

“The Laws That Men Have Made”: a speech made by Emmeline Pankhurst at the Portman Rooms in London on 24th March 1908. Emmeline Pankhurst was an English political activist, and leader of the British Suffragette movement which helped women win the right to vote. She was first arrested for militant activities after suffragettes tried to rush the House of Commons, and sent to prison for three months. British women won the right to vote in 1918 at the end of the First World War.

Men politicians are in the habit of talking to women as if there were no laws that affect women. ‘The fact is,’ they say, ‘the home is the place for women. Their interests are the rearing and training of children. These are the things that interest women. Politics have nothing to do with these things, and therefore politics do not concern women.’ Yet the laws decide how women are to live in marriage, how their children are to be trained and educated, and what the future of their children is to be. All that is decided by Act of Parliament. Let us take a few of these laws, and see what there is to say about them from the women’s point of view.

First of all, let us take the marriage laws. They are made by men for women. Let us consider whether they are equal, whether they are just, whether they are wise. What security of maintenance has the married woman? Many a married woman having given up her economic independence in order to marry, how is she compensated for that loss? What security does she get in that marriage for which she gave up economic independence? She is told that she ought to give up her employment when she becomes a wife and a mother. What does she get in return? All that a married man is obliged by law to do for his wife is to provide for her shelter of some kind, food of some kind, and clothing of some kind. It is left to his good pleasure to decide what the shelter shall be, what the food shall be, what the clothing shall be. It is left to him to decide what money shall be spent on the home, and how it shall be spent; the wife has no voice legally in deciding any of these things. She has no legal claim upon any definite portion of his income. If he is a good man, a conscientious man, he does the right thing. If he is not, if he chooses almost to starve his wife, she has no remedy. What he thinks sufficient is what she has to be content with.

I quite agree, in all these illustrations, that the majority of men are considerably better than the law compels them to be, so the majority of women do not suffer as much as they might suffer if men were all as bad as they might be, but since there are some bad men, some unjust men, don’t you agree with me that the law ought to be altered so that those men could be dealt with?

[...] I have spoken to you about the position of the married woman who does not exist legally as a parent, the parent of her own child. In marriage, children have one parent. Out of marriage children have also one parent. That parent is the mother — the unfortunate mother. She alone is responsible for the future of her child; she alone is punished if her child is neglected and suffers from neglect. But let me give you one illustration. I was in Herefordshire during the by-election. While I was there, an unmarried mother was brought before the bench of magistrates charged with having neglected her illegitimate child. She was a domestic servant, and had put the child out to nurse. The magistrates — there were colonels and landowners on that bench — did not ask what wages the mother got; they did not ask who the father was or whether he contributed to the support of the child. They sent the woman to prison for three months for having neglected her child. I ask you women here tonight, if women had had some share in the making of the laws, don’t you think they would have found a way of making all fathers of such children equally responsible with the mothers for the welfare of those children?

Question	Response	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Carefully read the two texts and compare the ways in which <b>Text A</b> and <b>Text B</b> use language to present ideas.</p> <p>In your answer you should analyse the impact that the different contexts have on language use, including for example, mode, purpose and audience.</p> <p><b>A higher level response (levels 4 to 6) will:</b></p> <p><b>AO4:</b> Make explicit comparisons between texts, be aware of both similarities and differences</p> <p><b>AO1:</b> Use vocabulary and terminology appropriately, referring to a range of language levels, including grammar and discourse e.g. Co-ordinating conjunctions, antithesis, passive construction. Express ideas fluently and coherently, with a wide vocabulary.</p> <p><b>AO3:</b> Understand the significance of a range of contextual factors: how the reader is addressed and engaged in both texts.</p> <p><b>AO2:</b> Explore the ways the writer and speaker across the different texts, use language to achieve their purposes for their respective audiences.</p>	32	<p><b>Genre:</b> both speeches – one part-scripted (Gillard) (“He has said, and I quote...”) and one scripted speech, from practiced speakers. Purpose of both: to persuade, and to inform through use of facts (“March 2004”, “all that a married man is obliged to do”) and quoted direct speech in both. Audience: wider audience for Gillard speech (Australian parliament (seen in field-specific lexis: “carbon pricing campaign” “House of Representatives”), with low-frequency lexis (“under-representation”) and the electorate in general; in contrast, Pankhurst is speaking to a supportive, female, local audience Both advocating women’s rights.</p> <p><b>Lexis: Features of spoken discourse, for example:</b> Sentences opening with co-ordinating conjunctions “And then of course...” “And now...” in Gillard; and in more grammatically standard Pankhurst speech (“So you see...”); the parody of Tony Abbott’s voice in “Oh dear, there’s this thing” and in Pankhurst (“The fact is...” they say”) <b>Repetitions</b> for emphasis “sexism (x7) and “misogyny” (x8) in Gillard, and “women” (x6) in first paragraph of Pankhurst, and repetition of phrases “I was... offended...” (x6) cumulative effect to persuade. Similarly, “let us... let us... whether they are just, whether they are wise” in Pankhurst <b>Colloquial lexis</b> (“he’s woken up and gone...” in Gillard, ) abbreviations and contractions (“Let’s go through” “Doesn’t turn a hair... doesn’t walk...”) Reflecting time in which it was written. Use of second person pronoun to engage and address the audience (explicitly addressed in Pankhurst: “I ask you women here tonight”) In Gillard, the focus on Abbott’s behaviour means that first and third person pronouns dominate (I, he), personal engagement seen in Pankhurst (“I have spoken... I ask .. I was there”)</p> <p><b>Syntax:</b> variety of sentence types (contrast of compound sentence followed by simple sentence “I will not”; minor sentences create impact and immediacy in both (“Not now, not ever.” (Gillard), “All that is decided by Act of Parliament” (Pankhurst)). Purpose to inform and persuade: balance of declarative and exclamatory sentences in Gillard, repeated use of rhetorical questions (x4) in Pankhurst; following a pattern of interrogative, declarative, interrogative etc). <b>Persuasive language</b> features characteristic of written speech, repetition of phrase “I was offended” in Gillard, and “Let us” in Pankhurst; rule of three or tripling (“Doesn’t turn a hair... doesn’t walk ... doesn’t walk” in Gillard, “shelter of some kind, food of some kind, clothing of some kind” in Pankhurst)</p> <p><b>Phonology and interactional features:</b> rhyme of sign (contrast of taboo language in predominantly high register text in Gillard) Use of rhetorical questions and inclusive first person plural pronoun “us”, and repeated imperatives “Take the case... take what happens” in Pankhurst.</p> <p><b>Structure:</b> in Gillard: shift from personal outrage (I was very personally offended...”) to presenting herself as representative of her gender (offended on behalf of the Women of Australia), in contrast to the move from general “Men politicians...”) to anecdotal specific cases “an unmarried mother” in Pankhurst</p>