a routine procedure.

Pigs, sheep and goats are stunned by electrical tongs that should be held to the side of the head for at least seven seconds to induce insensibility. The tongs are regularly only applied for a few seconds, to immobilize the animal (observation, Jan. 1992) which, according to both animal welfare groups, and the MAFF State Veterinary Service remains sensitive to pain (CIWF, 1989, p.2; 1989, p.50, re: 1990 Reg.14(b), 16 (1)(c)). This is conceded by Official Veterinarians who work in the industry: 'In some cases, the animal may not have been properly stunned, being only paralyzed and so be able to feel pain, or even recover full consciousness' (Jones, R.A., TMH, Jun. 1987 p.12). Some bulls and most horses are instantaneously stunned and killed by a bullet from a pistol held against the forehead. This is because horses become highly agitated at the slaughterhouse or knackers yard, and a mature bull is usually too large for, or unwilling to enter, a stunning pen (conversation, EHO's, Havering, Feb. 1992). The inadequacies of stunning techniques, recognized by EHO's and slaughtermen (Romford, Jan. 1992), means that in fairly significant numbers, goats, sheep and pigs may be killed whilst conscious. Pigs, for example, may reach the scalding tank alive and conscious and die from drowning (Tyler, 1990, p.4), despite having had an electric shock and their throat slit.

Birds die incredibly violent deaths in terms of the likelihood that they may die conscious. Animal welfare groups claim, and those working within the slaughter industry acknowledge, that birds often rise in the shackles by which they are confined supposedly head downwards, 'flying' over the electrified water bath and thus reaching the knife fully conscious (CIWF, 1989, p.8; interview, Romford, Jan. 1992). From the stunner, birds travel to an automatic knife where their neck is 'guided' across a revolving blade. Should the knife fail (cutting off the top of a small birds head, for example), there is (or should be but sometimes is not, RSPCA, 1988) manual back-up, but the MAFF appointed FAWC estimated 15% of birds reach the scalding tank alive (FAWC Report Jan. 1982, para. 52). Although birds could be instantaneously stunned and killed, abattoirs resist changing methods to keep production costs low (*Meat Industry* Jul. 1986).

The correct techniques for handling, stunning and sticking, are outlined in legislation and MAFF directives (1991a, 1991b, 1991c), which are broken as a matter of course due to concern with speed (observation, Jan. 1992). Whilst violences can be seen in all areas of animals lives, slaughter is their most violent experience. Inadequacy of stunning does not account for this violence, but renders an animal's ordeal more dreadful.

Every year 40 million male chicks are hatched which are of no use to the egg or meat industries, as they are genetically unsuitable for meat production. They are either gassed, placed in sacks and suffocated, or drowned in overcrowded nets or cages. The least cruel method, according to animal welfare groups is 'mechanical homogenization', where chicks are fed into a mill and mashed to pulp (CIWF, 1988, p.9). Chicken meat can only come from females, but it is unlikely the life of the average chicken weighs favorably on the side of the female, allowed to live between seven weeks and two years. Animals only live if they can be commodified, a process which can be seen as gendered. The slaughter of day old chicks is key to the chicken and egg industries, and is clearly gendered and natured. Pullets lead short and miserable lives (as discussed in the final section of this chapter) because their gender enables them to become meat.

Animals that are killed to become meat are subjected to a variety of forms of physical violence throughout their artificially shortened lives, but I feel there is little doubt that their slaughter is likely to be the most violent. The mass slaughter of certain non-human animals for food is a means of anthroparchal distinction. Certain animals are bred, through means of human manipulation, for killing as food. The violence of their killing is not only natured, but also gendered in a number of ways. As will be seen from the final section of this chapter, the animals killed in the slaughterhouse are disproportionately female. As suggested by the description of the slaughter process above, many of the animals are feminized by their treatment in the abattoir prior to slaughter by the language used by the slaughtermen who are themselves strongly masculinized. I think there is a case to be made for the violence of mass killing of animals as food to be seen as a process in which discourses of gendered power relations and gendered violence are deployed.

Sexualized consumption

The actual killing of cattle, sheep, pigs and goats is via the slitting of the animals throat, followed by a process known as 'sticking' wherein a large knife is 'stuck' with some force down into the animal's chest cavity in order to ensure fast blood loss through the main arteries. This process is almost by definition, infused with violence, but I would suggest it can also be seen as involving the deployment of gendered and natured discourses of sexualized consumption, as in this act, men appear to enhance their machismo through sexualized violence upon the bodies of passive (hopefully stunned), most often feminine and feminized animals.

After stunning, larger animals (i.e. not birds) are shackled by chains by the hind leg to a conveyer, eyes rolling and free back leg kicking (if cattle or sheep), front legs 'paddling' (appearing to be running (away?), if pigs) and moved to the bleeding area. The animals throats are slit and the 'boning' knife 'stuck' into the chest cavity. Although this is intended to induce full brain death, 'experts', including MAFF scientific researchers are uncertain when consciousness is

lost (conversation, EHO's, Romford, Jan. 1992). Slitting and sticking are the crux of slaughter - the point animals die. Amongst slaughtermen themselves, two jobs command respect: the removal of the hides, requiring skill, and sticking (conversation, Senior EHO, Havering, Jan. 1992). The latter, I would suggest, commands respect because it requires the clearest expression of machismo, and certainly Tyler's conversations with slaughtermen confirmed that this aspect of their work was considered to be the most 'manly' (Tyler, 1990). Sticking could be seen to be sexualized practically and metaphorically. In sexual slang for example, 'boning' is one of the derisory terms for heterosex. Like others (fucking, screwing) it implies dualism: those who fuck and those who are fucked. I would suggest that in the heavily macho act of sticking, the feminized stunned animal can be seen as a passive victim of male violence, feminized. The slaughterman is expressing in physical form a combination of the acts which patriarchal culture associates with machismo - he fucks and kills simultaneously. In the numerate animals I observed being killed, the 'boning' knife was used with relish and thrust into the animal with a necessary force (to ensure blood letting) so that the man who 'sticks' is splattered with most blood, proof perhaps of his superior status.

This sexualization does not exist at the level of metaphor alone, amongst slaughtermen themselves, sticking is heavily sexualized - they think what they do is sexy. In the discourse of the abattoir, the person who 'sticks' is surrounded by innuendo, and the task described with heavy sexual connotation (conversations, abattoirs, Romford, Jan. 1992). I feel there is a case to be made that the actual killing of animals, sticking, is a process which deploys the discourses of gendered sexualized consumption. The natured Other, the stunned and shackled animal, is a passive 'recipient' of a violent act which is heavily gendered and sexualized, both as a process which is observed, and in the construction of the identity of those men who carry it out.

Fragmentation

There are two aspects in which discourses of gendered and natured fragmentation may be suggested in the slaughter process: fragmentation of the animals' experience; and the physical fragmentation of animal bodies.

Abattoirs are highly compartmentalized, with different activities confined to different buildings, rooms or areas. When animals arrive, they are put in the lairage - fields outside, a separate building, or area distanced from the killing floor - where they are kept for most of the day, or overnight, often without adequate food or water (interview, Havering DC, Jan. 1992). Above the sounds of animals, can be heard clanking chains used to shackle them, the wail of the electric saw which will decapitate and cut larger animals in half, the hiss of power hoses, the bang of the captive bolt as it penetrates skulls. In theory, animals are kept unaware of their fate: 'blood and refuse (should be) removed...(so) animals awaiting slaughter cannot see or smell such blood or refuse.' (Statutory

Instruments 1990, No.1242, p.4). However, animals appear highly aware of the strange atmosphere and exhibit unease in the lairage (observation, Havering, 1992), and according to vets working alongside the industry, are fearful of separation from one another (Jones, TMH Jun. 1987, p.12). They are segregated by species, cattle laired separately and slaughtered first, then sheep and goats, then pigs. Birds are slaughtered in separate abattoirs, different species on different days (conversation, Chief E.H.O., Havering, Jan, 1992). Thus it can be suggested that the structure and operation of abattoirs is designed to fragment the animals experience prior to literal fragmentation.

The naming of the dismemberment of the dead animal's body, 'dressing', is an example of reversal, as the dead animal is not dressed but peeled then fragmented. Skin is peeled with a knife, or an animal plucked of feathers, or dumped in boiling water and scrapped free of bristles. Pigs have toenails struck out, cattle have heads and lower legs sawn off and are split down the sternum. All large animals are hoisted on chains and gutted (observation, Havering, Jan 1992). Guts are used for tripe and sausage 'casings', (interview, Hackney E.H.O. Dec. 1991), stomachs split, emptied, and sent to produce rennet (to harden some cheeses), or lard. Remaining parts are thrown into petfood bins, those unfit for petfood 'stained' and disposed of. Internal organs of certain birds are removed, packaged, and returned to the cavity. Consumers are seen by those working in the industry to be likely to object to gutting the animal, but willing to use guts for cooking (interview, Havering 1992), although such practice has lessened (interview, butcher, Feb. 1992). Thus cooks incur less gore, and are able to increase the distance between themselves and dead animals.

Slaughterhouse workers relate to dead animals as meat and live animals as potential meat; and the labour of fragmentation can be seen to provide expression and proof of machismo. Frenzied activity takes place in a restricted space - one can see cattle entering the stunning box or sheep coming down the run toward the stunning pens simultaneously with a carcass being sawn in two, or dead sheep with skins attached to their spine (observation, Romford, Jan. 1992). Industrial fragmentation is perhaps clearest on the killing floor of a slaughterhouse, and the disassembly of animals is objectified to the extent it is considered a macho, not a horrific process.

Deception and scientific rationality

Such fragmentation only appears orderly when clinically described by MAFF documents or those produced by the meat inspectorate. The texts of legislation, Ministerial circulars and regulations, and documents produced by the Official Veterinary Service, can be seen to deploy a discourse of natured deception through use of the language of scientific rationality which tends to obscure the reality of that which it describes. This may be illustrated by the following example, taken from MAFF regulations on 'dressing' (disassembling) the carcass:

'(i)...by the removal of the tonsils, the hide or skin, the head (save where the retention of the ears on the carcasses of bovine animals is necessary for any certification purpose removal may be delayed until completion of that certification), the viscera (save that the lungs, the heart, the liver, the spleen, the mediastinum and the kidneys may remain attached to the carcass by their natural connections), the genital organs...the urinary bladder, the feet up to the carpal and tarsal joints, and, in the case of animals that have given birth or are in advanced pregnancy, the udder.' (*Statutory Instruments* 1991, No. 984)

This account obscures the violence of killing and dismemberment via fixation on detail which tells us only of parts of an animal, the processes via which an animal is dismembered are omitted. We are informed carcasses have feet removed 'up to the carpal and tarsal joints', but not that feet are 'removed' by hacking with cleavers and saws. We are not informed what happens to the offspring of animals in advanced pregnancy, which remain alive for a short time in the body of their dead mother. In this language of dissociation, which characterizes the legal descriptions of stunning and sticking as well as 'dressing', the terror which may be experienced by the animals is largely absent, as is the violence of the treatment of the animals and of the acts of slaughter.

Slaughtermen themselves may find the procedures dull due to their extensive repetition, but they are aware, I would suggest, of the drama of machismo in which they engage, and this is often appealed to in escaping monotony. Meat professionals, such as the Official Veterinary Service and the meat inspectorate, do not engage in drama, but rational procedure. This technical language is a means, I would suggest, of distancing inspectors from killing and dismemberment. Thus EHO's do not inspect the bodies of dead animals, but of standard units of 'parity' established by MAFF, for example: '1 bovine, horse or deer, 0.33 swine and 0.15 sheep or goat will be equivalent to one livestock unit' (MAFF Newsletter, no.4). Animals in this discourse of anthroparchal deception become irrelevant, and are replaced by a numerical category.

Fetish

In slaughter, the deployment of natured fetishism can be seen in the fixation on certain procedures which can involve repetitive and elaborate rituals. Two examples of fetishized rituals relating to the slaughter process can be seen in those surrounding the inspection of carcasses for disease, and in religious slaughter.

In the case of inspection, fixation on detail obscures what is happening - looking at parts of animals recently killed. Inspection is repetitive, clinical and distancing. The head and pluck (heart, lungs, spleen, windpipe), are placed on what is euphemistically known as a chandelier, a pyramidal series of iron rings attached by chains. Inspection involves copious legislation and directives (e.g. MAFF, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1991d) which are routinely ignored (interviews, Havering, Jan. 1992). Once inspection is complete, parts of the animal for human consumption are stamped with a

label that declares them 'fit' (interview, Hackney EHD, Dec. 1991). The avoidance of diseased meat is a fetish of the local state, although, strange as it might appear, those diseases which currently part of public debate around food hygiene, BSE, scrapie and salmonella, are absent from regulations (due to cost, for they require microscopic inspection). This form of fetishism can be seen to be natured, for in the rituals of meat inspection, the animals are absent referents. Their lives and deaths are recalled by the process of close examination of parts of dismembered bodies hung together, but the lives of these once sentient beings is also denied, for inspectors check objects which have become potential food, in order that they be safely consumed.

Islamic and Judaic slaughter regulations involve exemptions from stunning, allowing animals' throats to be slit whilst they are fully conscious. It is often contended that critique of religious slaughter should be avoided least it be construed by Muslim and Jewish communities as racist (Carlton and Kaye, 1985, p.24). Such slaughter however, I would suggest, is a case of anthroparchal oppression, not a matter for religious toleration. Cattle are placed in a 'Weinberg pen', a metal crate which revolves until the animal is upside down, the slaughterman then pinning its head to the floor with his foot (RSPCA, 1988. p.10), causing animals 'considerable terror' (interview, chief technical officer, Humane Slaughter Association, Nov. 1994). Sheep and goats are placed on their backs in a metal 'cradle' before their throats are cut; birds simply held head downwards. The time lag from the moment the throat is cut to loss of consciousness, is between seventeen seconds and two minutes; wherein the animal is not free from pain and can have considerable awareness (CIWF, 1989, p.15). Ritual slaughter is a also patriarchal obsession based on blood taboo. Animals should be conscious when its throats are cut to maximize bleed out - Moslems and Jews being forbidden to consume meat with high blood content. However, efficiency of bleeding is the same whether an animal is conscious, unconscious or dead (Jones, in Comrie, Jun. 1987 p.13). Patriarchal religion damns animals as mere matter and tabooed polluter, ensuring through ritual practices deploying the discourse of natured fetishism, they die an even more painful death than they might.

I have suggested that the material on slaughter in this section involves the deployment of six of the seven discourses. In some cases, such discursive deployment should be seen to be an aspect of anthroparchal relations of power alone. For example, in the specific instance of slaughter, texts which operationalize a dissociating technical language can be seen to be deploying natured discourse which denies the oppressive experience of animals. Similarly, the deployment of discourses of fetishism can be seen as natured but not gendered. The other discourses however can largely be seen to be deployed in ways which are both gendered and natured.

Slaughter involves sexualized violence against objectified animals who become Others. These natured victims are also constructed as gendered Others within the slaughter process, and are

feminized at three levels. First, these animal Others are disproportionately physiologically female (see the final section of this chapter). Second, animals are metaphorically feminized by the language slaughterhouse staff direct towards them, whatever their physiological sex. Third, the animals which probably suffer most intensely in the slaughter process are those which are arguably most strongly gendered, female breeder animals. In addition, gendering constructs the Subject of the violence of slaughter, the slaughtermen themselves, who are both exclusively male, and heavily masculinized according to patriarchal ideas of machismo. Slaughter involves the most obvious forms of gendered and natured violence in meat production. Whether it is the pinnacle of a hierarchy of violences is debatable, certainly the violences of butchering operate symbolically rather than materially, as will be discussed in the section which follows. I have suggested that 'sticking' can be seen as a practice through which gendered and natured discourses of sexualized consumption can be seen to be deployed, as this process is sexualized and gendered both symbolically, and in the minds of those who carry it out. Finally, slaughterhouses deploy discourses of fragmentation in which the lived experience of the animals is fragmented, and the natured and gendered carcasses they become are physically fragmented.

BUTCHERING

Whilst slaughter is the process via which animals become absent from the proceedings (dead), butchering is the means by which they become meat. Butchery creates objects which deny their origin as parts of sentient animals, and I will suggest that this material on butchering can illustrate the possible deployment of five of the seven discourses: fragmentation, the Other, violence, sexualized consumption and objectification in either or both natured and gendered form.

In the recent past (and still today in rural areas), slaughter and butchery were closely linked. Pre 1945, butchers usually had a slaughter-room 'out back', and older men within the industry tend to see such 'old-fashioned' 'family' butchers as men of skill that form part of a romanticized past of the meat trade. Animals would be killed by being battered over the head with a 'pithing rod' - a hammer with a hook on the end (interview, slaughterhouse manager, Romford, Jan. 1992). A veteran EHO, describing himself as 'rather desensitized', asserted however that such practices were 'intensely cruel'; pithing rods were clumsily used, and animals could take an agonizing ten minutes to die (interview, Havering, Jan 1992). It is no longer the norm for butchers to slaughter animals whose bodies they fragment, and butchering has been de-skilled by mechanization. The division of carcasses into 'joints' remains important, but the industry is currently pre-occupied with 'added-value' in processed products which maximize profit, and are made largely by processing plants using 'mechanically reclaimed meat' (bone slurry, blood, back fat) that twenty years ago, would have been discarded (interview, butcher, Enfield, Jan, 1992). Whilst the obvious physical violences

of slaughter are now rarely the preserve of butchering, the section will argue that butchers recall violence against animals by hacking their dead bodies into pieces.

Fragmentation

In butchering, the discursive deployment of fragmentation can be seen to be both physical (of the carcase) and non-physical, involving the fragmentation of experience - not of the dead animal at this stage, but of the 'meat plant operative' due to the intensity of the division of labour, and the high levels of alienation that result.

Most butchering in Britain takes place in EU approved meat processing plants. Unlike abattoirs, such plants are bloodless, the washing of surfaces, clothing and hands a repetitive ritual (observation, Romford, Jan. 1992). Processing plants deal with imported carcasses as well as British, such as lambs and pigs from New Zealand, Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina. Butchers are increasingly referred to as 'line operatives' whose existence is considered to be 'dead-end' (interview, lecturer, Smithfield, Feb. 1992). Butchering is almost completely de-skilled ('monkeys could do the job'; interview, 'meat plant operative', Jun. 1991). Pay is poor in processing plants ('It's shit, for what you're expected to do'), and most staff come from agencies who 'can't get enough people to work there' (interview, meat plant operative, Nov. 1993). Division of labour is optimized: loading and unloading, packing and checking, all differentiated. 'Boxing' meat is considered by the operatives to be the worst task: 'It drives you mad. The 'freak show', that's what we call it, 'cause they all look like freaks when they come out!' (interview, meat plant operative, Nov. 1993). Workers who endure longest tend to be ex-butchers, who are paid a higher rate than agency workers, but dislike the work and undertake it of necessity (interview, Barnet, Jun. 1991).

The physical process of the fragmentation of the animals body involves carcasses being sawn up on a conveyer belt, one man taking coverings off the carcase, passing it through a hole in the wall to another who passes it across a saw which halves it. A third man will quarter the animal which will usually be divided up by those with some level of skill into 'joints', cuts, chops etc., ready for packing (interviews, Nov. and Dec. 1993). According to operatives, a carcase can be chopped, wrapped and boxed in twenty minutes. Operatives view this procedure as extremely dull, and have no particular feeling about cutting up dead animals ('We could be doing anything really, well, anything really boring!'; interview, Nov. 1993). The animal is the absent referent in the physical act of butchering. The physical presence of the carcase can be seen to recall the once live animal, but its construction as an object to be further disassembled, denies the possible oppression of animals in the slaughter process.

The human experience of the alienated labour of butchering in part reflects Braverman's (1974) model of the development of capitalism where labour is progressively de-skilled to reduce costs; but there is also evidence, I would suggest, of patriarchal closure in the gendering of this particular employment. Braverman assumes cheap unskilled labour is female with wimmin released from the household into paid employment by the movement of domestic tasks to the factory. However, there is no evidence wimmin have been 'freed' from domestic labour (Cowan, 1983), and de-skilling in butchering has not increased female labour for two reasons. First, butchering involves heavy manual labour, and patriarchal attitudes of employers may prevent wimmin undertaking such work, as may wimmin's apprehension that such work may be inappropriate for them. Second, the culture of butchering is imbued with machismo, discouraging female employees.

This research found that workers construct a highly sexualized and macho culture in the workplace both to overcome the tedium of repetitive disassembly, and because they see heavy manual labour involving dead animals as highly masculine. The masculinization of this employment culture is examined below, but as an illustration at this juncture, operatives claimed that there are certain 'perks' to working in meat packing. Some of these involved the camaraderie of an all male working environment where much thought was put into 'havin' a laff, like, cause it's so fuckin' borin'" (interviews, Nov. 1993). Other perks were more specific, and can also be seen to be gendered. One example involved the practice often adopted by packing companies of letting out their freezers for products other than meat in order to enhance profitability when demand for imported meat periodically falls (for example, a packing company may agree to stock 'Kodak' film at an exact 13 degrees centigrade, or allow the testing of cars in the low temperatures of the freezers). For workers at a company in Stratford, East London, one of their favourite stories is when 'girls came in from *Penthouse* and took their clothes off in the freezers' (interview, Dec. 1993). Female workers would be unlikely to enjoy such 'perks'. It can be suggested that butchering involves gendered and natured processes of fragmentation, in which objectified animal carcasses are physically fragmented by unskilled and alienated male labour. As we will see below, a gendered work culture imbued with machismo is the workers response to the boredom resulting from such a degree of de-skilling.

The machismo of the Subject - butchering as male labour

Butchering is overwhelmingly male employment. Wimmin have periodically entered the trade usually as wives assisting 'traditional' local butchers in their shops with some processing (e.g. making sausages, interview, butcher, Feb. 1992); but they are generally excluded from modern meat processing plants and male workers tend to see the work as unsuitable for wimmin:

'Without being sexist (!), they couldn't do the physical work. Well, I'm sure there are some girls who could do it, but y'know - it's very 'laddy'...Well, I mean they (male workers)

comment on women they've seen in passing, like, where they drank last night. where they'll drink together that night. They all drink together. Men only.' (interview, Dec. 1993)

Whilst wimmin could be seen as inappropriate for the heavy lifting jobs, it is other aspects of masculine culture that serve to exclude them from packing, boxing and checking. The usual forms of male group sexism could be observed outside the processing plant when the workers came into contact with wimmin such as bar workers ('Give 'er one'), but in their working day, male meat processors have little contact with wimmin except canteen staff and secretaries. They often brag together about sexual exploits and prowess with wimmin (interview, Dec. 1993), but unlike slaughtermen, workers in meat processing were not of the impression their work conferred desirable masculine status as far as attracting the opposite sex was concerned:

'A lot of the guys...are powerlifters an' that and look quite good...and did pull the birds...they used to tell the girls they were firemen.' (interview, Dec 1993)

Such men tend to be engaged in strenuous physical labour as opposed to checking, weighing and boxing, and claim to enjoy it. Certainly work is arduous. Most carcasses are frozen, and a sheep will weigh over eighty pounds. A container lorry may bring in 685 carcasses which require unloading within an hour and a half. The boxes of processed meat will be loaded onto the supermarket lorries in less time with only slightly less weight. Whilst labourers may not see this work as 'sexy' in terms of attracting wimmin, despite the physical strength and endurance required, they certainly sexualized their work amongst themselves. Like the slaughtermen, the meat packers interviewed for this research tended to be muscular in physique and highly masculine in appearance. The meat packers had a dichotomous conception of patriarchal gender roles which they felt were appropriate and felt an all male work environment which required heavy manual labour enhanced their own sense of masculine identity (interviews, Nov. and Dec. 1993). Thus animals are butchered by men who are highly masculinized, and the butchers have a strong tendency to both sexualize and feminize the animal Others, i.e. the carcasses, in their work.

Sexualized consumption

The sexualization of labour in butchering is strongly gendered and natured. Whilst sexualization of labour may be endemic to employment in patriarchal society, in the meat industry it can be seen to operate to a very high degree due to the specific work involved. Butchers work with 'products' (dead animals) which are selected on the basis of species membership, and are strongly gendered. In this context, workers have a tendency to relieve the monotony of their labour via gendered sexualization of animal carcasses. This sexualization may be seen as an expression of patriarchal machismo, as carcasses are feminized, similarly to animals awaiting slaughter. According to meat plant operatives for example, simulating sex with frozen sheep is a routine practice:

'You can do it best with a sheep...You can pick them up by putting your hand up their rib cage, or up their arse, basically, 'cause there's a big hole where their tail's bin cut off. There's lots of it, all the time y'know - sex with sheep...You might get a huge steak, they're chilled, not frozen, right, an' you might slap it about a bit...Well, slap it about someone's head, like, especially if we got a bag of steak that's full of blood, could squirt it on them. It looked like the inside of someone, something, y'nah? (EC: 'The inside of what?') Beef curtains (laughs).' (interview, Dec. 1993)

These kinds of practices take place daily ('all the time'), but are most frequent when everyone is 'chirpy', usually pay day. Sexualization can be seen as escapism for men engaged in low status work. Butchering is gendered and sexualized labour reflecting the cultural sexualization of meat and its producers. Butchering is obviously natured due to the work itself, transforming dead animals into food defined by anthroparchal distinction. It is also an extreme example of a gendered and sexualized form of production, and the symbolic construction of the gendering and sexualization of such labour, will be examined in some detail below.

The pornographic culture of butchering

Sexualization of meat eating has already been examined in Chapter 5, but I would suggest that the actual production of meat is also sometimes sexualized in texts of popular culture. An example of such a text which addresses a number of issues pertinent to this thesis is Alina Reyes pornographic novel *The Butcher* (1992), in which the young female narrator works in a butchers shop during her college vacation. The girl is attracted to her employer largely due to the work he does, and they have an affair. This novel illustrates ways in which the violences of meat production may be gendered and sexualized, and Others (wimmin and dead animals) gendered and natured. Chapter 6 argued sexual pornography was generally discursively natured, but this text is an extreme example of natured in pornography. This does not make it representative of pornography as a whole, but it is indicative of the possible extension of natured discourse within pornographies.

The gendering and natured of the Other

The relationship between the butcher and the girl is constructed through the discourse of the Other, and power dichotomies of dominance and submission. The butcher is tall, fat, strong and at pains to ensure the girl's awareness of the possible implications of this: 'I'll have to undress you with great care so as not to break you' (p.15). She is constructed as sexually submissive, for he defines her desire: 'you'll give me your cunt and your arse and I'll be the lord and master' (p.16), tells her how she feels, what he will do to her, and how she will respond. At one level, *The Butcher* is a classic pornographic text. The girl is passive recipient of the butcher's words: 'I'll take care of you...I've got skillful hands you know...I'd do whatever I want with you, you'd be my little doll...' (p.9-11). He is active, she passive. He chops meat, unloads carcasses, serves the majority of customers; she waits, listens, sits and does little it would seem, to earn her wages. She is powerless

to resist his advances, for like the characterization of most heterosexual wimmin in pornography, the girl has insatiable/animal sexuality:

'The men who came into the shop I undressed with my eyes, I saw them become erect, I stuffed them between my legs...My head was full of obscene thoughts,...I wanted to relieve myself by hand behind the till, but that would not have been enough' (p.31)

Whereas the butcher is defined by the work he does, the girl defined by sexuality alone, and she even defines herself as sex object:

'I lost my hands first of all, and then my name, the name of my race, lost humanity from my memory, from the knowledge of my head and of my body, lost the idea of man, or woman, or even of creature...who am I? My sex.' (p.55)

Alternatively, she is defined as animal. At the end of the novel for example, having been fucked by the butcher, her carnal sexuality appears inevitably to lead her to want to be fucked by the male sex in general. She picks up men in a bar. She fucks a man she doesn't know in a forest and falls asleep. The next morning she crawls along the ditch into which she finds she had fallen, battered, bruised and scratched, enjoying being on all-fours and imagining she is a dog (p.69). This identification of woman-sex-object-animal is a common pornographic construction of the discursive Other, but is rarely expressed as crudely. Once the girl has been fucked by the butcher she becomes nothing more than sex and flesh for the discovery of the power of her sexuality animalizes her. Sexual woman is thus represented here as both animal and flesh - as meat.

Sexualized consumption: meat as female - wimmin as meat

The novel, though an extreme example, is an extension of much pornography in which the body is discursively represented as objectified for sexual consumption, and often portrayed as meat. In the novel sexuality, animality, live flesh and dead flesh (meat) are fused. Meat itself is infused with the qualities of human (usually female) sexuality, as may be illustrated by the following description of the butcher's knife (a surrogate phallus, I would suggest) cutting a piece of meat:

'The blade plunged gently into the muscle...The slice curled limply onto the chopping block...The black meat glistened, revived by the touch of the knife...opening it up like a shinning wound. The steel blade slid down the length of that dark shape....They (slices of meat) fell with a flat slap - like a kiss against the wood.' (p.3)

In addition to the gendering and sexualization of lumps of muscle, is the sexualization of whole animal bodies which are represented in terms of desirable sexual display:

'The rabbits were hung behind the glass pane, pink, quartered, their stomachs opened to reveal their fat livers - exhibitionists, crucified martyrs, sacrificial offerings to covetous housewives.' (p.5)

Like the pornographic construction of wimmin as sexually insatiable, the dead rabbits are represented as arranging their bodies in a manner which will attract the consumer. They do this actively, it seems, despite the fact they are dead, for they are 'exhibitionists'. The pain of their death is denied because these rabbits have willed it, they are 'martyrs' for human desire. Sexualization of animal flesh and animal bodies for human consumption as meat obscures the processes via which animals become meat, for live and dead flesh are considered synonymous. As such, this example of the deployment of the discourse of sexualized consumption involves gendering (the characterization of the dead animal bodies as similar to those of pornographically represented wimmin) and naturing (as the once live rabbits become the absent referent).

Wimmin are represented in this novel as sex objects which are both gendered and natured, for wimmin become meat, both at a metaphorical level, and at times in an almost physical sense, consumed by men during sex, as illustrated by the following quote in which the 'butcher' addresses the girl: 'What I like more than anything is eating the pussies of little girls like you,..will you let me graze on you?...I'll eat your arse and your breasts your shoulders your arms your navel...' (p.12). At times, the girl is both animal and meat simultaneously, for example: 'you'll stick yourself on my skewer and gallop towards your pleasure' (p.15). At other junctures, she describes herself as sexual meat to be butchered and eaten:

'the butcher with his blade will cleave my belly...will cleave and cleave again cleave and cleave again and cleave again until he fills me with his white milk...the butcher has thrown me completely naked on the stall, he has raised his axe, my head will roll on the bloody chopping block...he will eat me as he promised.' (p.34-5)

In this gendered and natured discourse of sexualized consumption, wimmin are represented as synonymously animal, meat, sex. Once 'seduced' by the butcher, she becomes metaphorical meat. In pornographic sexuality, wimmin are sexual commodities, and because meat is a sexualized product for male consumption, I would suggest it is an appropriate metaphor for sexual woman who is constructed through interlinking patriarchal and anthroparchal discourse. There are numerous examples in this novel where wimmin physically resemble meat, such as an instance in the butchers freezer where a female colleague, the 'butcher-woman' is represented as meat:

'Between the rows of hanging carcasses of sheep and calves the butcher-woman was grabbing hold of two thick iron hooks...hanging like a carcass and the butcher pushing his excrement into her in the middle of a forest of meat.' (p.19-20)

Womun-as-meat as a metaphor in this example becomes a closer approximation of reality as the womun is a body hung from a meat hook. Within the girl's fantasies towards the end of the novel, sexuality is represented in a way which suggests it reduces people and bodies to meat:

‘We would both need to be hanging from an iron hook face to face in a red fridge, hooked by the top of the skull or the ankles, head down, legs spread, our flesh face to face, rendered powerless to the knife of our sexes burning like red-hot irons, brandished, open.’
(p.54)

However, whereas wimmin can become meat metaphorically in a text such as this, for animals, becoming meat is material reality. Although gendering and sexualization are key to rendering animals meat, anthroparchal discrimination determines who becomes meat. Patriarchal structures of sexuality and sexual violence and their discursive practices can symbolically represent wimmin as meat, and occasionally render them literally meat in the case of sex crime, but they do not make animals meat. Animals are made meat via forms of anthroparchal violence that are also often sexualized and gendered: slaughter and butchery, farming practices such as rape and castration. Although gendered sexualization connects violences against wimmin and animals, specific violences reflect different forms of gendering and sexualization, for there are natured differences which construct these forms.

This section has argued that butchering can be seen to be gendered and natured, and constituted through five of the seven discourses. Fragmentation can be seen in the physical fragmentation of the carcass in which the animal is the absent referent, discursively constructed as an object, and in the fragmented labour of contemporary butchering, the tedium of which is ameliorated by a strongly masculinized and sexualized employment culture. Implementational violence may be suggested by the sawing and chopping of the animal bodies which are natured and also feminized and sexualized as Other. Butchering is carried out by men in a culture of machismo within which the natured animal carcass is represented and sometimes treated as a female sexual body. The gendered and natured discourses of the Other and of sexualized consumption may also be seen to operate symbolically in the representation of butchering in popular culture. Although an extreme example, the pornographic novel analyzed in this section illustrates the deployment of these discourses particularly clearly.

FARMING

Farming can be seen as the processes and institutions which enable meat to exist, for it involves the mass breeding of ‘meat animals’ and their maintenance to slaughter weight. In the case of every species reared for meat, such maintenance is brief, and the animal’s life span is artificially lowered quite drastically. For example, cattle live approximately thirty years but are killed at about eighteen months if for ‘beef’, and six years if ‘dairy’ cattle. Chickens can live for six years, but are killed at

about seven weeks (for meat) or two years (if laying eggs) (interviews, dairy farmers, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994; Mar. 1994). This section will suggest that farming may be seen to be both patriarchal and anthroparchal, and will contend that all seven of the discourses can be seen to be deployed within farming practices in natured, and often also in gendered form.

Contemporary farming methods are derived from industrial production and the majority of the 600 million animals slaughtered for food each year are reared in factory farms (The Vegetarian Society, 1991, interview, sales executive, pig breeding company, Nov. 1994). Incarcerated in cages or small pens, these animals never see daylight nor take proper exercise. Before the post-war advent of such practices, farming could be seen to be more 'environmentally friendly' in respect of vegetation and soil, and most farm animals did spend much of their short lives on open land (CIWF, 1991). With the development of factory farming, animals were housed indoors, fields given over to continuous monocultures of crops largely to feed them. Hedgerows were pulled out, trees felled and ponds filled so machinery could be used 'efficiently'. The result, according to green pressure groups, was long-term ecological and human disaster in terms of rural unemployment, threat to wildlife from pollution and extinction of habitat, and soil devitalization due to artificial fertilizers which also contribute to water pollution (e.g. CIWF, 1990). 90% of British farmland is used for grazing, or producing feed, and increased meat consumption has involved dramatic expansion of farmland. The meat trade argues intensive animal farming is vital to feed Britain's population (Chairman of the NFU, BBC1 Breakfast News, 3.7.96). However, according to green pressure groups, Britain could be organically self-sufficient if its diet avoided meat, for it a vegetable diet is more efficient in avoiding the need to process plant energy through animals (The Vegan Society, 1991). I concur with the arguments of animal welfare pressure groups that the scale, intensity and means of animal abuse increased with factory farming, but material obtained in this research suggests the content of animal abuse remained similar: physical restriction, distortion of psyche, control of sexuality, and premature death by slaughter.

Objectification

Farm animals are defined through a discourse of natured objectification. Most Western countries adopt the same legal definition of a domesticated agricultural animal as outlined in the Treaty of Rome wherein they are 'agricultural products' (CIWF, Feb. 1992). However, as I argued in Chapter 1, farm animals are not objects, but sentient creatures (capable of experiencing physical pain and mental anguish), often intelligent and requiring a variety of stimuli. Treated as objects, farm animals may demonstrate 'stereotyped' (obsessive, pointless, repetitive) and violent behaviours (killing young, attacking peers) when denied opportunity to engage in activities biologically natural to their species: caring for young, company of adults of the same species, adequate diet, exercise, play, sex, and species specific behaviour (dust-bathing for hens, foraging for pigs) (CIWF, 1990,

1991). It is not only animal welfare groups which allude to the problematic objectification of animals in farming practice, but also some farmers. My interviews with dairy farmers found some who felt compassion for the animals they maintained as their lives were so 'boring' (interview, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994). They suggested however, that this was probably a minority view amongst farmers as a whole, and they felt factory farming left no room for human compassion towards animals. Although some farmers do see animals as creatures with a degree of personality, they ultimately view 'their' animals as agricultural products, and distance themselves emotionally from the killing process, as illustrated in the following example:

EC: 'How do you feel when they get taken to slaughter?'

Farmers father: 'If you've looked after them a long time it can be strange not seeing them about, you grow to recognize them you know. Oh its not as bad, the killing, as it used to be, not when they used to pole axe 'em.'

Dairy farmer: 'Some are such a cuss you're glad to see the back of them'. (conversation, dairy farm, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994)

As 'agricultural products', farm animals all lead restricted and dull lives, many of which, in factory farms are particularly 'nasty, brutish and short', because they are defined and treated as meat from birth. The discourse of objectification which defines animals as 'agricultural products' is one which is primarily constitutive of anthroparchal relations of power. Such a discourse can be seen to be indirectly gendered however, as farm animals are disproportionately female, and usually feminized.

Violence

Animals' lives on British farms are constituted through discourses of natured and gendered violence which is physical/psychological rather than symbolic in form, and often intense in degree, for example: incarceration in sheds, stalls or cages, goading, beating, overcrowding, and enforced sex or impregnation against their wills which I think is properly termed 'rape'. An overview of the lives of British farm animals indicates the species specific violences they endure.

Most chickens are reared in very large numbers (40-80,000 birds per unit) in windowless sheds called broiler units. They live less than seven weeks, fed on a high protein diet, which multiplies their weight over fifty times; putting great strain on limbs and organs and leading to 60,000 dying daily from disease, deformity and stress (The Vegetarian Society, 1991). Towards the end of their lives they are packed tightly, unable to move around on their contaminated litter which burns them when they rest, and in which rats, flies and maggots thrive (CIWF, 1991). Such methods have made chicken production highly profitable and are now applied to rearing turkeys and ducks (CIWF, 1991). Thirty million laying hens are kept in battery cages for between one and two years, five to a cage measuring eighteen by twenty inches. They cannot spread their wings, their feet grow deformed from standing on wire mesh floors, and they lose their feathers rubbing against the cage.

Lack of exercise means they suffer brittle bones and a fatty liver. The frustration associated with this environment may send a hen mad and lead her to pecking cagemates, sometimes to death (CIWF, 1991). To prevent this many are 'de-beaked' with a hot blade. Agribusiness can subject birds (if chickens, all female) to such abuse because they are anthropomorphical objects.

The meat and dairy industries are closely linked, with 70% of beef cattle reproduced by the dairy herd (interviews, dairy farmers, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994). It is common to fatten beef cattle quickly on a high protein barley-based diet (beef farmer, Lincolnshire, Jan. 1995) and slaughter them below eighteen months. Some beef cattle are reared on a free range system, but farmers are increasingly turning to semi-intensive housing with cattle kept in groups on uncomfortable concrete slats (CIWF, 1991). Dairy cattle are still free range, consuming grass, silage, cattiecake and grains (interview, dairy farmers, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994) but kept inside throughout winter. There is little organic dairy farming, but also little intensive farming, with many farmers wary of using hormones (BST) to boost milk production, although such discernment is based upon economic consideration: 'What you put in (to the cows) must have some effect, like shortening the cows productive life' (interview, Hertfordshire, Mar. 1995). But despite this relative lack of intensive farming, cattle suffer incarceration over winter, as well as an early death.

Although there are experimental battery lamb farms in Britain, most sheep live outside. This creates different problems, with three million lambs dying each year from cold or starvation due to what even the industry will admit is inadequate stockmanship (*The Sheep Farmer*, vol.14,no.3, p.2). Survivors are five months old when slaughtered. Sheep are farmed not just for flesh, but fur. Increasing amounts of British wool come from Australia, where scientists have bred Merino sheep with wrinkled skin to produce more fur. These animals are susceptible to heat exhaustion from which large numbers annually die (CIWF, 1991); and 'fly strike', resulting from maggot infestation in sweaty folds of over-wrinkled skin, and treated by 'mulseling', slicing off sections of flesh around the anus, without anaesthesia. More suffering is caused by crippling foot rot (Batt, 1982), encouraging some farmers keep sheep indoors in windowless sheds. Australian sheep are transported often vast distances to slaughter, unlucky ones suffering cruelties of live export to the Middle East, packed 120,000 to a ship and forced to stand in their own urine and faeces for weeks (Batt et al, 1984). British sheep are transported live across Europe (although this practice is supposed to cease after the implementation of an EU ban after 1998), most journeys lasting 24 hours. Live export ensures a higher price per animal due to 'additional benefits' of offal and hides (RSPCA, 1988). It is often assumed products such as wool are not related to the meat industry, yet violences experienced by sheep in producing wool are premised on their objectification as meat.

Pigs are the most intelligent of farm animals, and may have an especially miserable existence, for they require a particularly stimulating environment. Between 80 and 90% of pig farming is

highly intensive (sales executive, pig breeding company, Nov. 1994; CIWF, 1990). Most sows are tethered and spend most of their time in metal crates, boars are kept in small pens, piglets fattened in pens and small runs with no bedding and nothing to do (interview, MD, agricultural products company - making the metal crates and the bars for the runs! - Nov. 1994). Rape is systematic for adults, piglets are not fully weaned, and slaughtered at eighteen weeks (RSPCA, 1992; CIWF, 1991; Animal Aid, 1991).

'Meat' animals suffer systematic anthroparchal violences in farming. The specific violence varies by species, but in all cases the natural instincts of animals are thwarted due to their manipulation and treatment as object. The anthroparchally defined victims of violence may also be gendered. In the case of chickens, all animals raised are female, as are dairy cattle and the majority of wool-producing sheep. As will be seen, farmers of all the various 'meat' animal species are increasingly applying reproductive technologies in order to maximize the numbers of female animals they breed, thus the population of farm animals is becoming exaggeratedly female.

The gendering of the Other

The naturing of farm animals as Others is clearly evident. They are owned, controlled and treated as objects due to the anthroparchal distinction of species membership. These natured Others are also constructed through gendered discourse in two ways. First, farm animals are largely female - being most useful profit maximizers as they produce feminized protein (eggs, milk etc) and reproduce young, as well as becoming meat themselves. Male animals are not so useful, and reproductive technology attempts to minimize their numbers. Some of the worst violences against farm animals involve females through the systematic manipulation of female reproduction upon which animal farming is largely premised. Second, farm animals are constructed in ways resembling human gender dichotomies, breed journals indicate genetics are manipulated to produce attractive, docile 'good mothers', and 'virile', strong, 'promiscuous' males.

The overwhelming majority of chickens are female, as only hens and castrated cocks are used for meat production. The egg industry involves the abuse of exclusively female birds transformed into super egg-producers by genetic interference. Such genetic manipulation ensures hens become reproductive machines ('units'), for their eggs are infertile. Motherhood is effectively deconstructed as the brooding instinct is bred out of hens who constantly reproduce but never see their eggs hatch. The battery industry is premised on manipulation of fertility, and the violence of incarceration is anthroparchally denied, for example:

Ex battery farmer: 'Battery farming has got to be the most boring, you work 365 days a year, collecting the eggs and slopping out. Its really boring 'cause the chickens don't move.'

EC (incredulous): 'But they can't move – you've stuck them in small cages. Apart from immobile, what do you think of chickens?'

EBF: 'Stupid and noisy. Can't have a relationship with them – they're just egg-producing machines really. Anyway, they're not worth much and they don't last very long.' (interview, Hertfordshire, Feb. 1995)

The dairy industry is also based on reproductive manipulation of female animals. Male offspring they produce, along with most female calves, will be sold for beef (or exported for veal) production. After birth, each calf will be taken from its mother, causing considerable distress to both (The Vegan Society, 1991; interview, dairy farmer, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994). In the 1990s, some farmers have adopted the use of the genetically engineered growth hormone BST which increases milk production by between 10 and 20%, forcing cows to eat more and making them more prone to diseases (CIWF, 1991). The natural lifespan of cows is thirty years, however:

'they're done for aged six or seven....For her calf, a cow would naturally produce 14 pints. Dairy cattle produce 80 pints a day....They are chronically weary and hungry, because they are fighting all the time to keep up with the yields from their mammary gland, and that erodes their resting time.' (Prof. Webster, University of Bristol, in The Vegan Society, n.d.)

The dairy and egg industries depend almost exclusively on female animals who produce female-identified foods. Violences towards dairy cows are some of the most unmistakably gendered, and cannot be separated from those relating to meat as the industries are related by production of the calf. The benefit of artificial insemination for dairy farmers is to ensure the reproduction of all female calves from which future breeders can be selected, the others sold to be reared as beef cattle so 'If you get a bull, it's not a complete disaster'. Not only is there an attempt to gender farm animals by reproducing all females, cattle are bred for characteristics which conform to patriarchal discourses of domesticated femininity. Cattle are inquisitive, following people for amusement, investigating unfamiliar places (interviews, dairy farmers, Dec. 1994). On a dairy farm however 'their lives are so boring', and farmers seek placid breeds disinclined to be difficult ('the last thing you need is a stroppy cow'). The ideal cow has 'a friendly personality', is 'affectionate', not 'independent or willful', and is 'a good mother'. In addition, they should have qualities that can be seen to be similar to those within the patriarchal representation of wimmin. For example:

'You want 'em tall and quite large, stature's important,...Good solid legs. Udders are important, they need to be fairly firm, not too droopy or they can get infected. Even size is good. The udder is probably the most important factor in selection really, you want a 'milky' cow, if she doesn't give a good yield, she's done for. If you look at them from the top, they should be pear-shaped'. (interviews, dairy farmers, Dec. 1994)

Cattle are selected via trade exhibitions, or through publications produced by the MLC. In beef cattle, there are three considerations: 'value of the carcass at the point of slaughter. The cost of the feed in getting to slaughter point...calving difficulty and associated mortality at birth.' (*South*

Devon National Sire and Dam Summary, 1993, p.11). All breeds are monitored according to weight gain, mothering instinct, reproductive ease and meat value (p.55); and marketed accordingly:

‘BULL: leaves calves that: are naturally polled with a will to live, Grow well on grass, do well on roughage, need a minimum of concentrates, give a high killing out percentage...COW: is easily managed, is a good forager, means low maintenance costs, calves easily, lives long, breeds regularly, with outstanding mothering ability.’ (The Aberdeen Angus Cattle Society, leaflet, The Royal Smithfield Show, Nov. 1994)

Breeders and buyers map family trees of certain herds and determine the heritability of each desirable trait (*The British Carolais Sire and Dam Summary*, 1994, p.7,8,11; *Simmental Beef*, Spring, 1994, p.1). The natured and gendered evaluation of cattle as potential meat is reflected at agricultural shows, where ‘best of breeds’ are paraded around a ring rather like models in fashion shows (observation, The Royal Smithfield Show, Nov. 1994) and evaluated according to gendered considerations of appearance (interview, beef cattle breeder, Nov. 1994). The real evaluation of beef cattle however, comes when the best of a breed are selected and slaughtered, and butchers are responsible for an animal’s evaluation as meat (interview, beef cattle breeder, Nov. 1994, also *Hereford Breed Journal*, 1994, p.41). In the case of dairy cattle, they are spared slaughter at shows, but evaluated according to appearance and milk yield (RABDF News, Nov. 1994, p.1; *Unigate, Milk Now*, Sept 1994, p.3). A successful new breed from France, the Blonde d’Aquitaine, is held to have particularly docile cows and ‘promiscuous’ bulls, as well as ‘good fleshing’ (*Blondes - the Ultimate*, 1993), and breeders argue they are also popular for their pleasing appearance (interview, Secretary, Blonde d’Aquitaine Breeders Society, Nov. 1994). I would suggest cattle breeding is a highly natured process whereby animals are genetically manipulated for human use as meat and milk machines. This process is also gendered, manipulating sexuality and reproduction to produce gendered characteristics.

The lamb industry is similarly premised on the manipulation of reproduction. Although male sheep are useful for both wool and meat, females are also useful as reproductive machines, and farms require few males. Female sheep selected for breeding must produce as many offspring as possible. Ten years ago, ewes would undergo one pregnancy per year, but reproductive technology now enables two lambing periods. On farms in South East England, ewes now have reproduction synchronized via use of chemicals and vaginal sponges to concentrate lambing periods, and fertilization takes place by artificial insemination with pedigree selection according to the MLC ‘Sheep breeder’ scheme (*The Sheep Farmer*, Nov/Dec, 1994, p.12). As with cattle, breeding is gendered and natured, with animals selected according to natured characteristics of good meat and gendered characteristics of temperament and good mothering/birthing.

There are about 800,000 breeding sows in Britain, over half kept in stalls tethered by the neck or around the girth (pending government ban from 1999; *Agscene*, 1991, p.6). The tether often rubs

the pig's skin raw. They are unable to turn round or exercise throughout their sixteen and a half week pregnancies, and forced to lie in their own excreta. When it is time for them to give birth, they are taken to a farrowing crate (with a concrete or perforated metal floor), where they stay for three weeks confined by metal bars. Sows have strong maternal instincts and would normally spend days nest-building. Deprived of opportunity to fulfill this instinct they may lapse into stereotyped behaviour, trying repeatedly to build a nest in the barren cell (CIWF, 1992). Tyler carried out research on pig farming by participant observation and found that in the farrowing crate, the sow is confined to such a degree: 'the bars of the crate permanently intrude into...her stomach, her vagina, her nipples' (Tyler, 1991, p.3), and sows often have grazes resultant from rubbing against confining bars, symptomatic of intense frustration. Once piglets are born, the mother cannot see them as she can hardly move, which often results in sows becoming frightened of their young, or aggressive due to their biting, and killing one or all (Tyler, from interviews with those working in a factory farm, 1991, p.3). As these animals received negligible mothering themselves, it is rather unsurprising they are often 'bad mothers'. Piglets would properly be weaned at two months, but are taken away at two weeks, causing much distress (Tyler, 1991, p.2), with sows developing sore teats as they are given no medication to stem milk flow (CIWF, 1991).

The management of reproduction in pigs is highly mechanized, deconstructing the pig as mother, and reducing her to patriarchal and anthroparchal object. The lives of these animals are highly fragmented, and sows confined in a series of different spaces within the factory, with no meaningful contact with peers. Tyler suggests the violences he witnessed are representative not extreme cases, for the farm he observed regularly attained top marks from MAFF inspectors. Some firms are adopting genetic mapping produced by absolute reproductive and dietary control to produce larger and leaner pigs (Newsam, 1994b, pp.2-5). Pork is one of the cheapest meats (interview, Feb, 1992) due to the 'efficiency' of the industry, premised on absolute control of reproduction. In the case of free-range pig farming, breeding remains as tightly controlled, although criteria differ for pigs are bred for gendered as well as natured characteristics:

'Docility and mothering ability, so important in outdoor sows...giving the potential of a lifetime of large litters with strong healthy piglets. When crossed with the Newsam Large White boar, the Newsam gilt produces vigorous, thriving piglets, capable of rapid and efficient growth...Large Whites have a reputation for their strong legs and mating ability...This hybrid boar combines high libido and stamina with...a lean carcass...' (Newsam Hybrid Pigs, *Outdoor Production Brochure*, 1994a)

When pigs are raised outdoors, the gendering of breed selection is stronger, as the piglets need to be more 'durable' (The Pig Improvement Company, 1994, p.5), boars more highly sexed, as these pigs reproduce naturally, and gilts (young sows) docile and motherly, as unlike the factory farm, mothering on a free-range system is not fully deconstructed. Sows in factories survive about five

pregnancies before their teats and cervix are worn out, outdoor sows live slightly longer. Thus like cattle and sheep, pigs may be bred according to gendered as well as natured considerations.

I would suggest the four major meat animals in Britain, chickens, cattle, sheep and pigs, are natured Other, bred for meat, eggs or milk for human consumption. This Other is also gendered, for meat animals have a strong tendency to be female. This is extreme in the case of chickens, for cocks are considered largely unsuitable for meat production and the vast majority are slaughtered at birth. Amongst the populations of other species of farm animal, the proportion of females is higher than males, for females are seen as more profitable as they can reproduce. This feminization of farm animals is increasing with the development of reproductive technology that facilitates sex selection. Gendering can further be seen in the human manipulation of female animals' fertility and reproduction, wherein animals are often raped and forced into constant reproduction. If the chicken stops laying eggs or the dairy cow no longer carries calves to term, they will be slaughtered, as will the ewes and sows which farms keep purely for the purpose of reproducing. Finally, gendering may be seen in the criteria for the breeding of cattle, sheep and pigs, in which the different sexes are constructed as having clearly gendered desirable characteristics.

It can also be suggested that there is gendering of the human dominance of animals. Farming, like butchery and slaughter, is a male dominated form of employment. Farm workers are the Subject of relations of dominance and subordination which construct the objectified Other (farm animals) and farm workers are natured human and gendered as male. In factory farms, labour is almost exclusively male, bar office staff (interview, MD agricultural products company, Nov. 1994). In farms based on family production, wimmin tend to be involved in subsidiary activities such as running farm shops and 'pick-your-own' enterprises (interview, farmers wife, PYO and dairy farm, Hertfordshire, Mar. 1994). Farmers see their working conditions as masculine, involving heavy machinery and animals (interview, dairy farmer, Hertford, Dec. 1994). It would seem there is a gendered division of labour that prevents wimmin engaging in the heavier manual work, the use of heavy machinery, and certain tasks involving the animals (interview, farmers wife, Hertfordshire, Mar. 1994). There is a sexual division of labour proscribing farm work, whether in factories or more traditional farms, as male.

Deception

There are many attempts to obscure violence against animals in farming which often involve the attempts of the meat industry to safeguard the practices of farming from public scrutiny. I shall look at only one example here however, due to constraints of space, and in order to corroborate the argument made in Chapter 5, that meat consumption cannot be 'environmentally friendly', despite

recent attempts to represent meat within a discourse of environmentalism. I would argue such an apparent discourse of environmentalism is in fact one of anthroparchal deception.

It is a popular assumption that production of 'free-range' meat and eggs is 'cruelty free'. Our evaluation of sheep farming, currently in Britain still free range, shows this is questionable. Many vegetarians eat 'free range' eggs. However, on conventional free range units birds are given 'freedom' of an open field. Lack of cover leads to birds feeling so insecure, they tend not to wander far from the hen house, and they are even afraid of wild birds flying overhead. Some animal welfare pressure groups (such as CIWF, *Agscene* no.103, p.23) are in favour of the adoption of tree cover for chickens, a sylvopastoral system. However, even despite extensive effort taken to ensure that animals lead a life that is most suited to them, I would argue that the farming of animals remains patriarchal and anthroparchal. The killing of male chicks for example, is not resolved by 'free range' methods, neither is the control and manipulation of the sexuality, fertility and reproduction of other animals (as mentioned with reference to pigs above). Thus whilst the meat industry may increasingly attempt to portray itself as concerned with animal welfare, I would argue that this should be seen as an example of natured deception, for free-range, like other animal farming, involves breeding animals for human food, an inevitable corollary of which is that animals will incur the anthroparchal violences of the slaughterhouse and an artificially shortened life.

Sexualized consumption

The production of eggs, milk and meat is premised on the manipulation of reproduction. This process can be seen to be constituted through gendered and natured discourses of sexualized consumption in which animal sexuality is controlled by highly masculinized humans, to satisfy human desire (producer's desire for profit, and consumer's desire for meat, milk and eggs).

To produce milk, cows give birth every year from two years of age. Should they not 'come into calf' they will be slaughtered (interview, dairy farmer, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994). They are usually impregnated artificially, and separated from their calf after a few days, from whence the calf is fed powered milk via a tank with rubber teats. Birth is a long and painful process as it is increasingly usual for dairy cows to be impregnated with semen from larger breeds of beef bull (interview, dairy farmer, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994). A few male calves are reared as bulls, most spending their lives in solitary confinement which, for a herd animal is 'terribly cruel' (interview, beef farmer, Lincolnshire, Nov. 1994). Some female calves will be selected for dairy replacements, to follow their mothers in lives of frustrated pregnancies and the stresses of overproducing milk. Male calves and those females not selected as breeding replacements, will be sold to beef farms or exported to the Netherlands for veal production. Reproductive technology now makes it possible to transfer embryos, and although this procedure is not used in the majority of farms, its practice is increasing

(interview, beef cattle breeder, Nov. 1994). In this procedure, when young beef heifers are slaughtered their ovaries are removed for IVF and the consequent embryo implanted in the womb of a surrogate mother dairy cow. It is not developments in reproductive technology alone that constitute patriarchal and anthroparchal violence however. Cattle are raped by human males, by their hands and arms, and pipettes or guns designed for injecting into their cervix, the sperm of an unwitting bull forced by (literally) the hands of men into ejaculation (Jannaway, 1991).

The reproduction of pigs is entirely controlled by men. Tyler observed that farm workers decide whether sows are 'ready' to be 'served' by either leading the boar into the pen and seeing which sows become excited, or by pushing on the backs of the sows, even riding on their backs, and examining their vulva's (Tyler, 1991, p.2). Some sows may have to be 'served' repeatedly. Tyler correctly identifies this practice of forced sex as rape: the sow has no choice, and men facilitate this act of sex-and-violence:

'The boar tries to mount, she screams and runs. They try her again....She's mounted and, as the penis is inserted, she howls and begins bleeding, quite a lot of blood. They...continue anyway...Mac assisting entry with his fingers....' (Tyler, 1991, p.2)

Such reproductive control, which is acute in the cases of cattle and particularly pigs, is an instance of patriarchal and anthroparchal violence, as well as a practice discursively constituted through sexualized consumption. Human males intervene in the reproductive process via rape, and the determining of when and how animal sex takes place. Male animals are feminized by their subordinate role in sex, for men prescribe their actions by for example, deciding which pig will be forced to have sex with which other, and in inserting the pigs penises into the sows. Animals sexuality is, in this instance, violently appropriated to satisfy human desire in meat consumption. Thus in the case of the farming of larger 'meat' animals, sheep, pigs and cattle, both male and female animals can be seen to be sexually consumed by humans who manipulate their sexuality and reproductive capacities.

Ownership

Larger animals on all British farms are identified with some form of branding that determines their ownership by humans. The practice of branding is adopted not only to prevent theft and loss, but mainly so that the meat inspectorate can determine where a carcass came from (interview, dairy farm, Hertfordshire, Dec. 1994). Such branding can be seen, I would suggest, as a symbolization of animals' legal status as human chattel, and is an example of the deployment of natured discourses of ownership. Cattle are identified by human ownership by being branded on the rump with a stamp. They are also identified patriarchally, by being labeled with the code of their fathers, for they are tagged through the ear indicating the code number of the bull that sired them

(interview, beef farmer, Lincolnshire, Jan. 1995). Pigs are tattooed on the ear, sheep tagged, both have numerical identity. Some dairy cattle are named, but farmers usually refer to them by number for example:

Dairy farmer: 'Do you remember what happened to number 11?'

Farmers father, now retired: 'That was terrible that, with number 11, we were all upset. Did the splits, sent to the knackers yard.' (conversation, dairy farm, Hertford, Dec. 1994)

In patriarchal and anthroparchal society, cattle, sheep and pigs are identified by male bloodline, evaluated for reproductive potential and ability to produce good meat or much milk. The vast majority of farm animals are objectified as units of production and reproduction, owned and controlled by human beings who seek to make a profit from them, and who are, as we have seen, most likely to be men.

Fragmentation

Farming can be seen to be constituted through discourses of natured and sometimes also gendered fragmentation. The experience of animals in farming is fragmented. Sheep, pigs, cattle and chickens all naturally live in groups (herds, flocks) of mixed sexes. On farms however, they are often separated and segregated according to sex and age. Some, such as breeding sows, veal calves and bulls, are kept in solitary confinement, others such as battery hens, are incarcerated in small numbers with strangers. Such fragmentation may also be gendered on occasion, for example, in the deconstruction of motherhood on farms. Most farm animals are unable to mother their young, and will be separated from them shortly after birth. The experience of piglets can be seen as an illustration of the nature of such fragmentation.

The day after birth, piglets have teeth and tails 'clipped' to prevent 'vices' such as knawing the mother's teats, and biting off tails of penmates, caused by stress and boredom resultant from a barren, over-crowded environment (Tyler, 1991, p.2). The piglets are then separated from their mothers, packed into flat deck cages, sweltering rooms (28-30oc) containing metal cots with slatted floors, graded according to sex and size, and placed with strangers (The Vegetarian Society, 1990, p.3). Once grown a little, the pigs are moved to the dirty and overcrowded fattening pens, and once 200lb and above, deemed fit for slaughter. In their short lives (18-24 weeks) these animals will see nothing outside the factory, have been deprived of exercise, and had no opportunity to play. Animals such as these can be so abused because patriarchal and anthroparchal domestication constructs them as objects which become meat. The treatment of animals as objects whose life experience can be fragmented with impunity is reflected by many of those working in the meat industry. The fragmentation of animals lives is anthroparchally legitimated by species

differentiation, by the fact that pigs, for example, are not human beings, as illustrated in the following excerpt from a recorded conversation:

MD, agricultural products company: 'It's luxury, intensive pig farming. Huge buildings, lovely and warm and bright. I don't know what these animal libbers complain about. The pigs don't complain, if they were unhappy, they'd be thin. They're very happy pigs, they stay in a five star hotel.'

EC: 'They don't get out and about much though do they? The argument is they get bored.'

MD: 'Bored? They're *pigs*! Of course they don't get bored, heat and food, that's all they want. You're not one of those animal loonies are you?'

EC: 'Another glass of wine Brian?'

(National Farmers Union courtesy tent, Royal Smithfield Show, Nov. 1994)

This section has suggested that in contemporary farming practice, all seven discourses can be seen to be deployed. They are not all deployed in gendered and natured form however. Objectification, ownership and deception can be seen to be largely natured, whereas the other four can be seen to exhibit both gendering and natured. The Other, constructed in submissive relations of power is both animal and animalized and gendered by being largely female, and also bred according to patriarchal constructions of human masculinity and femininity. The dominant Subject in such dichotomous power relations is also likely to be gendered, as farming is overwhelmingly a male dominated industry. Violence in farming is always natured, involving an animal and animalized victim, and is often also gendered, for example in the systematic rape of female animals. This also relates to the deployment of sexualized consumption as constitutive of farming praxis, for animals' sexuality and reproductive capacity can be seen to be appropriated by men in ways that are sexualized and gendered. Finally, discourses of fragmentation can be seen as constituting the lived experience of animals in farming, and this process can also be seen to be gendered as it is often the case that the fragmentation of female experience is most acute.

Conclusion

This chapter has been based on a range of material obtained in part from interviews with people working in various institutions within the meat industry, and having differentially vested interests in its operation. It is also based on material obtained from pressure groups concerned with the welfare of farm animals which has been corroborated where possible by my own observation of the procedures within the various constitutive institutions which compose the meat industry, and by interviews and conversations with those working within such institutions. The chapter suggests this material provides some evidence which indicates that the processes of meat production involve the deployment of all seven of our discourses, and these processes, taken as a whole, are both anthroparchal and patriarchal. The chapter has focused on the material construction of meat, and I would suggest that as barriers in an anthroparchal society prevent people being materially treated like animals, the meat industry should be seen as primarily located within anthroparchal structures

of domination. This said, I feel gendered discourses and patriarchal structuring processes also contribute quite significantly to the production of meat. Whilst I would argue all the seven discourses can be seen to be present in meat production, they do not always operate in gendered form, although they do so operate in natured form. Thus I feel patriarchy and anthroparchy may be likely to coalesce and interlink less strongly at the material than the symbolic level.

The victim of domination in the manufacture of meat, the Other, is anthroparchally defined as domestic animals and patriarchally defined by virtue of the fact that such animals are largely female and are usually feminized in terms of their treatment. Farmers disproportionately breed female animals so they can maximize profit via the manipulation of their reproduction. Female animals who have been used for breeding can be seen to incur the most severe physical violences within the system, particularly at slaughter; although all animals are abused by slaughterhouse staff in part via their feminization. There is a clear gender division of labour in all three aspects of meat production, and feminized animal Others are dominated directly by highly masculinized men who breed them, incarcerate them, rape them, beat them, kill them and cut them into pieces. Meat production involves sexualized consumption in which the sexuality of animals is manipulated by humans via rape, artificial insemination etc. In addition, male workers in parts of the meat industry, namely slaughtering and butchery tend to heavily sexualize their labour, possibly more than in other all male manual work environments, for they deal with animals and carcasses which they regard as gendered sexual objects.

Ownership and commodification are discursively apparent in natured form, for farm animals are legal chattel. As such, they may be commodified via slaughter and butchery into meat. The definition of animals as chattel is premised on their construction as objects with no intrinsic value. Farm animals are treated as potential meat, and their natural instincts are thwarted. Animals are turned into literal objects via slaughter and butchery, and those objects, the carcasses, may sometimes be gendered and sexualized as feminine. Deception can be seen in the denial of abuse of animals within farming as can be seen in breed journals and in the language of scientific rationality through which legal regulation of the meat industry is constructed. Fragmentation can be seen in all three areas. Animals are killed and literally fragmented in slaughter and butchery, and their lives are fragmented via farming practice. Violence is seen most clearly in the killing of the animals, but can also be seen in their treatment on the farm, and symbolically, in the butchering of the carcass.

Meat is a discursively produced through procedures and institutional operations which can be seen as constructive and constitutive of both patriarchal and anthroparchal dominations. Whilst I have suggested there is significant interlinking and overlapping of gendered and natured discourses in meat production, the power relations of anthroparchy can be seen to predominate. Whilst the production of meat is shaped by patriarchal relations, the intense degree of oppression described

here is a reflection of relations of anthroparchal power through which animals are constructed as objects for human consumption.

Notes

- (1) The contention that violence against animals is physical and intense is premised upon the realist ontology for which I argued in Chapter 1. In making this claim I assume animals are real - beings which can experience pain, fear and distress. I feel it is a position of anthroparchal objectification which suggests animals and their bodies are texts and human violence towards them can be seen in terms of narratives. Slitting an animal's throat and cutting out its internal organs is an extreme act of physical violence, it is not a 'story' 'applied' to animals.
- (2) I am aware that the second of my questions here is leading. I felt this necessary here as my intention was to evaluate the claims of animal welfare groups such as the RSPCA, Animal Aid and CIWF that pigs, being bred solely for meat, are extremely overweight, and likely to suffer additional distress from heart attacks and various forms of stroke in transit to the slaughterhouse and prior to stunning. I felt the corroboration of the claims of animal welfare groups by those working in the meat industry enabled me to use material from such groups to analyze pig and poultry slaughter. I must admit to some cowardice or 'sentimentalism' here for I could not face seeing pigs killed. My affection for porcine beings was the turning point in my progressive rejection of meat eating from the age of seventeen. Having just finished reading the scene in which a pig is 'stuck' in Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, I was presented with a meal including pork fillet. I ate it, but with some effort, as for the first time I realized I was eating something's flesh. A moment of clarity! The attitude towards animals, and language used by this interviewee is illustrative of that generally used by slaughtermen. This material is not included to cause offense to the reader, but with the intention of illustrating the general attitude towards animals exemplified by those who kill them. I do not think this attitude should be regarded in any way as shocking, but as inevitable and as functionally necessary. I feel it would be difficult to kill large numbers of mammals and birds as an occupation were such creatures not so intensely objectified.
- (3) This made the observation of cattle slaughter the most personally traumatic aspect of the entire research for this thesis, for I found the animal's trust particularly poignant. In 'real life' outside research, I would at least have said something in protest at what I observed. Dworkin (1987) has written of researching pornography and how pornographic images had colonized her thinking. I can certainly not lose the images and sounds of the abattoir. I felt a dreadful complicity in watching the mass killing of animals without protesting. In retrospect, I take some comfort in the words of the late primatologist Goodall (1993), quoted in Adams and Donovan (1995) with respect to her research on vivisection amongst primates used in a rather different context:

'Why do I care so much? Why, in order to change attitudes and actions in the labs, do I subject myself repeatedly to the personal nightmare of visiting these places...? The answer is simple...It is time to repay something of the debt I owe the chimpanzees.'

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE PORNOGRAPHY INDUSTRY

'Hard core pornography? It's not really sexual – it's like butchery.'

(Chief Inspector, Obscene Publications Department, New Scotland Yard, Nov. 1991)

Introduction

This chapter investigates the extent to which the processes of the production of pornography might be shaped by patriarchal and anthroparchal relations. The chapter examines the three key stages in the production of pornography: its distribution and sale, pornographic modeling and pornographic photography. Similarly to Chapter 7, this one analyzes both the symbolic regimes through which the processes and procedures constituting the pornography industry are constructed, and the material nature of those processes and practices. Various aspects of the industry are examined in order to ascertain the possible deployment of the seven discourses outlined in Chapter 3. Should such discourses be co-present in gendered and natured form, it may be suggested that there is a relationship between anthroparchal and patriarchal formations of power.

Chapter 6 contended that at a cultural level, pornography exemplifies not only power relations of patriarchy, but those of anthroparchy also. This chapter will argue the production of pornography is strongly gendered and (inevitably) sexualized, but will contend the extent of naturing in the pornography industry is far more limited than is the case when pornography is considered as a symbolic regime. In each of the other chapters of empirical research, it is contended both naturing and gendering have substantial roles to play, although in Chapter 7, it was argued that meat production is more firmly located within anthroparchal than patriarchal relations of power. In this chapter however, naturing is less apparent than in any of the other three. This does not mean pornography is not both gendered and natured, but it must be conceded that the naturing of pornography operates far more strongly when pornography is considered as a symbolic regime than as an industry. This is not so in the case of meat where there is a strong linkage between gender and nature at both levels of analysis. Whilst Chapter 7 suggested the gendering of meat is less strong when meat is considered as an industry (compared to its symbolization in popular culture), I feel that all seven discourses are present in both gendered and natured form to an extent which is sufficient for it to be argued that the meat industry is shaped by systemic power relations of both patriarchy and anthroparchy. With pornography, the seven discourses are both gendered and natured with respect to the analysis of pornography as a symbolic regime, but in this analysis of the pornography industry, it will be suggested that they are evident as patriarchal in the main, and only on occasion, anthroparchal.

In Chapter 7, it was argued meat production was both gendered and natured because domination involved subordination of anthroparchally and patriarchally defined 'Others' - domestic animals who are both disproportionately female and usually feminized. In the pornography industry however, although the Other is often gendered, it is relatively rare it is natured i.e. that it is an animal or is animalized by being treated as are animals in anthroparchal society. The contention that pornography is anthroparchal must rest primarily on the analysis of pornographic symbolization in Chapter 6, although the natured of the Other in the pornography industry can be seen in two limited and specific instances of pornography: bestiality, where the Other is an animal, and in s/m, where the Other may be treated like an animal.

The reason for this relative absence of natured in the pornography industry, I would suggest, lies in the differences in the oppressive form and degree of structures of power relations which constitute anthroparchy and patriarchy. Systems of oppression are not parallels, and although some structures of systems overlap, others may not. Anthroparchy and patriarchy may have some similar structures, as will be suggested in the following chapter, but these are unlikely to assume identical forms nor to operate at the same level of intensity. The main area of difference between these two systems is likely to lie in the forms and degrees violence may assume at the material level. For example, although many wimmin do experience significant violence from some men, this is not as usual, nor as normative in physical practice, as for animals who become meat. Animals in anthroparchy, unlike wimmin in patriarchy, have no means of contesting their oppression, and because they are more strongly objectified, there are few limits on the violences which may be carried out against them. Nature features symbolically in pornography as a means of degrading the human Other. It is less apparent in the pornography industry I would argue, because there are anthroparchal barriers which prevent humans being treated like animals. Thus natured can be seen only where animals are present (bestiality) and where humans are treated like animals (s/m).

The chapter investigates the extent to which the production of pornography is based around power relations of dominance and subordination wherein discursively constructed gendered human Others (wimmin, feminized men, children) and non-human Others (animals) may be subordinated in the passive role of the pornographic model. We examine the possible gendering of the subjects of pornographic production, publishers, distributors, photographers, and their relationships to the models. We also investigate whether relationships in the industry may be sexualized around power difference, and whether pornographic models can be compared to animals within the meat industry as objects of sexualized consumption. We examine the possible deployment of discourses of ownership and commodification, and whether these differ in an industry where those commodified (models) into photographic or film text, are not legal chattel (unlike animals in relation to the meat industry). The ownership of the pornographic model could take two forms: economic dependency on publishers, and ownership of texts produced. We examine the extent of possible dependency of

models on their employers (photographers, magazines), and whether forms of control over models may involve the expectation of sexual favours. This is a looser conception of ownership than the absolute economic dependence and legal domination that applies to domestic animals, and the chapter will compare the differential levels of control that operate for models in pornography and animals within the meat industry. For example, ownership of pornographic text may involve pornographic images usually becoming property of publishers or photographers rather than models, reducing models ability to earn. Ownership for models unlike meat animals, may be displaced from legal possession of the body to the text, and from absolute to relative economic dependence.

I have defined discourses of deception as those which help to maintain patriarchal and anthroparchal power structures by obscuring their operation and nature. Pornographic symbolism suggests that wimmin depicted in images are sexually aroused by posing for such photographs and films, as noted in Chapter 6. In this chapter we examine whether discourses of deception can be seen to operate in pornographic production, i.e. whether models enjoy their work, or whether their role is to deceive the consumer in appearing to be sexually aroused, and whether this process may be natured and gendered. As pornographic models are overwhelmingly female, it may be suggested that should deception be present, it is likely to assume gendered form.

Fetishistic sexuality is premised on objectification of animate beings which may be reduced to objects, most usually genitalia. We examine the extent to which discourses of objectification and fetishism might be involved in transforming humans into objects/texts for sexual use. We consider the gendering and naturing of such processes, and possible differences between the objectification of bodies in the pornography industry compared to the meat industry. We also look at the related discourse of fragmentation which may be deployed in physical form in the fragmentation of human or animal bodies, or may involve the fragmentation of experience. In pornography, for example, fragmentation may involve prioritizing particular parts or 'fragments' of bodies; or fragmenting the experience of sexuality by offering a range of bodies and/or body parts for sexual consumption which are constructed as separate from the models to whom they belong. In addition, there is the question of whether the making of pornography involves the fragmentation of the models' experience, for example, they may be compelled to deny the authentic expression of their sexuality in order to make pornography.

As suggested in Chapter 7, patriarchal and anthroparchal violences assume differing forms and varying degrees. Violence may be physical, or be discursively present in symbolic regimes of representation which may or may not attach to practices of physical violence. The previous chapter focused on the extremity of violence against 'meat' animals, involving the anthroparchally systemic mass killing of slaughter. Such extreme degrees of physical violence are patriarchally relatively rare (femicide) for there are anthroparchal barriers to the killing of humans. In the

production of pornography, models may experience the threat of physical violence, for example, in the form of sexual harassment or coerced sex (where models feel economically obliged rather than physically forced). Making pornography may also involve non-physical violences such as objectification. We compare violence in the pornography industry to the case of the meat industry, in order to examine possible differences in the forms and degrees it assumes. In addition, we consider the possible gendering and naturing of violence, i.e. whether violence is deployed against Others who are gendered and/or natured.

This research involved interviews with people working in, or in close proximity to, the pornography industry, and some observation of pornographic material. Interviews were carried out with officers and civilian members of the Obscene Publications Department at New Scotland Yard, and officers at HM Customs and Excise Heathrow Airport. Interviews provided information on the regulation of pornography, distribution networks for pornographic material, and afforded an opportunity to observe a range of hard core pornographies, and inquire about their production. Employees in sex shops in London's Soho were also interviewed, in order to find out more about the gendered structure and operations of the industry. In order to gain an insight into modeling and photography, a number of photographers were interviewed who had some involvement with the industry. This research had particular access difficulties (see Chapter 4). It does not reflect the perspectives of models working within the pornography industry, and does not reflect as broad a range of perspectives than had been possible with the research into the meat industry. There were fewer interviews undertaken for this part of the research and less material and fewer examples are included in this chapter to support the arguments I make. Whilst I was able to observe the content of some pornographic material that made an important contribution to the analysis of this chapter, I was unable to observe procedures in the making of pornography as I had done in the case of meat.

I consider this material less representative than that for the other chapters of empirical research, although given the specific access difficulties, I feel it is as representative as I was able to make it. Research does involve a variety of perspectives on pornography from those with different relations of interest toward the industry as represented by the police and customs on one hand, and pornographic photographers and sex shop staff on the other. Unfortunately however, there was less opportunity to corroborate the evidence from these various sources (as had been the case with research into the meat industry) as for example, the information provided by New Scotland Yard was on usually different subject matter to that provided by the photographers. The police may be likely to have a vested interest in articulating a certain position on the pornography industry, and the material provided by the photographers is probably less problematic in terms of bias. In addition, the police themselves admit that they do not always give a representative picture to the public. For example, when questioned about their claim of 1991 that child pornography was on the increase, the second most senior officer in the Obscene Publications Department did confess:

'No actually, it's not. We leak false info to the press to push the Home Office into giving us more money. If we say kiddie porn is up, there's not much the Government can do except throw money at us – if it's kids, the public will always be concerned.' (interview, Chief Inspector (C.I.), NSY, Dec. 1991)

Some of the material obtained from the police must necessarily be regarded with a critical eye in instances where it is not corroborated by another source. In view of some of these questions of representativeness, I feel the claims made for this part of the research should be regarded as more tentative than those for the previous three chapters. This said, I will suggest this material does provide some sufficiently representative evidence which may be consistent with some of the arguments developed in the previous three chapters.

The chapter is divided into three sections based on different aspects of the production process: modeling, photography, and publication, distribution and sale. These can be seen to be parallel to those in Chapter 7 on the meat industry. The section on slaughter analyzed the key point of production, killing; analogous in the pornography industry is photography, the point at which the model is objectified into text. The distribution and sale of meat is enabled by butchering; analogous, is the role in pornographic production of 'sex shops' and publishers. In Chapter 5, it was argued that farming facilitated meat production; a corollary in the pornography industry can be seen to be modeling, within which people are groomed, trained and manipulated for sexual commodification. Although naturing is less apparent in the pornography industry than in the other case studies, it will be suggested that all the seven discourses are evident: the Other, ownership, deception, objectification, fragmentation, sexualized consumption, and violence. These discourses however can be seen to be predominantly gendered, and a part of patriarchal relations. There are instances where discourses are deployed in ways both gendered and natured, and it will be suggested that the presence of naturing in some instances and not others, may itself shed light on the complexities of the relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy.

PUBLISHING, DISTRIBUTION AND SALE OF PORNOGRAPHY

This section looks at the pornography industry in terms of the role of publishers, networks of distribution and sales outlets. It finds a number of our seven discourses are present: ownership, the Other, violence, and fragmentation. These can be evidenced in both patriarchal and anthroparchal form, although the former strongly predominates.

The pornography industry in Britain

British pornography has a history that goes back to the Victorian period (Fiedler, 1978; Kendrick, 1987), or earlier if one accepts the argument that the genre of the nude in eighteenth and nineteenth century European oil painting constitutes pornography (Berger, 1973; Nead, 1992).

Until the second world war, consumption of pornography was elitist, but from the 1950's, the industry produced for mass consumption following its American predecessor. The latter began publishing magazines showing wimmin in bathing costumes targeted at servicemen in the second World War, and nudist magazines (Talese, 1980, p.45). 'Avant garde' publishing houses began publishing 'erotic' novels, legally able, after a period of contestation, to defend these from obscenity charges (as discussed by Rembar, 1986). Photographer Russ Meyer, began making soft-core films for mainstream cinema, some of which were exported to Britain in the early 1960s, as were early American magazines such as *Esquire* and *Playboy*. Their success led to the setting up of indigenous pornographic publishing houses. The industry has expanded with increased tolerance by public and state of sexual imagery and British pornography is now 'big business'. According to Thompson's figures from 1989 for mainstream soft-core publishers: Congate, publishing *Parade* (circulation 65,000) and New Park Lane (15,000) made a profit of 7 million; Paul Raymond, whose businesses publish *Club International*, *Escort* and *Men Only* (selling between three-quarters of a million and several million copies) made 16 million; the producers of *Penthouse* (100,000) and *Forum* (30,000), Northern and Shell made about 6 million, and Galaxy Publications (*Fiesta*, 300,000; *Knave*, 150,000) made 4.4 million (1995, p.4). In 1989, soft-core publications for wimmin were launched, selling 75,000 (*Ludus*), and 400,000 (*For Women*) copies of their initial publication. Statistics for gay and 'minority interest' material are difficult to obtain due to its legal status, and hard core pornography is not possible to estimate due to illegality. New Scotland Yard declined to comment (interview, CI, Dec. 1991) other than to suggest far more material was in circulation than they could document. Different forms of pornography are purchased at different outlets. Heterosexual soft core magazines are usually obtained at newsagents, 'minority interest' material is sold by licensed sex shops (around 60 in number, Thompson, 1995, p.4).

Legislation restricts the availability of pornography and distinguishes hard core (illegal) and soft core (mostly legal) varieties. Best known is the 1959 Obscene Publications Act and its 1974 amendment, which defines material as illegal on grounds it is 'obscene', i.e. tends to 'deprave and corrupt' (interview, CI, NSY, Dec. 1991). The 1984 Video Recordings Act makes it an offence to distribute material not approved by the British Board of Film Certificators, according to which sex must be simulated, and video sale confined to sex shops. Import is limited by the 1876 Customs Consolidation Act which prohibits material deemed 'indecent' by a customs officer, then a magistrate (interview, customs officer, Heathrow, Aug. 1995). Distribution is limited by the 1953 Post Office Act which makes it illegal to send obscene material by mail (interview, CI, NSY, Dec. 1991). Child pornography is unlawful under the 1978 Child Protection Act, and bestiality is unlawful under the 1977 Cruelty to Animals Act. 'Extreme/bizarre' pornography is defined largely by the police and courts, and focuses on violent material (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992), which may be obscene due to levels of violence inflicted.

The police and customs are responsible for deciding what is 'obscene'. When members of the Obscene Publications Department (OPD) were asked the difference between pornography that is 'obscene' and that which is not, they were unclear, claiming 'we know it when we see it.'. According to the Department, erect penises are 'obscene', as is anal sex, and 'models' should appear over the age of sexual consent (interviews, NSY, Dec. 1991; Jan. 1992). Violence in pornography may define it as illegal on grounds of committing, or abetting ones own, GBH. Legal definition of 'obscenity' provides greater immunity for male heterosexual than other pornographies (interview, CI, NSY, Dec. 1991). The Obscene Publications Squad is overwhelmingly male, and composed not of police officers but civilians (3 of whom were, in 1991, the only wimmin) (conversation, CI, Nov. 1991). In 1991, all the (18) officers were male, but by 1993, a WPC had joined as part of the content monitoring team. Officers have higher status within the Squad, and are responsible for seizure. Civilians are involved with content monitoring - watching videos at high speed, against a check list of acts the law deems 'obscene'. The screening process is undertaken by men watching different videos in the same room, filled with television screens (observation, Dec. 1991). This is apparently 'a job like any other....Looking at this material has no effect on me at all.' (interview, DI, Jan. 1992). One is left wondering however, how this is so when such material is seen to 'deprave and corrupt' the 'average person'. The police insist that they view material with detachment, however, as will be seen, they have certain values they bring to pornographic regulation, and legal restriction of pornography relies heavily on the values expressed by the police and the courts.

Ownership and the gendering of domination

The production of pornography can be seen to involve the deployment of discourses of ownership, where those who produce pornography exercise significant control over the lives of Others. This may take the form of economic dependency, economic exploitation of model's labour, and sexual exploitation, because models are often expected to have sex with publishers and photographers due to economic dependency. Those who make money and have prestige in the porn industry are not the models, although big American names such as that of Jeff Stryker, perhaps the best-paid porn star in the world, make vast amounts. Most models however are unlikely to make much money at all. Stryker and his ilk are successful not because of their peculiar circumstances (having a very large cock), but because they direct and produce their own films. Those who produce pornography in Britain are overwhelmingly men (interview, Soho, Aug. 1995), and may be seen to behave according to patriarchal fantasies of masculinity and male sexuality.

Such fantasies of patriarchal masculinity can be seen for example, in the research on the American sex industry carried out by Talese in the 1970s. Talese had access to those making and publishing pornography established through his reputation as a popular journalist and the networks

he was involved in as a frequenter of massage parlours. Talese gained an insight into the lives of American pornographers which I feel may have some similarity with those in Britain. A significant part of Talese's research involved an examination of the lives and businesses of perhaps the most famous contemporary pornographer, Hugh Hefner, creator of *Playboy*. According to Talese, Hefner attempted to realize the patriarchal fantasy he created in his publication (Talese, 1980, p.25). Whereas the readership could fantasize about possessing the wimmin Hefner presented to them, Hefner became the *Playboy* fantasy. He pursued large numbers of models, becoming possessive and preventing them seeing other men. He regarded models as 'product(s) of his creation, and he assumed a right to repossess (them) whenever he wished' (Talese, 1980, p.90). Hefner's ownership was not only gendered in a material sense as he exercised significant control over his female models, but also involved the deployment of the symbolization of the natured Other. This could be seen in Hefner's creation of the 'bunny girl', waitresses and barmaids dressed in black leotards and stiletto shoes, with rabbit 'tails' on their arses and rabbit 'ears' on their heads which he introduced when he opened the first *Playboy* club. The 'bunny girl' was created in part to attend to the desires of the pornographers (most slept with Hefner), and had relatively little control over their lives, for after selection at a 'bunny hunt' 'bunnies' then lived in purpose built dormitories attached to Hefner's homes (Talese, 1980, p.451).

In the British context, the individual who may most closely resemble Hefner is Paul Raymond. Raymond Enterprises own large amounts of Soho property, including a number of strip clubs, the best-known being the 'Raymond Review Bar', and publishes soft core magazines such as *Men Only* and *Escort*. Raymond, like Hefner, is a self-made man. Wimmin working for his company as waitresses and models operate in a climate wherein personal favouritism is rife (interview, waitress, The Raymond Review Bar, Aug. 1995; photographic assistant, Aug. 1995). Raymond is well-known for arranging weekends away for himself and key management, accompanied by his favourite models of the time, which some within the business see as 'a kind of prostitution, just not so blatant' (interview, photographer, Aug. 1995), and models are generally dependent on the approval of Raymond and the male hierarchy who run his business, for success. I think this control can be seen as constituted through the discourse of patriarchal ownership, for wimmin are largely controlled by the publishing house. This material ownership takes patriarchal and not anthroparchal form. The wimmin who work for Raymond for example, are controlled as gendered humans - they allow their lives to be controlled by him, and exchange sexual favours for a successful 'modeling' career.

Violence

According to Scotland Yard, hard core material is increasingly physically violent (interview, DI, NSY, Dec. 1991). Considering the admission by the police (cited earlier) that they sometimes

present a more negative picture of the industry than is representative, and the finding of Chapter 6 that contrary to some feminist claims (Itzin, 1992), soft core pornography was unlikely to be becoming increasingly violent, I feel the question of whether levels of physical violence involved in making hard core pornography, or in its' images, is increasing, is uncertain. Violence is certainly apparent in the making of much of the material however (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991; Jan. 1992). The violence apparent in the making of hard core pornographic material can be seen to be often gendered, as those against whom violence is carried out are usually wimmin (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991; interview DI, NSY, Dec. 1991). The largest sector of the hard core market is heterosexual violent pornography which remains the fastest expanding area of sales, and in this type of material, according to the police: 'The violence is overwhelmingly, well, almost totally, directed against women.' (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992).

An illustration of the violence possibly involved in the production of hard core material, can be evidenced by the video which became the subject of the 'Operation Spanner' trial of December 1990. This case also provides an illustration of the ways in which occasionally, the violence may be natured by victims of violence being treated in the ways in which it is most usual to see animals treated. Such animalization tends only to be seen in a limited amount of pornography, most often in the genre of s/m. The Operation Spanner case involved the prosecution of sixteen consenting gay sado-masochists who videoed scenes of s/m sex and circulated the material. Thompson dismisses prosecution as gay harassment (1994, p.233) as did the gay press (*The Pink Paper*, 5.1.91, p.3), but the police claim to be concerned at spending public money in prosecuting consenting adults (interview, D.I. chief prosecution witness, NSY, Dec. 1991), and would not have prosecuted, or so they assert, had the violence not been so great. The level of physical violence in the video is significant (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991) but this is also the case with much straight hard core material. Usually, the 'victim' or 'submissive' is a woman (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991; Jan. 1992); and I would suggest it is because the 'Spanner' video showed men as victims, that prosecution was so actively sought, as a number of members of the Obscene Publications squad claimed this material worried them, as illustrated in the following quote:

'I've worked here for years, and nothing's bothered me until that video. We were all just so shocked. I watched it with my legs crossed! I mean, having your foreskin nailed to a table, your dick cut with razor blades - this guy's fantasy, right, was to have his foreskin removed with a knife. What is that? Sick - that's what.' (conversation, civilian, NSY, Dec. 1991.)

It is not the level of violence involved that so disturbed the highest ranks of the judiciary, I would suggest, but that male victims are subjected to violence, and constructed as sexually submissive. Discussion into the context of the making of the video provided some insight into the backgrounds of those depicted in it. The video was produced by the key 'master', who directed the film and designed scenarios for victims. The 'masters' tended to have backgrounds locating them in positions of relative social and economic power compared to the submissives. For example, most

had middle class occupations (a senior missile designer for British Aerospace, a lay preacher, a theatrical designer). But by contrast, only one 'victim' had a similar background (lawyer), most did not have prestigious occupations and had histories of sexual abuse (for example, one was abused in childhood, another was gang raped resulting in psychiatric institutionalization) (interview, DI, NSY, Dec. 1991). This case does demonstrate extreme levels of physical violence conducted in a context of dominance and subordination. In the production of hard core material, as illustrated by this video, significant physical violence can be used. In some pornography, such as s/m, the Other is clearly constructed as submissive, and can also be seen to be natured for although being human, they may be animalized by being treated physically as animals most usually are in anthroparchal society, for example by being beaten, whipped, caged, tethered and harnessed (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991).

The gendering and naturing of the Other

In terms of the power relations structuring the making of pornography, the model can be seen to be the subordinated Other, as will be discussed in detail in the following section. In the majority of soft core pornography, wimmin are the models (see Chapter 6). In hard core material, wimmin are often shown masturbating, or being fucked by men (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991). As seen above, this Other may be natured by being treated as an animal in some specific genres. On occasion, the making of pornography does involve the naturing of the animal Other, as animals may be indirectly implicated in the making of pornography and present as the absent referent. For example, some pornography involves the sexualized use of animal products as food (meat, cream), apparel (leather, fur) or sexual aids (whips and harnesses, objects suggesting the control of animals such as cages, shackles, collars and leads) (observation, NSY, Jan, 1992).

The literal naturing of the Other can also be seen in the limited pornographic genre of bestiality, material usually re-circulated often and occupying a small niche of the market. This material usually has the same theme: wimmin having 'sex' with animals (eels, horses, dogs). If bestiality involves men, the animals used are mostly chickens, or alternatively, pigs and cattle. Dogs are used most commonly in the bulk of bestial pornography which involves wimmin, due to their accessibility as pets (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992). Wimmin in films masturbate male animals such as horses and dogs until their penises become erect, and then put them inside their vaginas (observation, NSY, Dec, 1991). These animals are sometimes sedated (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992). Although male animals are in effect raped, it is the female animal 'model' who is likely to incur the greatest physical harm.

Human heterosexual male models in bestiality commonly fuck live female chickens, and by doing so, kill them by disemboweling (observation and interview, NSY, Dec. 1991). Here, the act

of sex is synonymous with the killing of the gendered and natured 'Other'. Hens become sexualized and feminized orifices for the pleasuring of the penis. The making of this pornography has direct links with the slaughter of animals for meat. Whilst hens are usually slaughtered to satisfy human appetite for meat food, the hen in this kind of pornography is slaughtered to satisfy the male appetite for sex. As we saw in Chapter 7, chickens are economically of little value, and relatively easy to procure for making pornography (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992). Occasionally, bestiality involving men will feature sows and cows which are raped by men. In the case of pigs, severe injuries can be inflicted as the vagina of a pig was not designed with the human penis in mind (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992). Again, it can be seen that victims of patriarchal violence can include female and/or feminized animals in addition to women.

In this example of a relatively small genre of pornography, female animals, cast by human force and/or manipulation as pornographic 'models', suffer at the hands of men a far worse fate than male animals at the hands of pornographic actresses. Whilst the latter are involved in the manipulation of an animal's sexuality, they do not damage them physically, nor kill them in the production of this pornography. The pornography of bestiality is difficult to produce due to the illegality of filming nude scenes outdoors (interview, photographer, Aug. 1995). The police claim in order for this pornography to be produced, people either film with their 'pets' at home, or pay farmers to allow them access to their animals, which according to the police, is not uncommon:

'permitting the filming of bestiality on farms should not come as a surprise to us. It's (sex with farm animals) not seen as an especially abnormal practice for those who work with animals.' (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992, see also Chapter 7)

As will be argued in the following section, in making pornography, the subordinated Other is usually female and feminized. I have indicated here that Other may occasionally also be animal. In bestiality, the Other is clearly constructed as materially both gendered and natured. It should be conceded however, that the corporeal presence of a natured Other is relatively rare when pornography is considered as a whole, and that such naturing tends to pertain to bestiality and s/m pornographies in the main.

Fragmentation

With reference to soft core pornography, I argued in Chapter 6 that the bodies of models were symbolically fragmented by being represented as body parts. However, such fragmentation in soft core material can only be seen to operate symbolically. In hard core pornography, material may more clearly recall the butchering of 'meat animals' who can be seen as the absent referent with the physical fragmentation of their bodies recalled yet denied. In some material, a fairly direct form of fragmentation is physically depicted, usually exemplifying a fetishistic focus on the genitalia. For example, the showing of genital piercing, wherein violence is faked (piercings made in advance and

re-inacted) or (less often) involved in the making of the material where actual piercing is filmed/photographed (observation, NSY, Dec. 1991; Jan. 1992).

Most violence in hard core pornography however, is real, involving the use of bondage and gagging, burning with matches, cigarettes or naked flame, cutting with knives. The concept of the absent referent is pertinent here as for example, the use of knives recalls yet denies the butchering of animals. It can be argued however that in hard core pornography, wimmin choose to participate to some degree, whereas the farm animal has no control over their treatment. Although wimmin (and feminized submissive men) as submissively constructed characters in pornographic films and photography may be physically harmed in the making of the material (observation, NSY, Jan. 1992), they are not killed in order to produce pornography, unlike animals in meat production.

In one pornographic genre, video 'nasties', the butchering of animals is strongly recalled, yet there is little or no violence actually involved in producing such material, which has declined due to its restriction under the 1984 Video Recordings Act. 'Video nasties' often depict the sexualized mutilation and murder of actors and particularly actresses. The common themes of such material involve: the dismemberment of bodies, beheading, hanging and torture (observation, NSY, Jan. 1992). In such films, sexual consumption and eating is sometimes synonymous, and cannibalism is also a popular theme - sexualized violence used in order for people to become 'meat' (observation, NSY, Jan. 1992). Unlike much violent pornography however, the violence in such films is not real, for I would suggest, anthroparchal boundaries prevent human pornographic models becoming meat materially. Whilst the making of pornography may recall the butchery of animals, the sexualized fragmentation of the pornographic body remains metaphorical rather than literal, thus the discourse of fragmentation is largely present symbolically.

In the production of pornography, four of the seven discourses may be seen to be present: ownership, violence, fragmentation and the Other. Ownership can be seen to be discursively present in gendered rather than natured form, for it refers primarily to patriarchal control over wimmin working in subordinate positions (i.e. as models) within the industry. The other three discourses can be seen to be present in both gendered and natured form, although the former is more common. In making pornography, models are usually constructed as sexually submissive, or if a number of models are depicted in hard core material, then some form of power dichotomous relationship is most likely to be portrayed. Whilst models, as the Others of pornographic production, are usually gendered (the vast majority being female), they are rarely natured at the material level in the making of pornography except in specific and limited pornographic genres such as bestiality and s/m. Similarly, while a minority of pornographic material produced involves physical violence in its making, when physical violence is present, it is often gendered and sometimes natured, as in the case of violent s/m pornography wherein the victim of violence is

often female or feminized and may be treated physically in ways which recall the abusive treatment of animals. Such violences may involve the construction of the body in pornography through discourses of fragmentation, but I have contended that anthroparchal barriers on levels of violence against humans prevent the literal fragmentation of the body in the pornography industry as is endemic with reference to animal bodies in the production of meat.

MODELING

The section above contended some of the seven discourses may be present in both gendered and natured form, particularly with reference to the production of certain hard core pornographic genres. This section and the next examine the practice and procedures of the pornography industry in relation to modeling and photography, and will contend that although some of the seven discourses may be seen to be deployed, they are present in overwhelmingly gendered form. Due to the access difficulties outlined earlier (see Chapter 4), the material for these sections comes largely from interviews with photographers who have engaged in the production of some soft core material, and I would suggest that it may be that naturing in pornographic production can only be seen the manufacture of hard core material which involves physical violence, bestiality and s/m. These sections do throw some light on work in this part of the sex industry in Britain and I believe may raise some questions for those who assume the production of soft core pornography is not exploitative. I will suggest that the pornography industry can be seen to be constituted by patriarchal discourses to a particularly high degree.

The pornography industry is male dominated in terms of a clear gendered division of labour in which wimmin tend to be segregated into the (relatively) low paid work of modeling, and photographers, whether salaried working for soft core magazines or working free lance, 'journalists', and editorial staff, are overwhelmingly men. There are some exceptions however, and there are wimmin in positions of power within the industry. For example, publications such as *Penthouse* have had female editors for some time (Thompson, 1994, p.240), some soft core publications have female photographers (*Men Only*, 1991-1993). Such wimmin however, are the exception to the rule, and their presence can be considered supportive of the current power relationships within those industries as opposed to a challenge to those relations. For example, pictures taken by female photographers for straight male soft core publications are no different in content to those taken by men. Overwhelming, pornographic photographers are men, and it will be argued in the final section, they tend to sexualize the work they do and have significant gendered control over the predominantly female models they photograph. The sexual division of labour is reversed when we look at modeling in this section, wherein wimmin predominate, and the power relations are converse.

There are different forms of modeling depending on the material produced. Soft core modeling is dominated by a few big publishing houses. Models in the 'top end' of this market, working for publications such as *Penthouse* and *Playboy* are found through specialist 'skin model' or 'body model' agencies. Agency models are paid around £2-400 for an hours work, and agencies provide advice for models, such as the need to sign contracts to ensure they have certain rights of copy over the photographs taken, and minimum fee charges (interview, photographic assistant, London, Aug. 1995). Those who work for less up-market publications (such as *Men Only*) also come through such agencies, but will be lower paid (as these are relatively cheap publications which prioritise economy) and less likely to have contracts. In hard core modeling and the soft core genre of 'readers wives', there are no contracts and pay is lower apart from the rare exceptions with shows and slots on cable television. Part of the problem for these models is they have no legal immunity and means of grievance redress (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995).

Hard core modeling is perceived by some photographers and models alike to be similar to prostitution, for it involves sexual intercourse in exchange for a paltry sum (conversation, sex shop workers, Soho, Jul. 1995). In London's Soho, where different branches of the sex industry are in close proximity, it is often the case that younger prostitutes will engage in hard core modeling, and aging models may adopt prostitution (conversation, Soho, Aug. 1995). The degree of gendered oppression differs according to the work undertaken, but in modeling, I would suggest that the gendered discourses of power of fragmentation, deception, ownership, objectification and (in the case of hard core pornography) violence can be seen to be deployed.

Fragmentation

The production of pornography fragments models bodies into products for sexualized consumption via the evaluation and prioritization of particular body parts in photographs and films. In soft core pornography, models are overwhelmingly wimmin, and in hard core they are the majority (interview, DI, NSY, Jan. 1992). Pornographic model agencies may specialize in certain kinds of nude model (e.g. wimmin of colour) or certain parts of female anatomy (e.g. breasts). The woman is separated from herself, becoming a body rather than a person, evaluated according to pornographic criteria, before her image is fragmented and arranged according to patriarchal constructions of feminine sexuality via photography. Agencies carry dossiers on models that serve as examples of the patriarchal standardization of femininity, as one photographer claimed:

'If you look through their books, it's page after page of perfect female shapes. Well, pictures of certain types of women. Thin, sun-tanned, long hair...They (the models) all look the same, there's a certain look to all of them. They might have different coloured hair and eyes, but that's about it.' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

In mainstream soft core publications, models will all be white. Pictures of black, South Asian and South East Asian wimmin are regarded as 'minority interest' material, and there are specialist modeling agencies through which these wimmin work. Although such material does not appear upon newsagent shelves, there is a popular market for wimmin of colour in submissive roles (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Here, the fragmentation of wimmin's bodies involves the separation of wimmin according to male sexual preference, with wimmin of colour marginalized, often placed in specifically racist contexts of subordination, and defined by the overlapping discourses of race, gender and sexuality as 'exotic'.

The soft core model has a limited working life, for models are expected to be young (between 18 and 25), but must be seen to look over eighteen to avoid attention from police or customs, although for down market soft core such as 'readers' wives' publications, older wimmin are often popular (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Perhaps the greatest problem for the soft core model is that of becoming too well-known, and her earnings are limited by the fact she cannot appear in a major soft core publication too often. In an attempt to minimize familiarity, wimmin may be given different identities by the publication, giving the impression of a far more extensive range of wimmin posing for such shots than is the case. Publications are constantly changing both the style of shot they publish, and the wimmin they use, according to the dictates of fashion. Thus although soft pornographic modeling may be fairly lucrative for some wimmin (doing regular 'spreads' in high circulation magazines), it is a very limited career (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Models are subjected to the control of publishers, and of public demand. This, I would suggest, can be seen as a further example of the deployment of gendered discourses of fragmentation, whereby wimmin are objectified as bodies and evaluated according to patriarchal constructions of femininity. Pornographic magazines and films contain a variety of wimmin in order to appeal to a range of male taste and because fragmented parts of one woman may appeal more than those of another, thus according to photographers making pornography:

'The punters want some variety, 'thou most of the wimmin are similar. You know, but an editor will make sure that if one model's got small boobs or a large bum, another will have big tits and a pert little bum. They need to get the balance right. (EC: 'The balance?') Yeah, you know, little bit of this, little bit of that?' (interview, Feb. 1996, photographer, Derby)

Models are evaluated as fragments, 'little bit(s)', and pornography transforms wimmin into objectified parts with patriarchal appeal. This fragmentation of the model's body into objectified text, recalls the division of animal carcasses by butchering. However, fragmentation in pornography, whilst it produces fragmented bodies in text, does not physically fragment model's bodies, for as discussed in the previous section of this chapter, anthroparchal boundaries are likely to prevent the physical violence implied by actual fragmentation.

Deception

The manufacture of pornography can also be seen to be constituted through gendered discourses of deception. For example, most wimmin who feature in soft core publications are not, as captions would have male readers believe, the womun 'next door'. This deception operates so readers feel they 'know' the model in the shot, and models can increase their work by adopting multiple identities (interview, photographer, Aug. 1995). The figure measurements given for wimmin (but never for men) are also a product of the publishers imagination. Wimmin-as-pornography are objects constructed through patriarchal fantasy. The promotion of such fantasy in soft core publications ensures there is little that is genuine, and another example of deception can be seen in the so-called 'confessions' of female readers which are written by magazine journalists and illustrated not with shots taken especially for the purpose, but with old or unused pictures chosen to supposedly match the 'story-line' (interview, photographer, London, 1995). This can illustrate the deception upon which patriarchal fantasy is based. Fantasies supposedly written by wimmin serve to confirm that wimmin are as patriarchal men would have them: whore-like and insatiable, powerless and compliant in the face of male sexual desire. This is not merely a projection of the reader onto the model, but rather, it is likely to be constructed by the industry itself, as publishers employ journalists to imagine female desire for the male public.

Ownership

There are a number of forms which discourses of gendered ownership may assume in the making of pornography, which may include economic dependency of models on publishers, agencies and photographers; and ownership by the latter of photographs and film the models produce.

For example, modeling agencies may exercise control over models on whom they have dossiers, as the model may be dependent upon the agency to 'sell' their portfolio. As an alternative to securing work via agencies, models who have become established may be approached by a free-lance photographer, who will pay them and then sell the pictures to a magazine. Some models write directly to the publishing company or magazine themselves, whilst others may meet an employer at a party (Thompson, 1995, p.5). Prospective models are often contacted via word of mouth, if they already work within the sex industry, by those they work with (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Hard core modeling tends to be associated with those at the lowest end of the sex industry - prostitutes, whereas soft core is often associated with work in topless bars and strip clubs (interview, waitress, Soho, Aug. 1995). Wimmin working as models or strippers for one kind of Raymond enterprise for example, are likely to work in other parts of the conglomerate. In strip clubs, workers are often willing to be approached for modeling (interview,

waitress, Soho, Aug. 1995). The sex industry, according to my interviewees who worked alongside it or within it, is notoriously cliquy, partly because within it, it is often the case that 'work and socializing are the same thing' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995), which fosters connections and contacts across various branches. Forms of patriarchal ownership may also be evidenced where men are able to expropriate female labour via commodification and sale of their sexuality. Thus for example, those wimmin working for Raymond are dependent not only on consumers, but those who manage the businesses in which they work, and it may be 'unwise' to refuse work in another part of the sex industry if their employer so requests (interview, waitress, London, Soho, Aug. 1995; interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Much of a model's success it seems, depends on her ability to please employers as well as the consumer.

There are wimmin who pose for little or no payment in popular 'readers wives' publications which involve amateur photographers and models, pictured in models' homes. These models, according to the photographers I interviewed, are often paid in alcohol or drugs rather than cash. This setting proves far cheaper for magazines, as the hire of a studio for the day, for example, 'costs a bomb' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Models at the top end of the soft core market will be shot in studios, or properties owned by magazines such as *Penthouse* (1991-3). Outside shots are cheapest of all, and are always popular, but they are illegal as the model can be prosecuted for indecent exposure if shots are taken on public land (conversation, NSY, Dec. 1991). Thus photographers and magazines often contact farmers in order to gain permission to shoot film on their land. The farmer is usually paid, and farm workers are allowed to watch filming. Although some nude modeling may be quite well paid, pornographic modeling is relatively cheap:

'You would pay a fortune for a 'normal person', say a regular actress, to take off their clothes...these models who are used to doing that (porn shoots), you pay them quite a high fee, but nothing excessive.' (interview, Jul. 1995)

For most, modeling tends to be a part-time occupation, providing supplementary income for those already working within the sex industry, or within regular modeling. Such people are not blackmailed or coerced, and according to Thompson (1994), modeling is a positive choice for those who enter it, and he provides a picture of magazines inundated with offers of modeling from enthusiastic female consumers. According to those working in pornographic photography however, this is most unlikely to be the case, as it is professional models alone^{who} pose for mainstream soft core publications, the only exception being the genre of 'readers wives'. Thompson refutes charges of economic exploitation in soft core modeling, asserting it is no different from other forms of modeling, where the key profit makers are those who pay the model for signing over rights to the product. He argues economic disadvantage is not the cause of soft core employment (1994, p.278), with which I would agree. Soft core modeling however, remains exploitative to a greater degree than regular modeling due to lack of unionization (regular models can join Equity), low rates of

pay, and the high level of sexploitation. Models may feel pressurized into having sex with employers and photographers. Most aim to break into the regular modeling business because they can have a longer 'career', and work has higher status:

'It's the greater prestige of the job. Porn modeling - it's shit. You may get married, live with someone, you have your own circle of friends....And one day, someone you know sees you in a magazine. It's not quite like being seen in *Vogue*, now is it?' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

For some wimmin, particularly those with few qualifications or vocational skills, soft core modeling may seem lucrative. For unskilled work, it is relatively well paid. Some wimmin do benefit financially and sometimes socially from undertaking such work. However, I would argue this work should still be regarded as a highly patriarchal form of employment. Soft core modeling, as will be seen in the following section, involves the model in a situation where unless very successful, they have little control over their working environment, and occupy an insecure and lowly status in the business. Hard core modeling is most usually badly paid and physically risky:

'In hard core, you're coming into physical contact with someone, and the money's crap. People involved are also doing dangerous stuff. You don't see condoms in this kind of porn.' (interview, London, Soho, Aug. 1995)

Although the pay for soft core models can be greater than straight models receive on an hourly basis, this is not the case when net earnings are considered. This, according to pornographic photographers, is because regular models may receive certain extras, such as poster fees if a shot is used on bill boards. The only extras models can obtain is from usage on magazine covers, so supplementary earnings are low. In addition, regular modeling is more tightly regulated by contract. If pornographic models work via an agency, then contracting is the norm, where signed agreements bind both the photographer/magazine and the model in respect to the use of any pictures taken. If models are not contracted, they have no rights over the use of images of themselves which belong to the photographer (interview, photographer, Derby, Feb. 1996). In the absence of contracts, photographers themselves admit that they may not even show the model the negatives of pictures they have taken of them (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995).

Thus models, like men who labour in slaughterhouses, are paid only for the work they do i.e. the pictures taken or the animals killed, and must maximize the amount of work they undertake. The role of models within the pornography industry however, can be seen to be analogous in some ways to that of the animals whom the slaughterhouse turns into meat - both become objectified as products for consumption. A key difference here however concerns the question of agency, and is tied to the discursive constitution of ownership. In anthroparchal society, animals are legally owned as chattel property. As suggested in Chapter 7, although there are legal restrictions preventing certain abuses, domestic animals are treated almost entirely according to human will and can be

killed in the process of commodification. Animals have no agency in deciding how they live their lives, for this is determined by their status as potential meat and uncontestedly confirmed through legal ownership. In contrast, pornographic models can have their bodies commodified but with far less abuse and little physical violence, for they are not chattel property of photographers and publishers, but to some degree choose to model and, if working in soft core modeling, can have some limited control over their work (1). There is significant anthroparchal distinction between the treatment of the subordinate Other of the meat and pornography industries that is based on their status and reflected in forms of ownership. Gendered discourses of ownership can be seen, I would suggest, to characterize the relationship between models in pornography and photographers and distributors. These discourses are not natured however, and ownership in this instance can be seen to be deployed in terms of economic dependency and certain forms of exploitation, not as a highly restrictive and determining form of property relation, such as that which pertains to 'meat' animals.

Violence

There is a certain degree of coercion likely to be experienced by models in the making of soft core pornography, but this is most likely to assume economic and social forms. So far, I have argued the making of soft core pornography does not involve physical violence, but suggested that this was not likely to be the case with respect to hard core production, where coercion may be physical. As hard core pornography is illegal, there is no external regulation of its operation and photographers interviewed for this research suggested that the industry does not exercise internal regulation, so that violence may be more likely in the manufacture of such material (interview, photographic assistant, London, Aug. 1995).

The majority of hard core material is in video form (interview, OPS, NSY, Dec, 1991). In this case, photographers suggested that modeling tended to be the result of economic pressures, often from financial need related to drug addiction. Sexual liberals such as Talese, paint a rosy picture of hard core modeling, which he claimed did not exploit wimmin, nor glorify violence (Talese, 1980, p.534). However, photographers interviewed for this research claimed such models earn poor money, and work in unregulated conditions in which there are no prescribed limits upon what they may be asked to do. Where legal restrictions are less strong, such as the USA, some models may make reasonable money, but this does not mean they are not at physical risk, such as that of HIV/Aids infection (2). Models in hard core pornography are often seen to have little say in what they do (interview, photographic assistant, London, Aug. 1995), and a significant proportion of hard core material depicts violence, and appears to involve the use of violence (against wimmin particularly) in its manufacture (interviews and observation, NSY, Jan. 1992). Violent hard core pornography overwhelmingly involves female victims, and thus its production can be seen to be gendered. In addition, some of the ways in which these gendered victims may be treated, may

recall the abuse of animals (whipping, shackelling etc.), naturing the victim of violence also. Thus while the majority of pornographic modeling does not involve physical violence, in a minority of material produced, violence, which could be seen to be both gendered and possibly natured, may be involved in its production.

The objectification of the gendered Other

In the manufacture of pornography, models are actually made into objects via the manipulation of their bodies by photographers. The photographer directs a model's every move, and according to some of those having taken part in pornographic photographic shoots, often evaluates her appearance harshly, attempting to minimize that which they feel will not appeal and maximize that which may according to editorial convention, as illustrated here:

'If she's got small tits, you don't concentrate on her tits, you photograph her with her back to the camera if it's a topless shot, or stick her in a 'Wonderbra' to make her look like she's got something. If she's got a bad bum, you hide it with knickers or do frontal shots. You emphasize the best bits. For example if a model has small tits, if you shoot her lying down she'll look like she's got nothing, so you go for a crotch shot, and get her to lean forward for a shot of her tits.' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

It is often suggested that models enjoy their work, and are sexually aroused by what they do. Some photographers working with pornographic models concur: 'Some women love it, find it a big turn on...but that's not the case for most. They do it day after day. It's just a job' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). Photographers conceded that (soft core) modeling may be 'very demanding work', that requires stamina on the part of the model:

'You're working hard, being fussed over, always being told what to do, criticized all the time. There's always asides: 'that doesn't look nice, her tits are hopeless, her bum's too big', so models are conscious of that. Some of the positions they get into are not easy and they have to hold them for ages, 20 minutes or maybe half an hour.... 'Hold it, that's good, don't move', someone could be lying on a log full of splinters and insects (reference to a shoot for Pirelli calendars taken in the Seychelles) or in a rough sea. And then they're told 'No! don't put your hand there, it looks like you're clinging onto that rock for dear life - which they probably are - 'relax!'. That's when they earn their money' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995).

Models have to be prepared to do what the photographer demands without question. This is the case even when the model is experienced and the photographer far less so, for the model is not pornography, and it is the photographer's skill which is responsible for transforming her body into a pornographic image. It is this which constitutes the photographer/pornographer's power over the models and this can be seen as a gendered power exercised mainly by men over women. In pornography, models are literally turned into an object which can be sold, a film or a photograph. I would suggest this process can be seen to be highly gendered. In most pornographic production,

heterosexual soft core for male consumers, models are evaluated and objectified into a representation that accords with the stereotyped image of sexual woman in discourses of patriarchal femininity. The photographers, most usually men, have significant power to manipulate the bodies and behaviour of these wimmin in order that such a gendered object can be produced.

This section has contended that the processes and practices of pornographic modeling involve five of the seven discourses, but that their deployment overwhelmingly involves gendered relations of power rather than ones which can be seen to be natured. Only in the production of hard core pornography which may involve the physical concretization of discourses of violence, can natured be seen, as models may be physically treated like animals. Modeling involves the evaluation and fragmentation of models bodies in photography according to patriarchal constructions of femininity, and the deployment of patriarchal deception, where for example, the publishers of pornographic magazines deliberately deceive the consumer in constructing the patriarchal fantasies represented in the publication. In the process of making pornography, models are objectified by being made into texts, and this process can be seen to be gendered in terms of power relations pertaining to the division of labour, and the physical manipulation of female models bodies according to patriarchal constructions of femininity. Finally, discourses of gendered ownership can also be seen to be deployed, wherein models are relatively poorly paid, dependent on employers, and have little control over many areas of their working environment.

PHOTOGRAPHY

This section examines the practices and processes of pornographic photography, concentrating on soft core material almost exclusively, as the photographers interviewed to obtain the information on which this section is largely based, had experience in this genre but not of hard core production. This section will suggest that four of our discourses may be seen to be deployed in gendered but not in natured form: the Other, sexualized consumption, objectification and deception.

Deception

The transformation of the model's body into pornography is based on the ability of the photographer to fragment the body according to an established formula, and present an image able to deceive the consumer as to the disposition of the model. Unlike regular photographers, those taking pornographic shots are not merely concerned with the staples of angle, lighting and other techniques designed to enhance aesthetic appeal, but are tightly bound by the conventions of pornography. Thus in soft core shoots, there are a standard number and types of photographs taken (semi-clothed, breast, open crotch) (interview, photographers assistant, London, Aug. 1995). Perhaps the most difficult aspect is that the model should look as if she is sexually aroused. There

are a number of techniques designed to achieve this which involve the model altering herself physically:

‘Retouching photos, especially for a monthly publication, is very expensive; so its better to change the model herself - redden her vagina, and use baby oil to make it glisten.’ (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

The photographer is in a position of power over the models who are expected to do whatever the photographer requests to achieve the desired image:

‘anything. If you’re doing a bloke and he’s going soft, you send him off for a wank...If you want male models to look more muscular than they are, you get them to work out just before the takes. Because then you’re ‘pumped’ or ‘pumped up’. If people exercise, their muscles swell up and they look stronger....With women, you use baby oil or water misters to make them look sweaty. There’s the old ‘ice on the nipple’ trick, but it’s usually easier to get a woman to play with her nipples for you. She’s doing a job, you’re doing a job, it’s standard, you can cheat.’ (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

The photographer’s power, I would suggest, derives from the fact that models themselves cannot constitute pornography. Photographers claim models require good make-up artists and an experienced photographer to sufficiently improve the way they look (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). The idea that the model as a physical being is unsellable without professional manipulation is likewise echoed by modeling agencies who concur that models require photographic skill to render them attractive to the consumer (conversation, former model and agency administrator, Jul. 1989). Thus by fragmenting the body and creating a deceptive sexualization, the photographer objectifies the models bodies into pornography.

The gendering of the Other

Pornographic photography is a male dominated profession, in which models are constructed as the feminized Other. A largely female workforce is segregated from better paid employees (male photographers). Although photographers are better paid, both usually work without the benefit of union protection, unless photographers are working in other industries which are unionized, such as journalism (interview, photographer’s assistant, Aug. 1995). The motivations for men engaging in such photography differ according to which end of the market people are working. According to my interviewees, there is a distinct pecking order in pornographic photography, and within soft core production, there is also hierarchy in terms of status and earnings:

‘People who do the top end *Playboy*, *Penthouse*, that stuff, can earn big bucks, they’re often well-known photographers that don’t just specialize in that stuff (soft core)...If you look at their pictures, they’re technically excellent, the composition, lighting, sets etc. They shoot in studios on big budget sets. So, they get paid fortunes. But the guys at the lower end...they’re employed by the magazine....for a wage, and I don’t know, they’d get a grand

a month. But they'd shoot every day (which is considered to be a lot), or every other day, on 35mm gear (poor quality), just churning it out in models flats and houses'. (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

Photographers working on high quality soft core may do so because it pays well. Those at the lower end of the market however, may not be paid particularly well on a relative scale, but may have non-financial motivations for engaging in such employment, and it is likely that such motivations involve gendered power relations, for they revolve around the attainment of sexual power over women, as illustrated below.

Objectification and sexualized consumption

Photography involves transforming models into texts for sexual consumption, and within this, models are viewed by photographers in ways which, I would suggest, deploy two of the seven discourses, for female models tend to be seen either as an object to be photographed, or as a sexual object to be consumed (fucked) once a shoot is over. For some photographers, particularly those working at the top end of the soft core market, pornographic shoots are merely one job amongst many involving the sale of commodities: 'to me, they (models) were just like cars. Things to be photographed.' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995). For others however, the role of the pornographic photographer is different from other kinds of work, for the former offers unique opportunity for the expression of male patriarchal sexuality:

'There's all the seedy perks of it. You're working with all these females and living the life of a small time porn king, they love that. Sometimes, that's payment enough.' (interview, photographers assistant, Aug. 1995)

The soft core photographer is not just concerned with the physical appearance of the model, but with the presentation of her persona on camera. For example, a model cannot stare blankly at the lens for a 'pin-up' shot, but must look sexually alluring to some degree, despite the manipulation of her body and the poses struck, these are not sufficient to achieve the correct look, rather as one photographer suggested:

'Eye contact...that's the sexy bit. To get a certain type of look, wanting as opposed to just staring. Without eye contact, the picture doesn't really mean very much...The eyes say (to the reader) 'this is yours, you can have this'. The models don't have to be turned on at all, just encouraged by the photographer. Models need to be directed...you direct the person, sculpt them, mould them.' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995)

This sexualization of the Other is crucial to pornography. It is not only the fragmented and objectified body which makes an image pornographic, but that the Other is seen to be actively sexually desiring. As we have seen, models are unlikely to be sexually aroused by their work, however, this may not be so likely in the case of some photographers who engage in quite a large

amount of pornographic photography, and may be attracted by the lifestyle rather than the money. According to my interviewees, such photographers often have sex with the models after a shoot:

'(this happens) alot. It's a control thing. Control over the women. They (the photographers) control them in taking the shots and the sex is like an extension of that...Taking these photographs is almost like foreplay without orgasm. With the kinds of pictures you're taking, asking women to progressively undress, getting them to pose, you're going through a foreplay. And then unless you sleep with them, it's not finished. It's (sex with models) often standard.' (interview, photographer, London, Aug. 1995).

This is probably unremarkable, for in making wimmin into pornography for consumption by heterosexual males such as themselves, soft core pornographic photographers are involved in the manufacture of that which patriarchal popular culture suggests should sexually arouse them.

Wimmin who are involved in the production of hard core pornography are in a different position. With low pay, limited use of contracts and no legal immunity, they are often expected to sleep with the photographer and producers, who will already have filmed the wimmin having sex. In this case, the distinction between this kind of 'acting' and prostitution becomes blurred. Hard core heterosexual pornography usually involves intercourse for which the woman is paid. The connection between sex and monetary exchange is the nexus of prostitution, and in this kind of pornography, wimmin have sex, on film, for money. The director and or photographer occupies a position which can arguably be seen as similar to that of a pimp. In soft core pornography, there is a lesser expectation that sex will take place after filming, but many female models are accompanied to shoots by friends or more usually male partners to ensure they will not be pressurized for sex with producers/photographers. Problematically, if models are not established and bring 'protection' with them, they are unlikely to be asked back by the magazine or photographer (interview, photographer, Derby, Feb. 1996).

Thus in making pornography, photographers tend to see the wimmin they photograph or film as either simply objects per se, or as objects they themselves may sexually consume. This is perhaps unsurprising, as the work of the pornographic photographer is, by nature of what it is, highly sexualized. The majority of pornography is heterosexual, and the majority of photographers of pornographic images are heterosexual men, who may understandably, when making images that are intended to arouse people such as themselves, see the models they photograph as somehow sexually available for the satisfaction of their own desire.

Pornographic photography involves, I have suggested, the deployment of a number of our discourses, in gendered form. It involves the designation of models, mostly of wimmin, as Other, subject to control by overwhelmingly male photographers. That control can be seen to be highly sexualized, for example: models may not refuse sex for fear of their job prospects, or because the

photographer, cannot distinguish fantasy from reality, and assumes the sexually available woman of the image is such in reality. In the case of the latter, the sexually power-charged work environment is premised around the satisfaction of male desire. Finally, pornographic photography involves practices which deceive the consumer of the material and appeal to patriarchal construction of both masculine and feminine sexuality.

Conclusion

This chapter is based on material drawn from a number of sources, from interviews with police, customs officers and some of those selling and making pornography, in order to gain material which is likely to reflect a range of perspectives. The chapter has investigated the possible deployment of gendered and natured discourses in the production of a range of forms of pornography. It has argued that the stages of pornographic production taken as a whole, deploy the seven discourses, although they do so far more clearly in gendered as opposed to natured form.

The manufacture of pornography can be seen to involve power relations of dominance and subordination, which construct Others. Gendered Others (those subordinated in relations of oppressive power, here, the overwhelmingly female pornographic models), and occasionally natured Others (animals in bestiality, submissives in s/m) are placed in a similar relationship. Models are placed in a position of subordination in relation to photographers, publishers and consumers. In most cases, these models will be women, but they may also be children, animals, and men placed in powerless and feminized contexts. The pornographic Subject (photographers, publishers, consumers) is overwhelmingly male and female photographers are exceptions in the sexual division of labour. In addition, the intense sexualization of labour in making pornography does not apply to the female photographer making straight pornography, for the sexualized control of models is premised upon a (hetero)sexual division of labour. The 'Other' of pornographic production however, does not have homogeneous status, for some groups of Others (such as animals) have no ability to contest such relations of sexualized subordination and domination.

The level of contestation is related in part to the discursive deployment of ownership. There is anthroparchal distinction between forms and degrees of ownership which affects different Others. Animals, as legal chattel, can be pornographically commodified with an intense degree of physical violence, i.e. they can be raped and killed with relative ease in the making of pornography. Human pornographic models may be victims of such physical violence, but this is comparatively rare. Models may experience patriarchal ownership to the extent they are economically dependent upon modeling agencies, publishers or photographers, but their bodies are not literally patriarchal property. In the manufacture of pornography however, model's bodies become commodified into text which is owned by pornographic publishers and photographers, thus in the case of the human

model, the form of ownership is indirect rather than direct. The making of pornography can also be seen to be based on deception. An important pornographic deceit, I would suggest, is that models enjoy making pornography, and are sexually aroused in displaying their bodies for consumption by others. However, this chapter has argued modeling is arduous, often highly exploitative work, in which photographers are likely to have a great deal of control over models behaviour in order that models appear to be sexually aroused.

The objectification of models into pieces of text (photographs, films) for sexualized consumption is a defining characteristic of pornography. The person objectified is fetishized, made into an object seen to be capable of sexually arousing the consumer. The fetishized pornographic object is most usually adult, human and female, and pornography remains overwhelmingly, depictions of women for male heterosexual consumption. Although objectification involves the erasure of the models persona, as they become commodified as text, it does not involve physical violence except in specific cases (violent hard core and s/m pornography). Where animals are involved in bestiality, anthroparchy provides no constraints on physical violence, and animals are killed and/or raped. Pornographic objectification (bar bestiality and snuff) operates in contrast to that of the meat industry, wherein animals are ultimately objectified via slaughter. The degree and form of violence involved differs according to natured structures in the production of pornography and meat. Thus in the production of pornography, discourses of gendered and natured violence can be seen to be present, although its form is overwhelmingly gendered.

Pornography can also be seen to involve the fragmentation of bodies and of experience. Again, there is anthroparchal distinction from meat production where animals are dismembered, for in pornographic production, for the most part, bodily fragmentation is symbolic and operates through the photography of certain prioritized body parts, rather than by literal physical division. Fragmentation can also be evidenced in the model's experience, for they are separated from the authenticity of their sexuality, appearing sexually aroused when they are unlikely to be. Producing pornography also involves sexual consumption, as the model is constructed as object for the sexual satisfaction of consumers. In the process of becoming a commodity, the model's sexuality may also be consumed by those involved in the making of pornography, for example, models may be expected to have sex with photographers, publishers, or other models in the case of hard core. Here, there is some similarity with the consumption of animal flesh as food, for models are physically consumed in the process of making pornography. Finally, sexual violence is evident in the manufacture of certain pornography (most forms of s/m, bestiality, violent hard core). This may take the physical forms of battery, rape and (very rarely for human models) killing. Whereas in the production of meat, physical violence is systemic, in the making of pornography it is rare, although its threat may be common, and female models may experience sexual harassment at work and

coerced sex. The level and form of violence is specified by the form of pornography, and by anthroparchal distinction.

Whilst this chapter has contended that natured oppression may be evidenced in the production of certain pornographic genres such as bestiality, and is also present in some forms of violent pornography particularly s/m, it has generally contended that the naturing of pornography is largely symbolic rather than material. Whilst the above seven discourses are deployed in pornographic production, they are predominantly patriarchal rather than anthroparchal. It was argued in Chapter 7, that meat production demonstrates the similarity and interconnection of processes of gendering and naturing, but I have contended here that the production of pornography can be seen to be far more distinctly gendered than natured. Although pornography involves the systematic abuse of wimmin, it also demonstrates the protection against the worst excesses of physical abuse that anthroparchy provides members of the human species, whatever their gender. The operation of anthroparchal boundaries to violence against humans will be discussed in greater depth in the following chapter which compares and contrasts patriarchy and anthroparchy, in the light of the evidence suggested by the case studies.

Notes

- (1) I have discussed the question of agency in the first two chapters of this thesis, and suggested that the concept of agency can be seen to involve ability and choice. I argued structures of patriarchal power relations are not all encompassing, and wimmin are able to act in ways both supportive and challenging of such structures, and to make decisions, at least to some degree, about their lives. This does not apply to 'meat animals', for such is their domination by humans, these animals cannot make choices as to how they live to any meaningful degree.
- (2) For example, in 1995, at the annual pornography awards in Hollywood, the issue of most intense debate among 'stars' was condom use. Those who have contracted HIV through pornographic work have been campaigning for condom use to be accepted by the industry. There is strong resistance from producers, who feel this will reduce the appeal of the material. Whereas some consider leaving the business due to HIV/Aids related risks, most see this as part of the business of sex work (Eurotrash, Channel 4, May, 1995). For those at the Hollywood award, such choice may be real, but for most hard core models, particularly those with drug habits, it is likely to be limited.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION - RELATIONS BETWEEN PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY

This thesis has examined the case studies of meat and pornography in order to address the question of the relationship between two systems of oppression: patriarchy and anthroparchy. The first two chapters suggested patriarchy and anthroparchy should be conceptualized as relatively autonomous systems of oppression which may articulate and interrelate, and it was contended a dual systems approach might be efficacious in analyzing such interrelations. The theoretical framework adopted in this research attempts to combine a systemic and structural framework with a discursive approach. I suggested the possibility of seven discourses of power which I felt might be seen to be deployed in ways which could be seen as patriarchally gendered, and/or anthroparchally natured, and the empirical research for the case studies constitutes an attempt to examine the possible deployment of these discourses.

In terms of the empirical research, the key findings were that the both meat industry and the symbolization of meat in popular culture involved the deployment of anthroparchal and patriarchal discourses. This was also found to be the case in examining the symbolization of the body in pornographies. Consequently I would want to argue that meat and pornography can be seen as instances of oppression in which both patriarchal and anthroparchal discourses can be identified, indicating a close relationship between the two systems of domination. This conclusion will draw upon the findings of the empirical research in order to argue that it overlaps in the structures of patriarchal and anthroparchal systems which may account for their close relationship. The production of pornography however, was found not to be so clearly anthroparchal, suggesting the relationship between the systems is also likely to be characterized by difference, with patriarchy and anthroparchy seen to articulate closely in some instances but to a limited extent in others.

This conclusion will argue, in the light of the research findings, that the differences in content of particular structures of patriarchy and anthroparchy may provide an explanation for the limits of comparison between the two systems. It will contend that the structure of violence, which, it will be argued, is common to both patriarchy and anthroparchy, may demonstrate similarity in its symbolic or ideological aspects, but difference in its material forms and degree. Thus it will suggest that in anthroparchal society, violence against animals may assume more physically systematic forms operating to an intense degree, than may be the case regarding patriarchal violence against women.

This conclusion has a number of purposes. Most importantly, it will examine the relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy in the light of the research findings for the four case studies.

This research drew primarily upon a discursive framework for analyzing the empirical material, and this chapter will suggest possible ways in which this discursive analysis might be combined with a structural approach. The chapter will outline the structures of both patriarchal and anthroparchal systems, and compare and contrast them, drawing upon the findings of the empirical research. The chapter is divided into five sections of divergent length. The first section maps the theoretical basis for the analysis by discussing the different levels of abstraction involved in the various stages of theory building, and how these stages relate to each other; i.e. it will discuss the relationship between the generalizations drawn from the empirical material, discourses, structures and finally systems of oppression. In so doing, this section will argue a case for a structural dual systems approach. Second, this section will discuss the ontology adopted in the research and argue for the significance of a critical realist approach in theorizing relations of gender and nature. Third, the section discusses the relationship between the different aspects considered by the case studies, i.e. those of material production and ideological symbolization, and will discuss the discrepancies in the research findings when different aspects of the case studies are considered. The second section discusses the two systems of oppression, outlining the structures which might compose them, in the light of the evidence provided by the case studies. The third section attempts to compare and contrast such structures which may be seen to be common to patriarchy and anthroparchy in relation to the evidence of the case studies. Fourth, the extent of divergence between the systems is discussed by considering possible structures of both systems which may not interlink and overlap. Finally, this conclusion ends by considering the possible contribution of this thesis to sociological debates.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

This section outlines the theoretical basis of the research before we progress to a detailed consideration of the conclusions which may be drawn from the empirical findings. It first examines the different levels of analysis utilized in the process of theory building, and discusses the ways in which these may be seen to relate to one another. Whilst I have asserted that a combination of structural and discursive approaches may be useful and desirable, there are some tensions between these approaches that are not entirely resolved by their discussion here. I do not consider it necessarily problematic that some questions may remain unresolved however. This research hopes to show that discursive and structural approaches may not be mutually exclusive as is often assumed, but may enrich each other in mutual operationalization. The resultant framework is not necessarily cohesive in a watertight manner, but I feel this may be endemic in the process of combining rather different approaches, at least when such combination has been little practiced. This section also argues for the significance of a realist ontology and suggests how this may be combined with discursive analysis. Finally, this section examines the relationship between the two different aspects that form the subject matter for the case studies: the aspect of material production

(of meat and pornography as commodities), and the aspect of symbolic representation (of meat and pornography in popular culture). It will be contended that consideration of different aspects of the phenomena of meat and pornography leads to different conclusions based on the empirical research, and can help explain some of the different properties of systems of oppression.

Data, discourse, structure and system

There are four stages of differential and progressive abstraction operationalized in this thesis, which can be seen to constitute different but interrelated stages of theory building: concrete empirical research, discourses, structures and systems. The least abstract level is the concrete research for the case studies. Meat and pornography are specific instances or cases, which exist as processes, institutions and symbolic regimes, which may be seen to be oppressive. However, systems of oppression such as patriarchy and anthroparchy cannot be read off directly from such empirical instances, and intermediary stages of abstraction are required.

Discourses form the second stage of abstraction in the development of the theoretical framework for this thesis. Analysis of the empirical material led to the production of generalizations about symbolic representations and institutions and procedures. I thought that these generalizations could be grouped as they could be seen to be thematically interrelated. In grouping the empirically derived generalizations, I felt they could be seen as 'ideas-in-practice' which carried and constituted power relations and may be appropriately conceived of as discourses. As discussed in Chapter 3, I have conceptualized discourses as sets of ideas that are institutionally embedded in social practices, and which are both constructive of the social world and constitutive of oppressive relations of power - attaching patriarchal and anthroparchal ideas to social, economic and political institutions and practices. Following Foucault (e.g. 1971, 1976b), I argued that discourses should not be seen as heuristic devices, but as applied practices with real effects. Discourse analysis is seen in this research as both less and also differentially abstracted in relation to the structural analysis I draw upon. As argued in Chapter 3, I feel this is Foucault's own sense of discourse analysis as producing a local, specific, detailed and fragmentary knowledge that is able to catch the complexities of operations of power. I also suggested that such analysis might be combined with macro theoretical explanatory frameworks such as structural analysis.

Through undertaking some of the initial empirical research, and reading the material which was to be incorporated in the second and third chapters of this thesis, seven discourses were identified as possibly relevant for the analysis of relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy: the Other (the construction of groups which are subordinated within relations of dominance and subordination), sexualized consumption, ownership, deception, objectification, fragmentation and violence. These discourses, it was contended, may be seen to reflect power relations of gender and

nature, and might be deployed patriarchally and/or anthroparchally in cultural texts, social practices and institutions. The remaining bulk of the empirical research investigated whether these discourses could be seen to be deployed in two different cases, and if so, whether the discourses were both gendered and natured.

In Chapter 3, I contended discourses may be seen as operating both within and across groups or sets of relatively enduring oppressive relations of power – structures. As we move further from the empirical to the abstract, I posited that such structures could be seen to interrelate, forming complex social systems of oppression: patriarchy and anthroparchy. Structures themselves can be conceptualized as deep seated sets of institutional/organizational/procedural relations which shape social life in important ways but do not entirely determine it. Whilst societies are composed of structures of social relations, human beings have agency which impacts on such structures, for structures both survive and reproduce themselves, and are also contested and altered, by human action. In the light of the empirical research for the thesis however, it was found that the significance of agency may differ quite profoundly across different oppressive systems.

An important task of this research was to examine the extent to which animals could be seen to be oppressed and exploited in a human dominated or anthroparchal society, and investigate whether such oppression may also be gendered. In anthroparchal society, I would argue agency can be seen to be almost exclusively human. In Chapters 1 and 7, I contended that humans can be anthroparchal agents, for example, when slaughtering animals or eating them. Whilst the former is an extreme example of anthroparchal agency, the latter is most significant. In the domination of animals, almost all humans are implicated as agents of oppression as the overwhelming majority of humans in modern ‘Western’ societies eat meat. I feel the majority of meat eating humans are unreflexive as to their role as agents of anthroparchal domination, but there are instances in which (a small minority of) humans can be anthroparchally contesting agents, for example, by adopting vegetarianism or veganism. Systems and their constitutive structures of oppression are not static, changing in form, degree and mode of operation over time and across cultures, and oppressive structures are both reproduced and changed by human agency. Anthroparchal domination however, allows animals negligible agency, and I would suggest it is difficult to envisage a sociological theory of anthroparchy that is able to account for agency in nature itself. An analysis of agency is enabled by an understanding of agents thinking, and however intuitive one might be, understanding the ‘perception’ of animals is problematic. This analysis does involve human agency, but for the most part, this is not seen to assume contestatory forms, for most humans in these particular case studies are seen to be reproducing relations of oppression.

Structural and discursive analyses are often seen as antithetical approaches within sociology, and whilst I have attempted to combine them in this thesis, this combination is not a straightforward nor

an easy 'fit'. I conceptualize structures as more abstracted from empirical instances than discourses which I see as emerging from/within such instances. Discourses and structures are also differential abstractions, the former being more detailed, specific and fragmentary. Whilst I argued in Chapter 3 that discourses operate within structures and can be seen to construct and constitute structural relations of power, I do not see them as discreetly contained within structures, but as evident in differing form and content and operating in complex webs of interrelation across structures. This may give the impression that I am conceptualizing structures as rigid boxes across which discourses may flow, but this is not the case. I do see structures as relatively enduring sets of relations, but whilst they are distinct, they are not autonomous, and structures link, overlap and intermesh in certain instances. I think that such links, overlaps and intermeshing, and a sense of distinction combined with semi-autonomy, characterize all my stages of conceptual abstraction: discourses, structures and systems. This may appear to be a rather jumbled conceptualization, but I feel (and I hope) it may help to capture a sense of the complexities of oppressive formations.

Structures, in their interrelations, form complex systems of oppression. Such systems can be seen to subordinate certain populations in webs of oppressive relations. These systems do not exist in isolation, and I would argue that 'Western' contemporary societies can be seen for example, to be based on a number of systems: patriarchy, anthroparchy, capitalism, racism. I do not feel that these systems should be conceptualized as parallels however. Systems of oppression are likely to have particular structures which are specific to them. They may have structures which can be seen as similar or even the same, but despite any similarity, the content of those structures is likely to differ in terms of their specific formation and in the degree of oppressive relations which constitute them. For example, I would contend that violence can be seen as a structure of both patriarchy and anthroparchy but the form (type) of violence differs. Thus mass killing is not an endemic kind of violence for women in patriarchy, but is an endemic form for animals in anthroparchal society. Structures of violence operate to differing degrees, for example, anthroparchal violence is more intense than patriarchal violence due to routinized slaughter. Systems of oppression co-exist and relate in ways both co-operative and conflictual, and I would argue disparities and similarities between systems of oppression might be explained via an examination of their structures.

Thus discourses, structures and systems constitute the different stages of theory building in this thesis, each stage being progressively further abstracted from the empirical data, whilst also being differentially abstracted. Whilst I conceptualize systems of oppression to be composed of and constituted by structures, and structures in turn to be composed of and constituted by discourses, I do not see the abstraction of oppressions in terms of neat and discrete categories. Rather, at each level of abstraction, the concepts are seen as interlinked and overlapping in ways which I think may be appropriately reflective of the complexity of social life.

Dual systems analysis

In order to further attempt to capture social complexity, I have argued for the adoption of a dualist perspective in analyzing at my most abstract theoretical level - social systems. Specific instances of oppression are complex, and likely, I would suggest, to be produced by the articulation and interrelation of discourses and structures constitutive of more than one system of oppression. Thus in the case of this research, meat and pornography have been seen as predominantly the product of structures of particular systems: meat is predominantly anthroparchal, pornography is predominantly patriarchal. In each instance of oppression, a varying number of systems may be present, operating to different degrees. For example, domestic labour has been seen by socialist feminists as part of the structure of the household in capitalism and patriarchy. It is affected by 'race', although not necessarily in negative ways - for example some black feminist theorists have defended black families as less reflective of gendered disadvantage, and in contestation with an ethnically structured society. I feel it is most unlikely that the household can be seen as either a structure of, or a phenomenon affected by, anthroparchy. Thus I would suggest that it is not imperative in explaining particular instances of oppression, to refer to all four systems and that a dual or triple systems theory is usually likely to be sufficient.

This analysis is based on a dual, not triple or even a quadruple systems approach. The two most pertinent systems of oppression are theorized in the first two chapters of the thesis, in which I also contended that oppressive relations affecting animals in the case of meat were most likely to be located within a system of anthroparchy, and oppressive relations affecting humans as in the case of pornography, most likely to be located within a system of patriarchy. However, I also suggested it was possible that systemic relations of oppression could interlink. Thus pornography is seen in this research to be primarily a product of patriarchal relations but also to be produced by anthroparchal relations. Meat is seen primarily as a product of anthroparchal relations, but is also constructed through patriarchal relations. This is not to suggest capitalism and racism are irrelevant in the construction of meat and pornography, and they have been analytically employed at certain junctures. The analytical focus of the conceptual overlap between patriarchy and anthroparchy is based on their relative significance: patriarchal and anthroparchal relations were seen as crucial to meat and pornography, but relations of race and capital contingently relevant. In addition, due to restrictions of time and the need to restrict scope, it was felt conceptualization of two systems substantiated by comparative case study analysis constituted a suitably manageable project.

In Chapters 1, 2 and 3, I argued a case for a dual systems approach in contrast to the single systems approaches adopted by some radical feminists, eco-feminists and deep ecologists, and in contrast to poststructural and postmodern accounts of gender and 'nature' which have generally eschewed an analysis of system and structure. In the initial research for the thesis, the dominations

of gender and nature were seen to be highly divergent in the specific forms and degrees they assumed. It was felt a dual systems approach which examines contradictory relations of patriarchy and anthroparchy through the use of a discursive approach operating within a generally structural framework, would be able to capture the complexities and differences of gendered and natured dominations.

Ontological realism

The first two chapters argued a case for the adoption of a realist ontology. Within this, systems of oppression of patriarchy and anthroparchy and their constitutive social structures and discourses of power, are seen as having a real existence and effect. Thus systems, structures and discourses are not only heuristic devices a sociologist may use as a tool to explain phenomena. Rather, systems, structures and discourses are properties which I feel can be ontologically established via empirical investigation, for they have emergent features and powers and corporeal effects. These emergent properties can be seen to exist, I would suggest, regardless of our interpretations of them.

I contended in Chapter 1 for example, that the environment refers to specific physiological entities that should be analyzed in terms of specific systematic structures of power relations of 'nature' which are real and have real effects. I also contended that my adoption of critical realism was likely to necessitate a structural approach to the analysis of human domination of the environment, for the multifarious natural environment in an anthroparchal society was dominated and controlled by humans to the extent it could not be seen to possess agency. In Chapter 2, I linked my arguments for a realist ontology to those which held a structural approach significant for the analysis of gender relations. Here, I contended that whilst gender relations should be seen as dynamic, they exhibit regularity and continuity over time, and have a real existence beyond our knowledge of and enactment of them. Thus the discourses, structures and systems which I have attempted to identify through empirical research, I consider to be real objects with emergent properties that may help us identify why a particular phenomena such as meat and pornography, may be 'thus, and not so'.

The material and the ideological

The case studies examined the interconnections between patriarchy and anthroparchy at different levels or aspects of their operation: the material and the ideological or symbolic. In Chapter 2, I discussed some of the sociological debates around the relationship between the material and the ideological. I argued the latter should be seen to refer to the symbolic regimes of idea and belief that is at once both separable from corporeality and closely intertwined with it, to the extent of being constitutive. I also contended such symbolic regimes were both reflective and constitutive of

oppressive power relations. Thus ideology is at once a symbolic regime of ideas, and one which is embedded in social institutions, practices and processes and is shaped by various systems of domination which construct and legitimate dominant power relations.

Structures of oppressive systems are conceptualized as having ideological and material aspects or levels, which can be differentiated but are also interrelated. The material level is where discourses of oppression are concretized in physical form. Whilst this level can refer to economic institutions and processes, these can also be political or violent. For example, oppressive social structures such as the state can be seen to operate both ideologically and materially. Legislation deploys cultural discourses of gender and nature, but law is materially present in institutional form, practically enacted in gendered and natured ways by police, courts and punitive measures. The cases of meat and pornography were analyzed in both their material and ideological aspects. They were seen to exist as symbolic systems of representation that could be examined in texts of popular culture which deployed gendered and natured discourses. At the material level, meat and pornography were examined as industries infused, which provided institutional expression to discourses of gender and nature, and are facilitated by the state which is implicated practically. However, material and ideological aspects of analysis do interrelate, for example, the generally materialist analysis of the processes of meat and pornographic production, also involves an account of the cultural symbolism within such employment.

Patriarchy and anthroparchy assume different forms and degrees in different levels of analysis. At the symbolic level, our seven discourses (the Other, sexualized consumption, ownership/commodification, fragmentation, objectification, deception and violence) were seen to operate in the cases of both meat and pornography, in ways both gendered and natured. At the material level, comparison was weaker. All seven discourses were deployed in the production of both meat and pornography, but whereas the meat industry was strongly gendered as well as natured, the pornography industry was gendered but rarely natured. In the cases of the cultural symbolization of meat and pornography and the meat industry, discourses could be seen as part of structures of both patriarchy and anthroparchy. The pornography industry was the limiting case in this comparative analysis, being patriarchal, but only occasionally anthroparchal. Thus systems of oppression may be seen to interconnect at different levels, and may appear in some aspects of an instance of oppression, and not others. The following section compares structures of patriarchy and anthroparchy, and by outlining their content in terms of forms and degrees of oppression, seeks to explain the comparative presence of patriarchy and anthroparchy at the ideological level, and the absence of anthroparchy in certain cases at the material level. Before so doing however, it is pertinent to discuss the extent to which the model outlined in the rest of the conclusion might be applied both regionally and historically.

The question of universality

This thesis limited its scope in selecting its case studies in order to avoid the charge of universalism, and thus a comparative study of contemporary British cases was undertaken. In the four chapters containing the findings of empirical research, I suggested there are likely to be differences between the material obtained in these cases studied in the British context, and that which might have been obtained from studies undertaken in other parts of contemporary Western society. For example, in the rest of Europe and in America, pornography has different kinds of legal definition and restriction which may affect its production relations; in other 'Western' countries, there are different food preferences and cuisine in which meat may feature more heavily than in the British case (e.g. the United States, France) or slightly less (e.g. southern regions of Spain and Italy), and this may affect analysis of the symbolic regimes of food in popular culture.

The findings of this research can be seen to apply to contemporary Britain, although I feel much of the analysis may also apply to other contemporary developed countries characterized by the mass production and consumption of meat and pornographies, although it is beyond the scope of the thesis to test such application. I would not want to suggest that many of the findings might apply historically, for certainly in the case of pornography, mass production and consumption has a limited history (dating from the 1960s). I also feel the application of the ideas outlined here may be limited in countries which are less industrialized, and/or which have radically different cultures. For example, in the case of the popular culture surrounding food, the majority of cuisine within certain of the northern states of India (the so-called 'Hindi belt') is vegetarian, and whilst much of South East Asian cuisine is meat orientated even to a higher degree than in Britain (according to a Cantonese proverb for example, humans can eat the flesh of 'anything with its back to the sun'), dairy products rarely feature. I would not suggest that the forms and degrees of patriarchal and anthroparchal relations necessarily pertain for example, to such food cultures, although they may.

The claims made for this research are by no means universal. Whilst I have some confidence that they apply to contemporary British society in which context the empirical material is located, and I would think that some of these arguments apply to other modern Western contemporary societies. I would not suggest they might apply transhistorically, nor to regions with lower levels of industrialization and/or cultures very different to those of Europe and the United States.

SYSTEMS OF OPPRESSION: PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY

The purpose of this section is to outline the structures of patriarchy and anthroparchy in order to specify the range and limits of each system of oppressive relations. In order to do so, it will attempt to specify various social structures (groups of oppressive relations) of which such systems may be

composed. It contends some of these structures may be common to both systems, despite differing content, whilst others may not be. Thus this section is furthest abstracted from the findings of the empirical research, whilst the section which follows attempts to link the conceptualization of systems of oppressive relations outlined here to analyses of structure and discourse, by comparing different levels of interconnections between the various structures of the two systems, substantiated by discursive analysis drawn from the four chapters of empirical research.

Patriarchy has been defined as a system of social relations based on gender oppression, in which primarily women, but also feminized Others (e.g. children, insufficiently patriarchal men) are dominated and oppressed. Structures of patriarchy are linked, but have relative autonomy. Patriarchy is characterized by different structures which emerge from normative praxis. These structures are based upon aspects of systems of oppression, and in Chapter 2, I concurred with Walby's (1990) identification of six structures of patriarchy: paid employment, household, culture, violence, sexuality, and state, whilst disputing her theoretical prioritization of certain structures, and her nature-blind position. I suggested the structures most relevant for a comparative analysis of patriarchy and anthroparchy are: sexuality, culture, violence and to a lesser degree, the state.

Anthroparchy is a new concept developed by this research. In Chapter 1 it has been defined as a system of social relations based upon nature oppression, in which the environment (non-human animals, plants, land, sea, space) is dominated by human beings, and, if sentient (capable of experiencing pain, pleasure etc.) can be seen to be oppressed. Green theory has insufficiently clarified structures of oppression, merely arguing modern Western societies are characterized by anthropocentrism (human-centredness), or a 'logic of domination'. It has focused on a number of environmental 'problems' resulting from the latter, such as ozone depletion, global warming, habitat destruction and species extinction, food production etc. I have suggested these 'problems' might be seen as specific oppressive instances that operate as part of a system of oppression, formed from the interrelation of structures of oppressive relations and their constitutive discourses. I would suggest that anthroparchy could be seen to have six structures: violence, culture, sexuality, the state, domestication and industrialism. The first four can be seen as common to patriarchy, the last two likely to be specific to anthroparchy.

Anthroparchal violence can be seen to involve for example, the destruction of habitat, extinction of species via hunting, slaughter of animals for meat. Culture can also be seen as anthroparchal: encouraging resource consumption, legitimating resource depletion and human dominance of other species etc. Sexuality can also be considered to be an anthroparchal structure, involving material control of the sexuality, fertility and reproduction of animals, and the symbolic feminization and sexualization of human male dominance of the natural environment. The state is likely to be shaped by a number of oppressive systems: capitalism, racism, and patriarchy, in addition to anthroparchy.

It can be seen to have systematic bias toward anthroparchal interests, evidenced in its general conduct and specific policies. These structures are most relevant for the analysis of pornography and meat: violence, sexuality, culture and the state. Other structures of anthroparchy I would suggest are not so clearly patriarchal: domestication and industrialism. I use the term 'domestication' to refer to anthroparchal control of the wilderness as a mechanism of the domination of nature. Domestication involves human control of animals, instilling docility so animals may be used as human resources; and may also refer to the control of wilderness via ownership and cultivation. I use the term 'industrialism' in a way similar to its usage by green theorists discussed in Chapter 1, to refer to mass production of goods and services in affluent societies, and a world-view based on the belief human needs must be met via permanent expansion of production and consumption.

Systems of domination are not static, but change historically in form and degree. I concurred with Walby (1990) that patriarchy has changed and adopted a more public mode of operation, partly through a shift in the relative significance of certain structures: the lessening significance of the household, and increased importance of the public structures of paid employment and the state). I would give increased emphasis to Walby's (underdeveloped) contention that patriarchal structures have themselves shifted to a more public form. I would argue for example, that this may be seen with respect to: sexuality (e.g. patriarchal sexualization of popular culture, medicalization of fertility, pregnancy and childbirth), (popular) culture, and the expansion of the role of the state as a patriarchal agency and a site for feminist contestation. Violence, in the face of contestation, may adopt more subtle and public forms such as the expansion of pornography. Anthroparchal structures of dominance can and have also changed, but in most cases, I feel their intensity has increased. For example, violences against animals can be seen to have moved into an increasingly public mode with the advent of the factory farm. Sexuality can be conceptualized as an all-encompassing domination with the increased application of reproductive technologies. Whilst I would acknowledge there have been challenges to anthroparchal culture, meat eating remains overwhelmingly legitimate, and the meat industry, via its advertising power, is able to manipulate and circumvent challenges with the implicit and explicit support of the state.

Despite shifts in the content of oppressive structures, and the intensity of their oppressive power, I would suggest they may have some degree of continuity. Patriarchy and anthroparchy might be seen to have six structures. Patriarchy has structures of violence, culture, sexuality, state, household and paid employment. Anthroparchy has structures of violence, culture, sexuality, state, domestication and industrialism. The following sections relate the idea of systemic relations of oppression more closely to the empirical research of this thesis by examining the possible existence of structures of anthroparchy and patriarchy in relation to the discourse analysis of the case studies. In this way, I shall attempt to compare and contrast both systems by looking firstly at

structures which may be common to these systems and then ones possibly divergent, delimiting the boundaries of each system through a combination of structural and discursive analysis.

STRUCTURAL COMPARISON OF PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY

Four of the structures of patriarchy and anthroparchy I have suggested, are common: culture, sexuality, violence and the state - although their content, form and degree of oppression, differs. Structures of systems of oppression can be seen as analytically distinct, but having relative not absolute autonomy. The four structures will be discussed separately, but certain elements overlap and interlink. For example, some feminists have seen pornography as cultural, others as violence, others still, as an aspect of sexuality. However, I feel it is an aspect of all three structures and that specific instances of oppression cannot always be considered within one particular structure of a system of oppression. Meat and pornography are specific instances of oppression that are part of the patriarchal and anthroparchal structures of culture, sexuality and violence. The state functions largely to maintain oppressive structures, via intervention or non-intervention.

Culture

The culture of contemporary Western societies can be seen as a structure of both patriarchy and anthroparchy. Patriarchal culture involves the creation and deployment of notions of femininity and masculinity, and representation of gender via patriarchal discourse. The core of contemporary discourses of femininity is sexuality, within which wimmin should be sexually attractive to, and available for, men. Alternatively, there is a discourse of gendered domesticity, according to which wimmin should engage in domestic labour, 'care' for their male partner and children, and desire motherhood. As more wimmin contest and reject this domestic role, the cultural control of wimmin, I would suggest, has shifted toward sexualization of wimmin in popular culture. Anthroparchal culture creates notions of human superiority, and of inferiority of other animals and the natural environment which require human control. It also deploys discourses based upon sexualization and domestication. In this case, domestication does not involve the notion of service, but of control. The environment is symbolized as a dangerous wilderness which must be subject to domination e.g. cultivation of land, 'management' of forests, domestication and/or slaughter of wild animals. Thus the environment is constructed as a series of objects over which humans may exercise control. Anthroparchal culture encourages consumption and the value of 'affluence' which obscures and legitimates resource depletion, and certain violences (e.g. medical vivisection). These discourses of consumption and domestication may operate in tandem with the sexualization of human dominance, in which environmental control is constructed as sexual domination (e.g. cultivation of 'virgin' territory). Finally, anthroparchal culture is characterized by the discourse of mechanistic scientific rationality, which conceptualizes the natural environment as an inert

machine. The Enlightenment prioritization of human reason elevated legitimated both animal abuse, and exploitation of the environment for human benefit. Some eco-feminists have rightly noted such discourse was also part of patriarchal culture which constructed wimmin as less human.

The case studies provide some evidence that culture can be seen as both patriarchal and anthroparchal. The discourses of meat and pornography are both gendered (construct femininities and masculinities) and natured (construct animality and humanity), and this was substantiated via an examination of texts of popular culture: pornographic novels, film and magazines; and food magazines, food advertising, cookery books, and cookery articles in women's magazines.

Anthroparchal culture constructs meat as the pinnacle of the food hierarchy. Our seven discourses are deployed within meat culture as part of both patriarchal and anthroparchal structures. Meat involves the construction of the gendered and natured Other. As a product, meat is natured. The subordinated status of non-humans in anthroparchal society facilitates the killing of domestic animals and the eating of their flesh. The animal becomes an absent referent in meat eating culture, and is objectified via meat, for human use. Meat is gendered, feminized via association with feminine qualities: passivity, sensuality, receptiveness. Preparation and consumption of meat is also gendered. Cultural discourses of domesticity encourage wimmin to prepare meat for consumption by men and other members of households. Meat forms part of the discourses of masculinity, where its consumption is associated with male strength and aggression, and meat culture is characterized by sexualized consumption that is gendered and natured. The consumption and preparation of meat is sexualized. Men consume meat, particularly red meat, to enhance their virility, and wimmin are encouraged to prepare meat for men as part of the sexualized discourse of patriarchal femininity. Food designated by anthroparchal and patriarchal culture as appropriate for wimmin and which wimmin may consume for their pleasure, is fish (associated pornographically with female genitalia), and 'feminized protein' - eggs and dairy products such as cream and milk chocolate (produced via manipulation of the sexuality and reproduction of female animals).

The way meat is represented deploys discourses of patriarchal and anthroparchal objectification, fetishism and fragmentation. Anthroparchy facilitates the division of meat into pieces, fragments, presented to the viewer as objects of desire. Animals are objectified as texts, pieces of meat, which humans desire, and the description of pieces of meat recall sexual pornography. Certain parts of an animal are discursively constructed as most desirable, sexually fetishized. Meat culture involves patriarchal and anthroparchal deception. It represents meat as an object distanced from the killing of a sentient animal, obscuring the violence of mass slaughter intrinsic to meat production. The preparation of food also involves deception. Wimmin are encouraged by patriarchal food culture to prepare recipes involving animal products and to deny the intense domestic labour involved. Meat as a cultural product involves relations of ownership for as a cultural text, meat becomes a means

through which commodified animals can be bought and consumed. Finally, meat culture involves the representation of patriarchal and anthroparchal violences. In the representation of carving, men are depicted using knives as tools of implementational violence upon feminized and natured meat. Meat culture thus exemplifies a complex variety of discourses of gender and nature. As a product, meat is defined anthroparchally (flesh of non-human animals), but it is represented in advertisements and recipes, in ways both gendered and natured.

Pornographic culture is shaped by discourses of both patriarchy and anthroparchy, and again the seven discourses are apparent in gendered and natured form. Pornographic culture defines sexuality in terms of power relations of dominance and subordination, and constructs wimmin/feminized men and animals as Others which are gendered and natured. The Other of pornographic representation is gendered by being feminized and usually female, and natured by being animalized, constructed as animal-like in nature and behaviour. Sexuality is constructed as animal behaviour in which inferior humans engage, and the abuse of animals is often recalled in pornographic texts as a means of reducing the status of the gendered objects of pornographic representation. Occasionally, the Other may actually be represented as animal, as in the pornography of bestiality, but most usually, animals are absent referents in pornographic discourse. Pornographic representation also constructs the Other, usually female flesh, as meat, for sexual consumption. Bodies and parts of bodies are placed under relations of ownership - commodified for sexual use (masturbation) and metaphorically constructed as meat.

In pornography, sexuality and the sexual body is represented through the deployment of discourses of objectification, fragmentation and fetish. Living beings are objectified as commodities that can be consumed sexually. This objectification is gendered and natured as the pornographic object is overwhelmingly female and/or feminized, and animalized metaphorically. The pornographic body is also fragmented, divided into parts defined by their levels of sexualization. This involves the depiction of particular sexual acts, or, more usually, particular body parts, especially the genitals of wimmin. These fragments recall the fragmentation of animals in butchery, and wimmin's genitals may be pornographically referred to as animals (pussy), dead animals (split beaver), or meat (salmon sandwich, beef curtains). Finally, pornographic culture is characterized by violence, both physical and metaphorical. Images may depict physical violence such as whipping, beating, rape or physical restraint, or be suggestive of such. Pornographic objectification also suggests violation of the integrity of the Other. Such violences are gendered and natured. The victims of violence are usually female and feminized, and often also metaphorically animalized. In addition, the use of animal products such as leather and fur involves natured, for animals are absent referents in pornographic images.

Cultural discourses are sexualized, and I would suggest the increased sexualization of discourses of femininity in the texts of popular culture is likely to be a means of patriarchal incorporation. The sexualization of discourses of femininity has involved the increasing influence of pornography, defining sexuality in highly gendered and power dichotomous fashion, in a variety of forms of popular culture. Meat culture in contemporary patriarchy is overtly masculinized in terms of consumption, and feminized in terms of preparation. However, discourses constructing this have altered in the last decade from emphasizing female domesticity (wimmin in the family preparing meat for men) to emphasizing feminine sexuality (wimmin become attractive to men and increase male virility via their preparation of meat food for men).

Patriarchal culture can also be seen as overlapping the structure of paid employment, which has implications for gender segregation. The killing of animals combined with heavy manual labour offers a sense of strongly sexualized masculinity for those who work in the meat industry. The association of this type of work with the culture of machismo serves to both exclude wimmin from such employment (horizontal segregation); and ensures if wimmin are involved in the meat industry it is low status and peripheral employment (vertical segregation) which places them in a position of 'camp follower'. The pornography industry is similarly infused with macho culture, but the effect of this on the structure of the industry is different. With the pornography industry, wimmin are present in significant numbers (no horizontal segregation) but confined, in the majority of cases, to lower status jobs such as modeling (vertical segregation). Wimmin in pornographic production are far less of a marginalized minority than in the meat industry. However, they can be seen to occupy a different position. In the meat industry, wimmin are not sexualized, but pornographic models work in an industry based on the appropriation of their sexuality. Female models can be seen to occupy a position comparable to animals slaughtered in the meat industry. In both cases, those subordinated in oppressive relations are feminized and sexualized, and their sexuality or reproductive power lies at the basis of exploitation. Rather than occupying the status of wimmin as workers, models become the commodified product.

The cultural structures of patriarchy and anthroparchy shape behaviour, and justify differences, violences and exploitation. This is not to adopt a cultural determinist position. Discourses evident in popular culture are important in the construction and maintenance of patriarchal and anthroparchal power relations, but culture is one structure of these systems of oppression which interacts with others. Whilst animals are in no position to contest anthroparchal structures, humans are, and structures of patriarchy and anthroparchy do not go uncontested by those subjected to their discourses, as the existence of feminists and vegetarians attests.

Sexuality

Sexuality in patriarchal and anthroparchal society can be seen to be constructed through the deployment of discourses based on dichotomous power relations of gender and nature. Discourses of gendered and natured sexuality often interlink, for example, 'Others' constructed as submissive through discourses of patriarchal sexuality may not only be feminized according to gendered domination, but animalized according to natured domination. Radical feminists have seen sexuality as a key structure of patriarchy, which is male dominated and involves objectification of women in pornography, compulsory heterosexuality, sexual harassment, and the general sexualization of gender domination. I concur with those arguing sexuality has changed form in the twentieth century, adopting increasingly public mode with the decline of privatized sexual control of women in the family, and that the sexual revolution incorporated women into heterosexual relations of oppression. However, I would also include fertility and reproduction as part of the structure of sexuality, for I see the control of women's fertility as in part related to sexual behaviour.

If we define sexuality as encompassing fertility and reproduction, I would suggest comparisons may be drawn with anthroparchy. Animals, once domesticated, have no control over their sexuality and fertility. The basis of domestication for meat production lies in reproductive and sexual control. Reproductive technologies were developed in the context of meat and dairy farming, with the purpose of increasing human control of fertility and reproduction in animals. Animals are decreasingly likely to have any determination over their sexuality, farm workers decide when and how animals have sex, and animals are often denied their sexuality via castration, artificial insemination etc. Technologies to control animal reproduction are increasingly applied to women with the medicalization of fertility, pregnancy and birth. Anthroparchal constructions of sexuality involve absolute domination of animals, whereas patriarchal sexuality is contested through human agency, and in certain aspects, patriarchal sexuality has altered. However sexualization of popular culture still encourages gender dichotomous heterosexuality, and encroaching medicalization of reproduction has increasingly removed this aspect of women's sexuality from their control. Anthroparchal sexuality can be seen in the discursive sexualization of the control of the environment. Symbolically, this may involve the sexualization of the control of animals and their domestication, or the characterization of particular forms of animal abuse as sexual. Materially, this may involve the sexualization of labour associated with animals. Farmers, butchers and slaughtermen sexualize their labour, and may rape female and male animals as farmers, or may sexualize animal victims the processes of slaughter and butchery. The latter involves a high degree of machismo, indicating, I would suggest, a close relation between anthroparchal and patriarchal structures of sexuality.

Pornography can be seen as a clear expression of patriarchal sexuality in public mode. When considered in its ideological aspect, pornographic sexuality was found to operate in both patriarchal and anthroparchal form. It defines wimmin and occasionally feminized men, as sexual Other, an object arranged most usually to serve patriarchally defined male desire premised on sexual relations of domination. Pornography eroticizes subordination and dominance in gendered form, and involves physical and/or psychic violence. This pornographic Other is natured by being animalized, symbolized as possessing animal-like, uncontrollable sexuality. Pornographic sexuality is also constructed through discourses of fetishization of the body, particularly the genitalia. Naturing can also be seen to be apparent, for fragmentation of the body recalls the butchering of animals, as parts of bodies are prioritized for sexual consumption.

When the material aspects of pornography are considered, sexuality in pornography is overwhelmingly a patriarchal and not an anthroparchal structure. The industry producing pornography is based on sexualized ownership - the appropriation of female labour in terms of sexuality. Animals are rarely treated in such a manner, bar in the specific case of the pornography of bestiality. Whilst the manipulation and expropriation of female sexuality at work may be a common feature of patriarchal relations in employment, in the sex industry, sexploitation is the nexus. In the production of pornography, wimmin and other Others are subjected to intense forms of sexploitation for the labour power they 'sell' is the projection of their sexuality and the image of their body. Relations of dominance and submission are part of the production of such images, in terms of relations between photographers and models. Pornography is also characterized by deception which is sexualized - models must appear sexually aroused, and research indicated this was most unlikely. Finally, pornography may involve the discursive deployment of sexual violence: suggested symbolically through images, or materially, as the work of the pornographic model is sexualized to the extent they may be pressurized for sex with photographers etc.

Sexuality can be seen as a key structure of anthroparchal relations. Domestic animals have sex overwhelmingly at the determination of humans as farmers and breeders. Their domestication and transformation from sentient being to meat/milk/egg machine is effected via manipulation of their sexuality and control of reproduction. Anthroparchal sexuality involves construction of domestic animals as feminized sexual Other, consumed for example via the sexualization of their carcasses by butchers; and sexually owned, for farmers legal ownership of animals enables them to determine animal's sexual behaviour. Animal's experience of sexuality and reproduction in the meat industry is fragmented via for example, artificial insemination, rape and foreshortened weaning. The production of meat can also be seen to be sexualized from the perspective of those in power. In managing reproduction in farm animals, humans effectively rape them, deciding which animals have sex and when, and facilitating sex for example, forcing an animal's penis into another's

vagina, injecting them with fertility drugs, stimulating an animals penis by hand. Animals also have their sexuality controlled via castration or neutering, which is carried out by men.

Not only are animals sexualized in farming practice, they are also sexualized in slaughter and butchery. The meat industry is overwhelmingly staffed by men. In slaughtering animals, patriarchal men affirm their machismo, and they treat their natured victims in a gendered fashion metaphorically (e.g. referring to them in derisory terms usually reserved for wimmin) and sexually (e.g. beating in the genital region). Meat culture is sexualized in gender dichotomous ways: meat is seen to enhance male virility, whilst dairy foods and fish are sexualized for female consumption. Food in popular culture is sexualized in gender dichotomous ways, and the sexualization of meat food is anthroparchal deception. Meat is symbolized as enhancing human sexuality, and is itself a sexual object, denying its origin as a sentient animal.

Materially, there is anthroparchal distinction in structures of sexuality between the two systems. Anthroparchal sexuality is an all-embracing structure. The sexuality, fertility and reproduction of farm animals is almost entirely controlled by men. Patriarchal sexuality has proved a more flexible structure, altering in form and degree as a result of contestation. Pornography is an instance of patriarchal sexuality in its increasingly public mode, but it is not an all-encompassing form of control. Models are exploited sexually, and sometimes sexually coerced due to economic dependency on photographers and publishers. In the production of meat however, sexual domination can be seen to be all-encompassing as animals are controlled without contestation.

Violence

Violence can be seen as a structure of both patriarchy and anthroparchy, for systems of oppression are. I would argue, as a last resort, based upon socially constructed structures of violence. In examining patriarchal and anthroparchal culture, I stressed the similarities to be drawn between the two systems of oppression. When looking at structures of sexuality, I argued a case for similarity at the ideological/symbolic level, but some disparity in the extensiveness of control of sexuality at the material level, with animals being controlled more extensively by anthroparchal constructions of sexuality because they have negligible agency. Violence is a particularly important structure for this analysis, for I wish to contend that it is crucial in differentiating the two systems. Violence may take symbolic form for images may for example, recall actual physical violence, but it overwhelmingly assumes physically coercive form. At the material level of physical violence, we see the greatest difference between the systems of oppression, because the forms structures of violence assume differ between patriarchy and anthroparchy, and so do the degrees at which they operate. Violence is endemic in patriarchy and anthroparchy, but it operates to a lesser degree in patriarchy (i.e. it is less systematic, and less extreme) and adopts different forms (e.g. meat animals

are systematically slaughtered, femicide is comparatively rare). All wimmin may experience violence in terms of threat, for example fear of rape. Farm animals however, experience extreme physical violence on a regular basis: if they are designated as 'breeders' they are likely to be raped at least once a year, and all will experience premature killing in the slaughterhouse.

Patriarchal violence is seen by feminists as constituting violence against wimmin (and children); appearing in a number of forms and having differing degrees of severity: from rape, child sexual abuse, the battering of female partners to the less physically harmful instances of sexual harassment. In Chapter 2, I argued patriarchal violence may also take non-physical form. Wimmin's behaviour may be restricted because of fear of violence, and violence may exist where its presence is suggested, for example in certain pornographic images. Whilst these are instances of violence, they represent lesser degrees than forms of physical violence. Just as sexuality is socially constructed in patriarchal form, so too I would argue, is violence. Whilst meat is primarily a case of anthroparchal violence, it is affected by patriarchal structures of violence. Such a relationship between patriarchy and anthroparchy is weaker however, in the case of pornography.

Anthroparchal violence is likely to adopt physical form and operate to an intense degree. The type of violence differs in relation to the aspect of the environment it affects. Anthroparchal violence can be indirect, such as destruction of habitat which results in species extinction. Anthroparchal structures of violence operate to particularly extreme degrees in terms of human treatment of some Other animals. Wild animals may be subjected to the aforementioned loss of habitat, or hunted for meat, fur, skin or simply human pleasure. Most domestic animals live on farms within systems of control deriving from their status as meat animals. Animals are often incarcerated which physically enforces restriction of freedom of movement and can be seen as a form of violent containment and psychological abuse e.g. pens, crates, separation from kin and peers. Farm animals experience other forms of physical violence: battery, rape, electric shock, and slaughter. Such violences are systemic for animals. Whilst wimmin experience the violence of killing rarely (femicide), this is normative for 'meat' animals.

Violence is often highly sexualized in patriarchal and anthroparchal culture. Not only are the targets of violence female/feminized and/or animal/animalized, they are also sexualized. Patriarchal and anthroparchal Others are often represented as potential victims, passive feminine/animalized objects whose existence is defined in terms of male human desire, and upon the bodies of whom violences can be acted out. Thus whether or not physical violence against feminized/animalized Others is present, violence can be seen to operate at the symbolic level in both the cases of meat and pornography. The representation of the Other as sexualized object of violence can be seen in some pornographies, and animals are also absent referents in food pornography, with the violence necessary for the creation of meat, recalled yet denied, by the cultural construction of meat.

An examination of the industries producing pornography and in particular, meat, reveals a significant degree of material violence. The pornography industry involves violences against those constructed as Other in patriarchal, and less usually, anthroparchal society. Pornographic models are Other, subordinated in relation to publishers, photographers and consumers. In the vast majority of cases, these models are wimmin, but they may also be patriarchally selected as children, or anthroparchally selected as animals in bestiality. Pornographic subjects (photographers, publishers, consumers) are overwhelmingly men, and work is intensely sexualized. Relations of ownership affect violence in pornographic production. Animal models are killed and raped due to their status as legal chattel. Female human models may feel obliged to have sex with employers due to economic dependency, but they are usually in a position to contest extremes of physical violence such as rape and battery. In making pornography, animals may be violently and literally fragmented, but there are anthroparchal taboos on such violences against wimmin preventing their literal dismemberment. Models may be physically consumed in making pornography, by having coerced sex with photographers, but, unlike the pornography of bestiality, rape is not the norm. Pornographic models have limited agency in the pornography industry when agency is considered as the ability to make decisions which have tangible effects (i.e. to exercise choice). Despite restriction of their choices, models usually do choose to pose, and the possibility of choice however circumscribed, is a corollary of human privilege in anthroparchal society.

When its material aspects are considered, pornography is far more clearly patriarchal than anthroparchal, due to differences in acceptable intensity of physical violence in patriarchal and anthroparchal systems. In pornography, naturing is less apparent, for there are anthroparchal barriers to treating human beings (even if they are wimmin), in ways animals are treated. In s/m and some forms of hard core pornography, wimmin and feminized Others are beaten, bound, caged, whipped etc. and treated like animals. This is rare, and they are not killed. The materiality of violence for animals in the meat industry however, is slaughter. Violence in the meat industry is both patriarchal and anthroparchal. Most farm animals are female: all chickens and dairy cattle, and through selective breeding, increasing majorities of sheep, beef cattle, and pigs. If 'meat' animals are not female, they are still likely to be feminized in both physical treatment (e.g. rape, castration) and metaphorically (e.g. by being verbally derided as female) by men who breed and raise them, and kill them and cut them to pieces. The feminization of the animal, and the intensely masculinized work culture of slaughter, render this violence both anthroparchal and patriarchal.

The suggestion of violence or the denial of violence is an important part of both meat and pornography at the symbolic level. At the material level, the meat industry can be seen as part of a structure of anthroparchal violence that is also patriarchal. The pornography industry however, can be seen as constructed through structures of patriarchal violence but is rarely characterized by anthroparchy except in the cases of bestiality, where animals are directly victims of violence, and

in aspects of s/m pornography where human victims are physically treated with violences usually reserved for animals. Thus pornography, analyzed in its material aspects, is the limiting case in a comparison of patriarchy and anthroparchy. This is because humans cannot be treated with the same intensity and severity of physical, material violence as can animals. This difference in the form and degrees of violence between patriarchal and anthroparchal structures is the explanation, I would argue, for the relative absence of anthroparchy in the pornography industry.

The State

The modern state is shaped by structural considerations pertaining to various systems of oppression based on gender, class, race, and I would suggest, nature. With respect to this research, the British state can be seen as both patriarchal and anthroparchal, and the gendering and naturing of the state can be evidenced as much in what the state does not do, as in its actions and policy, for the state may exclude certain issues, grievances and constituencies from policy making. The state may intervene to positively support oppressive structures for example, concealing information about BSE from a concerned public. Alternatively, the state may support oppressive systems via its non-intervention, which functions to protect and maintain such systems, for example in discriminating against single mothers. In the last quarter of the twentieth century, largely in response to feminist political action, the state has shifted policy regarding gender relations, resulting in some benefits for wimmin (decriminalization of abortion, equal opportunities legislation etc), and particularly at local government level, feminism has been seen to have some impact on policy making. However, certain other policies have, in an indirect way, had negative effects on wimmin (e.g. cuts in welfare provision that disadvantage wimmin as primary carers). The role of the state in reinforcing gender relations can be seen largely in its lack of intervention to protect wimmin and act against inequalities which legitimate the patriarchal status quo.

Despite the actions of animal 'rights' activists who are anthroparchally contesting agents, the grievances of animals are largely excluded from policy making, and legislation to guarantee animal 'welfare' is limited, particularly in the case of 'meat' animals who are defined as property by law as 'livestock'. The meat industry however, has a significant impact on policy making. The National Farmers Union is the key insider pressure group in the MAFF, and I would concur with the claims of animal rights pressure groups that agricultural policy tends to reflect its' interests rather than those of public health or animal welfare (e.g. support for the egg and beef industries in the cases of salmonella and BSE, lack of support for organic farming). This prioritization of the meat producer also pertains to the local state, for example, the support of local government for the piece-rate system in slaughterhouses and the oversight of improper conduct within them. The state also sponsors the public discourse of meat eating in terms of subsidizing campaigns for 'British Meat' via the Meat and Livestock Commission.

The pornography industry has no such pressure group access to central government, but is maintained by a lack of state intervention in its activities. At the level of the central state, this involves non-intervention against pornography, or the prioritization of attempts by the police to take legal action on forms of pornography which are of least concern to feminists (e.g. consensual gay s/m material made within, and for the use of, the gay s/m community). Material such as the bulk of heterosexual soft core porn, the most common and most sexist, the state largely defines as legitimate 'erotica' as it serves to promote patriarchal sexuality. The local state can be seen to be tacitly supportive of the pornography industry, for example, Westminster Council's facilitation of the sex industry in London Soho. In addition, pornography is a good example of the way the patriarchal state operates to prevent only the worst excesses of violence against Others in order to legitimate their abuse. Thus it will seek to prevent child pornography and hard core 'violent' pornography, whilst having a policy of cohabitation with soft core material. Similarly with the meat industry, the state may act to prevent the worst excesses of the meat trade (e.g. those highlighted by the governments' own FAWC Reports), whilst maintaining the conditions for the operation of the industry as a whole. The state acts both positively and negatively to maintain patriarchal and anthroparchal relations in terms of organization and policy.

STRUCTURAL DIVERGENCE OF PATRIARCHY AND ANTHROPARCHY

The following section is necessarily brief and does not draw upon the empirical research for this thesis. It is thus largely suggestive of other structures which might be part of patriarchal and anthroparchal systems of oppression, but not being common, have been largely absent from the research findings of the empirical material. My suggestions here are based upon the review of the feminist and green literature for the first two chapters of the thesis. On this basis, I think it may be likely that there are two structures in each system of oppression which are specific to each particular system.

The household and paid employment have been important to Marxist feminist, socialist feminist and dual systems accounts of the structures shaping contemporary gender relations. Whilst I would concur that they are significant, I feel they are likely to be patriarchal but not anthroparchal. Both deep and social ecologies, see industrialism as a key feature of contemporary modern (and 'developing') societies that involves the exploitation and domination of the environment by human beings. I would suggest industrialism is likely to be an oppressive structure located more firmly in systems of natured rather than gendered domination, and should be theorized as part of anthroparchal rather than patriarchal relations. In addition, I would propose a structure of 'domestication' through which the environment is subjected to human domination, and feel whilst it may be seen to have some similarities with the patriarchal structure of the household, it can be thought of as distinct.

The household and paid employment

The household is the site of privatized production relations and is of less significance in the control of wimmin in the latter twentieth century, than in the past. It can still be considered a patriarchal structure due to the continuing gendered division of domestic labour, the prevalence of domestic violence against wimmin, and the ways wimmin's domestic labour may impinge upon their position in paid employment. It is not a structure of anthroparchy. Although the household is an important site of mass consumption which affects the environment, this consumption is more accurately seen as part of the anthroparchal structure of industrialization. Some animals are kept in households as 'pets', but this I would argue, is an aspect of anthroparchal domestication. There are some similarities between the domestication of animals and of wimmin within the household in the forms these oppressive relations adopt such as physical confinement and the appropriation of labour and sexuality, but I feel there is sufficient difference in the content and form of anthroparchal domestication and the patriarchal household, to conceptualize them separately.

Paid employment should likewise be seen as a patriarchal and not an anthroparchal structure. Wimmin in patriarchal society are paid less than men and horizontally and vertically segregated in low status employment which is clearly gendered. This gendering of employment affects the industries examined in this thesis, meat and pornography. The meat industry is overwhelmingly male dominated at all levels, and the pornography industry has a distinct gendered division of labour in which models are segregated in relatively poorly paid and potentially exploitative work. I do not consider paid employment to be a structure of anthroparchy. Human labour can form part of anthroparchal structures of industrialism and violence, of which paid employment is an aspect.

Domestication and industrialism

I use the term 'domestication' to refer to the exercise of human-centered control over the environment. Anthroparchal domestication may involve the management and control of the wilderness, the cultivation of land, and use of land for rearing tamed animals who have been rendered docile by incarceration and genetic manipulation in order that they become human resources. Whilst I feel there is probably a gendered element to such domestication, such as the feminization of the land/animals domesticated, this is not a patriarchal structure, for I would suggest that the basis of domestication is natured difference, and the domestication of nature may have a different purpose to the domestic role of wimmin in the household. The former is anthroparchally necessitated to control a wilderness which is constructed as potentially dangerous for humans, whereas the latter is necessitated by capitalism and patriarchy for the expropriation of female labour. There is also difference in the degree of domestic control which is far greater for animals who have no agency through which to contest structures of oppression. Finally, whilst the

patriarchal household is largely a privatized structure, anthroparchal domestication is public. Household domestication is primarily an individual form of appropriation, whereas anthroparchal domestication involves collective appropriation of the labour and bodies of animals in mass industries to produce commodities (meat, milk, eggs, leather, wool) for mass consumption.

Industrialism refers to societies structured according to mass production of goods and services, with the aim of affluence and economic 'development' specifically designed to benefit human beings without regard for the consequences for the planet. I would suggest industrialism is a characteristic of contemporary anthroparchy and occurs in capitalist and those remaining state 'socialist' economies. Whilst industrialism has affected gender relations, for example, in paid employment, I do not think such division is its key characteristic, and should be seen as part of the patriarchal structure of paid employment. I do not feel industrialism is necessarily a defining characteristic of anthroparchy but one which may be contingent, thus it may be that European societies, prior to the transition to modernity may have been anthroparchal, and contemporary 'less developed/developing' societies may have other anthroparchal structures such as domestication and violence, in the relative absence of industrialism. Paid employment may be part of industrialism but in the context of farming for example, with its increased mechanization and factory production methods, this is a decreasingly important feature, and I see industrialism as a broader conception of socio-economic organization than human labour relations of paid employment.

I see patriarchy and anthroparchy as separate systems of domination and feel they are likely to have structures which are specific to them. My thoughts as to what form these structures may take are outlined above, and they are necessarily theoretically rather than empirically derived and/or confirmed. Where patriarchy and anthroparchy can be seen to have structures in common, it is likely that there may be close relationships between the systems of oppression. However, the content of patriarchal and anthroparchal structures, even when common, is divergent in form and degree. Thus I would suggest relationships between systems of oppression will be characterized by tension and conflict, as well as co-operation and mutual accommodation.

THE CONTRIBUTION TO DEBATE

This research has contributed to a number of debates in social theory and I feel to some degree, it also breaks new theoretical ground. First, the thesis contributes to green theory in arguing for a reconceptualization of relations between humans and the environment as a system of dominance in which all humans are potential oppressors and exploiters of the environment. Green theorists have seen human relations to the environment as either a product of 'anthropocentrism', or a by-product of intra-human systems of dominance, or both of these, via a 'logic of domination' in which the environment and certain groups of humans are oppressed. I have critiqued the deep green position

of anthropocentrism for ignoring difference between human beings, and proposed a new term, which I feel is appropriately stronger and captures a sense of systemic coherence more effectively than 'anthropocentrism' - anthroparchy. As a system of domination, I argue anthroparchy operates at the level of an ideology of human dominance over nature, and its discourses are concretized in institutional forms and material practice. This is a departure from the position of social ecology, although I acknowledged anthroparchy is linked to forms of 'intra-human domination'. Whilst I applauded eco-feminism's attempt to combine both positions, I dispute the idea that human dominance and patriarchy constitute one system, with a single 'logic of domination'. I have drawn on a 'dual systems' approach in order to demonstrate patriarchy and anthroparchy are separate systems of domination that interrelate in complex ways. In addition, the thesis is a contribution to the emergent sociology of the environment. It draws upon some of the insights of more postmodern approaches to the environment in arguing a case for 'nature' to be conceptualized as socially constructed whilst generally adopting and developing the arguments for a realist ontology in environmental sociology.

This thesis is also a contribution to feminist theory and the sociological analysis of gender. Dual systems approaches to gender relations have attempted to conceptualize systemic interrelations between patriarchy and capitalism, whereas this project analyzes relations between patriarchy and anthroparchy. Most eco-feminist theory has tended to see the domination of nature as patriarchal, but I have suggested that the differences in specific instances, forms and degrees of oppression indicate patriarchy and anthroparchy are separate systems which differ in content, form and degree. Whilst I have drawn on eco-feminist theory to investigate some of the connections between gender and nature, I have argued a dual systems approach may overcome the shortcomings of those eco-feminist positions which suggest only similarity between oppressions of gender and nature, and thereby failed to account for difference. I acknowledge that various oppressive systems interlink and interrelate in the manner of a complex web, but see dualist analysis as a tool for understanding the specifics of interrelations of certain systems in instances of oppression.

In adopting a dualist analysis, I have argued for the adoption of a critical realist and structural approach. However, this has not meant that I have dismissed poststructuralist theorizing in its entirety. Rather, this research has sought to combine a form of discourse analysis within a broadly structural framework. This research has examined the content of discourses as ideologies that are concretized both in symbolic, cultural forms and material institutions and their associated practices, such as the meat and pornography industries. In advocating a realist ontology, I have suggested that gendered and natured discourses have concrete effects. Such discourses can be evidenced at a symbolic level in cultural texts of meat such as advertising, and in pornographic texts such as novels and magazines. These discourses also have a material presence and may be evidenced in practices and processes in the production of pornography and meat. This research tries to embed a

notion of discourse in specific cultural symbolization and concrete material processes. In so doing, it suggests discourses can be conceptualized as specific realities of power within systems of social domination.

The empirical research provides new insights into a number of debates. Analysis of meat as a cultural text has been undertaken by feminist and other sociologists, whilst green theorists have usually concentrated on abuse of animals by the meat industry. This thesis has examined both cultural and material processes and thus analyzes meat at two levels. Most research has emphasized the role of meat in the specific oppression of animals and has not sought to examine its relationship to other oppressive systems. This thesis has provided a complex account of meat as a case of anthroparchal oppression which can be seen to be constituted also through patriarchal relations of power. Feminist research on pornography has overwhelmingly examined pornography at the symbolic level, but this thesis differs from most radical feminist accounts in arguing pornographic texts can be seen not only as patriarchal, but as influenced by anthroparchal domination. This research provides an insight into the pornography industry, providing some evidence for radical feminist claims that pornography is produced in an oppressive gendered context.

Academic disciplines accommodate or change as a result of political struggle and socio-economic change. Feminist activism, theory and research has forced the study of gender onto mainstream academic agendas. Sociology has been made to take seriously the study of class, race and gender as systems of stratification, forms of social interaction or social difference, forms of discrimination, structures of power or systems of oppression. Conceptions of nature and human interactions with the natural environment are social, and I would urge that the discipline take seriously the sociological study of human relations with the environment. Feminists, cognizant of gender oppression, are often aware of other intra-human forms of domination, and may be interested in their interrelations. Black feminists have effectively criticized 'white feminism' for its inability to see white wimmin as potential oppressors in an ethnically structured society. Many feminists appear unable to see wimmin in the contemporary West as potential oppressors of animals in an anthroparchally structured society. The oppression of animals and of wimmin is both differentially, gendered and natured. Feminist theory needs to take account of anthroparchal domination, and I would suggest a dual systems and structural approach is an effective method of so doing. Due to the extent of interrelation between patriarchy and anthroparchy, I feel feminism is well placed to undertake such analysis. Also, I would hope, feminists may have their consciousness raised and reject the consumption of the flesh of Other animals as implicating them in both patriarchal and anthroparchal domination.

APPENDIX I

SOURCES FOR RESEARCH ON THE MEAT INDUSTRY

i) Interviews

Specialist advisor in Environmental Health, specifically meat inspection and meat hygiene. Environmental Health Department, London Borough of Hackney. Two interviews, October 1991 and December 1991; correspondence thereafter until July 1992.

Environmental Health Officer. Environmental Health Department, London Borough of Hackney, October, 1991.

Senior Environmental Health Officer and Chief Meat Inspector. Havering District Council, Romford. Two interviews, January 1992 and February 1992.

Two Environmental Health Officers regularly engaged in meat inspection. Havering District Council, January 1992.

Chief Meat Inspector for Brentwood District Council. February 1992.

Lecturer in meat hygiene, butchering and slaughter, Smithfield Central Market. Also own business as local butcher, Enfield. February, 1992.

Local butchers (two). Enfield, February, 1992.

Ex-butcher, meat plant operative. London Borough of Barnet, June, 1991.

Meat plant operatives working for a frozen food multinational haulage firm (Frigascandia) in Stratford, East London, which deals mainly with imported carcasses. Six interviews, five interviewees. November and December, 1993.

Slaughterhouse owner/manager. Palmers Family Meats, Romford, Essex, January, 1992.

Slaughterhouse owner/manager. Knight's Abattoir, Romford, Essex, February, 1992.

Beef farmer's assistant. The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Ostrich farmer. Hertfordshire, The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Managing director, agricultural products company (Tuffbrand Ltd.). The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Sales executive, pig breeding company (Newsam Hybrid Pigs). The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Chief Technical Officer, Humane Slaughter Association. The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Senior Scientific Officer, Freedom Food Limited, RSPCA. The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Secretary, Blonde d'Aquitaine Breeders Society, Midlands Regional Club. The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Simmental beef cattle breeder. Best of breed competition, The Royal Smithfield Show, November, 1994.

Beef farmer. Lincolnshire, January, 1995.

Dairy farmers (two). Hertfordshire, December, 1994.

Dairy farmer and his wife (with fruit and vegetable 'pick-your-own', replacing battery egg production). Hertfordshire, March, 1994.

ii) Documents

Aberdeen-Angus Cattle Society (1994), *Aberdeen-Angus: breed on the move* (Perth: Sunprint)

Abbott, R. (1994), 'Hutches are Healthy', *Dairy Farmer*, October 1994

Association of Metropolitan Authorities, EHCA Circular 34/1991: *1992 And The Single Market – Animal Health and Intra-Community Trade*

Association of Metropolitan Authorities, EHCA Circular 34/1991: *Final Update on EC Red Meat Proposals*

Batt, E. (1982), '*Sheep Farming*' (Leatherhead: The Vegan Society)

Batt, E. with Carson, L. (1984), '*Wool Machines*' (Leatherhead: The Vegan Society)

Blonde d'Aquitaine Breeders Society (1994), *Blondes: The Ultimate*

British Deer Farmers Association (1994), *The Good Venison Guide* (Coventry: BDFFA)

Campaign for the Abolition of Angling (n.d.), '*Angling: the neglected bloodsport*' (Sevenoaks: The Campaign for the Abolition of Angling)

Clover, C. (1991), 'Fishing Crisis', *The Sunday Telegraph Magazine* October 26th

Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) (1989), Factsheets: *Slaughter of Red Meat Animals, Slaughter of Poultry, Religious Methods of Slaughter* (Petersfield, Hampshire: CIWF)

CIWF (1990), leaflets: 'Factory Farming Today'; 'Life Imprisonment in the Battery Cage, 'Milked for all she's worth - the modern dairy cow', 'Death journey's to Europe' (Petersfield: CIWF)

CIWF/Athene Trust (1991): 'Factory Farming' (Petersfield: CIWF)

CIWF *Agscene* no.99, May/June 1990

CIWF *Agscene* no.103, Summer, 1991

Comrie, P. (ed.) *The Meat Hygienist* official Journal of the Association of Meat Inspectors (monthly publications from May 1987 to December, 1990)

Devon Group of Environmental Health Officers (n.d.), *Guidance Notes on the Slaughter of Farmed Deer and the Production of Venison*

Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) (1982), *Report on the Welfare of Poultry at the Time of Slaughter* (Alnwick, Northumberland: The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) Publications)

- FAWC (1984), *Report on the Welfare of Livestock (Red Meat Animals) at The Time of Slaughter* (London: HMSO)
- FAWC (1985), *Report on the Welfare of Livestock when Slaughtered by Religious Methods* (London: HMSO)
- FAWC (1985), *Report on the Welfare of Farmed Deer* (Ainwick: MAFF Publications)
- FAWC (1986), *Report on the Welfare of Livestock at Markets* (Ainwick: MAFF Publications)
- FAWC (1990), *Report of the Enforcement Working Group* (Ainwick: MAFF Publications)
- Hereford Breed Society (1994), *Hereford Breed Journal*, vol. xiv, no.3 (Hereford: The Hereford Herd Book Society)
- Humane Slaughter Association, *Seventy-Eighth Annual Report 1988-89* (London: Humane Slaughter Association)
- Humane Slaughter Association, *Seventy-Ninth Annual Report 1989-90* (London: Humane Slaughter Association)
- Humane Slaughter Association, *Taking Responsibility: Eighty-Third Annual Report 1993-94* (London: Humane Slaughter Association)
- Humane Slaughter Association, leaflets: 'Livestock Markets: a fair deal?' (August, 1994); 'Poultry Slaughter' (May, 1994); 'Transport of Animals' (August, 1994); 'Slaughter by Religious Methods' (May, 1993); 'From Farm to Food' (December, 1991) (Potters Bar, Herts.: Humane Slaughter Association)
- Hunt Saboteurs Association (n.d.), leaflets: 'Shooting', 'Angling' (Hunt Saboteurs Association)
- Jannaway, K. (1978), *'Two Population Explosions?'* (Leatherhead: The Movement for Compassionate Living (MCL))
- Jannaway, K. (March, 1991), *'Humane Slaughter?'* (Leatherhead: MCL)
- Jannaway, K. (May, 1991), *'What happens to the cow and her calf?'* (Leatherhead: MCL)
- League Against Cruel Sports (1991), leaflets: 'Deer and Stag hunting', 'Shooting Birds' (London: The League Against Cruel Sports)
- Meat and Livestock Commission (M.L.C) (July, 1986), *Meat Industry*
- M.L.C (1993), *South Devon National Sire and Dam Summary* (Milton Keynes: M.L.C)
- M.L.C (1994), *British Charolais National Sire and Dam Summary* (Milton Keynes: M.L.C)
- Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) (July, 1991a), *Animal Health and the Single Market: Newsletter No. 4* (Milton Keynes: MAFF)
- MAFF (July, 1991b), *Licensing of Poultry Slaughtermen and Supervision of Welfare in Poultry Slaughterhouses draft proposals* (Milton Keynes: MAFF)
- MAFF (July, 1991c), *Welfare of Poultry at Slaughter: Code of Practice* (Milton Keynes: MAFF)

MAFF (August 1991d), Circular FSH 1/91 *The Fresh Meat and Poultry Meat (Hygiene, Inspection, and Examinations for Residues) (Charges) Regulations 1990* (Surbiton: MAFF)

National Sheep Association (November/December 1994), *The Sheep Farmer* vol.14. no.3 (Malvern, Worcs.: National Sheep Association Publications)

Newsam Hybrid Pigs, (1994a), *Outdoor Production Brochure* (Malton, Yorks: Newsam Hybrid Pigs Ltd.)

Newsam Hybrid Pigs (1994b), *Supplement to International Pig Topics - All in the Genes: A look at the future technology of breeding* (Edinburgh: Roslin Institute)

Pig Improvement Company (n.d.), *Getting Started in Outdoor Pig Production* (Abingdon: The Pig Improvement Company)

Reyes, A. (1992), *The Butcher* (London: Minerva)

Royal Association of British Dairy Farmers (November, 1994), *RABDF News* no.18 (Leamington Spa: The Royal Association of British Dairy Farmers)

RSPCA (1988), *The Slaughter of Food Animals* (Horsham: RSPCA)

RSPCA (1991), 'Puppy Farming', *Animal Life*, Summer (Horsham: RSPCA)

RSPCA (1994), *Freedom Food: RSPCA Monitored information pack* (Horsham: Freedom Food Limited)

Simmentel Breeders Society (Spring 1994), *Simmentel Beef* no.21

State Veterinary Service (Meat Hygiene Division) (Jun 1989) *Red Meat Manual*

Statutory Instruments (1987), No. 2237 *FOOD. FOOD HYGIENE: The Fresh Meat Export (Hygiene and Inspection) Regulations 1987* (London: HMSO)

Statutory Instruments (1990), No. 1242 *ANIMALS: The Slaughter of Animals (Humane Conditions) Regulations 1990* (London: HMSO)

Statutory Instruments (1991), No. 984 *FOOD: The Slaughterhouse (Hygiene) and Meat Inspection (Amendment) Regulations 1991* (London: HMSO)

Tyler, A. (1990), *Don't Look Now: An Everyday Story of Pig Slaughter* (report for Animal Aid, Tonbridge; first published in edited form in *The Independent*, 13th March, 1989)

Tyler, A. (1991), *Pigs Diary* (report on intensive pig farming for Animal Aid, Tonbridge)

Unigate (September, 1994), *Milk Now*, issue no.6 (Swindon: The Unigate Dairy Group Ltd.)

Vegan Society (n.d.) leaflets: 'Health', 'Animal Rights', 'World Food Problem', 'Ecology', 'Dairy industry: the milk marketing fraud', (St. Leonard-on-Sea, E.Sussex: The Vegan Society)

Vegetarian Society (1991), *The Vegetarian* February and April (Altrincham: The Vegetarian Society)

Whittall, J.D. (1981), *People and Animals* (The National Anti-Vivisection Society)

World Health Organization (1987), *Meeting of the Committee of the League of the Muslim World/World Health Organization to Study the Animals' Stunning by Electric Shock* (transcript)

trans. from the Arabic (WHO: Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean)

World Society for the Protection of Animals (n.d.) Factsheet: 'Bloodsports'(London: WSPA)

APPENDIX II

SOURCES FOR RESEARCH ON THE PORNOGRAPHY INDUSTRY

i) Interviews

Chief Inspector (CI). Obscene Publications Department, New Scotland Yard. Interviewed twice, November and December, 1991.

Detective Inspector (DI). Obscene Publications Department, New Scotland Yard, December, 1991, January, 1992.

Police Constable. Obscene Publications Department, New Scotland Yard, January, 1992.

Civilians (two) working in content analysis of material. Obscene Publications Department, New Scotland Yard, December, 1991.

Customs Officers (two). H.M. Customs and Excise, London Heathrow Airport, August, 1995.

Sex shop staff (two). London Soho, August, 1995.

Shop owner. London Soho, August, 1995.

Waitress. The Raymond Review Bar, London Soho, August, 1995.

Photographic assistant. London, August, 1995.

Photographer (undertaking free-lance work for soft-core publications). London, August, 1995.

Photographer (having worked a short term contract for a soft-core publication in the recent past). Derby, February, 1996.

APPENDIX III

SOURCES FOR RESEARCH ON THE SYMBOLIZATION OF MEAT IN POPULAR CULTURE

i) Correspondence

Steve Conor, Campaigns Director, The Vegetarian Society, September, 1995

Colin Maclean, Director General, The Meat and Livestock Commission, October, 1995

ii) Documents

Asher, J. (1996), *Good Living*, issue 1, summer

Barry, M. (1992), *Michael Barry's Great House Cookery*, (London: Merehurst)

BBC *Good Food* (monthly publications from July 1990 to June 1996) (London: BBC Magazines)

BBC *Vegetarian Good Food* (monthly publications from January 1994 to June 1996) (London: BBC Magazines)

Butcher, N. (1990), *The Spanish Kitchen* (London: Macmillan)

Canter, D., Canter, K., and Swann, D. (1985), *The Cranks Recipe Book* (London: Granada)

Carluccio, A. (1996), *Antonio Carluccio's Italian Feast* (London: BBC Books)

Cox, P. (1986), *Why You Don't Need Meat* (London: Thorsons)

Elliot, R. (1986, revised), *Rose Elliot's Vegetarian Cookery* (London: Harper Collins)

Family Circle (periodic monthly publications from October 1994, to December 1995)

Floyd, K. (1982), *Floyd on Food* (Bath: Absolute Press)

Floyd, K. (1986), *Floyd on Fire* (London: BBC Books)

Floyd, K. (1986), *Floyd on Fish* (London: BBC Books)

Floyd, K. (1992), *Floyd on Oz* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Franco, S. (1995), *The Really Useful Student Cookbook* (London: Merehurst)

Franco, S. (1996), *The Really Useful Vegetarian Student Cookbook* (London: Merehurst).

Good Housekeeping (monthly publications from March 1994, to Dec, 1995)

Gwynn, M. (1995a), *The 30 Minute Vegetarian* (London: BBC Books)

Gwynn, M. (1995b), *Vegetarian Food for Friends* (London: BBC Books)

Harris, V. (1993), 'The Cooking of Italy', *The Sunday Times Cooks Companion* (London: Ebury Press)

- Hopkinson, S. with Boreham, L. (1995), *Roast Chicken and Other Stories* (London: Cassell)
- Luard, E. (1986), *European Peasant Cookery* (London: Grafton Books)
- McCartney, L. and Cook, P. (1989), *Linda McCartney's Home Cooking* (London: Bloomsbury)
- Mossiman, A. (1993), 'The Cooking of Great Britain and Ireland', *The Sunday Times Cooks Companion* (London: Ebury Press)
- Nairn, N. (1996), *Wild Harvest* (London: BBC Books)
- Rhodes, G. (1995), *More Rhodes Around Britain* (London: BBC Books)
- Richardson, R. (1996), *The Great Green Cookbook* (London: Kylie Cathie)
- Sainsbury's - *The Magazine* (monthly publications from May 1993, to December, 1996) (London: New Crane Publishing)
- Smith, D. (1994), *The Sainsbury's Guide to Meat Cookery* (London: New Crane Publishing)
- The Sunday Times Cooks Companion* (1993) (London: Ebury Press)
- Turner, B. and Worrall-Thompson, A. (1995), *Ready, Steady, Cook!* (London: BBC Books)
- Wakeman, A. and Baskerville, G. (1996), *The Vegan Cookbook* (London: Faber and Faber)
- Woman and Home* (monthly publications from January 1994, to December 1995)
- Womans Weekly* (occasional weekly publications from January 1993 to June 1995)

APPENDIX IV

SOURCES FOR RESEARCH ON THE SYMBOLIZATION OF BODIES AND SEXUALITIES
IN PORNOGRAPHY

i) Documents

Califia, P. (1988), *Macho Sluts* (Boston: Alyson)

For Women (monthly publications, from December 1993, to November, 1994; vols. 1, 2. Portland Publishing Ltd., Northern and Shell, London)

Men Only (monthly publications, from January 1991 to December, 1994; vols. 56, 58, 62. Paul Raymond Publications Ltd., London)

Penthouse (monthly publications, from April 1991, periodically to September 1993; vols. 26, 27, 28. Northern and Shell Plc., London)

Prowl (quarterly publications from Spring 1989, to Winter 1991; vols. 1, 2, 3. Prowler Press Ltd. London)

Quim (quarterly or bi-annual publications, Spring 1991, to Winter 1992. Publisher unstated, (London)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, C. J. (1976), 'The Inedible Complex: The Political Implications of Vegetarianism', *Second Wave*, 4, 1:36-42
- Adams, C. J. (1990), *The Sexual Politics of Meat* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Adams, C. J. (1994), *Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals* (New York: Continuum)
- Adams, C.J. & Donovan J. (eds.) (1995), *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (London: Duke University Press)
- Adams, C. J. (1995), 'Woman Battering and Harm to Animals', in C. J. Adams & J. Donovan (eds.) *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (London: Duke University Press)
- Adler, M. (1986), *Drawing Down the Moon: Witches, Goddess-Worshippers and Other Pagans in America Today* (Boston: Beacon)
- Afshar, H. & Maynard, M. (1994), *Dynamics of 'Race' and Gender: Some Feminist Interventions* (London: Taylor and Francis)
- Agarwal, B. (1986), *Cold Hearths and Barren Slopes: The Woodfuel Crisis in the Third World* (London: Zed Books)
- Alcoff, L. (1988), 'Cultural Feminism versus Post-structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory', *Signs*, 13, 3:405-436
- Alexander, S. & Taylor, B. (1980), 'In Defence of Patriarchy', in Evans, M. (ed.) (1982) *The Woman Question* (London: Fontana)
- Amos, V. & Parmar, P. (1984), 'Challenging Imperial Feminism', *Feminist Review*, 17:3-20
- Antonio, D. (1995), 'Of Wolves and Women' in Adams C.J. & Donovan J. (eds.) *op cit*
- Arac, J. (ed.) (1988), *After Foucault: Humanistic Knowledge, Postmodern Challenges* (London: Rutgers University Press)
- Archer, M.S. (1995), *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Archer, M.S. (1996), 'Social Integration and System Integration: Developing the distinction', *Sociology*, 30,4:679-699
- Ardill, S. & O'Sullivan, S. (1987), 'Upsetting an Applecart: Difference, Desire and Lesbian Sadomasochism', in *Feminist Review* (ed.) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Virago)
- Arditti, R., Duelli Klein, R., & Minden, S. (eds.) (1984), *Test Tube Women* (London: Pandora Press)
- Assiter, A. (1989), *Pornography, Feminism and the Individual* (London: Pluto)
- Assiter, A. & Carol, A. (1993), *Bad Girls and Dirty Pictures* (London: Pluto Press)
- Bacchi, C. (1990), *Same Difference: Feminism and Sexual Difference* (London: Allen and Unwin)

- Bahro, R. (1982), *Socialism and Survival* (London: Heretic Books)
- Bahro, R. (1986), *Building the Green Movement* (London: GMP)
- Bailey, M.E. (1993), 'Foucauldian feminism: contesting bodies, sexuality and identity' in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *Up Against Foucault* (London: Routledge)
- Barker, T., Johnstone, N., & Ekins, P., (1994) *Global Warming and Energy Demand* (London: Routledge)
- Barrett, M. (1980), *Women's Oppression Today* (London: Verso)
- Barrett, M. & McIntosh, M. (1982), *The Anti-Social Family* (London: Verso)
- Barrett, M. & McIntosh, M. (1985), 'Ethnocentrism and socialist feminist theory', *Feminist Review*, no.20, summer
- Barrett, M. (1987), 'The concept of difference', *Feminist Review*, 26:29-41
- Barrett, M. & Philips, A (1992), *Destabilizing Theory Contemporary Feminist Debates* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Barry, K. (1996), 'Deconstructing Deconstructionism' in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Barthes, R. (1972), *Mythologies* (New York: Hill & Wang)
- Barthes, R. (1979), 'Towards a Psychosociology of Contemporary Food', in Forster, R. & Ranum. (eds.) *Food and Drink in History* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press)
- Bartky, S. (1988), 'Foucault, femininity and the modernization of patriarchal power', in Diamond, & Quinby, L. *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance* (Boston: Northeastern University Press)
- Beck, U. (1992), *The Risk Society* (London: Sage)
- Beck, U. (1996), 'Risk Society and the Provident State', in Lash et al. *Risk, Environment and Modernity* (London: Sage)
- Beechey, V. (1979), 'On Patriarchy', *Feminist Review*, 3:66-82
- Bell, D. and Klein, R. (eds.) (1996), *Radically Speaking: Feminism* (London: Zed Books)
- Benhabib, S. (1992), *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Benny, N. (1983), 'All One Flesh: the Rights of Animals', in Caldecott, L. & Leyland, S. (eds.) *Reclaim the Earth* (London: Women's Press)
- Benton, T. (1981), 'Realism in Social Science', *Radical Philosophy*, no.27
- Benton, T. (1984), *The Rise and Fall of Structural Marxism* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)
- Benton, T. (1988), 'Marx, Humanism and Speciesism', *Radical Philosophy*, no.50
- Benton, T. (1991), 'Biology and social science: why the return of the repressed should be given a (cautious) welcome', *Sociology*, 25,1:1-30

- Benton, T (1992), 'Why the Welcome Needs to be Cautious: A Reply to Keith Sharpe', *Sociology*, 26,2:225-233
- Benton, T. (1993), *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights and Social Justice* (London: Routledge)
- Benton, T. (1994), 'Biology and Social Theory in the Environment Debate' in Redclift, M. and Benton, T., *Social Theory and the Global Environment* (London: Routledge)
- Benton, T. and Redclift, M. (1994), Introduction, in *ibid.*
- Berger, J. (1972), *Ways of Seeing* (Harmondsworth: BBC & Penguin)
- Berger, J. (1980), *About Looking* (New York: Pantheon)
- Bernauer, J. & Rasmussen, D. (eds.) (1988) *The Final Foucault* (Cambridge: MIT Press)
- Bharo, R. (1986), *Building the Green Movement* (London: Heretic Books)
- Bhaskar, R. (1978), *A Realist Theory of Science* 2nd edn. (Brighton: Harvester Press)
- Bhaskar, R. (1979), *The Possibility of Naturalism*, 2nd edn. (Brighton: Harvester Press)
- Bhaskar, R. (1989), *Reclaiming Reality*, (London: Verso)
- Biehl, J. (1991), *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* (Boston: South End Press)
- Birke, L. (1991), 'Science, Feminism and Animal Natures I: Extending the Boundaries', *Women's Studies International Forum* 14, 5:443-50
- Birke, L. (1994), *Feminism, Animals and Science* (Buckingham: OUP)
- Birke, L. (1995), 'Exploring the Boundaries: Feminism, Animals and Science' in Adams, C.J & Donovan J. (eds.) *op cit*
- Bleier, R. (1984), *Science and Gender* (Elmsford, NY: Pergamon)
- Bloom, D. (1991), *The New Age* (London: Richer)
- Boffin, T. & Fraser, J. (eds.) (1991) *Stolen Glances: Lesbians Take Photographs* (London: Pandora)
- Bookchin, M. (1971), *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* (Berkeley: Ramparts Press)
- Bookchin, M. (1980), *Toward an Ecological Society* (Montreal: Black Rose Books)
- Bookchin, M. (1986), *The Modern Crisis* (Philadelphia: New Society)
- Bookchin, M. (1989), *Remaking Society* (Montreal: Black Rose Books)
- Bookchin, M. (1990), *The Philosophy of Social Ecology* (Montreal: Black Rose Books)
- Bookchin, M. (1991), *The Ecology of Freedom* (Montreal: Black Rose Books)
- Bonner, F., Goodman, L., Allen, R., Janes, L., & King, C. (1992) *Imagining Women: Cultural Representations and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity, in association with The Open University)

- Bordo, S. (1990), 'Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender Scepticism', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Bordo, S. (1993), 'Feminism, Foucault and the politics of the body', in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *Up Against Foucault* (London: Routledge)
- Bourdieu, P. (1984), *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Nice, R. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)
- Bowen, A. (1996), 'Enabling a Visible Black Lesbian Presence in Academia', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Bowles, G. & Duelli Klein, R. (1983), *Theories of Women's Studies* (London: Routledge)
- Boyne, R. & Rattansi, A. (eds.) (1990), *Postmodernism and Society* (London: Macmillan)
- Bradford, G. (1989), *How Deep is Deep Ecology?* (Ojai: Times Change Press)
- Braverman, H. (1974), *Labour and Monopoly Capital* (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- Bruegel, I. (1979), 'Women as a reserve army of labour', *Feminist Review*, 3:12-23
- British Ecology Party Manifesto* (1983) (London: Ecology Party)
- British Green Party Manifesto* (1987) (London: Green Party)
- British Green Party Manifesto* (1992) (London: Green Party)
- Brod, H. (1994), *Theorizing Masculinities* (London: Sage)
- Brodribb, S. (1992), *Nothing Mat(t)ers: A Feminist Critique of Postmodernism* (New York: New York University Press)
- Brodribb, S. (1996), 'Nothing Mat(t)ers', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Brown, D. (1993), *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (London: Vintage)
- Brownmiller, S. (1976), *Against Our Will* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Buege, D. J. (1994), 'Rethinking Again: a defense of ecofeminist philosophy', in Warren, K. J. (ed.) *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Bunyard, P. & Morgan-Grenville, F. (eds.) (1987), *The Green Alternative* (London: Methuen)
- Butler, J. (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge)
- Butler, J. (1993), *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'* (London: Routledge)
- Butler, J. & Scott, J. (eds.) (1992) *Feminists Theorize the Political* (London: Routledge)
- Caldecott, L. & Leyland, S. (eds.) (1983), *Reclaim the Earth* (London: Women's Press)
- Califa, P. (1980), 'Among Us, Against Us', in Ellis, K. et al (eds.) (1986) *Caught Looking: Feminism, Pornography and Censorship* (New York: Caught Looking Inc.)
- Califa, P. (1984), 'Feminism and Sadomasochism', in *Heresies*, issue 12, 3,4:30-34

- Callinicos, A. (1989), *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Cambell, B. (1987), 'A Feminist Sexual Politics: Now You See It, Now you Don't', in *Feminist Review* (ed.) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Virago)
- Cambell, J. (1958), *The Masks of God* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Caputi, J. (1989), *The Age of Sex Crime* (London: Women's Press)
- Capra, F. (1983), *The Turning Point* (London: Fontana)
- Carby, H. (1982), 'White women listen! Black feminism and the boundaries of sisterhood', in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, *The Empire Strikes Back: race and racism in '70's Britain* (London: Hutchinson)
- Carter, A. (1981), *The Bloody Chamber* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Carter, A. (1993), *The Sadeian Woman* (London: Virago)
- Catton, Jr., W.R. (1980), *Overshoot: the Ecological Basis of Revolutionary Change* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press)
- Chapkis, W. (1988), *Beauty Secrets: Women and the Politics of Appearance* (London: Women's Press)
- Charles, N. & Kerr, M. (1988), *Women, Food and Families* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- Charles, N. & Hughes-Freeland, F. (1996), *Practising Feminism: Identity, Difference, Power* (London Routledge)
- Charles, N. (1996), 'Feminist Practices: Identity, Difference, Power', in Charles, N. & Hughes-Freeland, F. *ibid.*
- Chase, S. (ed.) (1991), *Defending the Earth: A Dialogue between Murray Bookchin & Dave Foreman* (Boston: South End Press)
- Cheney, J. (1994), 'Nature/Theory/Difference: Ecofeminism and the reconstruction of environmental ethics' in Warren, K.J. *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Chesler, P. (1972), *Women and Madness* (London: Allen Lane)
- Chesler, P. (1978), *About Men* (London: Women's Press)
- Chesler, P. (1982), 'Men and Pornography - Why They Use It', in Lederer, L. (ed.) *Take Back The Night* (New York: Bantam Books)
- Chester, G. & Dickey, J. (eds.) (1988), *Feminism and Censorship* (Bridport, Dorset: Prism Press)
- Chisholm, D. (1995), 'The 'Cunning Lingua' of Desire: Bodies-language and perverse performativity', in Grosz, E. & Probyn, E. (eds.) *Sexy Bodies: The strange carnalities of feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Chodorow, N. (1978), *The Reproduction of Mothering* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Clarke, A. (1987), *Women's Silence, Men's Violence* (London: Pandora)

- Clark, K. (1956), *The Nude: a study in ideal art* (London: John Murray)
- Clarke, W. (1987), 'The Dyke, the Feminist, and the Devil', in Feminist Review (ed.), *Sexuality: A Reader* (London: Fontana)
- Cockburn, C. (1985), *The Machinery of Dominance* (London, Pluto)
- Collard, A. & Contrucci, J. (1988), *Rape of the Wild* (London: The Women's Press)
- Collier, A. (1989), *Scientific Reasoning and Socialist Thought*, (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf)
- Collier, A. (1994), *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy* (London: Verso)
- Collins, P. (1990), *Black Feminist Thought* (London: Unwin Hyman)
- Cooper, D., & Palmer, J., (1992), *The Environment in Question* (London: Routledge)
- Corea, G. (1985a), *The Mother Machine* (London: Women's Press)
- Corea, G. (1985b), 'How the New Reproductive Technologies could be Used to Apply the Brothel Model of Social Control Over Women', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 8, 4: 299-305
- Corea, G., Duelli-Klein, R. et al (1985c), *Man-Made Women: How New Reproductive Technologies affect Women* (London: Hutchinson)
- Coveney, L., Jackson, M., Jeffreys, S., Kaye, L., & Mahoney, P. (1984), *The Sexuality Papers* (London: Hutchinson)
- Coward, R., Lipshitz, S., Cowie, E. (1976), 'Psychoanalysis and Patriarchal Structures', in *Papers on Patriarchy*, (published from the 'Patriarchy Conference', London, 1976)
- Coward, R. (1983), *Patriarchal Precedents* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Coward, R. (1984), *Female Desire* (London: Granada)
- Coward, R. (1987), 'Sexual Violence and Sexuality', in Feminist Review (ed.), *Sexuality: A Reader* (London: Fontana)
- Cowie, L. & Lees, S (1987), 'Slags or Drags', in *Feminist Review*, *ibid.*
- Craib, I (1992), *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf)
- Craig, S. (1994), *Men, Masculinities and the Media* (London: Sage)
- Crowley, V. (1989), *Wicca* (London: Thorsons)
- Cumberbutch, G & Howlett, D. (1990), *Pornography: Impacts and Influences* (London: HMSO, Home Office Research and Planning Unit)
- Cuomo, C. J. (1994), 'Ecofeminism, Deep Ecology, and Human Population', in Warren, K. J. (ed.) *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Currell, M. E. (1974), *Political Woman* (London: Croom Helm)

- Daly, M. (1973), *Beyond God the Father* (Boston: Beacon)
- Daly, M. (1979), *Gyn/Ecology* (London: Women's Press)
- Daly, M. (1991), *Gyn/Ecology*, new introduction, (London: Women's Press)
- Daly, M. (1984), *Pure Lust* (London: Women's Press)
- Daly, M. with Caputi, J. (1988), *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language* (London: Women's Press)
- Daly, M. (1993), *Outercourse: The Be-dazzling Voyage*, (London: The Women's Press)
- Daly, M. (1996), 'The Witches Return: Patriarchy on Trial', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Davion, V. (1994), 'Is Ecofeminism Feminist?', in Warren (ed.) *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Davis, A. (1981), *Women, Race and Class* (London: Women's Press)
- Davis, A. (1990), *Women, Culture and Politics* (London: Women's Press)
- Davis, K. (1995), 'Thinking Like a Chicken: Farm Animals and the Feminine Connection' in Adams C.J. & Donovan J. (eds.) *op cit*
- Delphy, C. (1984), *Close to Home: a materialist analysis of women's oppression* (London: Hutchinson)
- Delphy, C. (1987), 'Protofeminism and antifeminism', in Moi, T. (ed.), *French Feminist Thought: A Reader* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Deleuze, G. (1988), *Foucault*, trans. Hand, S. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)
- Derrida, J. (1978), 'Cogito and the history of madness', in *Writing and Difference* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Devall, B. & Sessions, G. (1985), *Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books)
- Diamond, I. & Quinby, L. (eds.) (1988), *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance* (Boston: Northeastern University Press)
- Diamond, I. & Orenstein, G. F. (eds.) (1990), *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books)
- Dickens, P. (1991), *Society and Nature: Towards a Green Social Theory* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf)
- Dinnerstein, D. (1987), *The Rocking of the Cradle and the Ruling of the World* (London: Women's Press) first published in the USA, 1976
- Di Stephano, C. (1990), 'Dilemmas of Difference: Feminism, Modernity and Postmodernism', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Dobash, R. & Dobash, R. (1980), *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against Patriarchy* (London: Open Books)

- Dobson, A. (ed.) (1991), *The Green Reader* (London: Andre Deutsch)
- Dobson, A. (1992), *Green Political Thought* (London: Routledge)
- Donnerstein, E. (1984), *The Question of Pornography* (London: Free Press)
- Dorovan, K. (1982), 'The Male Appendage: the legal definition of woman', in Evans, M. (ed.) *The Woman Question* (London: Fontana)
- Donovan, J. & Adams, C.J. (eds.) (1996) *Beyond Animal Rights: A Feminist Ethic for the Treatment of Animals* (New York: Continuum)
- Douglas, M. (1966), *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Douglas, M. (1975), *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)
- Douglas, M. & Nicod, M. (1974), 'Taking the biscuit: the structure of the British meal', *New Society*, 30:744-7
- Dunayer, J. (1995), 'Sexist Words, Speciesist Roots', in C.J. Adams & J. Donovan (eds.) *Animals and Women* (London: Duke University Press)
- Dunleavy, P. & Husbands, C. (1985), *British Democracy at the Crossroads* (London: Allen & Unwin)
- Dunleavy, P. & O'Leary, B. (1987), *Theories of the State* (London: Macmillan)
- Dworkin, A. (1974), *Woman Hating* (New York: E. P. Dutton)
- Dworkin, A. (1981), *Pornography* (London: Women's Press)
- Dworkin, A. (1983), *Right Wing Women* (London: Women's Press)
- Dworkin, A. (1988a), *Intercourse* (London: Arrow Books)
- Dworkin, A. (1988b), *Letters from a War Zone* (New York: Secker & Warburg)
- Dworkin, A. (1996), 'Dworkin on Dworkin', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Eastlea, B. (1981), *Science and Sexual Oppression: Patriarchy's Confrontation with Women and Nature* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson)
- Eckersley, R. (1992), *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Ecocentric Approach* (London: University College London Press)
- Ehrenreich, B. & English, D. (1973), *Witches, Midwives and Nurses: A History of Women Healers* (London: Writers & Readers)
- Ehrenreich, B. & English, D. (1983), *For Her Own Good: 150 years of the experts advice to women* (London: Pluto)
- Eisler, R. (1990), *The Chalice and the Blade* (London: Unwin)

- Eisenstein, Z. R. (1979), 'Developing a theory of capitalist patriarchy and socialist feminism', in Eisenstein, Z. R. *Capitalist Patriarchy* (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- Eisenstein, Z. R. (1981), *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism* (New York: Longman)
- Eisenstein, Z.R. (1984), *Feminism and Sexual Equality* (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- Ekins, P. (1992), *A New World Order: Grassroots Movements for Social Change* (London: Routledge)
- Elkington, J. & Burke, T. (1987), *The Green Capitalists* (London: Victor Gollancz)
- Elkington, J. & Hailes, J. (1988), *The Green Consumer Guide* (London: Victor Gollancz)
- Elshtain, J. B. (1981), *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought* (Oxford: Martin Robertson)
- Elstain, J. B. (1987), *Women and War* (Brighton: Harvester)
- English, D., Hollibaugh, A., & Rubin, G. (1987), 'Talking Sex: A Conversation on Sex and Feminism', in *Feminist Review* (ed.) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Fontana)
- Enloe, C. (1983), *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives* (London: Pluto)
- Estes, C.P. (1992), *Women Who Run with the Wolves: Myths and Stories of the wild Woman Archetype* (London: Rider)
- Evans, J. (1995), *Feminist Theory Today: An Introduction to Second Wave Feminism* (London: Sage)
- Evans, M. (ed.) (1982), *The Woman Question: readings on the subordination of women* (London: Fontana)
- Evans, M. (ed.) (1994), *The Woman Question 2nd ed.* (London: Sage)
- Faderman, L. (1981), *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love Between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (London: Junction Books)
- Faludi, S. (1992), *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against Women* (London: Chatto & Windus)
- Feminist Review* (ed.) (1987), *Sexuality: A Reader* (London: Virago)
- Ferguson, A. (1989), *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance* (London: Pandora)
- Fiedler, L. (1978), *Freaks: Myths and Images of the Secret Self* (New York: Simon & Schuster)
- Figs, E. (1970), *Patriarchal Attitudes* (London: Macmillan)
- Finkelstein, J. (1989), *Dinning Out* (New York: New York University Press)
- Firestone, S. (1988), *The Dialectic of Sex* (London: Women's Press), first British publication, 1971
- Fisher, E. (1979), *Woman's Creation: Sexual Evolution and the Shaping of Society* ((Garden City, NY.: Doubleday)
- Flax, J. (1987), 'Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory', *Signs*, 12, 4:621-43

- Flax, J. (1990), *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Flax, J. (1990), 'Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Foucault, M. (1971), *Madness and Civilization* (London: Tavistock)
- Foucault, M. (1972), *The Archeology of Knowledge*, trans. Sheridan, A. (London: Tavistock)
- Foucault, M. (1976a), Lecture, 7th January, 1976, in Kelly, M. (ed.) (1994) *Critique and Power* (Cambridge: MIT Press)
- Foucault, M. (1976b), Lecture, 14th January, 1976, in Kelly, M. (ed.) *ibid.*
- Foucault, M. (1979), *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison* trans. Sheridan, A. (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Foucault, M. (1981), *The History of Sexuality, Volume One: An Introduction* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Foucault, M. (1985), *The History of Sexuality, Volume Two: The Use of Pleasure* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Foucault, M. (1986), *The History of Sexuality, Volume Three: The Care of the Self* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Fox, W. (1984), 'Deep ecology: a new philosophy of our time?', *The Ecologist*, vol. 14, no.5/6
- Fox, W. (1986), *Approaching Deep Ecology* (Tasmania: University of Tasmania)
- Fraser, N. & Nicholson, L. (1988), 'Social criticism without philosophy: an encounter between feminism and post-modernism', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 5:373-394
- Francione, G.L. (1995), 'Abortion and Animal Rights: Are They Comparable Issues?' in Adams C.J. & Donovan J. eds. *op cit*
- Fraser, N. (1989), *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Fraser, N., and Nicholson, L. (1990), 'Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Freidan, B. (1986), *The Feminine Mystique* (Harmondsworth: Penguin), first published in the USA, 1963
- Freidan, B. (1981), *The Second Stage* (London: Michael Joseph)
- Frey, R. G. (1980), *Interests and Rights: the case against animals* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Freer, J. (1983), 'Gaea: the Earth as our spiritual heritage', in Caldecott & Leyland (1983)
- French, M. (1986), *Beyond Power* (London: Abacus)
- Frye, M. (1983), *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory* (Trumpenburg, NY: The Crossing Press)

- Fuss, D. (1989), *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference* (London: Routledge)
- Gabor, M. (1984), *The Illustrated History of Girlie Magazines* (London: Harmony Books)
- Gallagher, J. (1987), 'Eggs, Embryo's Foetuses: Anxiety and the Law', in Stanworth, M. *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Gamman, L. & Marshment, M. (eds.) (1988), *The Female Gaze* (London: Women's Press)
- Gearheart, S. M. (1982), 'The Future, If There Is One, Is Female', in McAllister, P. (ed.) *Reweaving the Web of Life* (Philadelphia: New Society)
- Giddens, A. (1979), *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis* (London: Macmillan)
- Giddens, A. (1984), *The Constitution of Society* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Giddens, A. (1990), *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and Self-Identity* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Gilligan, C. (1982), *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)
- Gimbutus, M. (1977), 'The First Wave of Eurasian Steppe Pastoralists into Copper Age Europe', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5, winter, 1977
- Gimbutus, M. (1982), *Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Gimbutus, M. (1990), *The Language of the Goddess* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Goldberg, S. (1979), *Male Dominance: The Inevitability of Patriarchy* (London: Abacus)
- Goldsmith, E. & Hildyard, N. (1986), *Green Britain or Industrial Wasteland?* (Oxford: Polity Press)
- Goldsmith, E. (1988), *The Great U-turn: De-Industrializing Society* (Bideford: Green Books)
- Goodin, R. E. (1992), *Green Political Theory* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Goodman, D. & Redclift, M. (1991), *Refashioning Nature: Food, Ecology and Culture* (London: Routledge)
- Goodwin, B. (1987), *Using Political Ideas* (Chichester: John Wiley)
- Gorz, A. (1985), *Paths to Paradise* (London: Pluto Press)
- Greenwood, S. (1996), 'Feminist witchcraft: A Transformatory Politics', in Charles, n. & Hughes-Freeland, F. (eds.) *op cit.*
- Greer, G. (1971), *The Female Eunuch* (London: Paladin)
- Greer, G. (1981), *The Obstacle Race: The fortunes of women painters and their work* (London: Pan Books)
- Greer, G. (1984), *Sex and Destiny: The Politics of Human Fertility* (London: Pan Books)
- Griffin, S. (1982), *Made from this Earth* (London: Women's Press)

- Griffin, S. (1984), *Woman and Nature* (London: Women's Press)
- Griffin, S. (1988), *Pornography and Silence* (London: Women's Press)
- Griffin, S. (1992), *A Chorus of Stones: The Private Life of War* (London: Women's Press)
- Grimshaw, J. (1993), 'Practices of Freedom', in C. Ramazanoglu (ed) *Up Against Foucault* (London: Routledge)
- Grosz, E. (1994), *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism* (London: Allen & Unwin)
- Grosz, E. & Probyn, E. (eds.) (1995), *Sexy Bodies: The strange carnalities of feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Grover, J. Z. (1991), 'Framing the Questions: Positive Imaging and Scarcity in Lesbian Photographs', in Boffin, T. & Fraser, J. (eds.) *Stolen Glances* (London: Pandora)
- Gruen, L. (1994), 'Toward an Ecofeminist Moral Epistemology', in Warren, K.J. (ed.), *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Gubar, S. & Hoff, J. (eds.) (1989), *For Adult Users Only: the Dilemma of Violent Pornography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)
- Gutting, G. (1989), *Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Habermas, J. (1979), *Communication and the Evolution of Society* (London: Heinemann)
- Habermas, J. (1984), *The Theory of Communicative Action Vol.1: Reason and the rationalisation of society* (Oxford: Polity)
- Habermas, J. (1987), *The Theory of Communicative Action Vol.2: A critique of functionalist reason* (Oxford: Polity)
- Habermas, J. (1989), *The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historians' Debate* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Hackett, P. (1994), *Conservation and the Consumer* (London: Routledge)
- Hanmer, J. (1978), 'Violence and the social control of women', in Littlejohn, G., Smart, B., Wakefield, J., & Yuval-Davis, N. (eds.) *Power and the State* (London: Croom Helm)
- Hanmer, J. & Saunders, S. (1984), *Well-founded Fear: a community study of violence to women* (London: Hutchinson)
- Hanmer, J. (1985), 'Transforming Consciousness: Women and the New Reproductive Technologies', in G. Corea et al. *Man-Made Women* (London: Hutchinson)
- Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (eds.) (1987), *Women, Violence and Social Control* (London: Macmillan)
- Hanmer, J. (1989), 'Women and Policing in Britain', in Hanmer, J., Radford, J., & Stanko, E. A. *Women, Policing and Male Violence* (London: Routledge)
- Hannigan, J. (1995), *Environmental Sociology: A social constructionist perspective* (London: Routledge)

- Haraway, D. (1988), 'Situated Knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective', *Feminist Studies*, 14, 3:575-599
- Haraway, D. (1989), *Primate Visions: Gender, Race and Nature in the World of Modern Science* (London: Routledge)
- Haraway, D. (1991), *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (London: Free Association Press)
- Harding, S. (1986), *The Science Question in Feminism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)
- Harding, S. (1987), *Feminism and Methodology* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press)
- Harding, S. (1990), 'Feminism, Science and the Anti-Enlightenment Critiques', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Harding, S. (1991), *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press)
- Harding, S. (1994), 'Feminism and Theories of Scientific Knowledge' in Evans, M. (ed.) *The Woman Question*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage)
- Harris, M. (1974), *Cows, Pigs, Wars and Witches* (New York: Vintage)
- Hartmann, B. (1987), *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs: The Global Politics of Population Control and Contraceptive Choice* (New York: Harper & Row)
- Hartmann, H. I. (1979), 'Capitalism, patriarchy, and job segregation by sex', in Eisenstein, Z. (ed.) *Capitalist Patriarchy* (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- Hartmann, H. I. (1981), 'The unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism: towards a more progressive union', in Sargent, L. (ed.) *Women and Revolution* (London: Pluto Press)
- Hartsock, N. (1990), 'Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women?', in L. Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Harvey, D. (1989), *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Hearn, J. (1987), *The Gender of Oppression* (Brighton: Wheatsheaf)
- Hebditch, D. & Anning, N. (1988), *Porn Gold* (London: Faber & Faber)
- Harvey, D. (1989), *The Postmodern Condition* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Held, D. (1980), *Introduction to Critical Theory* (London: Hutchinson)
- Hekman, S. (1990), *Gender and Knowledge: Elements of a Postmodern Feminism* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Henderson, H. (1983), 'The warp and the weft: the coming synthesis of eco-philosophy and eco-feminism', in Caldecott & Leyland (1983) *op cit*
- Hoff, J. (1989), 'Why is There no History of Pornography?', in Gubar, S. & Hoff, J. *For Adult Users Only* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)
- Hoff, J. (1996), 'The Pernicious Effect of Post-structuralism on Women's History', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)

- Holloway, W. (1987), 'I Just wanted to Kill A Woman' Why? The Ripper and Male Sexuality', in *Feminist Review* (ed.) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Virago)
- hooks, b. (1982), *Ain't I a Woman?* (London: Pluto Press)
- hooks, b. (1984), *Feminist Theory: from margin to center* (Boston: South End Press)
- hooks, b. (1991), *Yearning: race, gender and cultural politics* (London: Turnaround)
- hooks, b. (1992), *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (London: Turnaround)
- Honour, H. & Fleming, J. (1982), *A World History of Art* (London: Macmillan)
- Hubbard, R. & Lowe, M. (1983), *Woman's Nature* (New York: Pergammon)
- Hubbard, R. (1990), *The Politics of Women's Biology* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press)
- Irigaray, L. (1985), *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian Gill (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)
- Irvine, S. & Ponton, A. (1988), *A Green Manifesto: Policies for a Green Future* (London: Macdonald Optima)
- Irvine, S. (1989) *Beyond Green Consumerism* (London: Friends of the Earth)
- Itzin, C. (1992), *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Itzin, C. (1992), 'Pornography and the Social Construction of Sexual Inequality', in Itzin, C. (ed.), *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Jackson, C. (1994), 'Gender Analysis and Environmentalisms', in Redclift, M. & Benton, T. (eds.) *op cit.*
- Jaggar, A. (1983), *Feminist Politics and Human Nature* (Brighton: Harvester)
- Jameson, F. (1972), *The Prison House of Language* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press)
- Jayawardena, K. (1986), *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World* (London: Zed Press)
- Jeffreys, S. (1985), *The Spinster and Her Enemies: feminism and sexuality 1880-1930* (London: Pandora)
- Jeffreys, S. (1990), *Anti-climax: a feminist perspective on the sexual revolution* (London: Women's Press)
- Jeffreys, S. (1994), *The Lesbian Heresy: a feminist perspective on the lesbian sexual revolution* (London: The Women's Press)
- Jeffreys, S. (1996) 'The Return to Gender: Post-modernism and lesbainandgay theory' in Bell, D. and Klein, R. (eds.) *op cit*
- Johnson, D.K. & Johnson, K.R. (1994), 'The Limits of Partiality: Ecofeminism, animal rights, and ecological concern' in Warren, K. J. *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)

- Jong, E. (1982), *Witches* (London: Granada)
- Joseph, G. (1981), 'The incompatible menage a trois: Marxism, feminism and racism', in Sargent, L. (ed.) *Women and Revolution* (London: Pluto: Press)
- Kappeler, S. (1986), *The Pornography of Representation* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Kappeler, S. (1987), 'The White Brothel: the Literary Exoneration of the Pornographic', in *Feminist Review* (ed.) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Virago)
- Kappeler, S. (1992), 'Pornography: The Representation of Power', in Itzin, C. (ed.), *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Kappeler, S. (1995), 'Speciesism, Racism, Nationalism... or the Power of Scientific Subjectivity', in Adams, C.J. & Donovan J. (eds.) *op cit*
- Kariel, H. S. (1989) *The Desperate Politics of Postmodernism* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press)
- Keller, E. F. (1985), *Reflections on Gender and Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
- Kellner, D. (1988), 'Postmodernism as social theory: some challenges and problems, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 5:239-69
- Kelly, L. (1988), *Surviving Sexual Violence* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Kelly, L. (1992), 'Pornography and Child Sexual Abuse', in Itzin, C. *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Kelly, M. (ed.) (1994), *Critique and Power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate* (Cambridge: MIT Press)
- Kemp, P. & Wall, D. (1989), *A Green Manifesto for the 1990's* (London: Greenprint)
- Kendrick, W. (1987), *The Secret Museum: Pornography in Modern Culture* (New York: Viking)
- Kerr, M. & Charles, N. (1986), 'Servers and Providers: The distribution of food within the family', *Sociological Review*, 34,1
- Kimmel, M. (ed.) (1987), *Changing Men* (London: Sage)
- King, Y. (1983), 'The eco-feminist imperative', in Caldecott & Leyland (1983) *op cit*
- King, Y. (1987), 'The ecology of feminism and the feminism of ecology', in Plant, J. (ed.) *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers)
- Khun, A. (1982), *Women's Pictures* (London: Routledge)
- Khun, A. (1985), *The Power of the Image* (London: Routledge)
- Khun, T. (1970), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
- Klein, R. (1996), '(Dead) Bodies Floating in Cyberspace: Post-modernism and the Dismemberment of Women', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Knight, C. (1991), *Blood Relations: Menstruation and the origins of culture* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press)

- Kolakowski, L. (1987), *Main Currents of Marxism: 1. The Founders* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- La-Belle, B. (1982), 'Snuff: the Ultimate in Woman Hating', in L. Lederer (ed) *Take Back the Night* (New York: Bantam Books)
- Lappe, F. M., & Collins, J. (1982), *Food First: Beyond the Myth of Scarcity* (London: Abacus)
- Lash, S. & Urry, J. (1987), *The End of Organized Capitalism* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Lash, S. (1990), *The Sociology of Post-Modernism* (London: Routledge)
- Lash, S. & Urry, J. (1994), *Economies of Signs and Space* (London: Sage)
- Lash, S., Szersynski, B. & Wynne, B. (eds.) (1996) *Risk, Environment and Modernity* (London: Sage)
- Lash, S., Szersynski, B. & Wynne, B. (1996), 'Ecology, Realism and the Social Sciences', in Lash, S. et al. *op cit*
- Layder, D. (1994), *Understanding Social Theory* (London: Sage)
- Layder, D. (1996), 'Review Essay: Contemporary Social Theory', *Sociology*, 30,3:601-608
- Leakey, R.E. & Lewin, R. (1979), *Origins* (London: MacDonald & Jones)
- Lederer, L. (ed.) (1982), *Take Back the Night: women on pornography* (New York: Bantam Books)
- Leeds Revolutionary Feminist Group (1981), 'Political lesbianism: the case against heterosexuality', in Onlywomen (ed.) *Love Thy Enemy? The debate between heterosexual feminism and political lesbianism* (London: Onlywomen Press)
- Leghorn, L. & Roodkowsky, M. (1977), *Who Really Starves? Women and World Hunger* (New York: Friendship Press)
- Lerner, G. (1986), *The Creation of Patriarchy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Leyland, S. (1983), 'Feminism and ecology: theoretical connections', in Caldecott, L. & Leyland, S. (1983) *Reclaim the Earth* (London: Women's Press)
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1970), *The Raw and the Cooked* (London: Jonathan Cape)
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1978), *The Origin of Table Manners* (New York: Harper & Row)
- Lienert, T. (1996), 'On Who is Calling Radical Feminist "Cultural Feminists" and Other Historical Sleights of Hand', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Lockwood, D. (1964), 'Social Integration and System Integration', in G.K. Zollschan and W. Hirsch (eds.), *Explorations in Social Change* (London: Routledge)
- London Rape Crisis Centre (1984), *Sexual Violence* (London: Women's Press)
- Lorde, A. (1981), 'An Open Letter to Mary Daly', in Moraga, C. & Azadula, G. *This Bridge Called My Back: writings by radical women of color* (Waterdown: Persephone Press)
- Lorde, A. (1994), 'Age, Race, Class and Sex: Women Redefining Difference', in Evans, M. (ed.) *The Woman Question*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage)

- Lovejoy, T.E. (1986), 'Species leave the ark: one by one', in Norton, B.G. *The Preservation of Species: The Value of Biological Diversity* (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press)
- Lovelock, J. (1979), *Gaia: a new look at life on earth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Lovenduski, J & Norris, P (1994) *Gender & Party Politics* (London: Sage)
- Lovibond, S. (1989), 'Feminism and Postmodernism', *New Left Review*, 178, 2:5-28
- Lowe, M. & Hubbard, R. (1983) *Woman's Nature* (London: Tavistock)
- Luke, B. (1995), 'Taming Ourselves or Going Feral? Toward a Non-Patriarchal Metaethic of Animal Liberation', in C.J. Adams & J. Donovan (eds) *op cit*
- Lukes, S. (1974), *Power: a radical view* (London: Macmillan)
- Lupton, D. (1996), *Food, the Body and the Self* (London: Sage)
- Lury, C. (1990), *Cultural Industries: a political economy* (London: Routledge)
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- Lyotard, J. F. (1988), *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)
- MacKinnon, C. (1982), 'Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State' *Signs*, 7,3: 515-544
- MacKinnon, C. (1987), *Feminism Unmodified: discourses on life and law* (Cambridge, Mass.: University of Harvard Press)
- MacKinnon, C. (1989), *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Cambridge Mass.: University of Harvard Press)
- MacKinnon, C. (1994), *Only Words* (London: Harper Collins)
- MacKinnon, C. (1996), 'From Practice to Theory, or What is a White Woman Anyway?' in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Maguire, J. (1996), 'The Tears Inside the Stone: Reflections on the Ecology of Fear', in Lash, S. et al. *op cit*
- Mahony, P. and Zmroczek, C. (1996), 'Working-Class Radical Feminism' in *ibid*.
- Malmuth, N. M. & Donnerstein, E. (eds.) *Pornography and Sexual Aggression* (New York: Academic Press)
- Malos, E. (ed.) (1980), *The Politics of Housework* (London: Allison and Busby)
- Marks, E. & de Courtivron, I. (eds.) (1981), *New French Feminisms* (Brighton: Harvester)
- Marshall, D. (1993), *Demanding the Impossible: a history of anarchism* (London: Macmillan)
- Martin, P. (1994), 'Mad, Bad, and Dangerous to Eat', in *Night and Day* (Mail on Sunday) March 6th 1994
- Maynard, M. (1990), 'The re-shaping of sociology? trends in the study of gender' *Sociology*, 24, 2: 269-90

- Maynard, M. (1994), 'Race', Gender and the Concept of Difference in Feminist Thought' in Afshar, H. & Maynard, M. (eds) *Dynamics of 'Race' and Gender* (London: Taylor & Francis)
- McAllister, P. (ed.) (1982), *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Non-violence* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers)
- McIntosh, M. (1978), 'The state and the oppression of women', in Evans, M. (ed.) (1982), *The Woman Question* (London: Fontana)
- McIntosh, M. (1992), 'Liberalism and the contradictions of sexual politics', in Segal, L. & McIntosh, M. (eds.) *Sex Exposed* (London: Virago)
- McLennan, G. (1995), 'Feminism, Epistemology and Postmodernism: Reflections on Current Ambivalence', *Sociology*, 29,2:391-409
- McNay, L. (1992), *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self* (Cambridge: Polity)
- McNay, L. (1994), *Foucault: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Polity)
- McNeil, M. (1993), 'Dancing with Foucault: feminism and power knowledge' in C. Ramazanoglu (ed.) *Up Against Foucault* (London: Routledge)
- Mellaart, J. (1965), *Earliest Civilizations of the Near East* (London: Thames & Hudson)
- Mellaart, J. (1967), *Catal Hüyük* (London: Thames & Hudson)
- Mellaart, J. (1975), *The Neolithic of the Near East* (New York: Scribner)
- Merchant, C. (1980), *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper & Row)
- Merchant, C. (1985), *Ecological Revolutions* (New York: Harper & Row)
- Mies, M. (1986), *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale* (London: Zed Books)
- Mies, M. & Shiva, V. *Ecofeminism* (London: Zed Books)
- Midgley, M. (1983), *Animals and Why they Matter* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Millet, K. (1985), *Sexual Politics* (London: Virago) first published in Britain, 1970
- Mitchell, J. (1971), *Woman's Estate* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Mitchell, J. (1974), *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (London: Allen Lane)
- Mitchell, J. & Oakley, A. (eds.) (1976), *The Rights and Wrongs of Women* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Mitchell, J. (1977), *Women, the Longest Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Mitford, J. (1992), *The American Way of Birth* (London: Victor Gollancz)
- Morgan, E. (1972), *The Descent of Woman* (New York: Stein & Day)
- Mouzelis, N. (1991), *Back to Sociological Theory: The construction of social orders* (London: Macmillan)

- Mouzelis, N. (1995), *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong?* (London: Macmillan)
- Mouzelis, N. (1997), 'Social and System Integration: Lockwood, Habermas and Giddens', *Sociology*, 31,1:111-119
- Morgan, R. (1978), *Going Too Far. The Personal Chronicle of a Feminist* (New York: Vintage)
- Mulvey, L. (1989), *Visual and Other Pleasures* (London: Macmillan)
- Murcott, A. (ed.) (1983), *The Sociology of Food and Eating* (Aldershot: Gower)
- Murcott, A. (1988), 'On the altered appetites of pregnancy: conceptions of food, body and person', *Sociological Review*, 36,4:733-64
- Naess, A. (1973), 'The shallow and the deep. long-range ecology movement. A summary', *Inquiry*, 16
- Naess, A. (1989), *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Nead, L. (1992), *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality* (London: Routledge)
- Neal, B. & Smart, C. (1997), 'Experiments with Parenthood?', *Sociology*, vol.31,2:pp.201-221
- Neilson, J. M. (1990), *Feminist Research Methods* (New York: Westview Press)
- Nestle, J. (1984), 'The Fem Question', in Vance, C. (ed.), *Pleasure and Danger* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Newby, H. (1980), *Green and Pleasant Land* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Newby, H. (1988), *The Countryside in Question* (London: Hutchinson)
- Newby, H. (1991), 'One world, two cultures: sociology and the environment', *BSA Bulletin Network*, vol. 50 (May):1-8
- Nicholson, L. J. (ed.) (1990) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge)
- Nicholson, L. (1992), 'On the Postmodern Barricades: Feminism, Politics and Social Theory' in Seidman, S. & Wagner, D.G. (eds.) *Postmodernism and Social Theory* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Nicholson, M. (1987), *The New Environmental Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Norden, B. (1990), 'Pornography: the debate goes on', in *Everywoman*, Dec 1990-Jan 1991
- Oakley, A., (1972), *Sex, Gender and Society* (London: Maurice Temple Smith)
- Oakley, A. (1976), 'Wisewoman and Medicine Men: Changes in the Management of Childbirth', in Mitchell, J. & Oakley, A. (eds.) *The Rights and Wrongs of Women* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Oakley, A. (1984), *The Captured Womb* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Oakley, A. (1987), 'From Walking Wombs to Test Tube Babies', in Stanworth, M. (ed.) *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- O'Brien, M. (1981), *The Politics of Reproduction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

- Offe, C. (1987), *Disorganized Capitalism* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Okin, S. M. (1980), *Women in Western Political Thought* (London: Virago)
- Okin, S. M. (1990), *Gender, Justice and the Family* (New York: Basic Books)
- O'Neill, J. (1993) *Ecology, Policy and Politics* (London: Routledge)
- O'Riordan, T. (1981), *Environmentalism* (London: Pion)
- O'Sullivan, S. (1987), 'Passionate Beginnings: Ideological Politics 1969-72', in *Feminist Review* (ed.) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Virago)
- Pahl, J. (ed.) (1985), *Private Violence and Public Policy* (London: Routledge)
- Pateman, C. (1988), *The Sexual Contract* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Pateman, C. (1989), *The Disorder of Women* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Pepper, D. (1984), *The Roots of Modern Environmentalism* (Beckenham: Croom Helm)
- Pepper, D. (1993), *Eco-Socialism: from Deep Ecology to Social Justice* (London: Routledge)
- Petchesky, R. P. (1987), 'Foetal Images: the Power of Visual culture in the Politics of Reproduction', in Stanworth, M. (ed.) *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Pfeffer, N. (1987), 'Artificial Insemination In-Vitro Fertilization and the Stigma of Infertility', in *ibid.*
- Phelps, L. (1981), 'Patriarchy and Capitalism', in *Building Feminist Theory: Essays from Quest* (London: Longman)
- Phillips, A. (1985), *Divided Loyalties: Dilemmas of Sex and Class* (London: Virago)
- Phillips, A. (1991), *Engendering Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Phillips, A. (1993), *Democracy and Difference* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Pierson, R. R. (ed.) (1987), *Women and Peace* (Beckenham: Croom Helm)
- Pizzey, E. (1974), *Scream Quietly or the Neighbours Will Hear* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Plant, J. (1989), *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers)
- Plumwood, V. (1991), *Nature, Self and Gender* (London: Routledge)
- Plumwood, V. (1993), *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (London: Routledge)
- Plumwood, V. (1994), 'The Ecopolitics Debate and the Politics of Nature', in Warren, K. J. (ed.) *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Pollert, A. (1996), 'Gender and Class Revisited: or, the Poverty of Patriarchy', *Sociology*, 30,4:639-659
- Pomeroy, S. B. (1975), *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves* (New York: Schocken Books)

- Pornography and Sexual Violence. Evidence of the Links: The complete transcript of Public Hearings on Ordinances to Add Pornography as Discrimination Against Women.* Minneapolis City Council, Government Operations Committee. Dec. 12 and 13, 1983 (London: Everywoman)
- Porrirt, J. (1984), *Seeing Green* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Porrirt, J. & Winner, D. (1988), *The Coming of the Greens* (London: Fontana)
- Porter, R. (1990), *English society in the Eighteenth Century* 2nd ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Ramazanoglu, C. (1989), *Feminism and the Contradictions of Oppression* (London: Routledge)
- Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) (1993), *Up Against Foucault* (London: Routledge)
- Ramazanoglu, C. & Holland, J. (1993), 'Women's sexuality and Men's appropriation of desire', in *ibid.*
- Randall, V. (1982), *Women and Politics* (London: Macmillan)
- Raymond, J. (1992), 'Pornography and the Politics of Lesbianism', in Itzin, C. (ed.) *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Raymond, J. (1994), *Transsexual Empire* (London: The Women's Press)
- Redclift, M. (1984), *Development and the Environmental Crisis* (London: Methuen)
- Redclift, M. (1989), *Sustainable Development* (London: Routledge)
- Redclift, M. & Benton, T. (ed.) (1994), *Social Theory and the Global Environment* (London: Routledge)
- Redclift, m. and Woodgate, G. (1994), 'Sociology and the Environment: Discordant discourse?', in Redclift, M and Benton, T. *ibid.*
- Reed, E. (1975), *Woman's Evolution: From Matriarchal Clan to Patriarchal Family* (New York: Pathfinder)
- Regan, T. (1988), *The Case for Animal Rights* (London: Routledge)
- Rembar, C. (1968), *The End of Obscenity* (New York: Harper & Row)
- Rich, A. (1977), *Of Woman Born: motherhood as experience and institution* (London: Virago)
- Rich, A. (1980), 'Compulsory heterosexuality and the lesbian existence', *Signs*, 5,4: 631-660
- Rich, B. R. (1987), 'Anti-Porn: Soft Issue, Hard World', in Feminist Review (ed) *Sexuality: a reader* (London: Virago)
- Richards, J. R. (1982), *The Skeptical Feminist* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
- Richardson, D. (1996), "'Misguided, Dangerous and Wrong": On the Maligning of Radical Feminism', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Rifkin, J. (1994), *Beyond Beef: The Rise and Fall of Cattle Culture* (London: Thorsons)
- Ritson, C., Gofton, L., McKenzie, J. (eds.) (1986), *The Food Consumer* (New York: John Wiley)

- Roberts, H. (1988), *Doing Feminist Research* (London: Routledge)
- Rollin, B.E. (1981), *Animal Rights and Human Morality* (New York: Prometheus Books)
- Rose, H. (1987), 'Victorian Values in the Test Tube: the Politics of Reproductive Science and Technology', in Stanworth, M. (ed.) *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Roseneil, S. (1995), *Disarming Patriarchy: Feminism and Political Action at Greenham* (Buckingham: Open University Press)
- Roseneil, S. (1996), 'Transgressions and Transformations: Experience, Consciousness and Identity at Greenham', in Charles, N. & Hughes-Freeland, F. (eds.) *op cit.*
- Rowbotham, S. (1979), 'The Trouble with Patriarchy', in Evans, M. (ed.) *The Woman Question* (London: Fontana)
- Rowland, R. and Klein, R. (1996), 'Radical Feminism: History, Politics, Action', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Rozak, T. (1979), *Person/Planet* (New York: Doubleday)
- Rozak, T. (1993), *The Voice of the Earth* (New York: Simon & Schuster)
- Ruddick, S. (1990), *Maternal Thinking* (London: Women's Press)
- Russell, D. (1982), *Rape in Marriage* (New York: Macmillan)
- Russell, D. (1992), 'Pornography and Rape: A Causal Model', in Itzin, C. (ed.) *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Russell, D., Radford, J. (1994) *Femicide: the Politics of Woman Killing* (London: Hutchinson)
- Ryan, A. (1970), *The Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (London: Macmillan)
- Ryle, M. (1988), *Ecology and Socialism* (London: Rodins)
- Said, E. (1983), *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (London: Vintage)
- Said, E. (1988), 'Michel Foucault 1926-1984', in Arac, J. (ed.) *op cit.*
- Salamone, C. (1982), 'The Prevalence of the Natural Law Within Women: Women and Animal Rights', in McAllister, P. (ed), *Reweaving the Web of Life* (San Francisco: New Society Publishers)
- Sale, K. (1985), *Dwellers in the Land: the Bioregional Vision* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books)
- Salleh, A. K. (1984), 'Deeper than Deep Ecology: the eco-feminist connection', *Environmental Ethics*, 6, 4:339-45
- Samois (ed.) (1982), *Coming to Power. Writings and Graphics on Lesbian S/M* (New York: Alyson)
- Sanday, P. (1981), *Female power and male dominance: On the origins of sexual inequality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Sargent, L. (ed.) (1981), *Women and Revolution. The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: A Debate on Class and Patriarchy* (London: Pluto)

- Saunders, G. (1989), *The Nude: A New Perspective* (London: Harper & Row)
- Sayer, A. (1992), *Method in Social Science: A realist approach* (London: Routledge)
- Sayers, J. (1982), *Biological Politics: Feminist and Anti-feminist Perspectives* (London: Tavistock)
- Sawicki, J. (1988), 'Feminism and the power of Foucauldian discourse', in Arac, J. (ed.) *op cit.*
- Sawicki, J. (1991), *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power, and the Body* (London: Routledge)
- Schumacher, E. (1976) *Small is Beautiful* (London: Sphere)
- Schwichtenberg, C. (1993), *The Madonna Complex: Representational Politics, Subcultural Identities, and Cultural Theory* (Oxford: Westview Press)
- Segal, L. (1987), *Is the Future Female? Troubled Thoughts on Contemporary Feminism* (London: Virago)
- Segal, L. (1990), *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (London: Virago)
- Segal, L. & McIntosh, M. (eds.) (1992), *Sex Exposed: Sexuality and the Pornography Debate* (London: Virago)
- Segal, L. (1992), 'Sweet sorrows, painful pleasures: Pornography and the perils of heterosexual desire', in Segal, L. & McIntosh, M. *Sex Exposed* (London: Virago)
- Segal, L. (1994), *Straight Sex: The Politics of Pleasure* (London: Virago)
- Segal, L. (ed.) (1997), *New Sexual Agendas* (London: Macmillan)
- Segal, L. (1997), 'Feminist Sexual Politics and the Heterosexual Predicament', in Segal, L. (ed.), *New Sexual Agendas* (London: Macmillan)
- Seymour, J. & Girardet, H. (1987), *Blueprint for a Green Planet* (London: Dorling Kindersley)
- Sharpe, K. (1992), 'Biology and Social Science: A Reply to Ted Benton', *Sociology*, 26,2: 219-225
- Sheridan, A. (1980), *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* (London: Tavistock)
- Shiva, V. (1988), *Staying Alive* (London: Zed Books)
- Short, C. (1991), *Dear Claire... This Is What Women Feel About Page 3 letters* ed. and selected Tunks, T. & Hutchinson, D. (London: Hutchinson)
- Shuttle, P. & Redgrove, P. (1986), *The Wise Wound: The Myths, Realities, and Meanings of Menstruation* (New York: Grove Press)
- Singer, P. (1979), *Practical Ethics* (Boston: Cambridge University Press)
- Singer, P. (1981), *The Expanding Circle: Ethics and Sociobiology* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux)
- Singer, P. (1985), *In Defense of Animals* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Singer, P. (1990), *Animal Liberation* (New York: Avon Books) first published, 1975

- Slicer, D. (1994), 'Wrongs of Passage: three challenges to the maturing of ecofeminism', in Warren, K. J. (ed.) *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Smart, C. & Smart, B. (1978), *Women, Sexuality and Social Control* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Smart, C. (1984), *The Ties that Bind: Law, Marriage and the Reproduction of Patriarchal Relations* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)
- Smart, C. (1987), 'There is of course the distinction dictated by nature': Law and the Problem of Paternity', in Stanworth, M. (ed.) *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Smart, C. (1989), *Feminism and the Power of Law* (London: Routledge)
- Smart, C. (1992), 'Unquestionably a moral issue: rhetorical devices and regulatory imperatives', in Segal, L. & McIntosh, M. *Sex Exposed* (London: Virago)
- Smart, C. (1994), 'Theory into Practice: The Problem of Pornography', in Evans, M. (ed.) *The Woman Question* 2nd ed. (London: Sage)
- Smith, J. (1990). *Mysogonies* (London: Faber & Faber)
- Smith, P. (1988), *Discerning the Subject* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)
- Soble, A. (1986). *Pornography* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
- Solonas, V. (1983), *SCUM Manifesto* (San Francisco: Phoenix Press), first published, 1968
- Sontheimer, S. (ed.) (1991), *Women and the Environment: Crisis and Development in the Third World* (London: Earthscan)
- Soper, K. (1989), 'Feminism as Critique', *New Left Review*, 176:91-114
- Soper, K. (1990), 'Postmodernism, subjectivity and the question of value', *New Left Review*, 186:120-8
- Soper, K. (1993), 'Productive Contradictions', in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *Up Against Foucault* (London: Routledge)
- Soper, K. (1994), 'Feminism, Humanism and Postmodernism' in Evans, M. (ed.) *The Woman Question* 2nd ed. (London: Sage)
- Soothill, K. & Walby, S. (1991) *Sex Crime in the News* (London: Routledge)
- Spada, J. (1979), *The Spada Report* (New York: Signet)
- Spelman, E.V. (1988), *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought* (Boston: Beacon Press)
- Spender, D. (1980), *Man Made Language* (London: Routledge)
- Spender, D. (1983), *Women of Ideas* (London: Ark)
- Spender, D. (1985), *For the Record: the Making and Meaning of Feminist Knowledge* (London: Women's Press)
- Spiegel, M. (1988), *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and Animal Slavery* (London: Routledge)

- Spretnak, C. (ed.) (1982), *The Politics of Women's Spirituality: Essays on the rise of Spiritual Power within the Women's Movement* (New York: Doubleday/Anchor)
- Spretnak, C. & Capra, F. (1985), *Green Politics* (London: Paladin)
- Spretnak, C. (1996), 'The Disembodied Worldview of Deconstructive Post-modernism, in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Stacey, M. & Price, M. (1981), *Women, Power and Politics* (London: Tavistock)
- Stanko, E. (1985), *Intimate Intrusions: women's experience of male violence* (London: Routledge)
- Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1983), *Breaking Out: feminist consciousness and feminist research* (London: Routledge)
- Stanley, L. (1990), *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology* (London: Routledge)
- Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993), *Breaking Out Again* (London: Routledge)
- Stanworth, M. (1987), *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Stanworth, M. (1987), 'Reproductive Technologies and the Deconstruction of Motherhood', in *ibid.*
- Starhawk, (1989), *The Spiral Dance: a rebirth of the Ancient Religion of the Great Goddess* (New York: Harper & Row) first published in the USA, 1979
- Starhawk, (1990a), *Dreaming the Dark: Magic, Sex and Politics* (London: Unwin), first published in the USA, 1982
- Starhawk, (1990b), *Truth or Dare* (San Francisco: Harper Collins)
- Steim, J. H. (1987), 'Women and Men's Wars' *Women's Studies International Forum* 5, 3 and 4
- Stone, M. (1977), *The Paradise Papers: the Suppression of Women's Rites* (London: Virago), published later as *When God Was a Woman*
- Stone, M. (1984), *Ancient Mirrors of Womanhood* (Boston: Beacon)
- Talese, G. (1980), *Thy Neighbour's Wife: Sex in the world today* (London: Collins)
- Tester, K. (1991), *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights* (London: Routledge)
- Thomas, K. (1971), *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfield & Nicholson)
- Thomas, K. (1983), *Man and the Natural World* (New York: Pantheon)
- Thompson, B. (1994), *Soft Core: Moral crusades against pornography in Britain and America* (London: Cassells)
- Thompson, D. (1996), 'The Self-contradiction of "Post-modernist" Feminism', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)
- Thompson, J. & Held, D. (eds.) (1982), *Habermas: Critical Debates* (London: Macmillan)
- Tobias, M. (ed.) (1985), *Deep Ecology* (San Diego: Avant Books)

- Tolkar, B. (1987), *The Green Alternative* (San Pedro: R. & E. Miles)
- Tolkar, B. (1988), 'Social ecology, deep ecology and the future of Green thought', *The Ecologist*, vol.18, no.4/5
- Tong, R. (1989), *Feminist Thought* (London: Unwin Hyman)
- Trevor Roper, H. (1974), *The European Witchcraze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York: Harper & Row)
- Turner, B. (1984), *The Body and Society* (London: Sage)
- Turner, B. & Hepworth, M. (eds.) (1991), *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory* (London: Sage)
- Twigg, J. (1983), 'Vegetarianism and the Meanings of Meat', in Murcott, A. (ed.) *The Sociology of Food and Eating* (Aldershot: Gower)
- Ussher, J.M. (1997), 'The Case of the Lesbian Phallus: Bridging the Gap between Material and Discursive Analyses of Sexuality', Segal, L. (ed.), *New Sexual Agendas* (London: Macmillan)
- Vance, C. S. (ed.) (1984), *Pleasure & Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Vance, C. S. (1984), 'Pleasure and Danger: Towards a Politics of Sexuality', in Vance, C. S. (ed.) *ibid.*
- Vance, L. (1995) 'Beyond Just-So Stories: Narrative, Animals and Ethics' in Adams C.J. & Donovan J. (eds.) *op cit*
- Vogel, L. (1983), *Marxism and the Oppression of Women* (London: Pluto Press)
- Vogler, J. & Imber, M. (1995), *The Environment and International Relations* (London: Routledge)
- Walby, S. (1986), *Patriarchy at Work* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Walby, S. (1988), 'Gender politics and social theory', *Sociology*, 22,2:215-32
- Walby, S. (1990), *Theorizing Patriarchy* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Walby, S. (1992), 'Post-post-modernism? Theorizing Social Complexity', in M. Barrett & A. Phillips (eds) *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- Walby, S. (1997), *Gender Transformations* (London: Routledge)
- Warde, A. (1997), *Consumption, Food and Taste* (London: Sage)
- Ward, B. & Dubois, R. (1972), *Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet* (London: Andre Deutsch)
- Warren, K. J. (1987), 'Feminism and ecology: making connections', *Environmental Ethics*, 9, 1:3-20
- Warren, K. J. (ed.) (1994) *Ecological Feminism* (London: Routledge)
- Waters, K. (1996), '(Re)turning to the Modern: Radical Feminism and the Post-modern Turn', in D. Bell and R. Klein (eds.) *Radically Speaking* (London: Zed Books)

- Watney, S. (1987), *Policing Desire: Pornography, Aids and the Media* (London: Comedia)
- Weaver, J. (1992), 'The Social Science and Psychological Research Evidence: Perceptual and Behavioural Consequences of Exposure to Pornography', in Itzin, C. (ed.) *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Weedon, C. (1987), *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Weeks, J. (1981), *Sex, Politics and Society* (London: Longman)
- Weeks, J. (1989), *Sexuality and its Discontents* (London: Routledge)
- Weston, J. (ed.) (1986), *Red and Green* (London: Pluto)
- Williams, L. (1989), 'Fetishism and Hard Core: Marx, Freud and the "Money Shot"', in Gubar, S. & Hoff, J. (eds) *For Adult Users Only* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)
- Williams, L. (1990), *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure and the Frenzy of the Visible* (London: Pandora)
- Williams, L. (1992), 'Pornographies on/scene, or diff'rent strokes for diff'rent folks', in Segal, L. & McIntosh, M. *Sex Exposed* (London, Virago)
- Wilson, E. (1992), 'Feminist fundamentalism: The shifting politics of sex and censorship', in Segal, L. & McIntosh, M. *Sex Exposed* (London: Virago)
- Wolf, N. (1991), *The Beauty Myth* (London: Vintage)
- Wynne, B. (1992) 'Risk and social learning: reification to engagement' in Krinsky, S. & Golding D. (eds.) *Social Theories of Risk* (Westport, CT.: Praeger)
- Wynne, B. (1994), 'Scientific Knowledge and the Global Environment', in Redclift, M. & Benton, T. (eds.) *op cit.*
- Wynne, B. (1996), 'May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-Lay Knowledge Divide' in Lash, S. et al *op cit*
- Yearley, S. (1992), *The Green Case: a sociology of environmental issues, arguments and politics* (London: Routledge)
- Yearley, S. (1994), 'Social Movements and Environmental Change', in Redclift, M. and Benton, T. (eds.) *op cit.*
- Young, I. (1981), 'Beyond the unhappy marriage: a critique of dual systems theory', in Sargent, L. (ed.) *Women and Revolution: the unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism* (London: Pluto Press)
- Young, I. (1990a), 'The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference', in L. Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism*, first published 1987 (London: Routledge)
- Young, I. (1990b), *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Oxford: Princeton University Press)
- Zipper, J., Sevenhuijsen, S. (1987), 'Surrogacy: Feminist Notions of Motherhood Reconsidered' in M. Stanworth (ed), *Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Zillman, D. & Bryant, J. (eds.) *Pornography: Research Advances and Policy Considerations* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum)