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Abstract

This thesis explores the interplay of gender, media, politics and women's political representation in Australia. I examine how the Australian media has tended to reinforce rather than challenge dominant cultural aspects of Australian politics. Specifically, I analyse the ways in which Australian media has reflected women's marginalisation in parliament.

As Australia's first female head of state, Julia Gillard's term as Prime Minister provides a unique opportunity to analyse explicit and implicit ways in which gender has been used by media commentators in their assessment of her achievements. Analysis of the media's treatment of Julia Gillard is used throughout the thesis, as her time in office exposed underlying conflicts surrounding gender and sexism in Australian media and public discourse. Media response to Gillard's so-called Misogyny Speech is used as a particular case study.

The thesis draws on a range of scholarship and commentary, including the works of Erving Goffman, Walter Lippmann, Pierre Bourdieu, Robin Lakoff, Anne Summers, Julia Baird, Pippa Norris and Marian Sawer, to construct a framework through which to examine the period of Gillard's prime ministership. The last two writers (Norris and Sawer), *inter alia*, discuss the significance of women's representation in parliament.

In particular, the analysis highlights the significance of Anne Summers' contribution to Australian feminism and draws on her Newcastle Speech (August
2012). I argue that Summers’ ideas and writing have been influential in shaping public discourse on Julia Gillard.

I place the widely varied media responses to Gillard’s *Misogyny Speech* into a historical and comparative context to demonstrate the conflict within Australian society around issues of gender, feminism and female participation in public life.
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Introduction

This thesis is structured into three main chapters. Chapter One collects together primary data of media representations of Julia Gillard, Australia’s first female Prime Minister, and situates it in the context of Australia’s record on women’s participation in Australian politics. I show how Australian media and politics are framed by discourses which privilege masculinity. Chapter Two provides a detailed analysis of the contribution of feminist scholar Anne Summers to public discourse on sexism and feminism in Australia, with particular focus on her Newcastle Speech (2012) and Julia Gillard. Chapter Three is a case study of the media responses to Julia Gillard’s Misogyny Speech (2012). This is followed by a short concluding chapter.
Chapter 1: Gillard, Gender, and the Australian political process

Women and Gender in Australian Federal Parliament

Julia Gillard became Prime Minister of Australia in 2010 after replacing Kevin Rudd as the leader of the Australian Labor Party (ALP) and served until June 2013, when she was voted out of the party leadership in favour of Kevin Rudd. Her prime ministership exposed underlying sexism and gender stereotyping in Australian society.

Whilst women have recently occupied some of the most powerful positions in Australia’s government, including Prime Minister, Governor-General, Deputy Prime Minister and state or territory premier or chief minister, overall Australia’s parliament cannot be said to be representative. Although Australia was the first country in the world to grant settler women the right to run for office in 1901, only 10.2% of all members of federal parliament between 1901 and 2012 have been women (McCann & Wilson 2012: 11).

It is not in the scope of this thesis to broadly examine the role and status of women in the political sphere, in Australia and elsewhere. There is a large body of literature deals with this issue. See, for example, Sawer & Simms 1993; Jamieson 1995; Kahn 1996, 2003; Norris 1997; Lovenduski and Norris, 1993; Caine 1998; Baird 2004; Sawer, Tremblay & Trimble 2006; Ross and Comrie, 2012; and Palmieri 2011. A parliamentary Background Note, Representation of women in Australian parliaments, provides in-depth statistical information about women’s representation in federal, state and local parliament, as well as analysis of structural, cultural and social barriers that inhibit women’s
parliamentary engagement, and a summary of attempts to overcome these barriers (McCann & Wilson 2012).

As Australia is a democracy, its parliament is intended to be representative of the views and interests of Australian society, and for those perspectives to shape its social, economic and political direction (ibid). Given that women make up approximately 50.2% of Australia’s population, it follows that the parliament should reflect and encourage the equal participation and representation of half the population (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2013). It is relevant then to view statistical indicators of Australia’s performance in relation to women’s representation in parliament and women in parliamentary leadership positions. The statistics serve as an objective test of women’s representative equality in Australia, and reveal that women, both historically and today, are significantly and consistently underrepresented in parliament, particularly in more senior roles.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) compiles data on numbers of women in countries’ lower or single houses of parliament, in order to rank countries according to the proportion of women in their parliaments. At the time of writing, Australia ranked number 47 internationally. Women made up 24.7 per cent of the House of Representatives, or 37 of 150 members. The Senate was more proportional, with 38.2 per cent women, or 29 of 76 Senators. Overall, women therefore comprise 29.2 per cent of all parliamentarians, less than one

1 It is also important to consider women’s representation and leadership in other key institutions, to gain more holistic insight into women’s representative equality in Australia.
2 A partial Inter-Parliamentary Union table is included at Appendix A.
third. Comparatively, Rwanda is first, with 56.3 per cent women in parliament. New Zealand is at 26 with 32.2 per cent women, whilst the United States is ranked 80, with 17.8 per cent in their lower house (IPU 2013: online reference).

The IPU identifies 30 per cent of women parliamentarians as a minimum yardstick for equality in political representation (McCann & Wilson 2012: 14).

Commenting on the need for women’s equal representation Sawer writes

[T]he presence of women in parliament increases respect for women in society and is a form of recognition of the equal status of women, whether or not this is associated with recognition of “difference” (2002: 6).

Conversely, the absence of women may convey the social meaning that women are ‘unable or unfit to rule’ (ibid).

McCann and Wilson’s work, along with other empirical analysis, reveals that most senior parliamentary positions are still predominantly held by men, and that entry to these positions is controlled through male dominated networks and factions (Broughton & Zetlin 1996; Ross 2012). Gillard herself has revealed as much, ‘I had to fight hard to get pre-selected, I had to play a factional game to do that, I had to count numbers, I had to make deals and I’d do all of that again tomorrow if I needed to.’ (ABC 2006: online transcript available)

The percentage of women in Australian parliament has worsened over time compared to international trends. Australia’s IPU rank has fallen from 15 in 1999, to 21 in 2001, 36 in 2006, 41 in 2011 and now 47. This indicates that other countries have implemented greater measures to promote women’s political representation and to overcome barriers to this goal, such as the
selection process within political parties (McCann & Wilson 2012). A study published by the IPU in 2011 identified prejudiced cultural perceptions of women’s role in society and lack of financial resources as key obstacles for women attempting to enter politics (Palmieri 2011: online resource). These findings are reflected in the literature cited above.

A range of measures are, however, available to political parties to promote women’s entry into politics. These can include financial assistance, informal targets, special training and programs for women, women’s networks such as EMILY’s List3 and quotas or affirmative action strategies. The Australian Labor Party (ALP) has a gender quota system, which specifies that women must be pre-selected for at least 40 per cent of safe seats4, 40 per cent for men, with 20 per cent leeway (Kelly & Ashiagbor 2011). While this has not consistently been achieved in practice, the ALP has endorsed commitment to affirmative action since 1981, with the proportion of female candidates preselected rising from 14.5 per cent in the 1994 election to 35.6 per cent in the 2010 election (McCann & Wilson 2012: 23), and women holding 37% of Labor seats since the 2013 election.

The Coalition (Liberal and National parties) rejects a gender quota system on the basis that such an approach is patronising to women and contradicts the principle of merit (ibid). Michaelia Cash, Liberal Senator and Minister Assisting the Minister for Women (a role of the current Prime Minster) believes pre-

3 For information on Emily’s list see http://www.emilyslist.org.au/
4 A ‘safe seat’ in Australia is one in which the winning candidate receives more than 60 per cent of the two candidate preferred vote. In comparison, 56-60 per cent is considered ‘fairly safe’ while less than 56 per cent is considered a marginal seat (AEC 2013: online reference).
selection ‘should recognise merit and excellence rather than be based on some unilateral quota’. She states that implementing quotas ‘could be intended or interpreted to placate women rather than promote excellence and advance the cause of Australian women’ (Cash quoted in Ewart 2013: online reference). Instead, the Liberal Party relies on training, mentoring and women’s party support networks to encourage the pre-selection of women (McCann & Wilson 2012).

The ALP has consistently outperformed the Coalition in the proportion of women elected over the past 20 years⁵, lending support to the effectiveness of quota systems to increase women’s political representation. However, the implementation of affirmative action policies and quotas remains controversial in Australia, and internationally.⁶

Prime Minister Abbott’s current cabinet has just one female, Julie Bishop, with four women in the outer ministry. In comparison, Julia Gillard’s final cabinet had four women including herself, and four in the outer ministry⁷ (Parliamentary Handbook 2013a). Kevin Rudd’s ministry prior to the 2013 election had six women in cabinet and five in the outer ministry⁸ (Parliamentary Handbook 2013b). Abbott’s ministry therefore represents a significant step backwards in

---

⁵ For a comparative table of party political representation, see Figure 3 at Appendix 2.

⁶ For further discussion of this debate see, for example, Sawer 2004, Drabsch 2007 and Squires in Lovenduski & Norris 1996.


terms of women’s representation, demonstrating that ‘Australia’s flirtation with having women at the apex of politics is well and truly over’ (Alexander 2013: online reference).

Gillard’s rise through the ranks of the Labor party goes against research on the trends of promotion of women within political parties. Studies indicate that women are more likely to be passed over for promotion to Cabinet positions in favour of male colleagues, instead awarded roles as parliamentary secretaries or in the outer Ministry (McCann & Wilson 2012; Norris 1997). This is the case in the current ministry under Tony Abbott, as noted above.

A number of studies also reveal that, despite increasing numbers of women in politics, parliamentary institutions still tend to be centred on a ‘gendered division of labour’. This is evident in the types of ministries typically allocated to men and to women. McCann and Wilson found that, in Australia, the majority of portfolios held by women are related to social and cultural services, whilst very few women have been granted what are considered ‘more senior’ portfolios such as defence, finance, communications and foreign affairs (2012: 30).9 Female politicians are perceived to have aptitude for particular policy areas such as education and health care, whilst men possess the requisite characteristics for more ‘serious’ policy areas (Huddy & Terkildsen 1993; Rhode & Kellerman 2007). For example, between 1943 and 2011, women most commonly held portfolios for the status of women (11 in total), followed by community services, families and housing (7), aged care and veterans affairs (5),

9 Against this trend, Julie Bishop was appointed as the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Tony Abbott’s 2013 Cabinet.
employment (5) and education (4). Only one woman, Nicola Roxon (ALP) has served as Attorney-General, and no woman has yet held the portfolio for defence or transport (McCann & Wilson 2012: 31).

Joan Acker’s (1990 & 1992) concept of ‘gendered organisations’ contends that institutions such as parliaments are not gender neutral, but are strongly subject to the influences of gendered division of labour, gendered symbols and images, gendered actions and interactions and the construction of gendered identities. Through these influences, ‘dominant’ gender identities are privileged, such as hegemonic masculinity (ibid; also see Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1985). Rhode and Kellerman argue ‘[O]ne of the most intractable obstacles for women seeking positions of influence is the mismatch between qualities traditionally associated with leadership’ (2007: 6).

Julia Gillard’s rise to the prime ministership and subsequent treatment by the media highlights the ‘gendering’ of institutions and the gendered nature of the response to her as a woman in power.

**Gillard’s Rise to Prime Minister of Australia**

Born in Wales, Julia Gillard moved to Adelaide when she was six. She studied arts and law at the University of Adelaide, where she became involved in student politics. She became leader of the Adelaide University Union and Australian Union of Students. After graduating, Gillard played an instrumental role in drafting affirmative action rules for the Labor Party in Victoria as the then-Victorian Opposition leader’s chief-of-staff, and also in establishing Emily’s

10 See tables at Appendix 2
List, a group dedicated to supporting and promoting pro-choice women in the ALP. She also worked as a lawyer for Melbourne law firm Slater & Gordon.

Julia Gillard was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1998 as the member for Lalor (Mitchell 2013: online reference). In her maiden speech (Gillard, 1998: online reference), Gillard expressed the honour of being pre-selected as the first woman candidate for the safe seat of Lalor, at a time when there was a record number of Labor women members in the House. She noted, ‘[I]t is a cause for celebration and will inspire us to ensure that many more women follow us into this parliament’ (ibid). The idea of women providing the foundation for other women to enter into politics is a key element of Gillard’s feminist beliefs, as I discuss in subsequent chapters. Likewise, in her maiden speech, Gillard established her political passion for education. She argued that education is the means through which Australia’s future would be transformed as a fairer society; that access to education is the key to opportunity and equality (1998: online reference).

After the Labor Party was defeated in the 2001 election by the incumbent Coalition, Gillard became Shadow Minister for Population and Immigration. In early 2003 she was also granted the shadow ministries of Reconciliation and Indigenous Affairs (Hudson 2003). In July that year Gillard was promoted to Shadow Minister for Health, opposite then Minister for Health Tony Abbott (ibid). She soon was granted further responsibility as Manager of Opposition Business in the House of Representatives (ibid 2003b; Banham 2003). Although Gillard’s ministerial roles generally conform to the trend to allocate women
particular types of ministries, her rise to Manager of Opposition Business confirmed her reputation as a leader in waiting.

Despite the trend to masculine privilege in Australian politics, Gillard was often pinned as a future leader. The ABC program, *Australian Story*, featured Julia Gillard in 2006 in a program titled *She Who Waits*. It included descriptions of her from media and parliamentary colleagues such as: 'She has the makings of a future leader,' ‘A supreme parliamentary performer,’ ‘She's smart, sharp, articulate. She's got an extremely forensic sort of style in parliament’, ‘She's a natural ... her speeches [are] superb’ and even from Tony Abbott, 'She obviously is one of those people who could well lead the Labor Party one day’ (ABC 2006: online transcript available).

Following her appearance on *Australian Story*, a poll revealed Gillard as preferred Labor leader, with 32 percent of the vote, compared with 25 per cent for Kim Beazley and 18 per cent for Kevin Rudd. Gillard's political advancement reveals that she was considered a very skilled politician, a 'rising star' amongst her colleagues and the media (Banham 2003, Hudson 2003; Davis 2010).

In 2006 Julia Gillard was appointed deputy leader of the Labor opposition, after she and Kevin Rudd defeated then leader Kim Beazley and his deputy, Jenny Macklin, in a caucus vote with 49 to 39 votes (AAP General News Wire 2006: 1). When Labor won the 2007 election, Gillard became Australia’s first female Deputy Prime Minister. She had the portfolios for education, employment and workplace relations, and social inclusion (Franklin 2007: 1). Most significantly in this role, Gillard removed the Howard government’s unpopular *WorkChoices* industrial relations system and implemented the *Fair Work Bill*, which saw the
establishment of a new industrial relations body and ombudsmen under the title of Fair Work Australia (Gittins 2008: 47; Hannon 2009: online reference).

In 2009, political journalist Peter van Onselen predicted ‘On her performance, Gillard deserves to be Australia’s first female prime minister . . . She is far and away the best parliamentary performer on the Labor side’ (2009: online reference).

Julia Gillard replaced Kevin Rudd as leader of the Labor Party in June 2010, becoming Australia’s first female prime minister. Rudd’s initial popularity amongst voters and his party had seen a dramatic reversal as a result of a number of policy failures and controversies, and an unease amongst his colleagues about his leadership capabilities.11 A leadership ballot was called for the June 24 and, amid speculation that he had lost the support of his party, Rudd withdrew his candidacy for party leadership. With no need for a caucus vote, Gillard was sworn in as Australia’s 27th prime minister.

In her first speech as Prime Minister, Gillard explained that her decision to take the leadership was a result of a ‘good government losing its way,’ and that she ‘believed we needed to do better’ (Gillard 2010: online reference). She also addressed the milestone of becoming the first woman to take top office, ‘First woman - maybe first redhead - we’ll allow others to delve into the history and I’ll allow you to contemplate which was more unlikely in the modern age ... But can I say to you I didn’t set out to crash my head on any glass ceilings. I set out

11 These include controversy over the implementation of a tax on the mining industry; the failure of and controversy over the Government’s home insulation scheme; and a failed attempt to negotiate an emissions trading scheme through Parliament (ABC 2010: http://www.abc.net.au/news/2010-06-24/smart-and-tough-the-rise-of-julia-gillard/879080)
to keep my feet on the floor and to be there walking the streets talking to Australians about what's the right thing for this nation' (*ibid*).¹²

**The Prime Minister and The Media**

Given the ‘gendering’ of parliaments highlighted earlier, it is important to note that ‘Gender equality is not guaranteed simply by the presence of women in parliament. It also depends on a parliament’s gender sensitivity and awareness, its policies and infrastructure’ (*Palmieri 2011: 2*). The media plays a dominant role in shaping perceptions of women and women parliamentarians. It therefore becomes important to recognise that what has been said in the media about Julia Gillard’s prime ministership has been significant in shaping public perception of her term of office and her historical importance as Australia’s first female head of state.

On Gillard’s appointment, there was a sense of excitement reflected in the Australian media at having reached the milestone of a woman prime minister. Headlines included ‘Women in power as Julia Gillard sworn in as Australian Prime Minister by Quentin Bryce’ (*The Australian*), ‘Voters welcome woman in the top job’ (*The Daily Telegraph*), ‘What a day: Australia gets its first female PM’ (*Sydney Morning Herald*), ‘Someone else can fill the fruit bowl...: JULIA GILLARD PM’ (*The Age*), and ‘Ceiling smash inspirational’ (*The Age*). Reporting suggested that Australia was ready and excited for a female head of state: ‘What a day. Who would have thought they would live to see a female prime minister sworn

---

into office by a female governor-general? . . . Australia is tickled pink at having its first female prime minister’ (Murphy 2010: online reference).

In a special edition of The Daily Telegraph, Sue Dunlevy wrote ‘Gender shouldn’t be a barrier to Australia’s first female Prime Minister winning an election, with polls showing Julia Gillard is more popular than Tony Abbott with both male and female voters’ (2010: 3). In an article for The Australian, Helen Trinca also referred to the role of gender and the new Prime Minister.

‘The redhead with the flawless skin ... is seen as compassionate, warm and real, all attributes often labelled as feminine. But she’s also decisive, tough, pragmatic, even wily – qualities regarded highly in men. That she has been able to mix the two streams to such good effect suggests that, perhaps for the first time in Australian public life at this level, gender has been taken out of the equation ... Gillard is our first post-gender leader’ (Trinca 2010: online reference).

The idea that ‘gender has been taken out of the equation’ was frequent in media reporting of the event. The concept of ‘gender’ remained abstract and undefined in the majority of articles, usually in the context of suggesting that Australia is a ‘post-gender’ society. The potential for sexism was referred to abstractly. For example, former Prime Minister John Howard speculated ‘[s]he has come to the job, she is coincidentally a woman, I’m sure she doesn't want to be judged just on the fact that she is a woman, and she won’t be’” (Howard quoted in The Age: online reference). However the fact that gender was so frequently cited in reporting suggests that it was an issue. A study by Campbell & Wolbrecht finds that the concept of ‘gender’ is taken up anew when women seek particular roles
for the first time, especially when a woman obtains an office such as prime minister (2006: 235).

According to a Newspoll survey, the decision to replace Kevin Rudd with Gillard as Prime Minister restored Labor’s chances of winning an election. In the first three days with Gillard as Prime Minister, Labor’s primary vote rose from 35 per cent under Rudd to 42 per cent, a 7 per cent leap. Gillard was preferred prime minister with 53 per cent to Abbott’s 29 per cent (Shanahan 2010: online reference). A Herald/Nielsen poll found Labor’s primary vote rose 14 points to 47 per cent compared with three weeks earlier; and that Gillard led Abbott as preferred prime minister by 55 points to 34 (Coorey 2010: online reference).

The initial rise in Labor’s and Gillard’s popularity amongst voters was significantly damaged during the 2010 election campaign. Whilst cabinet discussions are supposed to remain confidential, Channel Nine’s Laurie Oakes reported an anonymous but credible source that claimed Gillard had argued against two key welfare reforms - a Paid Parental Leave scheme and an increase in aged care pension. The source claimed that Gillard based her analysis of welfare reform on potential votes rather than fairness, and quoted her as saying ‘old people don’t vote for us’ (Hartcher 2010: 1). As Gillard is unmarried and childless, these leaks were particularly damaging as they were used to construct Gillard as out of touch with the needs of families with children and pensioners.13

Kerry-Anne Walsh notes, ‘The tumult of the leaks and attacks on Gillard’s

credibility helped drive Labor's polling numbers down during the campaign, resulting in one of the closest election results in Australian history (2013: 7).

When the 2010 election failed to deliver a majority Labor government, Gillard negotiated agreements with Greens’ leader Bob Brown and three Independents to form a minority government. As a result of these negotiations, Gillard backtracked on some crucial commitments made during her election campaign, most notably that she would not introduce a tax on carbon. The passing of the Clean Energy Bill in February 2011, which included a carbon tax, resulted in Gillard being branded a liar. Summers argues ‘Gillard's backflip on the carbon tax [has been used] to depict her as unreliable, as untrustworthy’ (2012a). The election campaign thus brought an end to the initial excitement at Gillard's leadership, and resulted in increasingly negative and gendered discourse in media reporting of Australia’s female Prime Minster.

**Media Framing**

The theory of ‘framing’ developed by sociologist Erving Goffman (1974) has become a common way to understand and interpret the way media processes and constructs information. Frames can be understood as interpretive structures through which particular events and information are selected, contextualised and presented. Since news frames can be expected to reflect social norms and dominant discourses, they also ‘work symbolically to meaningfully structure the social world’ (Reese 2001: 11, italics in original). ‘Media frames are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol handlers
routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual’ (Gitlin quoted in Norris 1997: 2).

Media has considerable power to frame public understanding of politics and public life, set the agenda on policy issues and influence the political process. Both the manner in which issues relevant to women are framed and the way in which those active in public life are represented may play crucial roles in the formation of public opinion in general and the mobilisation of voters towards or against a particular cause or candidate (Lovenduski & Norris 1996). Framing theory has been used by political scientists and gender theorists to analyse media coverage (Baird 2004).

Traditional media plays a crucial role in Australian society and politics in framing public understanding, but also in influencing political debates, strategy and public policy. Another media theory, mediatisation, describes the phenomena in which media-saturated societies such as Australia adopt the ideology of the dominant media culture, as the media both shapes and frames the society around it, and the political discourse (Lundby 2009). This has implications for how media shapes societal perceptions of women in both private and public life.

‘One factor which may prove an obstacle for women at every level, but which has yet to receive systematic attention, is the role of the media… Many believe media coverage may influence women’s participation in public life by reinforcing sex-role stereotypes throughout society’ (Norris 1997: 149).
The manner in which women in public office are represented in the media can therefore impact significantly not only on them as individuals but on political discourse, gender policy and societal opinions about their role in public life (Lovenduski & Norris 1996).

The remainder of this chapter concentrates on media framing of Julia Gillard to show how gender stereotypes influence this framing. Media coverage contributes to the political landscape in which politicians and politics are experienced, seen and understood; so the way media covers women matters, particularly if it relies on stereotypes that reinforce, rather than challenge, prevailing gender norms that reinforce masculine dominance (Kahn 1996). In his seminal work on framing (1922), Lippman argues that people use stereotypes to process and classify individuals, according to certain traits, as members of a particular group (based on race or gender, for example). This allows people to ‘complete’ a picture of that individual based on pre-conceived inferences and ‘stereotypes’ of the characteristics of membership to that group. Kahn argues

‘By relying on stored information about groups, people limit the amount of information that they need to draw conclusions about an individual ... When developing impressions of others, people routinely give priority to judgements based on stereotypes rather than judgements based on new information’ (1996: 4).

In relation to women in particular, Norris contends that

‘The feminist literature has long expressed concern that women newsmakers are not mirrored by the media in a way that accurately reflects their role and responsibilities. Many believe media coverage
may influence women’s participation in public life by reinforcing sex-role stereotypes throughout society’ (1997: 149).

In her 2004 book, *Media Tarts: How the Australian Press Frames Female Politicians*, Julia Baird found that the media did use repetitive framing to report on women parliamentarians. She identified a number of key frames into which women were categorised based on particular stereotypes: ‘The Steel Sheila’, ‘The Housewife’, ‘The Feminist’ and ‘The Covergirl’ (2004). Following Baird, I have categorised the predominant frames and stereotypes the media uses when reporting on Julia Gillard: ‘The Incapable Gillard,’ ‘The Childless and Unmarried Gillard,’’ The Gillard with a Big Arse,’ ‘The Bitch/Witch/Whore,’ and ‘The Treacherous Gillard.’ However, there are too many examples of sexist commentary to include in the confines of this thesis, and additional relevant examples are included in the bibliography at Appendix 8.

The examples below are all sourced from mainstream Australian media, as the main influence on public discourse around politics. Whilst there are many other examples of sexist comments directed at Gillard in social and other media, the focus in this thesis is mainstream media.

**The Barren, Unmarried Gillard**

A powerful woman such as Gillard, who chooses a career over the normative path of motherhood, violates the accepted order of the relationship between sex and power (Bourdieu 2001).

As part of that gender imbalance in coverage, the media continue in their attempts to link women with their traditional view of woman as wife and homemaker (Ustinoff quoted in Drabsch 2007: 16).
Empirical research on the role of parenthood in political media discourse reveals that the maternity and private lives of female candidates is considered, questioned and analysed far more than the paternity or private lives of their male counterparts in media reporting (Jamieson 1995; Cantrell & Bachman 2008; Falk 2010).

That many of the first media reports of Gillard’s accession to top office make reference to her lack of children or husband leads to the supposition that women in Australian society are primarily understood through their experiences as mothers and wives. This idea is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. Subtle or underlying assumptions and prejudices about gender roles are revealed through this and similar commentary.

The relationship between Gillard’s choice not to pursue motherhood and her leadership capacities had been scrutinised before she became prime minister. In 2006, leading Australian political scientist and senior lecturer Nick Economou said of Gillard

There’s so much about her that’s interesting, because on the one hand, she epitomises the modern career woman, on the other hand – and I have to choose my words carefully here – she doesn’t have children and that outs her a bit outside the mainstream of how we would profile voters in those swinging seats (Cazzulino 2006: 75).

This comment simultaneously constructs and reaffirms a particular image of the ‘mainstream’ Australian voter as one who would necessarily perceive Gillard’s decision to pursue politics over motherhood as objectionable.
Previously, in 2005, Gillard had faced criticism over a photograph in her home kitchen in Melbourne, which featured an empty fruit bowl and bare walls and benches. In the media, this image has served as a metaphor for Gillard’s status as a ruthless, barren, career-focused woman, out of touch with the needs of working mothers or families. Political journalist Janet Albrechtsen suggested that Gillard’s personal circumstances and lifestyle choices would ensure she would not become prime minister,

Australia is not ready for the Gillard package. While a working-class girl from Adelaide may sound attractive at first glance, Gillard revels in her otherness: living the austere lifestyle of a woman with none of the usual aspirations such as settling down, getting married, having children. Her kitchen is bare. She struggles with tongs at a barbecue. On the ABC’s Australian Story last week she said she can manage only one focus: politics. This is not sexism at work. Just realism.’ (Albrechtsen 2006: online reference)

The mobilisation of the concept of ‘realism’ is particularly interesting in this excerpt, as it presumes the lack of support for a certain type of woman as leader is simply ‘the way things are’ and therefore doesn’t require scrutiny or explanation. The media plays a reciprocal role in reflecting the social norms and dominant ideologies of a particular time and audience, while reinforcing and reconstructing these norms and ideologies. Albrechtsen’s comment can be read as a representative view of broader social attitudes.

In her review of Gillard’s prime ministership, Jennifer Rayner maintains that a ‘real’ female prime minister faces two separate demands about the way she should act. On the one hand,
women in particular, and progressive people more generally ... expect a ‘real’ prime minister to come to power in her own right, that is, with overwhelming support from the electorate (2013: online reference).

On the other hand, a more conservative view would expect a ‘real’ female prime minister to conform to the societal norms expressed by Albrechtsen.

During the 2010 election campaign, Gillard’s marital status was a focus of media commentary. She was frequently asked if her partner would live with her in the prime ministerial Lodge. During her term in office, journalists occasionally shifted the focus to her partner, Tim Mathieson. The implication is twofold: no ‘real’ male could cope with a powerful woman, therefore the male in Gillard’s life, must either be a token male, or gay. The most blatant example of this was when radio broadcaster, Howard Sattler, asked Gillard outright if her partner was gay (TripleM Newsroom, 2013).

**The Incapable Gillard**

*These are the central narratives that explain how Gillard threw away her respect, her credibility, her authority.* (Bolt 2011a: online reference)

Despite the fact that the Gillard Government had the highest record of legislation passed in the history of federal parliament in Australia, what became a truism in public discourse was that Gillard herself was unreliable and incompetent. The charge of incompetence was a deliberate tactic of the Opposition, particularly during Question Time in parliament, but mainstream media was also very influential (Donovan 2013). By 2011, the mainstream media had broadened allegations of Gillard’s incompetency, moving
commentary into hyperbole. Andrew Bolt, one of Gillard’s most consistent critics said,

It’s not just that she’s been the most incompetent and weak prime minister since at least World War II, with not a single achievement to boast of in a junkyard of failure. More devastating is that she’s flunked the moral test. Gillard has failed, above all, because of her lack of character (Bolt 2011b: online reference).

The media picked up on what they perceived as errors of judgement both in appointment of her personal staff and the support she gave to particular political candidates (Wright 2012: online reference; Reith 2013: online reference). For example, Gillard’s preference - but initial failure - to secure Bob Carr to fill a Senate vacancy in early 2012 resulted in strident media criticism, with Simon Benson in *The Daily Telegraph* declaring

‘Julia Gillard’s calamitous attempt to recruit Bob Carr to her cabinet . . . has demonstrated a complete lack of authority . . . The events of the past few days have exposed the Prime Minister as lacking any authority or political judgement (Benson 2012: online reference).

Bob Carr’s appointment was successfully secured by Gillard within a few days of this attack, but the discourse and image of her as an incompetent leader had already been achieved.

**The Gillard with the Big Arse**

*You’ve got a big arse Julia...just get on with it* (Greer, Q&A 2013)

Gillard’s time in parliament has also been characterised by a disproportionate focus on her appearance. As Anna Ty notes,
There has been a constant hum of chatter in the media about Gillard’s appearance: her earlobes, bottom, ankles, shoes, jackets, haircuts and even her spectacles’ (quoted in Goldsworthy 2013a: 22).

Drawing on Sandra Bartky (1988), Goldsworthy continues, ‘The demands of grooming represent a significant temporal handicap for the prominent woman; more problematically, they divert attention from her message’ (2013a: 23).

Bourdieu argues that

By drawing attention to their hairstyle or some other physical feature, or using familiar terms of address (darling, dear, etc.) in a formal situation ... so many infinitesimal “choices” of unconscious which come together to help construct the diminished situation of women and those cumulative effects are recorded in the statistics on the very weak representation of women in positions of power, especially economic and political power (2001: 59).

Frequent reference to Gillard’s appearance in the media had the effect of trivialising her politics by emphasising form over function and undermining her credibility by pointing to physical failings. Robin Lakoff explains that

It is true that men in the public eye can be criticized for their looks ... But these barbs are both less frequent and less prominent directed at men than at women. Further, comments about looks are much more dangerous to a woman’s already fragile grasp of power than to a man’s: they reduce a woman to her traditional role of object, one who is seen rather than one who sees and acts. (2003: 173).

Male political leaders are not subject to the same physical scrutiny and judgement. Examples of media scrutiny over Gillard’s appearance include an entire article in the Sydney Morning Herald dedicated to analysing a shoe
belonging to Gillard to ‘[offer] an insight into the Prime Minister’s leadership style’ (Safe 2012: online reference). Anita Quigley commented

On what should have been one of the proudest days of Gillard’s political career, she bungled it with a less than flattering haircut and a frumpy ‘80s tapestry print jacket (2006).

Paul Toohey described Gillard as ‘the woman who appears not to have bad hair days but a bad hair life’ (2010: online reference). Located in the section of The Australian dedicated to national politics, Glenda Korporaal authored an article on Gillard’s use of a handbag.

It is certain our first female Prime Minister has never had to go through the tote-bag-as-mobile-nursery routine that is the lot of mothers of young children (2010: online reference).

One of the most frequently cited references to Gillard’s appearance came from feminist icon Germaine Greer, who crudely said on live television, ‘You’ve got a big arse Julia...just on with it’ (2013: online reference).

**The Treacherous ‘Ju-Liar’**

Implicit in the media commentary about Gillard’s defeat of Rudd was the idea that if a woman defeats a male leader, she is treacherous and underhanded, whereas if a male defeats another male leader, it is a simple matter of a power play. In Australian political history, numerous challenges and changes of leaders, including transfers of the office of prime minister, have been achieved within political parties\(^\text{14}\) without the rancorous criticism that has been directed at Gillard. Descriptions of Gillard’s alleged betrayal of Rudd fed into later

---

\(^{14}\) A list of intra-party leadership challenges since 1964 is included at Appendix 4
descriptions of her as a liar over the carbon tax issue. Radio broadcaster Alan Jones renamed Gillard, 'Ju-Liar', constructing an image of Gillard as disloyal, manipulative and treacherous.

Bourdieu theorises the dilemma that if women display masculine characteristics, they are seen as a threat to the ‘natural order’ or power relations; if they display or emphasise feminine characteristics, they are seen as lacking the ability or qualification for power (2001). Whilst it has been acceptable for male parliamentarians to overthrow their colleagues, it appears that it is not accepted for a woman.

Women politicians should not contest a powerful leadership position; a woman politician who commands the numbers as the men do is untrustworthy, ambitious (bad!) and ruthless (malevolent); the male politician deposed by a woman is a victim of ruthless treachery (Lohrey 2012: online reference).

Rayner, drawing on research by Hall and Donaghue, picks up on the gendered nature of Gillard’s alleged treachery. By moving swiftly to resolve the leadership issue with Rudd, Gillard failed ‘to wait her turn’, and therefore failed to conform to assumptions about behaviour ‘appropriate’ to a woman (2013: online reference). Empirical research indicates that when voters favour women politicians, it is because they perceive them as warm and nurturing (Bligh et. al 2012; Kahn 1996). Mainstream media very quickly framed Gillard as guilty of double treachery: on the one hand, she ousted a sitting prime minister, and on other hand she was a woman who ousted a sitting prime minister.
Gillard’s negative image in mainstream media was fuelled by leaks to the press and perceived backtracking on key election commitments. Paul Toohey described Gillard as a rat and a traitor (2010: online reference). In the *Herald Sun*, Jill Singer said ‘Our new PM is such a skilful politician that she can slide a stiletto between an enemy’s ribs and make it look like she’s doing them a favour’ (Singer 2010: 31). Radio broadcasters described her as bitter, vitriolic, and a ‘lying cow’ (Burgman: online reference).

Alan Jones addressed the University of Sydney Liberal Club, including a comment about Julia Gillard’s recently deceased father: ‘The old man recently died a few weeks ago of shame ... To think that he had a daughter who told lies every time she stood for parliament’ (Marshall 2012: online reference). It later was revealed Jones had worn a jacket made from a chaff bag in reference to a comment he made on radio in 2011 about Julia Gillard: ‘The woman is off her tree and quite frankly they should shove her and Bob Brown in a chaff bag and take them as far out to sea as they can and tell them to swim home’ (Coorey 2012: online reference).

**Gillard the Bitch/Witch**

Journalists also picked up on public expressions of anti-Gillard sentiment. Media focus at a March 2011 anti-carbon-tax rally in front of Parliament House was fashioned around protest posters that featured slogans about Gillard such as ‘Ditch the Witch’ and ‘Bob Brown’s Bitch’. Opposition Leader Tony Abbott was extensively photographed and interviewed in front of these posters.\(^{15}\)

\(^{15}\) Examples of such images are included at Appendix 5.
Goldsworthy describes the use of ‘witch’ as a way to ‘denigrate a woman who has outgrown her sexual utility: the crone or harridan’ (2013a: 15) Similarly,

When a woman is dismissed as ‘weak’ or ‘hysterical’ or ‘emotional’ or ‘aggressive or ‘a bitch,’ her detractor is drawing on a repertoire of stereotypes about women that supposedly typecast the entire sex and are then seen as justification for discriminating against them (Summers 2013: 9).

The use of the pejorative and gendered language directed at Gillard moved beyond political protest into personal vilification, and underlined the level of hostility and sexist discrimination in public and media discourse. Journalistic codes of conduct specifically require that emphasis not be placed on personal characteristics and that gendered stereotyping, harassment and discrimination be avoided. These codes appear to have been consistently ignored.

Throughout most of her term of office, Gillard did not respond publicly to such examples of media stereotyping. When she did speak on feminist issues, it was in a broad rather than personal context. In October 2012, Gillard finally addressed issues of sexism in a public forum, from the floor of the House of Representatives. What has become known as ‘The Misogyny Speech’ was reasoned, personal and passionate, and its effect has been significant. The final chapter of this thesis analyses media responses to this speech. The next chapter foregrounds the work of Anne Summers, with particular reference to Summers’ recent work on sexism and misogyny.

16 Excerpts from Codes of Conduct for major Australian media organisations are included at Appendix 6.
Chapter Two: Anne Summers and The Newcastle Speech

This chapter provides an analysis of the contribution of Anne Summers to public discourse on sexism and feminism in Australia, and to the evolving examination of the gendered nature of media discourse around Gillard’s leadership. I discuss Summers’ career, publications and the evolution of her feminist philosophy. I provide an analysis of a speech that Summers gave in 2012, ‘the Newcastle Speech’, on the sexist treatment shown towards Julia Gillard.

Anne Summers was the first to contextualise and frame the gendered response to Gillard’s prime ministership in a comprehensive way. In August 2012, Summers was invited to present the yearly Human Rights and Social Justice lecture at the University of Newcastle under her nominated subject of ‘the political persecution of Australia’s first female Prime Minister’, referred to as the Newcastle speech. Summers sets out to ‘focus on depictions and comments about Julia Gillard that are utterly and undeniably sexist,’ and to ‘establish the extent to which the prime minister is being treated unfairly as a woman and because she’s a woman’. This speech was the first serious analysis of negative media and sexist commentary on Gillard’s her term in office. It seems likely that Summers’ speech influenced Gillard’s Misogyny Speech made in the House of Representatives, two months after the Newcastle Speech.

This chapter will focus on the role of Anne Summers in shaping Australian feminist thought. Summers has provided a pioneering contribution to

17 All quoted material for the remainder of this chapter comes directly from the online transcript of this speech, unless otherwise indicated. This document can be found online at http://annesummers.com.au/speeches/her-rights-at-work-r-rated/. The video of the speech can be found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RY7FFt-ciE4. Full references are included below.
Australian feminism and the intellectual analysis of the role and position of women in Australian society, both historically and today. The purpose of this chapter is to contextualise and analyse Summers’ particular feminist ideology in relation to the influence she has had on feminist discourse in Australia.

In addition to Summers, other key feminist thinkers routinely comment on and critique politics, business, culture and society. Among them are Eva Cox and Germaine Greer. These women were leaders of the second-wave feminist movement in Australia in the 1960s and 70s and defined the women’s liberation agenda of the time: the desire for a radical transformation of gender roles and relations. Despite helping to define this radical agenda, Summers became a ‘femocrat’, a term which referred to women who worked within public institutions with the aim of supporting the women’s movement. These women, working for both Labor and Liberal governments, achieved many important institutional policy reforms for women’s equality, such as health funding, rape law reform, equal opportunity employment legislation and government funded and regulated childcare (Bulbeck 1998: 33). This approach conforms to the definition of ‘liberal’ or ‘equality’ feminism, an approach to women's equality predicated on the idea of working within and reforming existing institutions to secure women's equality (Summers 1994).

Today Cox and Summers focus on public policy and government in Australia and how they impact women and equality. Each woman frequently writes for both mainstream and independent media on policy as it affects women and feminism. Their ideas and writing have been important in shaping public, and media,
discourse on gender, informing broader debates about women’s equality and representation in Australia.

**Career and Publications**

In 1965 Summers commenced the study of politics and history at the University of Adelaide and became involved with the Labor Club. However, she was drawn towards more radical student movements, including the budding women’s liberation movement (Summers 1999). In an interview in 1988, Summers recounts how this movement began,

> In 1968 ... we started getting the first articles and ideas trickling through from the United States, very early stirrings of the women’s movement, and we all became very excited. Good friends and I got back together at Adelaide University, and we organized the first women’s liberation meeting in 1969. At first we were very dependent on American ideas, but it didn’t take long before we started developing our own issues. And we started trying to apply our understanding about why Australian women were the way we were [in relation] to our particular past (Summers quoted in Gavron 1988: 3)

Summers’ achievements are considerable. She is a Walkley Award winning journalist, author of seven books, and columnist for the *Sydney Morning Herald, The Sunday Age* and *The Drum*. She is an active social media user and frequently provides comment on current affairs, politics, policy and gender issues, using Twitter, blogs and a personal website to share her views. She was the editor-in-chief and part-owner of American feminist magazine, *Ms.*; ran the Federal Office of the Status of Women under the Hawke government; advised on women’s issues for former Australian Prime Minister Paul Keating; chaired the board of
Greenpeace International; and has recently started her own digital magazine 
*Anne Summers Reports* (Summers 2013b; online reference).

In 1975, Summers’ seminal *Damned Whores and God’s Police: The Colonisation of Women in Australia*, addressed the position of women in Australian society, pointing out the dilemma facing them: to be either sexually active and socially independent, or to accept domesticity with its concomitant burdens of ‘civilising’ and nurturing Australian settler society. Summers argues that ‘the radical feminists have correctly identified the sexist division of societies as the major way in which women are oppressed but this recognition needs to be coupled both with a comprehensive understanding of the complex and subtle ways in which sexism permeates every facet of social and economic organization, and with a revolutionary strategy for undermining it’ (1975: 73). Although she indicates that the book attempts to undertake the first of these, she also proposes three simple requirements for women to achieve equality in post-Colonial Australia. These foundational ideas for achieving equality persist in her writing today: that women must be afforded reproductive and sexual freedom, including safe and legal access to abortion; that women must be economically independent, which may require policies which aid women in gaining entry to and returning to the workforce after having children; and that women must be free from domestic violence and sexual harassment.

Summers’ rigorously argued thesis became popularised in wider Australian society but was also appropriated to frame anti-feminist discourse. The affect is that what Summers analysed as the way colonial society was has been transformed into a prescription for the way society should be. This work
provides useful background to understand Australian popular gender depictions of Gillard; the dichotomy that Summers conceptualised as ‘damned whores’ and ‘god’s police’ remains pertinent today.

In 2003, Summers’ *The End of Equality* was published. It examines the erosion of women’s legislative rights under the Howard government. *The Misogyny Factor*, released early 2013, focuses on the ways in which sexism and misogyny are still present and active in Australian institutions, particularly business, politics and the media (Summers 2013). Although Summers’ early feminist engagement was based on a radical agenda, she acknowledges that her current brand of feminism is more practical in approach. In an interview in early 2013 she commented ‘My basic proposition is equality. It used to be liberation, but now I’m more pragmatic. If we could achieve equality, that’d be pretty f---ing amazing,’ (Ford 2013: online reference).

Summers’ long experience as an advisor to Labor governments has led her to believe that equality is best achieved through a gradual process from within political institutions.

I have come to understand the real power of government and of media, as distinct from how these are often imagined from the outside. These continuing encounters with reality, some of them involving the challenge of how actually to design and put into effect policies long advocated by the women’s movement, quickly rid me of my youthful utopianism. I became, instead, a fervent pragmatist, committed to the notion that political change is usually incremental and that we must grab every bit we can whenever the opportunity strikes and not, as I would have argued twenty years ago, hold out for perfection which, in politics as in life, almost never arrives (1994: 4).
Summers’ 2003 book, *The End of Equality: Work, Babies and Women’s Choices in 21st Century Australia*, illustrates that progress towards women’s equality is not guaranteed, and in fact can be reversed through the same institutions and structures through which it has been promoted. Summers commented ‘I never really expected to write another book on women but I ended up writing *The End of Equality* . . . because I started to realize that a lot of the progress towards equality which I had just assumed was unstoppable and irreversible has, in fact, come to a grinding halt (George Negus Tonight 2004: online reference).

*The End of Equality* illustrates that the political, economic, social and cultural progress towards women’s equality had been steadily undermined under the Howard government;\(^{18}\) that the legacy and goal of women’s equality was no longer politically considered. Summers argued that ‘Women’s equality is no longer on the agenda … [it] has been usurped by a new doctrine, the breeding creed’ (2003: 7). ‘The breeding creed’ is what Summers considers the political agenda for procreation – due to an anxiety about Australia’s declining birth rate - an ‘ideology that defines women first and foremost as mothers’ (*ibid*).

Summers argues that women were worse off under the Howard government than they were a decade previously, and that a royal commission into women’s status in Australia should be established. She comments ‘The trend towards equality between women and men had not only ground to a halt, it was going backwards… Instead of equality, it was now dependency once more’ (2003: 171).

\(^{18}\) John Howard was Prime Minister of Australia from 1996 until 2007, when he was defeated by Kevin Rudd. The Howard government was made up of members of the Liberal-National Coalition parties.
Summers cites policies such as the baby bonus – where women receive a lump sum after birth – as policies designed to keep women at home rather than return to the workforce. She claims that more than 160 000 Australian women are prevented from returning to work after having children due to a massive under-provision of childcare facilities, despite government reports that specify that more childcare services are required (*ibid*).

Summers continues to track the progress of gender equality in Australia. Recently, she has written on paid parental leave policy schemes (*Abbott’s baby bonus in disguise*, SMH, Summers 2013c), gender pay gaps (*Gender pay gap still a disgrace*, SMH, Summers 2013d), and abortion (*There is no such thing as a pro-life feminist,* SMH 2012; *‘Abortion and federal policy: Here are the facts’* The Drum, Summers 2013e). She has also extensively on the treatment of Julia Gillard and other prominent female figures in the Australian media.

**Summers, Gillard, Feminism and the Misogyny Factor**

Summers and Gillard were both active in student organisations in their respective eras at the University of Adelaide. Initially, they approached action from different perspectives. Summers was convinced an ideal or utopian society, in which women achieved liberation in all of its aspects, was only possible through direct radical action to overthrow patriarchal institutions. Gillard appears to have always been an incrementalist, relying on negotiation, consensus formation and change from within existing structures and institutions. As Summers shifted over two decades towards a more pragmatic position, the two women have ended up as aligned; they are both committed to change from within.
Julia Gillard has a long and consistent relationship with feminism, and an examina
tion of her parliamentary speeches reveals that, in particular, Gillard
admires courage, honesty, resilience, dignity and respect. In contrast to
Summers, who noted ‘Feminism became the filter through which we measured
everything: books and movies, newspaper articles and politicians’
pronouncements, day-to-day encounters and everyday speech’, Gillard’s
position is more accurately represented by the sentiment ‘I am a feminist but
that is not all that I am’ (Summers 1994: 522, Bulbeck 2000: 2). In her
parliamentary roles, before and during her prime ministership, Gillard
emphasises the importance of mobilising community, nationhood, and fairness
to achieve equality. Her political passion is education. She has argued that
education is the means through which Australia’s future would be transformed
as a fairer society; that access to education is the key to opportunity and
equality (Gillard 1998).

Although Gillard had been careful to avoid her gender becoming central to her
role as prime minister, instead emphasising her commitment to Australians and
the Australian nation, it seems it was unavoidable. “I never conceptualise my
prime ministership around being the first woman to do this job,” she explained,
in an Oration to EMILY’s List in 2011. “I conceptualise my job as being about
delivering the things that make a difference for the nation.”

Summers’ most recent book The Misogyny Factor (2013) chronicles the way in
which barriers to women’s equality still exist in Australian institutions. She
coins the term ‘misogyny factor’ to describe how many Australian institutions
are still based on
[An] entrenched system of attitudes and practices that are designed to exclude women, or to demean them if they do succeed in gaining entry... the embodiment of resistance to the equal participation of women and men in our society (Summers 2013a:21).

Summers provides a concise expose of how Australia’s national psyche is still predicated on an ultimately sexist agenda, which persistently regards women as inferior and unequal, and reinforces gender roles which confine women to the home. She sets out the ways in which progress towards women's equality has ultimately lost momentum, on a societal and political level. She admits,

My years of thinking, writing and acting on the many issues surrounding women’s equality have led me to conclude the following: in pursuing the strategy we did, we failed to take into account that it was not just a matter of legislating to prevent discrimination against women. We did not realize that it wasn’t just a case of challenging the sexist assumptions that women should remain locked in traditional roles. We were . . . unwilling to admit that there was actual opposition to the very idea of equality (ibid: 16)

Gillard reflects on the same issue in an oration to Emily's List in 2011,

... the women’s movement did not free us from every problem. It simply gave us the means - and the opportunity to solve them ... Lets not allow a myth to develop that women’s rights were somehow inevitable (2011: online reference).

Summers, however, proposes strategies for future engagement with and progress towards women's equality and respect in Australia. These include engaging with issues such as the pay gap, representation in business and parliament, childcare, abortion, domestic violence and an appreciation of basic respect. Gillard similarly maintains that ‘good government can really change
lives . . . women’s political emancipation is not complete unless we also enjoy economic emancipation’ (2011: online reference). She said women need ‘to bring issues like child care and domestic violence to public attention, not just as women’s issues but as issues affecting the whole community’ (ibid). Over a long period, Gillard’s public statements demonstrate that her view of feminism is inclusive. She sees women’s equality as a key element in nation building, that incorporating ideas of community, nationhood and fairness are fundamental to ensuring equality for women (Gillard 1998).

The Newcastle Speech

More recently, Summers addresses what she perceives as the sexist treatment shown towards Australia’s first female Prime Minister by the Australian media, her political opponents and the public. Summers attempts to reveal that sexism, misogyny and gender-based discrimination are still present in Australian society today, and are used as tools to undermine, demean and harass women in positions of power.

In the introduction to the Newcastle Speech, Summers comments that she was unaware that the subject she nominated would become so topical. In fact, on the same day that she gave her talk in Newcastle, Sydney broadcaster Alan Jones sparked outrage after declaring that women such as Sydney Lord Mayor Clover Moore were ‘destroying the joint’ (Totaro 2012: online reference). A few weeks prior, Julia Gillard herself had referred to ‘the misogynists and nut jobs on the internet,’ during a press conference (ABC News 2012: online reference). Australian mainstream media gave widespread coverage to these incidents.
The Newcastle Speech has been viewed almost 13000 times online since its broadcast in August and read by over 100,000 people (University of Newcastle 2012: online; Ford 2013: online). It has been cited in a number of subsequent opinion pieces and articles (for example, Galloway 2013; Plunkett 2013; Women’s Agenda 2012).

In the speech, Summers reveals a “whole industry of vilification”, sexually crude and explicit, designed to undermine Gillard’s authority and legitimacy as the Prime Minister of our country. She outlines the ways in which Gillard is ‘attacked, vilified or demeaned in ways that are specifically related to her sex’. On her website, Summers includes an appendix of additional materials not referenced in her speech to add to her claims and examples, and offers two versions of the Newcastle speech, a ‘vanilla’ version (in which confronting and explicit examples are removed) and an explicit version.19

Summers gives a brief background into Gillard’s ascension to power and undertakings as Prime Minister to provide possible context and rationale for the contempt directed towards Gillard. Summers, however, concludes that these events alone cannot account for the sexism and vitriol that Gillard has been shown.

One of Summers’ first arguments to illustrate sexist treatment of Gillard is that she is often referred to solely by her first name in the media, or as simply ‘she’ or ‘her’ in Parliament by members of the Opposition party. She categorises this

example as ‘benign’, a ‘double-standard . . . of a woman being treated less seriously than a man of similar status would be’. However, I would argue that the lack of respect shown in referring to Gillard by her first name, whilst male politicians are referred to by title or last name, cannot be regarded as simply benign. The use of ‘Julia’ in headlines or ‘she’ in parliament has the affect of diminishing Gillard’s status, and of undermining its authority by personalising the office of Prime Minister.

The practice of using ‘Julia’ or ‘she’ was also widely used in media broadcasts, including ABC TV, during the first months of the Gillard government. In an instance when a member of the public complained to ABC TV about the use of ‘Julia’ in place of ‘The prime minister, Julia Gillard,’ the complainant was told: ‘Well, we all know who she is...’ (Riddett 2013). This is an attempt to personalise and patronise the authority implicit in the office. The practice also denies the respect that has been historically afforded to the office bearer.

Denial of commonly accepted protocols for referring to a prime minister implies an exception is permissible because ‘she is just a woman.’ The ABC’s own style Guide, included at Appendix 6, provides editorial principles for referring to people in public office, which have been ignored in referring to the Prime Minister.

Summers provides evidence that such strategies work to influence mass public perception through anecdotal accounts, which reveal that ‘contempt for the prime minister has leached out of the political domain and into the daily lives of ordinary Australians.’ For example, she shares stories from friends of hers who
have experienced or overheard comments such as ‘How could you be staying at the same hotel as the lying cunt?’ and ‘We’ve got to get rid of the bitch.’

In my experience, these accounts ring true. Occasionally, when I have divulged that I am writing my thesis about Julia Gillard, I will receive comments such as ‘About how she’s a filthy lying dyke?’ or similar. I was recently encouraged to download an iPhone application in which the aim of the game is to throw sandwiches at a cartoon Julia Gillard for a point score.

The addition of anecdotal examples is a useful strategy by Summers; it encourages individuals to reflect upon their own experiences, comments or something they may have read or overheard, and to consider whether these experiences are indicative of sexism or simply political critiques.

Summers frames her speech around the issue of Julia Gillard’s ‘rights at work’, examining how the treatment of Gillard in the media and by the Opposition would be viewed under Australian discrimination law, specifically the Sex Discrimination Act and the Fair Work Australia Act. She questions how the Australian public would view the treatment of Gillard if she weren’t the Prime Minister, but the ‘CEO’ of company ‘Australia Pty Ltd,’ the Australian people as the shareholders and directors of this company.

Summers gives other examples illustrating ways Gillard has been bullied based specifically on gender, and concludes this treatment is tantamount to sexual harassment and abuse under Australian law. She references Section 5 of the 1984 Sex Discrimination Act which defines direct sex discrimination as “less favourable treatment” of a woman compared with a man in the same
circumstances. To show that this has been the case for Gillard, Summers points to the way in which Gillard has been singled out and criticized for her choice not to pursue motherhood. Male politicians are not ‘called upon to make choices about paternity in order to pursue careers’, says Summers. Therefore, judgements of Gillard’s political capability and lifestyle choices based on her lack of children is tantamount to direct discrimination. Summers concludes the Australian public ‘as shareholders of Australia Pty Ltd would expect... to do something about changing the culture of the company that allows this kind of behaviour to flourish’.

The framing of the treatment of Gillard in this way challenges us to reflect on why sexism, harassment, and misogyny are unacceptable in some contexts but accepted in others. However, it is also possible to argue that politicians knowingly and willingly put themselves in public positions where ‘everyone is fair game’ and therefore should tolerate negative treatment as ‘all part of the normal cut and thrust of politics.’ Summers effectively refutes this by illustrating how Gillard has been subject to treatment that would not and could not have been shown towards any past Prime Minister, as a result of and based upon her gender.

A compelling example Summers uses to highlight this point are the works of journalist and cartoonist Larry Pickering. Pickering has drawn many crude and explicit images of Gillard, usually naked and wearing or carrying a strap-on dildo. Summers includes one graphic example in her speech, and more in the

20 Specific examples of this can be found in the previous chapter, most notably Bill Heffernan’s comment in 2007 that Gillard was ‘deliberately barren.’
accompanying online appendix, making the astute point that ‘Pickering cannot envisage a prime minister without a penis – so he had to give Gillard a strap-on’ (2012). As Gillard fits neither stereotype defined by Summers in 1975 - damned whore or God’s police - the prime minister has to be depicted as a pseudo-male or a penis-envying female. This is illustrative of a key theme in representations of Gillard: Australians are unable or unwilling to accept political power held by a woman and therefore condone attempts to undermine her.

Summers reveals that Pickering executed an email campaign in which he sent daily crude cartoons and ‘hate-filled commentary’ about Gillard to every federal member of Parliament and Senator, but that not one person spoke out against it. She calls this a ‘conspiracy of silence.’ That the Canberra press gallery failed to regard these attacks against the Prime Minister as newsworthy is indicative of the way sexism is obscured in and accepted by particular institutions.

Ironically, Pickering’s response to Summers’ criticisms in a blog post entitled ‘Summers’ Winter of Discontent’ directly serves to validate her claims of the misogyny and sexism that exist in Australian culture, and illustrate his vitriolic sexism. He writes comments such as ‘This Summers woman has her prune-like ovaries in a knot over anything and everything’ and ‘Give me a normal decent woman … A yummy one who isn’t destructively confused by her own sexuality like Summers.’ (Pickering 2013: online text). In a parallel to his cartoons of Gillard, he uses Summers’ sex as a way to demean and insult her, meanwhile calling for a ‘normal, yummy’ woman that ‘smells nice’. This highlights the way in which powerful, well-informed women are targeted as abnormal, in need of being put in their place, as well as requiring ‘normal’ women to be sexualised.
It is this key point that I draw from Summers’ speech – that Gillard’s status as a woman is used as a reason and a tool for diminishing her authority, and that this is regarded as acceptable – or also that it was not NOTICED or called out as being unacceptable. Summers laments ‘It is difficult not to conclude that we Australians are – so far at least – simply incapable of accepting a woman in charge of our country’.

It may indeed be that this particularly offensive sexism has been brought out by having a female Prime Minister – that we are unable to reconcile the historical disjuncture between women and the notion of Prime Ministerial power, that is, power usually held by a married man with a family. However, Summers also draws attention to the rise of social media and the role it plays. She explains,

> With today’s information technology anyone can be a publisher...
> [Many] are increasingly using these tools to vilify, to degrade and to undermine the authority of the office of the prime minister.

The rise of social media and email has given people a much louder voice in influencing political opinion than they otherwise might have had.

Summers reflects in *The Misogyny Factor* that as she began her research for the presentation of the Newcastle speech she was unsure whether she would conclude that the harsh treatment of Julia Gillard could be attributed to ‘the brutal nature of politics in the era of social media’, as well the fact that she is a woman (2013: 88). After calling for examples on the topic through friends and social media, she concluded it could only be attributed to the latter.

> [The treatment of Gillard] ... was not just the usual give and take of politics; it could not even be described as unusually robust examples of
such cut and thrust. It was something more, and it was something we had not seen before in Australian politics. (Summers 2013a: 89).

Email, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, personal blogs and countless other forums enable individuals to disseminate information effortlessly to a wide audience. As Summers demonstrates with the work of Larry Pickering, it is easy to see that online material about Julia Gillard is derogatory, sexual, violent and crude.

Summers provides numerous other examples of chain emails, cartoons, doctored photos, pictures and videos that highlight this. One particular example is a Facebook site entitled ‘Julia Gillard – Worst PM in Australian history’.21 This site is still up and running, ‘liked’ by close to 50 000 people. Summers discusses and shows a number of images from this site in her speech, including Gillard’s face photoshopped onto a voluptuous naked body with the caption ‘I’m still not voting Labor!’, and a doctored Red Rooster fast food outlet sign ‘Red Roo-ter’ – a reference to Gillard. She concludes that ‘Facebook has given us new ways to intimidate, bully, harass and defame on a remarkable and previously unimaginable scale.’

In concluding her address, Summers presents one of her key aims: that by bringing the sexist treatment of Gillard out into the open, people may start to pay more attention to the process and to demand change. She comments,

“We have created a climate of misogyny that is widespread and contagious. It taints all of us, makes all women vulnerable and it is likely to act as a deterrent to young women thinking about a career in politics’.

21 This Facebook page can be accessed at this link: https://www.facebook.com/pages/Julia-Gillard-Worst-PM-in-Australian-History/243836265642512.
Summers appeals to the public to make a commitment to ending the sexist persecution of Julia Gillard by declaring ‘It stops with me.’ This means that we should no longer ignore or accept sexism when we see or experience it, as doing so allows a culture of sexism to perpetuate and flourish.

By providing an extensive and considered account and numerous examples of the vilification of Julia Gillard, Summers achieves her aim of bringing this sexism out in the open, of ‘document[ing] our inability to let a woman lead’. She reflects in *The Misogyny Factor* that

‘In documenting the vilification of Gillard in my Newcastle speech, I gave people ammunition. I gave them chapter and verse, examples of the disgusting things that were being said and the crude portrayals of her, which shocked and sickened most decent people’ (Summers 2013a:123).

I believe this to be the key value in Summers’ talk - that she fulfilled the aim of educating a significant number of the Australian people about the sexism against Gillard.

A particular critique of the Newcastle speech is that, although Summers provides evidence to demonstrate the sexism directed at Gillard, she does not extend this research to include an in-depth analysis of why Australia is this way, and what it says about our institutions and public discourse. Galloway argues that ‘In focusing on the imagery and language surrounding depictions of the Prime Minister, Summers highlights the ideology generating it’ (2013: page reference unavailable). Although Summers provides evidence and examples of sexist behaviour towards Julia Gillard, she has limited her investigation. She
does not seek to analyse the ideology and discourse surrounding female power in Australian politics, media and society that enable this type of discrimination to continue. A more complete investigation of these issues is a challenge to feminist scholars of the future.

Just a few months after Summers delivered the Newcastle speech, Julia Gillard herself delivered the now famous ‘Misogyny speech’ in which she labelled the leader of the opposition, Tony Abbott, a misogynist, and called attention to and denounced sexist and misogynistic behaviour in Parliament and politics. Given that Gillard employed terminology similar to that used by Summers in her speech in defence of Gillard, it is possible to speculate that the Newcastle speech played a role in influencing Gillard to take a stand. The following chapter of this thesis will examine this speech.
Chapter Three: Julia Gillard & The Misogyny Speech

This chapter examines the context and content of, and response to, the speech given by Julia Gillard in the House of Representatives in 2012, known as the Misogyny Speech. The focus of the speech was sexism in Australian parliament and media. The chapter addresses the media response to this speech and considers the role of social media and the media’s use of the metaphor of ‘playing the gender card’.

The earlier chapter addressing sexist framing of Julia Gillard in the media showed that having a female Prime Minister had a significant impact on political discourse in Australia and created controversy. This chapter examines Julia Gillard’s Misogyny Speech in the House of Representatives in 2012. Whilst the media originally speculated that gender would not play a role in Gillard’s term - that, in fact, the presence of a woman in the most senior government role would bring about the end of sexism in media representations - mainstream media commentary has been dominated by gender stereotypes and framing. According to Goldsworthy

The misogyny speech was, among other things, cultural critique, and it gave rise to further cultural critique. In consequence, it affirmed a great many things: the relevance of feminist debate; the importance of social media (2013a: 6).

In the House of Representatives on 9 October 2012, Leader of the Opposition Tony Abbott moved a motion of no confidence in the Speaker of the House, Peter Slipper. The motion referred to charges of fraud and sexual harassment
that had been laid against Slipper (Williams 2012, The Daily Telegraph 2012,)\textsuperscript{22}.

In the debate that followed, Tony Abbott argued that the Gillard government’s support for Slipper showed their hypocrisy and implicit acceptance of Slipper’s sexist attitudes; that hers was

\begin{quote}
 a government which is only too ready to detect sexism - to detect misogyny, no less - until they find it in one of their own supporters, until they find it in someone upon whom this Prime Minister relies on to survive in her job\textsuperscript{23} (Abbott 2012).
\end{quote}

Abbott’s main argument against Slipper referred to a text Slipper had sent to a member of his staff describing female genitalia. Abbott argued

\begin{quote}
 Every day the Prime Minister stands in this parliament to defend this Speaker will be another day of shame for this parliament and another day of shame for a government which should have already died of shame’ (2012).\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

References to ‘dying of shame’ echoed comments by radio broadcaster Alan Jones, discussed in the previous chapter, that Gillard’s father had ‘died of shame’ (Aston 2012: online reference).

Julia Gillard’s rebuttal was a powerful and passionate renouncement of the sexism she had witnessed and experienced during her term in office. She began, pointing at Tony Abbott,

\begin{flushright}
\textit{...}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{22} It is relevant to note that the sexual harassment case against Slipper has since been dismissed in court.

\textsuperscript{23} Gillard’s decision not to sack Slipper was argued to be on the basis that such an action did not follow parliamentary due process. However he stepped down as Speaker on 9 October.

\textsuperscript{24} The Parliamentary Hansard for 9 October 2012, including the transcript of Abbott’s debate, can be found at http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Hansard/Hansreps_2011#2012
I will not be lectured about sexism and misogyny by this man. I will not. The government will not be lectured about sexism and misogyny by this man — not now, not ever. The Leader of the Opposition says that people who hold sexist views and who are misogynists are not appropriate for high office. Well, I hope the Leader of the Opposition has a piece of paper and he is writing out his resignation, because if he wants to know what misogyny looks like in modern Australia he does not need a motion in the House of Representatives; he needs a mirror. That is what he needs. (Gillard 2012)

Over the next fifteen minutes, Gillard recalled occasions upon which Tony Abbott had demonstrated his sexist attitudes towards women in Australia. She referred to a time when he speculated during a radio interview that men are ‘by physiology or temperament more adapted to exercise authority or to issue command,’ when he called on Julia Gillard to ‘politically speaking, make an honest woman of herself’ in Parliament, or when he speculated upon ‘what the housewives of Australia need to understand as they do the ironing’ (Gillard 2012). Gillard outlined the numerous times that she had felt offended, as a woman, by the sexist behaviours of Abbott, members of his party and supporters.

Abbott’s motion was defeated. Nevertheless, Slipper resigned as Speaker later that afternoon. It was, however, Gillard’s speech in reply which became the focus of media attention in Australia and internationally. The mainstream media was quick to accuse Gillard of using the ‘gender card’, but apparently overlooked the fact that Tony Abbott was the first to strategically employ the terms of sexism and misogyny.
**Misogyny Speech - Media Response**

At the time of writing, the speech delivered by Gillard has been viewed more than 2.4 million times on YouTube, indicative of its significance in her term in office and in assessments of her role as a political figure. Immediately after its delivery, the speech was taken up in online social media, and received international interest, with coverage extending to international news outlets, including the *New Yorker, The Guardian, The Spectator* and *CNN*. Subsequent debate about the term ‘misogyny’ and what it meant in an Australian context prompted a change of its definition in the *Macquarie Dictionary* (2013). Media coverage of Gillard’s speech, however, was remarkably divided, between the Australian mainstream media, the international media and social media. In the main, Australian print media response was highly critical of Gillard’s refutation of misogyny in politics, international, social and online media on the other hand applauded her anti-sexism rhetoric.

Mainstream Australian media, particularly journalists in the parliamentary press gallery in Canberra, denounced Gillard’s speech. Paul Sheehan accused Gillard of personal abuse against Abbott for political gain, arguing ‘Why invoke the accusation of misogyny, hatred of women, against an Opposition Leader whose . . . mostly female staff is devoted to their boss?’ (2012: online reference). He concluded his sentence with a reference to Gillard’s childlessness - ‘and who, *unlike Gillard*, has raised three daughters’ - which was later removed. Michelle Grattan wrote ‘The Prime Minister threw everything into her argument, which

---

25 Prior to Gillard’s speech, misogyny had been defined in the Macquarie Dictionary as the ‘hatred of women’, but now includes the further definition of ‘entrenched prejudice against women’ (*Macquarie Dictionary Online* 2013).
revolved around trying to pin the “misogynist” label on the Opposition Leader. It was perhaps the only weapon available to her, but it sounded more desperate than convincing’ (2012: online reference).


Sheehan’s image that Gillard ‘came out snarling’ is illustrative of the notion that women who appear strong will be portrayed as crazy or out of control (2012: online reference). As Linguist Robin Lakoff argues

> there are lexical differences in the way we talk about men with power, versus women with power. For example, we use different words to describe similar or identical behaviour by men and women. English (like other languages) has many words describing women who are interested in power, presupposing the inappropriateness of that attitude. *Shrew* and *bitch* are among the more polite’ (Lakoff 2003: 162).

By shifting focus from Abbott, who set the debate in motion, to Gillard, journalists seek to delegitimise Gillard’s argument. Frequent references to Gillard ‘vilifying’ Abbott - although she based her argument on his own words - frame her within a gendered stereotype. Bourdieu explains ‘an outburst ... is inevitably seen as an unjustified whim or as an exhibition that is immediately defined as hysterical’ (2001: 59). The technique is used to set Gillard up as an aggressor attacking Abbott rather than as an intelligent human being debating
an issue. What emerges is a concept of a ‘real woman’ who is patient, long suffering, and compliant, as opposed to Gillard who is a hysterical, even possibly mad, woman.

**Double Bind**

Gillard’s repudiation of sexism was portrayed as a defence of Peter Slipper. Mainstream media stressed Peter Slipper’s sexism, revealed in text messages to his staffer Ashby, to imply mere political motives behind Gillard’s speech. Janet Albrechtsen was still emphasising this point months later (2013: online reference). Journalists chose to ignore themes of gender and sexism outside the immediate political context. Gillard was herself accused of sexism and of letting down Australian women.

She showed she was prepared to defend even the denigration of women if it would help keep her in power ... If there was one thing that should have been different about Gillard’s prime ministership, it should have been that Australia’s first female prime minister should have been a flag bearer for women ... If Gillard will not defend respect for women, what will she defend? (Hartcher 2012: online reference)

An examination of the transcript of Gillard’s speech reveals that she does not, at any time, defend Slipper. The implication that Gillard should have shown higher standards than ‘just another politician’ (Hartcher 2012: online reference) indicates the way Summers’ concept of God’s Police - that women are expected to act as moral arbiters of social behaviour - has been subsumed by popularist journalists into their discourse. It follows therefore that women parliamentarians should not only represent the public interest, but explicitly act to privilege the good of women.
Kathleen Jamieson, discussing female political candidates, describes the phenomenon of the femininity-competency double bind: Women who act in a manner deemed too assertive or confrontational may be perceived or criticised as transgressive or unnatural; whereas women who fail to conform to traditionally held assumptions or standards of (masculine) power may be deemed too weak for leadership (1995). It is explained that

All too often there is a contradiction between the attributes voters expect in a candidate and what they want in a woman. Ambition is a plus in a man but a drawback in a woman. Men should be tough, but strength in a woman is threatening (Cantor and Bernay quoted in Campus 2013: 54).

Following Jamieson (1995), it is possible to theorise a number of other double-binds that exist for Gillard and other women in leadership: women must seek to succeed on merit without reference to gender or sexism, with the corollary of accepting sexist behaviour; or denounce sexism aimed against them and, as a consequence, be accused of ‘playing the gender card’. Similarly, women leaders are expected to represent public interest, but privilege women’s interests at the same time. When these interests are perceived as conflicting, a woman leader will face criticism for failing to meet expectations.

‘Real Misogyny’

Two female journalists in articles criticising Gillard have mobilised the concept of ‘the real world’ or ‘realism’, as discussed in an earlier chapter. In the context of the misogyny speech, ‘the real world’, in their usage, frames a society in which women do not react to sexism, do not complain about it, or denounce it, and simply ‘get on with their lives.’ In one instance, Miranda Devine,
commenting on Gillard’s speech said, ‘Playing the gender card is the pathetic last refuge of incompetents and everyone in the real world knows it’ (2012: online reference).

Devine goes on to address ‘what boils down to five charges’ of the sexism that Gillard claimed against Abbott, by ‘debunking’ each claim from the context of ‘the real world’ (ibid). Similarly, Janet Albrechtsen offers a view of ‘real misogyny’ - ‘Just ask the women in Saudi Arabia who may still not drive a car’ - to establish Gillard as out of touch with the lived reality of women (2013: online reference). By claiming opinion as fact, Devine, Albrechtsen and other commentators establish their own views as authentic reflections of women in Australian society: women Julia Gillard cannot represent, because she is childless and unmarried, or because she is unreal or unrealistic.

**International media**

The international media, on the other hand, were widely supportive of Gillard’s speech. Amelia Lester for *The New Yorker* wrote,

Supporters of President Obama, watching Gillard cut through the disingenuousness and feigned moral outrage of her opponent to call him out for his own personal prejudice, hypocrisy, and aversion to facts, might be wishing their man would take a lesson from Australia’ (2013: online reference).

US website Jezebel deemed the speech ‘[t]he best thing you’ll see all day’ and *The Guardian* applauded the “masterful, righteous take-down” as tackling ‘sexism head on’ (Morrissey 2012: online reference; Angynl 2012: online reference).
Anna Goldsworthy questions ‘Why such a disparity in reception? The press gallery placed the speech in a political context. On YouTube, against a wider cultural context, it reverberated differently’ (2013: 5). The Australian mainstream media missed the way in which a woman speaking out publicly against sexism transcended the immediate political context, as it reflected the lived experiences of sexism that many women experience. Goldsworthy reflects ‘It was a repudiation of female stoicism, of being a good sport. It was a repudiation of turning the other cheek and getting on with it’ (2013b: online reference). Gillard became an inspiration for refusing to accept sexism. She explains,

‘I think it gave the words to a lot of women’s experiences … That they had felt a moment in their own lives, in their own workplaces, when they wished they had said something and they let the moment go by. (Gillard quoted in Goldsworthy 2013b: online reference).

On the other hand, the Australian independent media tended to focus on whether the Gillard government’s policy matched up with the anti-sexism rhetoric she employed and therefore whether or not her claims were legitimate (See, for example, Cox 2012; Cox 2013; Tietze 13). This response is evidence of the double bind discussed above.

**Emergence of feminism in social media**

The social media sphere also responded favourably to Gillard’s Misogyny Speech. Many women public commentators, such as Mia Freeman and Caitlin Moran, tweeted support (Moran n.d.: online reference; Freeman n.d.: online reference). US viral media website, *Buzzfeed*, posted a collection of the best
moments of the speech (Testa 2012: online reference). Comments of support and the YouTube link were promoted over Twitter under the hashtag #misogynyspeech (Twitter n.d.: online reference).

This reveals the way in which social media provides a space through which multiple voices and ideas can be heard and mobilised towards a particular issue or campaign. Social media provides an outlet for diverse viewpoints and is shaping political engagement, institutions, processes and discourse. (Information, Communication & Society, 2011, Keller 2012, Sowards and Renegar 2006, Harris 2010.) In this example of Gillard's speech, social media has provided a space for renewed interest in feminism, enabling discussions about misogyny outside mainstream media.

Even before Gillard’s Misogyny Speech, the social media sphere, predominantly Twitter, responded to Alan Jones’ comment that women were ‘destroying the joint’ referred to earlier. Jane Caro, an Australian social commentator, referred to Jones' comments via a Twitter post, ‘Got time on my hands tonight so thought I'd spend it coming up with new ways of "destroying the joint" being a woman & all. Ideas welcome’ (2012: online reference). This was followed by a flurry of activity on Twitter under the hashtag #destroythejoint, with suggestions on how to ‘destroy the joint’ as a means of subverting Alan Jones’ comment and highlighting its inherent sexism as unacceptable.

Through this online interaction, ‘destroy the joint’ was appropriated into a feminist movement. A successful petition was launched which saw advertisers abandon Jones’ radio station, 2GB (Caro 2013). Destroy The Joint has now
become an established community organisation to target sexism.  


Destroy The Joint shows how social media offers a new opportunity to challenge dominant discourse, including the mainstream media, and the privilege of masculine power. It also demonstrates creativity in disrupting traditional political practices, institutions and discourses. The openness of social media platforms facilitates the potential of what Charles Leadbeater called the “mass-collaboration” of individuals and groups who become the source of new innovations and ideas in democratic practices (quoted in Loader & Mercea 2011: 759).

**A New Kind of Feminism?**

The re-issued 1994 edition of *Damned Whores and God’s Police* included a letter from Summers to the next generation which lamented and criticised younger women’s lack of appreciation for the gains made during second-wave feminism. It challenged young women to take up their own feminist issues. Whilst Summers’ generation mobilised on issues of feminism with a collective and organised political agenda, women today have developed different forms of

---

26 Destroy The Joint’s Facebook page describes the movement: ‘Destroy The Joint stands for gender equality and civil discourse in Australia. The name “Destroy The Joint” came from the on-air comments of 2GB broadcaster Alan Jones, who stated in an on-air discussion on Friday August 31, 2012, that “women are destroying the joint”. This misogynistic comment was transformed into a witty Twitter hashtag that trended for four days. This facebook page was set up independantly to what was occuring in the twitterverse on 2 September 2012 to provide a community for those who are sick of sexism in Australia. The term “destroy the joint” or "destroying the joint" has entered the Australian lexicon. It rejects the suggestion that women are destroying the joint and represents a call to action for Australians who reject sexism and seek a civil and decent society. We're not out to destroy the joint - that was someone else's description. We're rebuilding it with good humour and optimism.’ (2013)
activism consistent with a broader shift away from hierarchical and formal protests (Juris & Pleyers 2009). What have emerged instead are decentralised, leaderless, diverse and transitory movements based on specific incidents or aims, such as the Destroy The Joint movement (Juris & Pleyers 2009). Social media creates a space for women to express, discuss, enact and mobilise around their feminist politics in a way that is decollectivised and marginal, which is not possible through mainstream media and traditional processes. Social media has therefore contributed to the re-emergence of feminist debate in Australia.

Sowards and Renegar suggest that this constitutes a new kind of feminist activism ‘that operates in the private sphere or in less public arenas in comparison to the activist measures described in extant literature on social activism’ (2006, 60). Importantly, however, all of these activities have strong continuities with earlier feminist political traditions, practices and performances, even while they are enacted under new social conditions.

At the same time, however, as Anne Summers has pointed to, social media can be used as a platform for extreme displays of anti-feminist and anti-women sentiment that are similarly not able to be expressed through mainstream media, such as in the example of the Facebook page ‘Julia Gillard - worst PM in history’ (2012).

**The Gender Card**

I turn now to a fuller discussion of how the frame of the ‘gender card’ has been used in response to Gillard’s speech. Gillard’s denouncement of the sexist
treatment of women in politics brought the issue of gender and sexism out into the open. As Sawer argues

This was important: maintaining silence over discriminatory treatment in order not to be accused of playing a gender card can condemn others to experience the same treatment. Silence over sexism is unlikely to encourage other women to take up political careers’ (2013: 117).

References to Gillard ‘playing the gender card’ include, along with those mentioned above, ‘power is Julia Gillard’s true passion as she plays the gender card, victim card . . . for advantage’ (Bolt 2013: online reference) and ‘the misogynist card is just another tactic’ (Kelly 2010: online reference).

There has been little academic research on the use of ‘card-playing’ in politics, except with reference to race (See Mendelberg 2001). In 2013, Erica Falk sought to analyse the use of playing the gender card with reference to Hilary Clinton’s leadership campaign (Falk 2013). However, as there is no established definition of what it means to ‘play the gender card’, in the case of Gillard, the accusation needs to be viewed in the context of the tone of the mainstream media’s response to Gillard’s speech. The implication is that ‘playing the gender card’ is a tactical choice for political gain. However, the implication goes beyond this. The fact that the Australian mainstream media chastised Gillard for denouncing sexism suggest that there is an expectation that women politicians are either expected to ignore discrimination against them - or perhaps even that such discrimination does not even exist except as an excuse for political failure.

Devine’s trenchant response to Gillard’s speech was to allege that Gillard was claiming she was a victim of misogyny. In Devine’s view, Gillard’s ‘judgment was
found wanting, the mistakes piled up, the polls plummeted ... she whipped out the failed woman's last resort: the gender card (Devine 2013: online reference).

Behind the framing use of the ‘gender card’ is the idea that by talking about gender, discrimination and misogyny, Gillard was attempting to gain a tactical advantage against Abbott. Using the metaphor of ‘the gender card’ suggests that sexism is not appropriate in or relevant to public discourse and the mainstream media. The metaphor was used to mask discussion about the discrimination against Gillard and to ignore or obscure the patriarchal and sexist forces at play in Australian political and media institutions. As argued by Erica Falk, ‘Media uses metaphors to hide relations of power and dominance. When arguments are hidden in implicit metaphors, the weaknesses in the arguments are harder to identify, question, or challenge’ (2013: 204).

Whether Gillard’s speech was a political tactic, or a defence of feminism, or both, is a question still being debated. However, as Annear points out ‘since Gillard spoke its name, misogyny - the word and its meaning - has been drawn from the shadow into the light, from the margin to the mainstream’ (Annear 2013: online reference).

On the 26 June 2013, Julia Gillard was herself voted out of the leadership of the Labor Party, and consequently lost the position of Prime Minister of Australia. In contrast to the furore surrounding the Misogyny Speech, Gillard delivered a dignified concession speech in which she announced she would be leaving parliament at the next election. Gillard outlined her key policy achievements and reflected on her position as Australia’s first female prime minister, stating that she believes it will be easier for the next woman to take top office. Gillard
referenced the criticism levelled against her that she had played the gender card, commenting 'heaven knows no one knew I was a woman before I mentioned it!' (2013: online reference). She commented, 'The reaction to being the first female prime minister does not explain everything about my prime ministership, not does it explain nothing about my prime ministership' (ibid).
Conclusion

This thesis examines the media’s role in the construction and perpetuation of sexist stereotypes and framing in the representation of Julia Gillard, during and prior to her term as Australia’s first female prime minister. It contributes to a body of academic work that analyses the way in which gender, media and politics interact. The academic investigation of women in political leadership is an emerging, and important, field of research and the ways in which women leaders act, govern, are perceived and represented is of importance to both revealing and shaping cultural attitudes towards women in general.

I will now summarise my main arguments. Chapter One examines Australia’s record on women’s representation in federal parliament. It shows that, although Australia was one of the first countries to grant settler women full political rights, this early step towards equality did not manifest itself in women’s equal representation in parliament, or equality more broadly. Women are significantly and consistently underrepresented in Australian parliament, particularly in more senior roles. The current Coalition government includes only one woman in its inner Ministry, representing a step backwards for women's representation.

It is not only the percentage of women in parliament, however, that is significant for women’s equality in Australia. The way in which these women are perceived, represented and treated is indicative of cultural attitudes towards women in leadership but towards women more generally. In this regard, the media play a key role in shaping perceptions of women and their leadership ability. The media’s response to, and treatment of, Australia’s first
female prime minister provides a unique opportunity to analyse and uncover these perceptions.

Marian Sawer, as quoted in Chapter One, finds that the presence of women in parliament is important for increasing the recognition of the equal status of women (2002: 6). Discussed throughout this thesis, the presence of a woman in Australia’s top political office had a different effect: it revealed the underlying sexist stereotypes that exist in the Australia media sphere, shown through the framing of Gillard in particular ways. Chapter one identifies a number of key frames, reliant on sexist stereotypes, through which Gillard has been presented.

Chapter Two of this thesis examines the contribution of feminist commentator Anne Summers to Australian feminism, and, in particular, her role in uncovering the sexist treatment of Julia Gillard and bringing this to public attention. Summers was the first to employ the term of ‘misogyny’ with reference to the attitudes underpinning representations of Julia Gillard. She put forward that the way public discourse had centred around Gillard is indicative of underlying systemic beliefs in key Australian institutions, such as the parliament, about women and their right to participate in public life. She conceptualises that sexism towards Gillard reveals the robust resistance to women’s equality and power, and demonstrates how this manifests in covert and overt ways.

Many of the attitudes that Summers brought to the fore were further revealed in the media responses to Julia Gillard’s denouncement of sexism in her Misogyny Speech. Chapter Three is a case study of the particular responses that emerged in the media following this speech. In particular, it examines why there was a disparity in reception between the Australian mainstream media, the
international media, and social media. The role of social media in the re-emergence of feminist discourse in Australia is discussed, along with an investigation into the accusation against Gillard of ‘playing the gender card’. The use of this metaphor is significant because it suggests that women in Australian parliament must remain silent of issues of sexism and discrimination, or be accused of requiring special treatment, ‘not up to the job,’ or calling out sexism for political advantage.

Why does it matter how the Australian mainstream media spoke about and represented Julia Gillard? As a young woman in Australia, I believe it is of fundamental importance, to me, my peers and the wider Australian public, to understand the way in which sexism functions within our society. Sexism that goes unnoticed or unremarked is the most insidious form of discrimination against women, as it shapes our attitudes and perceptions in such a way as to make it seem that this is simply ‘the way things are’.

That the journalists writing in the mainstream media were rarely called out on the sexist sentiments they expressed, and that these attitudes continued throughout the entirety of Gillard’s term of office, is evidence that particular attitudes towards women in Australia are inherent in our national psyche and public discourse. It is only through seeking to uncover and critique these attitudes that we may see a change towards women in leadership, and women generally. Although social media provides a new space for feminist (and anti-feminist) activism and discussion, the mainstream media has a dominant role in shaping attitudes, norms and standards of behaviour. Therefore, they must be
held accountable to legal standards and codes of conduct that do not perpetuate women’s discrimination.

Given that Australia has recently seen a backwards trend in the parliamentary representation of women, and the limited scholarly work that exists on women in leadership roles in Australia, there is a unique opportunity for further academic research into the political representation of women, and the role that the media plays in shaping this representation. Such research is a necessary step to ensuring that the attitudes shown towards Julia Gillard are not repeated towards our next female prime minister, and other women in leadership.
## Appendix 1: Comparison of women’s parliamentary representation in selected countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank /142</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lower or single House</th>
<th>Upper House or Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>9 2008</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>4 2011</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2 2013</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9 2010</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>9 2011</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>7 2012</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4 2011</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4 2009</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>11 2011</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>4 2013</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>7 2012</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9 2009</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>11 2011</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>10 2011</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5 2010</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>9 2010</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>5 2013</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>6 2012</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>8 2011</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>3 2010</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>4 2011</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal 47</td>
<td>Australia (Sept 2013)</td>
<td>8 2010</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A 47</td>
<td>Australia (Oct 2013)</td>
<td>9 2013</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5 2011</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5 2011</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>3 2013</td>
<td>2987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1 2013</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal 58</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5 2010</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1 2013</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>4 2009</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>11 2012</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2 2011</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>3 2011</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>11 2010</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>6 2012</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adapted from [http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif010913.htm](http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif010913.htm) (IPU 2013).
Appendix 2: Women’s representation and leadership in Australian parliament

Figure 1: Senators and Members since 1901 by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House of Representatives</th>
<th>Both Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Percentage of women in parliament, 1993 - 2013

Figure 3: Composition of Parliaments by Party and Gender, as at June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Lower House</th>
<th>Upper House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 4: Senior Parliamentary Roles by Gender, as at June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parliament</th>
<th>Government Ministers</th>
<th>Opposition Shadow Ministers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet (Inner Ministry)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ministry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ministers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary secretaries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5: Portfolios held by women in Commonwealth Parliament, 1943-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Total women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of women</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services, families, housing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing, aged care, veterans affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment workplace relations, workforce participation, training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence industry, science and personnel, assisting Minister for Defence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, revenue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous affairs, employment, justice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, climate change, energy efficiency and water</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive positions*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood, childcare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration, multicultural affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special minister for state</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Minister for State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figures are developed from data available from the following sources


and The Parliamentary Handbook -
Appendix 3: Timeline of Julia Gillard’s parliamentary career

1998: Gillard is elected to parliament in the Victorian seat of Lalor.

2001: Gillard is given the role of opposition spokesman on population and immigration.

December, 2003: Gillard is appointed as manager of opposition business in the lower house.

December, 2006: Gillard is elected as deputy leader of the opposition.

November 24, 2007: Labor wins the Federal election; Gillard becomes deputy prime minister with portfolio responsibility for education, employment and workplace relations. As education minister, Gillard oversees the government’s education reform, and as workplace relations minister, dismantles the former Liberal government’s ‘Work Choices.’

June 24, 2010: Gillard replaces Rudd as party leader and prime minister, becoming Australia’s 27th prime minister and first female prime minister.

July 17, 2010: Gillard calls an election for August 21

August 21, 2010: Federal election results in a hung parliament, with 72 seats each. Both sides begin discussions with crossbench MPs to secure government.

September 7 2010: Gillard secures the support of independent MPs and the Greens, to achieve a minority government.

March 9, 2011: Gillard addresses the US Congress, the third Australian leader to do so.

March 26, 2011: Key National Broadband Network legislation is passed in the senate.

May 7, 2011: Gillard announces the asylum seeker ‘Malaysia deal’, which ultimately fails after a High Court challenge

August 2, 2011: States and territories sign up to a modified $20 billion health reform agreement, originally initiated by Rudd.

October 12, 2011: Carbon tax (Clean energy) bill passed in the lower house, and in November by the Senate, to commence July 1 2012.

November 21, 2011: Cigarette plain packaging laws passed in the senate.

November 23, 2011: Gillard secures the passage of a revised minerals resource rent tax (MRRT) through the lower house; the bill passes the Senate in March 2012.

January 21, 2012: Gillard loses the support of independent MP Andrew Wilkie following withdrawal of her commitment to anti-poker machine
February 15, 2012: Labor achieves support for means testing the 30 per cent private health insurance rebate.

February 23, 2012: Gillard announces a leadership ballot for February 27, after Rudd resigned from the front bench the previous day.

February 27, 2012: Gillard wins leadership ballot 71 to 31.

April, 2012: Parliamentary controversy over Labor’s Craig Thomson’s alleged misuse of union funds, and former Liberal Peter Slipper’s alleged misuse of parliamentary entitlements and sexual harassment. In spite of Gillard’s contentious support for both, Thomson later quits Labor to become an independent, and Slipper steps down as speaker pending investigations.

July 1, 2012: Carbon pricing and minerals resource rent tax commences.

August 17, 2012: Gillard government reinstates offshore processing of asylum seekers on Nauru and Manus Island, following the August 13 release of the Expert Panel’s report on asylum seeker policy.

September 3, 2012: Gillard promotes support for Gonski school funding reform and challenges states to provide the additional funding needed. Negotiations ongoing over many months.

October 10, 2012: Continuing controversy over Slipper leads to his resignation as speaker and to opposition leader Abbott accusing Gillard of hypocrisy. Gillard responds with her widely reported “misogyny speech” attacking Abbott’s sexism.

October 18, 2012: Australia achieves a seat on the UN Security Council.

November 12, 2012: Gillard announces royal commission into institutional responses to child sexual abuse.


February, 2013: Alliance with Greens ends following policy differences.

March 21, 2013: National Disability Insurance Scheme passes the senate after previously passing in the lower house on March 14. Gillard apologises to victims of forced adoption prevalent from the 1950s to 1970s. This apology is overshadowed by senior cabinet member Simon Crean calling for a leadership ballot to end leadership speculation. Gillard calls for a spill of all Labor leadership positions. Rudd refuses to stand and several labor figures, including Crean, resign or lose their parliamentary positions.

March, 2013: The government withdraws several elements of new media laws, failing to gain support for the reforms from crossbenchers.

April 5, 2013: Gillard leads most senior Australian political delegation to
visit China, promoting trade and economic interests and exchanging views with Chinese leadership on economic and security issues.

**April 14, 2013:** Gonski reforms to significantly increase school funding are announced, pending state’s agreement; universities to lose some funding to pay for reforms. Although no states initially sign on, ongoing negotiations see NSW, SA, ACT Vic and Tasmania supporting the reforms. The NT, WA and Queensland continue to withhold support.

**May 1, 2013:** A national disability care scheme is announced by Gillard announces with Coalition support.

**May 11, 2013:** National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) is announced, with all states and territories except WA signed on.

**May 14, 2013:** Following earlier news of significantly lower than expected tax revenue, the federal budget shows the mining tax is also significantly lower than predicted, and that cost of asylum seekers has increased by $3 billion.

**May 16, 2013:** Disability Care Australia scheme slated to begin July 1 after laws pass both houses of parliament.

**June, 2013:** Ongoing speculation about Gillard’s leadership and the fate of the Labor party at the election, with poor polling and public and contentious division within the labor party.

**June 26, 2013:** Gillard calls for new leadership ballot the same day. Rudd agrees to run and wins the ballot 57 to 45 votes, succeeding Gillard as leader of the party and as Prime Minister. Gillard announces she will not re-contest her seat at the next election.

On the same day, Gonski education reforms are passed in the parliament.

**August 4, 2013:** Rudd announces the federal election date for September 14.

**September 14, 2013:** Labor defeated in federal election, and Gillard concludes her parliamentary career.

Adapted from

http://tvnz.co.nz/world-news/timeline-julia-gillard-s-career-5477701
http://www.afr.com/p/national/timeline_julia_gillard_in_power_XzA4w4wr00weGDkvU8pbON
http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-03-21/gillard-leadership-timeline/4583700#timeline
http://www.theguardian.com/world/interactive/2013/jun/27/julia-gillard-career-timeline#undefined

All website sources last accessed 14 October, 2013
Appendix 4: Australian intra-party leadership changes and challenges since 1960

1966 Harold Holt succeeds Liberal Prime Minister Robert Menzies on his retirement in 1966.


1968 Gough Whitlam resigns as Labor leader, then narrowly defeats Jim Cairns in leadership ballot.


1971 Prime Minister John Gorton relinquishes leadership after a tied motion of confidence. William McMahon elected leader and becomes prime minister.

1972 William McMahon resigns. Billy Snedden wins leadership ballot against Malcolm Fraser and Andrew Peacock.

1974 Malcolm Fraser challenges Billy Snedden. Malcolm Fraser narrowly loses.

1975 Malcolm Fraser successfully challenges Billy Snedden for leadership of Liberal Party.

1976 Gough Whitlam defeats Lionel Bowen in Labor leadership ballot, after Labor’s election loss.

1977 Gough Whitlam wins mid-term leadership ballot against Bill Hayden.


1982 Andrew Peacock unsuccessfully challenges Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser.

1982 Bill Hayden wins leadership ballot against Bob Hawke.


1983 Malcolm Fraser resigns after election defeat. Andrew Peacock defeats John Howard for leadership of Liberal Party and Opposition.

1985 Andrew Peacock unsuccessfully seeks to remove Deputy John Howard. Andrew Peacock resigns and John Howard elected Leader of Liberal Party.

1990 Andrew Peacock resigns after election loss and John Hewson defeats Peter Reith for leadership of Liberal Party.

1991 Paul Keating challenges Prime Minister Bob Hawke in June. He loses and resigns as treasurer and deputy leader.


1994 John Hewson calls leadership ballot but loses to Alexander Downer.

1995 Alexander Downer resigns and John Howard elected unopposed as Liberal leader.

1996 Paul Keating resigns after election defeat and Kim Beazley elected unopposed as Labor leader.

2001 Kim Beasley resigns after election loss and Simon Crean elected unopposed as Labor leader.

2003 Simon Crean calls a leadership spill in June and wins against Kim Beasley.

2003Simon Crean resigns in November, Kim Beazley and Mark Latham contest the leadership. Mark Latham wins.


2006 Kevin Rudd challenges Kim Beazley. Kevin Rudd wins Labor leadership.

2007 Brendan Nelson and Malcolm Turnbull contest the Liberal Opposition leadership.

Brendan Nelson wins.


2009 Tony Abbott challenges Malcolm Turnbull and wins.

2010 Labor Deputy Leader Julia Gillard challenges Prime Minister Rudd. He chooses not to contest a ballot and steps down as Labor Party leader and prime minister on the morning of the ballot.


2013 Julia Gillard calls a leadership ballot amid leadership tensions and speculation. Kevin Rudd wins.

Albert Albanese and Bill Shorten

Appendix 5: Photographs from carbon tax rally, Canberra (March 2011).

**Figure 6: Ditch the Witch**


**Figure 7: Bob Brown’s Bitch**

Sourced from: http://www.afr.com/p/national/at_last_the_pm_puts_her_foot_down_OQWBHfs7Amueo9X0myLUfN
Appendix 6: Journalistic guidance relevant to media reporting of Julia Gillard.

Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance – Journalists’ Code of Ethics

"Journalists will educate themselves about ethics and apply the following standards: . . .

2. Do not place unnecessary emphasis on personal characteristics, including race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, family relationships, religious belief, or physical or intellectual disability.


News Limited Professional Code of Conduct

8. Discrimination

8.1 Do not make pejorative reference to a person’s race, nationality, colour, religion, marital status, sex, sexual preferences, age, or physical or mental capacity. No details of a person’s race, nationality, colour, religion, marital status, sex, sexual preferences, age, or physical or mental incapacity should be included in a report unless they are relevant.


The Age Code of Conduct

Personal Behavior (sic)

5. No one should be harassed or discriminated against on the grounds of gender, sexual preference, race, color, nationality, religious belief, impairment, age, height, weight, marital status, pregnancy or being childless or having children. The Age supports and adheres to state and Commonwealth equal opportunity and anti-discrimination legislation.

Journalists will educate themselves about ethics and apply the following standards: . . .

2. Do not place unnecessary emphasis on personal characteristics including race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, family relationships, religious belief or physical or intellectual disability.


2010 Commercial television Industry Code of Practice, (incorporating amendments to July 2013)

SECTION 4: NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS PROGRAMS

4.3 In broadcasting news and current affairs programs, licensees:

4.3.10 must not portray any person or group of persons in a negative light by placing gratuitous emphasis on age, colour, gender, national or ethnic origin, physical or mental disability, race, religion or sexual preference. Nevertheless, where it is in the public interest, licensees may report events and broadcast comments in which such matters are raised;
CODE OF PRACTICE 1:
PROGRAMS UNSUITABLE FOR BROADCAST

Purpose
The purpose of this Code is to prevent the broadcast of programs which are unsuitable having regard to prevailing community standards and attitudes.

Proscribed Matter
1.1 A licensee must not broadcast a program which in all of the circumstances:
(e) is likely to incite hatred against, or serious contempt for, or severe ridicule of, any person or group of persons because of age, ethnicity, nationality, race, gender, sexual preferences, religion, transgender status or disability. . . .

GUIDELINES AND EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE PORTRAYAL OF WOMEN ON COMMERCIAL RADIO

These guidelines are to assist in defining acceptable practice in the portrayal of women on commercial radio – these guidelines do not form part of the Codes.

Women represent over 50% of the Australian population and as such there should be fair and accurate portrayal in the media that recognises the significant and ongoing changes in women”s attitudes and their evolving role in society.

In recognition of this, members of Commercial Radio Australia are encouraged to use the following Guidelines to assist in understanding and meeting the objects of Code 1.1(e).

Guidelines
In the portrayal of women on commercial radio, broadcasters should avoid promoting or endorsing inaccurate, demeaning or discriminatory descriptions of women.

1. Do not place undue emphasis on gender and resisting stereotyping.
   • Sexist language is language that unnecessarily excludes one sex or gives unequal treatment to women and men.
   • Negative or inequitable sex-role portrayal refers to language, attitudes or representations which tend to associate particular roles, modes of behaviour, characteristics, attributes or products to people on the basis of gender, without taking them into consideration as individuals. . . .

2. Ensure that reporting and “on-air” discussions respect the dignity of women and are non-exploitative.
   • Avoid expressions that infer that a person is inferior because she is a woman, or that men have exclusivity, i.e. “that”s a man”s job” or “a woman wouldn”t understand that”, “it”s a man”s world” (the tone of voice can cause more offence than the actual remark).
   • Avoid the use of overt sexual references in relation to a woman”s physical characteristics which have no relevance to the issue under discussion.

3. Recognise the changing roles of women and men in society.

4. Endeavour to achieve a balance in the use of women and men as experts and authorities and giving equal prominence to the achievements of women.
5. Do not broadcast material which condones or incites violence against women.
6. Report and discuss appropriate incidences of violence against women in a way that does not over-emphasise detail, but does include analysis of issues underlying such acts.


Australian Broadcasting Corporation Code of Practice 2011.

From IV. Principles and standards, Part 7: Harm and Offence

Principles . . . The ABC acknowledges that a public broadcaster should never gratuitously harm or offend and accordingly any content which is likely to harm or offend must have a clear editorial purpose.

Standards . . . 7.7 Avoid the unjustified use of stereotypes or discriminatory content that could reasonably be interpreted as condoning or encouraging prejudice.


Guide on naming conventions from ABC Radio National

Public figures: use both given and family names (Barack Obama, Paris Hilton, Osama bin Laden, Ai Weiwei, Vincent van Gogh) at first mention, then either both names or family name only (Obama, Hilton, bin Laden, Ai, van Gogh). Never use only given names as this will undermine the all-important tone and integrity of your writing.

(Downloaded from http://style.radionational.net.au/tags/names, last accessed 14 October 2013)
Appendix 7: Transcript of Julia Gillard’s Speech to the House of Representatives, 9 October 2012: The Misogyny Speech.

Thank you very much Deputy Speaker and I rise to oppose the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. And in so doing I say to the Leader of the Opposition I will not be lectured about sexism and misogyny by this man. I will not. And the Government will not be lectured about sexism and misogyny by this man. Not now, not ever.

The Leader of the Opposition says that people who hold sexist views and who are misogynists are not appropriate for high office. Well I hope the Leader of the Opposition has got a piece of paper and he is writing out his resignation. Because if he wants to know what misogyny looks like in modern Australia, he doesn’t need a motion in the House of Representatives, he needs a mirror. That’s what he needs.

Let’s go through the Opposition Leader’s repulsive double standards, repulsive double standards when it comes to misogyny and sexism. We are now supposed to take seriously that the Leader of the Opposition is offended by Mr Slipper’s text messages, when this is the Leader of the Opposition who has said, and this was when he was a minister under the last government – not when he was a student, not when he was in high school – when he was a minister under the last government.

He has said, and I quote, in a discussion about women being under-represented in institutions of power in Australia, the interviewer was a man called Stavros. The Leader of the Opposition says “If it’s true, Stavros, that men have more power generally speaking than women, is that a bad thing?”

And then a discussion ensues, and another person says “I want my daughter to have as much opportunity as my son.” To which the Leader of the Opposition says “Yeah, I completely agree, but what if men are by physiology or temperament, more adapted to exercise authority or to issue command?”

Then ensues another discussion about women’s role in modern society, and the other person participating in the discussion says “I think it’s very hard to deny that there is an underrepresentation of women,” to which the Leader of the Opposition says, “But now, there’s an assumption that this is a bad thing.”

This is the man from whom we’re supposed to take lectures about sexism. And then of course it goes on. I was very offended personally when the Leader of the Opposition, as Minister of Health, said, and I quote, “Abortion is the easy way out.” I was very personally offended by those comments. You said that in March 2004, I suggest you check the records.

I was also very offended on behalf of the women of Australia when in the course of this carbon pricing campaign, the Leader of the Opposition said “What the housewives of Australia need to understand as they do the ironing...” Thank you for that painting of women’s roles in modern Australia.

And then of course, I was offended too by the sexism, by the misogyny of the Leader of the Opposition catcalling across this table at me as I sit here as Prime Minister, “If the Prime Minister wants to, politically speaking, make an honest woman of herself...”, something that would never have been said to any man sitting in this chair. I was offended when the Leader of the Opposition went outside in the front of Parliament and stood next to a sign that said “Ditch the witch.”
I was offended when the Leader of the Opposition stood next to a sign that described me as a man’s bitch. I was offended by those things. Misogyny, sexism, every day from this Leader of the Opposition. Every day in every way, across the time the Leader of the Opposition has sat in that chair and I’ve sat in this chair, that is all we have heard from him.

And now, the Leader of the Opposition wants to be taken seriously, apparently he’s woken up after this track record and all of these statements, and he’s woken up and he’s gone "Oh dear, there’s this thing called sexism, oh my lords, there’s this thing called misogyny. Now who’s one of them? Oh, the Speaker must be because that suits my political purpose.”

 Doesn’t turn a hair about any of his past statements, doesn’t walk into this Parliament and apologise to the women of Australia. Doesn’t walk into this Parliament and apologise to me for the things that have come out of his mouth. But now seeks to use this as a battering ram against someone else.

Well this kind of hypocrisy must not be tolerated, which is why this motion from the Leader of the Opposition should not be taken seriously.

And then second, the Leader of the Opposition is always wonderful about walking into this Parliament and giving me and others a lecture about what they should take responsibility for.

Always wonderful about that – everything that I should take responsibility for, now apparently including the text messages of the Member for Fisher. Always keen to say how others should assume responsibility, particularly me.

Well can anybody remind me if the Leader of the Opposition has taken any responsibility for the conduct of the Sydney Young Liberals and the attendance at this event of members of his frontbench?

Has he taken any responsibility for the conduct of members of his political party and members of his frontbench who apparently when the most vile things were being said about my family, raised no voice of objection? Nobody walked out of the room; no-one walked up to Mr Jones and said that this was not acceptable.

Instead of course, it was all viewed as good fun until it was run in a Sunday newspaper and then the Leader of the Opposition and others started ducking for cover.

Big on lectures of responsibility, very light on accepting responsibility himself for the vile conduct of members of his political party.

Third, Deputy Speaker, why the Leader of the Opposition should not be taken seriously on this motion.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have come into this place and have talked about the Member for Fisher. Well, let me remind the Opposition and the Leader of the opposition party about their track record and association with the Member for Fisher.

I remind them that the National Party preselected the Member for Fisher for the 1984 election, that the National Party preselected the Member for Fisher for the 1987 election, that the Liberals preselected Mr Slipper for the 1993 election, then the 1996 election, then the 1998 election, then for the 2001 election, then for the 2004 election, then for the 2007 election and then for the 2010 election.
And across these elections, Mr Slipper enjoyed the personal support of the Leader of the Opposition. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that on 28 September 2010, following the last election campaign, when Mr Slipper was elected as Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition at that stage said this, and I quote.

He referred to the Member for Maranoa, who was also elected to a position at the same time, and then went on as follows: “And the Member for Fisher will serve as a fine complement to the Member for Scullin in the chair. I believe that the Parliament will be well-served by the team which will occupy the chair in this chamber. I congratulate the Member for Fisher, who has been a friend of mine for a very long time, who has served this Parliament in many capacities with distinction.”

The words of the Leader of the Opposition on record, about his personal friendship with Mr [Slipper], and on record about his view about Mr Slipper’s qualities and attributes to be the Speaker.

No walking away from those words, they were the statement of the Leader of the Opposition then. I remind the Leader of the Opposition, who now comes in here and speaks about apparently his inability to work with or talk to Mr Slipper. I remind the Leader of the Opposition he attended Mr Slipper’s wedding.

Did he walk up to Mr Slipper in the middle of the service and say he was disgusted to be there? Was that the attitude he took? No, he attended that wedding as a friend.

The Leader of the Opposition keen to lecture others about what they ought to know or did know about Mr Slipper. Well with respect, I’d say to the Leader of the Opposition after a long personal association including attending Mr Slipper’s wedding, it would be interesting to know whether the Leader of the Opposition was surprised by these text messages.

He’s certainly in a position to speak more intimately about Mr Slipper than I am, and many other people in this Parliament, given this long personal association.

Then of course the Leader of the Opposition comes into this place and says, and I quote, “Every day the Prime Minister stands in this Parliament to defend this Speaker will be another day of shame for this Parliament, another day of shame for a government which should already have died of shame.”

Well can I indicate to the Leader of the Opposition the Government is not dying of shame, my father did not die of shame, what the Leader of the Opposition should be ashamed of is his performance in this Parliament and the sexism he brings with it. Now about the text messages that are on the public record or reported in the – that’s a direct quote from the Leader of the Opposition so I suggest those groaning have a word with him.

On the conduct of Mr Slipper, and on the text messages that are in the public domain, I have seen the press reports of those text messages. I am offended by their content. I am offended by their content because I am always offended by sexism. I am offended by their content because I am always offended by statements that are anti-women.

I am offended by those things in the same way that I have been offended by things that the Leader of the Opposition has said, and no doubt will continue to say in the future. Because if this today was an exhibition of his new feminine side, well I don’t think we’ve got much to look forward to in terms of changed conduct.
I am offended by those text messages. But I also believe, in terms of this Parliament making a decision about the speakership, that this Parliament should recognise that there is a court case in progress. That the judge has reserved his decision, that having waited for a number of months for the legal matters surrounding Mr Slipper to come to a conclusion, that this Parliament should see that conclusion.

I believe that is the appropriate path forward, and that people will then have an opportunity to make up their minds with the fullest information available to them.

But whenever people make up their minds about those questions, what I won’t stand for, what I will never stand for is the Leader of the Opposition coming into this place and peddling a double standard. Peddling a standard for Mr Slipper he would not set for himself. Peddling a standard for Mr Slipper he has not set for other members of his frontbench.

Peddling a standard for Mr Slipper that has not been acquitted by the people who have been sent out to say the vilest and most revolting things like his former Shadow Parliamentary Secretary Senator Bernardi.

I will not ever see the Leader of the Opposition seek to impose his double standard on this Parliament. Sexism should always be unacceptable. We should conduct ourselves as it should always be unacceptable. The Leader of the Opposition says do something; well he could do something himself if he wants to deal with sexism in this Parliament.

He could change his behaviour, he could apologise for all his past statements, he could apologise for standing next to signs describing me as a witch and a bitch, terminology that is now objected to by the frontbench of the Opposition.

He could change a standard himself if he sought to do so. But we will see none of that from the Leader of the Opposition because on these questions he is incapable of change. Capable of double standards, but incapable of change. His double standards should not rule this Parliament.

Good sense, common sense, proper process is what should rule this Parliament. That’s what I believe is the path forward for this Parliament, not the kind of double standards and political game-playing imposed by the Leader of the Opposition now looking at his watch because apparently a woman’s spoken too long.

I’ve had him yell at me to shut up in the past, but I will take the remaining seconds of my speaking time to say to the Leader of the Opposition I think the best course for him is to reflect on the standards he’s exhibited in public life, on the responsibility he should take for his public statements; on his close personal connection with Peter Slipper, on the hypocrisy he has displayed in this House today.

And on that basis, because of the Leader of the Opposition’s motivations, this Parliament today should reject this motion and the Leader of the Opposition should think seriously about the role of women in public life and in Australian society because we are entitled to a better standard than this.
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