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Chrysalis, like The New Woman's Survival Catalogue and The New Woman's Survival Sourcebook from which it grew, takes its form and content from the women's movement itself. Feminism is not a monolithic movement, but rather includes the experiences, values, priorities, agendas of women of all lifestyles, ages, and cultural and economic backgrounds. Women building political alternatives to patriarchal institutions, women developing new theories and feminist perspectives on events and ideas, women exploring their visions in verbal or visual art forms. Women's culture includes all of this and Chrysalis exists to give expression to the spectrum of opinion and creativity that originates in this diversity.

In its content, Chrysalis aims to combine the practical with the analytical, the theoretical, visionary. A resource catalog in each issue will inform readers of practical alternatives. At the same time, we will present articles that challenge conventional assumptions by examining an aspect of feminism from a feminist perspective. The essays here reflect our title: a journey through the landscape of our understanding of feminism.

Coordinating editors: Elizabeth Peabody, Noreen N. Mulligan, Susan Griffin’s book Woman and Nature, the poetry of Audre Lorde, Rose Mary Manning.デザイン: Antagonist’s Design, and Mary Jane Davidson. Outside our own interaction with mainstream feminism, we have included material that relates to our mission to educate, inform, to inspire our readers.

Those of us who organize Chrysalis believe that to reflect the movement we must run a broad spectrum of material. Sex, women, sexism, race, gender, desire, family, violence, politics, and creation from all parts of the world and cultural, ideological, and intellectual world are woven into the fabric of Chrysalis, and the women and men who contribute. We are committed to the vision of Chrysalis, to the vision of the women and men who contribute. We are committed to the vision of Chrysalis, to the vision of the women and men who contribute.

We welcome your reactions and response to this and all issues of Chrysalis.
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“Did I ever have a chance?”
Patriarchal judgment of Patricia Hearst

I am not arguing that woman is evil and anti-moral; I state that she cannot be really evil; she is merely non-moral.

—Otto Weininger
Who is the real Patricia Hearst/ Patty/Tan? The story of her six jurors said, the woman who was programmed by her attorneys? Is she the girl who would say anything just to save her life? Is she, as her attorneys continually said, suffering from post-traumatic stress? Is she, as her mother believes, a victim who was looking down the barrel of a gun? Is she a violent outlaw or a kidnapped heiress? Liar or loving daughter? Converted revolutionary or turncoat? Frightened, fragile lover of Sollah or former tentative fiancée of Weed? A kid out for adventure? Common criminal?

In Patricia Hearst any one of these, or some, or all? Has her true identity been revealed through her trial or through her testimony, by the USA or the SLA? Can we trust to tell us who she is or where her loyalties lie?

Female slaves

Through all the confusion and continuing controversy surrounding the saga of Patricia Hearst, there has been no attempt to look at her simply as a woman - a woman caught in the violence of patriarchy against women. The closest parallel in women's experience is probably that of female (sea) slaves, women who are abducted and sold into brothels where they are forced to stay as prostitutes. Formerly known as white slavery, this practice is still prevalent today. It is said by some that female ("white") slavery is a better forgotten, unpleasant element of the 19th century. On the contrary, incredible as it may seem, there still flourishes a national and international slave trade in women. Female slavery has several different patterns, the most common involving the abduction of women by men who will sell them into brothels after they have been "seasoned." The woman's will must be broken before she can be sold into prostitution. Initially, as a frightened kidnap victim, she is not useful as a prostitute. By breaking her will, her abductors make her completely dependent on them. Isolation, beatings, starvation, drugs, rape . . . After only a few days of continuing brutality, the woman is thankful for a drink of water or a meal. Her relationship with her abductors becomes one in which she eventually feels grateful for not being beaten or for some apparent small kindness. When she is raped, she is just thankful it wasn't murder. She is still alive.

Meanwhile, "seasoning," the woman becomes totally dependent on her captors. She learns through it that she must please them if she wants to avoid the "seasoning." And at the same time the men deliberately keep her confused about their expectations of her so that she will try harder to please them. In this way, she learns to become what her captors expect her to be. She learns to be a survivor in a situation she never expected to encounter. Her attempts to adapt to the expectations of her captors are the only ways available to her to handle her captivity. At first she may attempt to act, or "go through the motions," in meeting her captors' demands, but she is never quite sure whether she is pleasing them, and so she must convince herself as she continues to "try harder." By the time she is forced to prostitute herself, she is trapped in an overwhelming dependency wrought out of her attempts to survive.

If the woman is going through this, she knows that there is no turning back. She has prostituted herself. She can no longer think of escaping back to a life where that behavior - that level of need and dependency - either doesn't exist or is carefully covered. She is sold into prostitution and doesn't try to escape. Could her husband, boy-friend, mother, or even the police possibly believe she wasn't just another streetwalker? The sense of judgments being made upon her from the outside completely cuts her off from the possibility of return, if she could escape. There is no turning back. While she may have thought initially that she was being brutalized by her abductors, she now sees them as the ones who are keeping her alive. In that way, she becomes a slave.

It is not difficult then to understand why, after being placed in the Hibernia Bank robbery, Patricia Hearst could not return even if she could have escaped. She was indeed living in fear of the FBI as well as the SLA: but fear was not enough. And at the same time the bank job especially for women. And as the months passed and her fear of the SLA began to wane, the dependency would not. Only slowly, with increasing freedom from her captors, could she try to reconstruct her life in the best way she knew. While she was enslaved by the SLA she was not only a victim, but also a prostitute. Her captors' demands were rape, a beating, or a burglary and expect the complaint to be processed. Regardless of her circumstances, class, or social standing, a woman defending her life against patriarchy is not to be believed, especially without legitimized male corruption.

When it was of negligible consideration in the trial of Patricia Hearst, her report of her kidnap-ping by the SLA was the only thing that all parties - defense, prosecution, judge, jury - accepted. Even though he didn't appear in the courtroom or testify at the trial, Steven Weed had many times publicly declared himself the man if his then-fiancée, Patricia. In this one instance, his word had been legitimately corroborated, and formal testimony wasn't necessary to prove his version of her life as a kidnapper, victim, and as a fugitive - we have only her word, her testimony. Her life continues to hang on the worth of her word.

Patricia Hearst's life as an actress, a kidnap victim, as an alleged revolutionary, as a prisoner of the State, has set her apart from other women. That is a rare combination of roles for anyone. But while the description of her life appears to make her separate, special, and isolated, her treatment by the patriarchy has been, in fact, not different from that which any other woman experiences from patriarchy. Neither Patricia Hearst's word, nor that of the welfare mother, nor that of the prostitute can be accepted or believed without male corroboration in patriarchy, especially when it is being used to stereotype women - life or well-being. Various states require corroboration of a rape victim's testimony in order to prosecute rapists; midnight visits by teams of certified social workers to the homes of welfare mothers have been the method for determining whether the woman has a man living with her or not; and of course a caprice's story can be overturned by a rape, a beating, or a burglary and expect the complaint to be processed. Regardless of her circumstances, class, or social standing, a woman defending her life against patriarchy is not to be believed, especially without legitimized male corruption.
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After 57 days she was allowed to leave the closet, two days later, Patricia reports, her hair was cut by Nancy Ling Perry down to one inch all over her head. Prior to leaving the closet, she was probably allowed out occasionally for some exercise and political discussion. During these discussions she realized that the SLA knew more about her family's wealth than she did. She was endlessly interrogated with questions she could not answer and demands for information she did not have. This tactic kept her in the untenable position of trying to meet her captors' impossible expectations of her while increasing her sense of futility and helplessness and engendering guilt for the wealth and practices of the Hearst empire.

Certainly Patricia Hearst would succumb to the fear which we as women too easily share when we were seized in our kitchens and dragged from the Berkeley apartment in February of 1974. And she would, as the minutes and hours and days passed, sink more deeply into that fear.

Males are socialized to fight against fear, not yield to its force. Females, on the other hand, learn at an early age to accept their fear. In a society that cultivates weakness in women, they frequently submit to their fears and then randomly—without design—try to fight their way out, usually becoming dependent on someone else to help neutralize the source of the fear.

But unlike most victims, Patricia did not have the opportunity to try one thing or another to alleviate her fear, to save herself. Fear usually tends to narrow options, but Patricia's options had not narrowed—she had no options. She could neither act on her fear nor be restrained by it. She could only internalize it. It affected her health, and it must have dominated her emotions. But through it all, despite the overwhelming impact her fear must have had on her, it did not destroy her will or her efforts to survive.

Lying
Did Patricia Hearst tell the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help her god? It is argued that she lied to save her life; it is not argued that she told the truth to save her life; it is not argued that her attorneys gave her a story to fit their strategy; it is not argued that her defense attorneys developed a defense strategy based on her story. It was, after all, known that Patricia Hearst stated in inflammatory rhetoric that she chose to stay with the SLA. Photographs placed her in the Hibernia Bank robbery. She admitted firing a gun to cover the Harries' Mel's Sporting Goods Store in Los Angeles. Could she be telling the truth when she described these actions in terms of her own survival? Would not her attorneys recommend the opposite? It is the duty of the State to prosecute anyone engaged in criminal activity. But what about her lawyers? The defense strategy concocted by F. Lee Bailey was a clear statement to Patricia and to the world of her lack of confidence in his client's guilt. Would he have portrayed her as a neurotic, mindless, brainwashed victim if he didn't believe she was guilty as charged? He not only created a description of her that would remove her from any responsibility for her actions, but he provided a platform for legitimating his picture of her by the experts. While Patricia was simply a witness in her defense, one psychiatrist after another exerted his expertise on her, attempting to assert or destroy, through that expertise, the credibility of her word.

In deliberations we felt she had been in the closet only two weeks." (Emphasis added.)

Each of the jurors I interviewed described Patricia as listless, empty, pale. In awaiting her answers to questions put to her by attorneys about the brutality she experienced from the SLA, the jury expected to hear emotional outbursts. But, as one juror said of her testimony on rape, "She described it so calmly and didn't have any emotion in her voice." This led another juror to assert that she had simply been programmed by her attorneys.

"She fit exactly what she was portrayed to be—selfless, helpless, defenseless creature." And so, it was reasoned, Patricia was lying through her body as well as through her words. Her clothes, her tone of voice, her complexion, her sad eyes all meant— to the jury and to the vigilant public that followed this trial—something other than what they were. In a society that requires women to lie through their bodies with makeup, wigs, bras, girdles, and other affects, it is assumed that members of the group that had taken responsibility for the brutal murder of Marcus Foster, Patricia Hearst's words paled in contrast to the intensity this juror attributed to her captors. Neither did the jury believe that she was raped. Another man on the jury stated he had only been one way or another, "It was only her word." Another juror, discussing Patricia's confinement in the closet, asserted, "We (the jury) didn't think she had been in the closet that long..."

In deliberations we felt she had been in the closet only two weeks. That credited Patricia's word—a voice that was not officially heard in the deliberations—was that of Mary Neiman, an alternate juror. She would have held out for acquittal even if it had meant a hung jury. Agreeing that Patricia was listless in the courtroom, Mary saw this as a result of her experiences and an indication of her truthfulness. "She could have made herself look better if she were lying." Dramatics would have impressed the other jurors, while to Mary dramatic staging would have been more questionable. For example, when asked why she wrote on the wall of one apartment in Spanish and signed her name "Tania," she said only that everybody else did it and they expected her to do it too, so she did. She offered no dramatic stories of great force exerted on her. This was sufficient for Mary Neiman, but the excluded jurors needed to see violent force governing all her actions.

Probably the pivotal question on which the credibility of Patricia's word rested was her willingness to join the SLA. On April 3, 1974, in a communiqué from the SLA, Patricia's voice pronounced:

I have been given a choice of one, being released in a safe area or, two, joining the forces of the Sym- bionese Liberation Army and fighting for my freedom and the freedom of all oppressed people. I have chosen to stay and fight.

On February 9, 1976, she provided in open court a description of the events that would remove her from any responsibility for her actions, but he provided a platform for legitimating his picture of her by the experts. While Patricia was simply a witness in her defense, one psychiatrist after another exerted his expertise on her, attempting to assert or destroy, through that expertise, the credibility of her word. According to this strategy, she did not have the opportunity to tell the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help her god.
her captors asked of her. The SLA advocated revolution by murder and had already implemented that strategy once. Her decision was not to join the SLA, her decision was to stay alive. And it was for that decision that she was convicted.

Patricia Hearst, after being locked in a closet for 57 days, simply interpreted what was presented to her on the basis of previous information and acted on what she interpreted. But even though she engaged herself in this basic human interaction, she was expected—if she wanted to be considered innocent—to have gone against her perceptions and intuition and risked her life for freedom from the SLA. She didn't, and since then she has been publicly and privately condemned as being just a bored rich kid out for cheap thrills with revolutionaries.

To vindicate herself, Patricia was expected to fight to her death or at least to be able to walk away from her captors and into the hands of the FBI—even witnessing on television the massacre in Los Angeles. She was expected to be able to extricate herself from her fear for her life at the hands of either her captors or the FBI, and to undo the dependency that had been cultivated in her as a condition by her captors. To vindicate herself to the SLA, to the American Left, and to the other self-proclaimed revolutionary movements, she was expected to expose to the death (her death) the cause of violent revolution through assassination. Had she refused to testify in her own behalf, she could have secured the support of the "revolution." Considering all this, as a woman, I am forced to ask myself what it means to have to be dead to prove yourself honorable in patriotism.

Rape was one of the brutalities Patricia Hearst suffered while a captive of the SLA. But on another level rape is the metaphor for her whole experience. Consider the woman held to the ground by the massive weight of a male body with a knife held to her throat. At that moment, her only thought is to survive this violence. Because of the knife she knows that the likelihood of her survival diminishes if she resists. She does not resist; she does what is expected of her and leaves with bruises and torn clothing, having been forcibly penetrated, but still with her life. She reports the rape to the police and the psychological torture continues. Rapes are rarely witnessed. Therefore, when it comes to trial, the victim's word is usually the major evidence for the prosecution. And one quickly realizes from one rape trial to the next that in patriarchy a woman's word is hardly heard and that it is her loyalty to patriarchy that is being evaluated. And so the woman's character is assaulted. The ruthless, uninhibited attempts to destroy a rape victim's character is in that parallel directly the portrayal of Patricia Hearst as being without moral integrity in her fight for her life. The defense attorney joins in the rape victim, just as the prosecution and the public hurled at Patricia Hearst, "You can't have it both ways!" In a rape case, the woman's husband may consider, as many men have, that he cannot forgive or accept this infidelity, forced though it may have been. The rapist in court is accused that the woman thought of it as anything other than a sexual encounter into which she had lured him. And the judge will traditionally tell the jury that the testimony of the victim should be taken with more caution than that of other witnesses. I am suggesting that rape was, and continues to be, the experience of Patricia Hearst. It matters not at whose hand the abuse has been suffered who is defendant and who is victim. Patricia Hearst has been raped by the SLA, the American Left, the U.S. Courts, the defense, and the jury. And each in turn has expected her loyalty and condemned her when she has changed it—to save her life.

Loyalty

From the moment Patricia Hearst's abduction became a national event, demonstrations of her loyalty were sought from each part of the patriarchal spectrum. She was, for the American Left, first a converted revolutionary and then a turncoat, a traitor. She was, for the U.S. Government, first a victimized hostage and then a common criminal—disloyal to her family, the law, and the American Way of Life.

But what, after all, is loyalty—that quality which has been so sorely tested and judged and found wanting in Patricia Hearst by all sides? Loyalty is first a dedication, a faithfulness, an allegiance to something—to one's country, to one's employer, to one's family. One is loyal to that which is in one's best interest, which is consonant with one's values. Loyalty is asked of those to whom certain rewards and privileges are given. In return, one adheres to a particular system of values and beliefs which determine the act of the loyalty as well as define the practice of it. Patriotism is loyalty to the fatherland for the rights and privileges it guarantees its citizens. On the other hand, measures of political correctness are used to determine loyalty to male ideology and politics which are in opposition to the fatherland.

Above all, loyalty is patriarchal—it is the granting and protecting of rights and privileges to men, by men. It means allegiance to a medical establishment that has maimed and mutilated women in hysterectomies, mastectomies, and estrogen therapies. It means allegiance to a militaristic culture that asks the woman jurist not to convict young male rapists, thereby damaging their chances for a prosperous future. It means allegiance to a patriarchal system which raises that experience onto a pedestal and knocks it to the ground when there is no male present to validate it. It stems directly from the linear thinking which always only allows for two opposite sides. It assumes that loyalty to one patriarchal system means disloyalty to another. In linear thought, the world is ordered in dichotomies where there are only two sides to everything. It was immediately assumed (except by her parents) that when Patricia announced "I've chosen to stay and fight," she had shifted her loyalties to the other side. Everyone assumed she meant what she said on that tape, for there is no room in linear thinking for any other options or possibilities. Some believed she meant it and it had become a revolutionary, while others believed she meant it, but was brainwashed, and so had no responsibility for it. Her mother, Catherine, alone believed that perhaps in addition to the brainwashing her daughter was just trying to survive: "She was looking down the barrel of a gun." But to the patriarchal parties in control of this scenario, she was either Tania, the revolutionary, or Patricia Campbell Hearst, alias Tania, common criminal.

The SLA had captured the attention of America by kidnapping this young heiress. Now, in order to continue to capitalize on her, they had to raise her from the status of a kidnap victim. As Tania, she would be a symbol of revolution. And as a symbol she would no longer be thought of as Patricia Hearst, a young woman. Symbols provide a way of removing attention from that from which the symbols are derived. As quickly as Patricia became a symbol to the Left for the revolutionary cause, her symbolic value increased immeasurably for the Right, who pursued her now as a political criminal. It should not be paralleled that, according to her own words, Patricia was not responsible for her elevation to this level. She chose to stay with the SLA out of fear of being murdered. Of course one real coup for the SLA was the sympathy they received from a heretofore disapproving Left for having raised the consciousness of a woman of privilege, a member of the bourgeoisie, to the plight of the oppressed. Not only did they succeed in punishing Randolph Hearst personally and economically by the kidnapping of his daughter, but they embittered him for all the Left to see by having his daughter denounce him and the family as the pig Hearsts.

Because of the double standards afforded to the brotherhood, no one thought it strangely inconsistent that it was this group that had committed the racist murder of
Marcus Foster and the misogynist kidnaping of Patricia Hearst. What matters is that they got her to identify on tape with the plight of the oppressed. It didn’t matter that their moral values were not consistent with their political rhetoric. And, interestingly, no one ever asked, “What is this for Patty?” But for those who were confused by the absence of this question, the answer came back from the American audience: “Just a rich kid out for adventure.”

Through it all, the SLA has been exempt from scrutiny of the vast disparities between their idealistic political rhetoric and their ruthless, vengeful actions. Most often they have been considered well-intentioned but a little misguided. They have not been expected to account either for their violence or for their lack of loyalty to any principles. In contrast, the most absolute standards of loyalty have been demanded of Patricia—even though there was nothing in it for her. When she was arrested, she was expected to continue to support people, actions, and symbols that meant nothing to her. Her refusal to do so, her continued attempts to save her life, allowed the SLA remnants, along with liberals and radicals, to condemn her as morally bankrupt.

On Feminism

Feminism at least echoes of it, permeated the leftist rhetoric of the SLA. Shortly after Patricia was kidnaped and before it became clear who the members of the SLA were, theories were pronounced by reporters and investigators that the SLA was a feminist revolutionary organization. Having acquired some of the papers left in the house burned by Nancy Ling Perry, Hartney (then a reporter for San Francisco’s KQED) asserted that “women are the dominant force, the leadership of the Symbionese Liberation Army.”[Ref. 2, p. 57.] She supported this assertion with references to the papers from the SLA house: “The only major editorial correction that appeared in them, again and again, was the reversal of the order of man and woman, and men and women every time they were typed.”[Ref. 2, p. 57.]

This theory, being promoted by news reporters, investigators, and the FBI, fed directly into the image that the SLA was trying to exploit. The most visible, viable, and active social movement of the 1970’s has been the Women’s Movement. An image of solidarity with feminism could allow the SLA to get media attention based on the energy that the Women’s Movement had created.

But the “feminist” rhetoric of the SLA was far removed from their political practices. And it is that discrepancy which must be challenged by feminists, for in that discrepancy are reflected some of the most misogynist practices of patriarchy. Feminists must scrutinize the contradictions between the SLA’s rhetoric and their political actions—a scrutiny from which they have been protected by the male Left. For example, while SLA women were claiming to go beyond the traditional male role of passivity, they were adopting the traditional male role of violence in the male model of militancy. Patricia Hearst’s testimony revealed the large extent to which the SLA women were doing the bidding of their male leaders. And Emily Harris states:

We get ourselves into such a heavy military state of mind that we lost control of our conditions . . . It was safe for the men to think of

On the female virtues to which she had been so carefully socialized. She had openly rejected wealth, her family, her finance, and the protection of the FBI. There were few female roles that tradition urged us to play that Patricia didn’t challenge as “Tania.”

What was assumed to be her ungratefulness and her defiance angered the public and enraged the establishment. The Attorney General denounced her as a common criminal. For two years she was hunted down with a vengeance that was carried into the courts, where the final stage was set in making an example of a woman who goes so far in rejection of what patriarchy has offered her. During that time there were no assumptions that she was just trying to survive. It is hard to imagine that degree of wrath or that level of insensitivity toward a male heir who tried as he might to survive a kidnapping: one presumes that he would be given the benefit of the doubt.

It was not just because Patricia defied sex roles that this wrath was brought down on her; it was the further implications of her role rejection. In a patriarchy set up to protect and thereby confine women, Patricia Hearst had turned her back on rather elaborate offers of protection—her father’s wealth and the FBI’s support (even though accepting could have meant her death). Try as they might, Emily Harris, Camilla Hall, Patricia Soltysik, Angela Atwood, or Nancy Ling Perry could never have rejected so much, for they had not so much patriarchal love, support, and protection offered to them. As a child of wealth, Patricia had inherited to total the Great American Dream for womanhood. The other women were only on the fringes of such a patrimony. But Patricia could have had it all. It was her rejection of this inheritance, her defiance against the offerings of patriarchal protection, which brought down the wrath of the FBI in the form of an anti-feminist backlash. And the backlash was directed against Patricia, who was not at that time intentionally a feminist, through her involuntary involvement with the SLA—a group that, ironically, had no genuine commitment to feminism.

The judgment of Patricia

As the first trial of Patricia Hearst came to a close, the parallel between her experiences and those of the female slave became pronounced. Not only had she undergone a violent and brutal abduction and “taunting,” but as she was “turned out” as an SLA revolutionary, she was—and continues to be—condemned by the Government, the courts, and the press. Even the courts have proven again that there is no room in it for a woman who, as a victim, tries to survive. It was tragically ironic to see Patricia Hearst brought from her jail, chained and cuffed by the U.S. Government, at the same time that the SLA fringes and the New World Liberation Front were threatening her life and home and property to punctuate the seriousness of their threats. It was even worse to hear that Federal marshals, in attempting to remove her (without her doctor’s permission) from the hospital near Marin to Los Angeles, threatened to wrap her in a sheet and drag her out over the objections of her lawyers. This not only recalled her original abduction two and a half years earlier—it was a threat to reenact it.

Because the Court had effectively dismissed Patricia’s word—counting it as worthless—the judge was able to sentence her to a full seven years, noting that her conduct could not be condoned, that a lesson must be made of her to serve as a deterrent to others. As the SLA’s vengeance against women shades and blends into the USA’s, we find that the lesson to be learned—from Clinks to Judge Orrick—is that a woman who tries to survive may’s violence against her will pay the full price of patriarchal wrath. Recognizing this at the time of her conviction, Patricia Hearst said simply, “Did I ever have a chance?”
A new round of accusations and judgments testify to the strength of the symbol Patricia Hearst has become of the unfair privileges and abuses of the corporate upper class. As before, when her symbolic value heightens, her victimization is obscured. Across the political spectrum, those who resent wealth and feel anger at corporate abuses can vent their resentment and anger on Patricia Hearst. This process is developing into a national phenomenon of vicious and symbolic assault on Randolph Hearst and the Hearst Corporation. The political impotence of those who would challenge Hearst is pathetically focused on his daughter, leaving his corporate practices virtually unchallenged.

There is nothing new in politicians “getting off” on attacking women as a substitute for attacking men and male institutions. Susan Brownmiller, in her book Against Our Will, eloquently discusses the rape of black women by white men as a way of acting out racist hostility against black men. And she describes black men’s retaliation, with the rape of white women substituting for violence against the white male oppressor. In rape, as in the kidnapping and enslavement of Patricia Hearst, we find the ultimate statement of woman as male property.

But after all, Patricia Hearst has demonstrated a vigorous and admirable will to survive. She survived beatings, rape, and incarceration by the SLA as well as by the State. She survived for more than two years without knowing whether the “people you’re with (are) going to kill you because you outlived your usefulness to them.” Through all her struggles to survive, her family’s wealth has worked against her.

And now, as a survivor, she has been returned to the many privileges of wealth and the love and protection of her parents. (Ideally we would like to see women survive without dependency and paternalistic protection, but women have not yet gained that kind of power and self-sufficiency.) For the first time in three years Patricia Hearst is in the daily company of people who love her.

Finally, my hope for Patricia Hearst’s ultimate survival was significantly strengthened by her statement that those killed in the Los Angeles shootout “got exactly what they deserved.” While I personally would prefer to have seen those people captured and in some way made answerable for their crimes, I applaud the ability of any kidnap/rape victim to express truly justified anger and hatred for her captors and rapists. This is where women begin in ending violence against themselves.
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Redesigning the Domestic Workplace

Dolores Hayden

1. Domestic work in a communal family: Oneida Perfectionists' dining room, 1870. (From Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly Newspaper, April 9, 1870.)
By what art, what charm, what miracle, has the twentieth century preserved the prehistoric sparrow?
—Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 1903

I'm not your little woman
Your sweetheart or your dear,
I'm a wage slave without wages,
I'm a maintenance engineer!

The private home
A rosy glow suffuses the portrayal of domestic life in much American and European visionary architecture of the past century. Economic and technological developments have subjected offices, factories, and transportation systems to cycles of design and redesign while the plans of dwelling units have remained much the same. Whether the private home is a freestanding house in Frank Lloyd Wright's Broadacre City or a high tower flat in Le Corbusier's Radiant City, domestic work has been treated as a private, sex-stereotyped activity, and most architects continue to design domestic workspaces for isolated female workers. Political revolutions have not shaken the home either. In most socialist countries housekeeping remains private, "women's" work. Although extensive child care facilities allow women workers to extend their hours in the factory, nothing has changed their jobs at home.

The feminist economist Charlotte Perkins Gilman satirized the home in a short poem:

Oh! the Home is utterly perfect!
And all its works within.
To say a word about it—
To criticise or doubt it—
To seek to mend or move it—
To venture to improve it—
Is the unpardonable sin!

Gilman was perhaps reviewing her own unpardonable sins. Between 1898 and 1903 she laid out the lines of an attack on the home which is still valid today: "The two main errors in the right adjustment of the home to our present life are these: the maintenance of primitive industries in a modern industrial community, and the confinement of women to those industries and their limited area of expression." A good number of 19th-century feminists had anticipated Gilman in these views; many contemporary feminists are still working along these two lines. Unwaged female labor in primitive domestic industries is the subject of Marianna Dalla Costa's "Women and the Subversion of the Community" and Selma James' "A Woman's Place"; the sexual stereotyping of domestic work is the subject of Patricia Mainardi's "The Politics of Housework." These contemporary manifestos have been translated into political campaigns — some groups demand wages for housework, while others encourage men to assume an equal share of housework and childcare. Ultimately these two political movements must converge, calling for drastic changes in traditional "women's" work and drastic redesign of the environments in which domestic work is conducted.

This essay surveys some social and architectural aspects of feminist agitation for domestic reform in the United States and Europe between 1800 and 1915. The designs and buildings are aimed at restructuring domestic work. They are not presented as solutions to the problems of "women's" work, but as critiques of the traditional home developed in architectural form rather than in words. In many respects they suggest more significant social options than the ideal family housing of the same period. Promoters of company towns often constructed "ideal" factories along with "ideal" workers' housing, demonstrating the role of the housewife and the house in keeping workers happy on the job. Tenement house designers played a similar role in late 19th-century cities. In contrast to those reformers who promoted domestic stability through improved family housing, the utopian socialists and cooperative housekeepers discussed in this essay challenged the traditional single-family home. They questioned the appropriateness of isolated domestic work. They criticized the separation of work and home, production and reproduction, and called for the development of industrial capitalism.

Utopian socialist alternatives
The earliest campaigns against private domestic work in the United States and Europe were launched by utopian socialists committed to building model communities as a strategy for achieving social reform. Both Robert Owen (1771-1858) and Charles Fourier (1772-1837) supported collective housework and child care to assist in the development of equality between men and women, and each of them inspired some 20 to 30 American experiments in model community building, as well as a few European experiments. As Fourier put it, the Associationist movement would introduce communal facilities which would make the most elegant conventional private home appear "a place of exile, a residence worthy of fools, who after three thousand years of architectural studies, have not yet learned to build themselves healthy and comfortable lodgings." Fourier's followers and other advocates of cooperative housekeeping criticized private houses as isolated, wasteful, and oppressive. John Humphrey Noyes, founder of the Oneida Community (1847-1881), complained of the "gloom and dullness of excessive family isolation," or the "little man-and-wife circle," where one suffered the discomfort and waste attendant on the domestic economy of our separate households. Alice Constance Austins, architect of the Llano del Rio Community (1914-1938), described the traditional home as a "Peculiar bed" which maimed women, an "inconceivably stupid" arrangement which falsified their labors. Other domestic reformers who were not themselves utopian socialists echoed these sentiments. Melpomena Fay Peirce, founder of the Cambridge Cooperative Housekeeping Society (1869-1872), claimed that all the best years of her life were sacrificed to the "dusty drudgery of house-keeping" — "a sacrifice so costly and unnatural" that she started organizing.

In contrast to the private houses which these domestic reformers denounced as isolated, wasteful, and oppressive, they hoped to build communal or cooperative facilities for domestic work - tangible, architectural demonstrations of the workings of a more egalitarian society. The architectural form which various arrangements took was determined by the economic and social structure of the communities they served, so that the problems of mechanizing and measuring domestic work were met with a great variety of ingenious solutions in urban, suburban, and rural situations. To begin with, at least three types of economic and social organizations must be distinguished: the rural utopian socialist community functioning as a large family; the rural utopian socialist community containing nuclear families within it; and the urban or suburban cooperative housekeeping society whose members included both nuclear families and individuals.

The communal family
Utopian socialist communities organized on a large scale were particularly eager to abolish the nuclear family in order to promote greater attachment to a shared communal ideology. Total economic communism and a commitment to free love (viewed as the sexual counterpart of economic communism) were often required by such groups. They often preferred large communal dwellings where members were housed in rooms or dormitories connected to a communal kitchen, dining room, and nursery.

Some communal families and their architecture are well known. The Oneida Perfectionists, led by John Humphrey Noyes and Erastus Fairbanks, built a communal house, and one community's architect, built a substantial communal home for 300 members, beginning in 1846 in central New York State. The masthead of their paper, The American Socialist, dedicated itself to "the enlargement and improvement of home," and in 1862, with the dedication of their Second Mansion House, they claimed that "Communism in our society has built itself a house." Views of Perfectionist communal housekeeping facilities were widely published in popular illustrated magazines between 1850 and 1875 (Fig. 1 and 2).

2. Plans of communal dwelling for 200 Perfectionists at Oneida, New York, 1863-1869: 1, hall; 2, reception rooms; 3, library; 4, lower sitting room; 5, single bedroom; 6, shared bedroom; 7, bathroom; 8, house or workshop; 9, workshop; 10, dining room; 11, dining room addition; 12, balcony of hall; 13, west sitting rooms; 14, home parlor; 15, nursery kitchen; 16, balcony of upper sitting rooms; 17, nursery; 18, "kitchen"; 19, south tower; 20, children's parlor; 21, west avenue; 22, ground corridor; 23, porch; 24, north tower; 25, hall; 26, stage; 27, upper sitting room. (From Hayden, Seven American Utopians.)
Compared with the eclectic Victorian mansion of the Onslawds, the housekeeping arrangements of A Cityless and Countryside World seem rather diagrammatic. Based on free love and nonsectarian utopian socialism, these plans for "big houses" (figure 3) were published in 1893 in Melrose, Iowa, by Henry Oelrich, who argued that "a family of husband, wife and their children, living alone in a country home, are largely wasting their lives, socially and economically." Single bedrooms for every individual fine bread under the communal service areas. The "big houses" are surrounded by mills and factories. Oelrich described his later designs as "a modern paradise" and predicted they would form the living arrangement of the world a thousand years hence. (See fig. 4 and 5.)

Another plan for a "Social Palace" for a spiritualist community, headed by Thomas Lake Harris at Fountaingrove, California, in 1894, suggests the possible whimsies of collective housekeeping in a communal family practicing free love. Facilities for "special household arts and crafts" are balanced by those for "light industry"; one has a view of an aviary. A section through the communal kitchen and dining facilities shows a large dining table. (From The Story of the World A Thousand Years Hence, 1923.)

The communal organization including families

In contrast to those utopian socialist communities where specific social, religious, or sexual practices were enforced among members of the communal family living under the communal roof, the utopian socialist communities which contained nuclear families within them offered more diverse housekeeping and childcare arrangements. Usually nuclear families had some private territory to themselves as well as access to communal kitchens, dining rooms, and nurseries. Some organizations wished their housing to take on the form of a "unitary dwelling," which contained all of these disparate communal and private facilities; others developed networks of related buildings, including private family houses or small apartment houses and various communal housekeeping facilities.

Fourierists or Associationists, like the Philanthropy, a single building containing both communal housekeeping facilities and private apartments for resident families. The Familistère at Givors, France, built by Jean-Baptiste-André Godin, beginning in 1850, provided innovative housing for several hundred iron foundry workers and their families. Apartments included private kitchens, but the Givors complex contained a large dining hall and cafe as well (fig. 8 and 9). Some earlier Fourierist communities in the United States built an even greater range of dwellings. At the North American Phalanx—a community of about 125 members established in New Jersey in 1843—a communal kitchen, laundry, and bakery were contained in the same building as private apartments (without kitchens) and dormitories, but members were also permitted to build private houses (with kitchens) on the domain.
In contrast to the Fourierists' "unitary dwellings," coherent villages composed of private apartments and communal housekeeping facilities were built by other groups. The Harmony Society, led by George Rapp, built three towns in the United States between 1805 and 1824. Nine hundred members at Economy, Pennsylvania, lived in small communal houses and dormitories, each with its own kitchen, but they also had a large communal kitchen and "Feast Hall" used on special occasions. The Amana Inspirationalists built 52 communal kitchen houses, each serving about 50 people, in the seven communal villages which they established in Iowa in 1855 (fig. 10). Residents dwelt in family apartments (usually four apartments to a house) and in dormitories. Schools, kindergarten, and other workshops were located near the residences and kitchens. Similar arrangements prevail in the Bruderschaft and Hutterian communities which are still active in the United States and Canada: small buildings containing several family apartments, some with minimal private kitchens, are served by communal cooking and dining facilities. This is also the arrangement most common in Israeli kibbutzim, although communal residences for children replace day-care facilities, giving parents even more freedom to take part in other aspects of communal life.

The cooperative housekeeping service

The organizers of cooperative housekeeping services were not utopian socialists. They believed in private property and the private home. They hoped to imitate the utopian socialist housekeeping arrangements previously described and transplant them to urban or suburban neighborhoods. These organizers expected nuclear families to subscribe to a cooperative housekeeping service as a matter of rational self-interest. Of the three approaches to domestic reform, this one required the least in the way of social and economic conformity, but proved the most difficult to finance and control in practice.

Melissa Fay Peirce and members of the Cambridge Cooperative Housekeeping Society, middle-class women, many of them wives of Harvard professors, organized the first such cooperative housekeeping service in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1869. In 1870 they established a cooperative store, laundry, and bakery for 40 subscribing households, but they did not provide child care, since the scheme was intended to give women the opportunity to spend more time with their children. The members argued for the inclusion of cooperative housekeeping services in the apartment houses which were at that time being introduced for middle-class residents in the United States, but architects and developers opposed any measures which would involve the owners of multiple dwellings with the problems of domestic cooperation. In 1871 the Cambridge experiment was discontinued, but Peirce continued to lecture and write on the cause, publishing Cooperative Housekeeping: How Not To Do It and How To Do It, a Sociological Study, in 1884. Although Peirce herself was not an architect and never published plans of the cooperative housekeeping facilities she described, Marie Howland, a feminist and a former resident of the Familistere in Gironde, France, collaborated with an engineer, Albert Kimsey Owen, and an architect, John Deery, to produce architectural plans for cooperative neighborhoods around 1885. One plan shows four single-family houses grouped around a building with kitchen, dining room, laundry, and bakery (fig. 11).

In Women and Economics, published in 1898, the economist Charlotte Perkins Gilman recommended kitchenless houses of a similar sort, suggesting that they can be linked in urban rows or connected by covered walkways in a suburban block. Like Peirce, Gilman also recommended the construction of kitchenless apartments with collective dining facilities for women with families. Twelve years later books added to this vision: Concerning Children, 1900, described the benefits of professional day-care arrangements; The Home, Its Work and Influence, 1903, provided a detailed critique of private, inconvenient domestic architecture. Cooperative housekeeping schemes were not only supported by feminist reformers; they also became the subject of popular utopian novels at the end of the 19th century. In 1874, in Papa's Own Girl, Marie Howland described a Familistere transported to Massachusetts. Edward Bellamy's best seller of 1887, Looking Backward, dealt with a socialist Boston in the year 2000, when families dwell in luxurious private apartments and dine in communal halls served by communal kitchens. A slightly later novel, The World A Department Store, published by Bradford Peck in Lewiston, Maine, in 1906, included illustrations of such an arrangement. Private apartments were restricted to parlor, bedroom, and bath, and the city was dotted with "public restaurant buildings" looking very much like many city halls built at that time (fig. 12). Peck's housing was similar to that built in Amana, Iowa, described in the previous section, but he expanded a communal system to include a whole city of cooperative consumers.

English enthusiasm for cooperative housekeeping was as keen as American. Melissa Fay Peirce, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and Edward Bellamy all had English disciples as well as American ones. Raymond Unwin advocated cooperative housekeeping arrangements in his influential treatise written in 1901, The Art of Building a Home, and he seems to have interested Ebenezer Howard in cooperative housekeeping as well; Howard organized extensive experiments in cooperative housekeeping at the Garden Cities of Letchworth and Welwyn, England. "Homesgarth" included 32 kitchenless units built in 1909, while "Meadow Way Green" included 23 kitchenless units built in Letchworth between 1915 and 1924. Residents shared a common dining room and kitchen, where they ate one cooperative meal a day, prepared at first by the women tenants on a two-week rotation and later by a hired cook. The experiments (figs. 13, 14, 15, and 16) lasted at least 30 years.

Gusenens Court at Welwyn was a similar venture including 40 kitchenless units served by cooperative housekeeping facilities which functioned until the time of World War II.

10. View of small apartment houses and kitchen houses in Amana, Iowa, 1875. (From Charles Nordhoff, The Communal Societies of the United States, New York, 1875.)

11. Plans for single-family houses and cooperative housekeeping facilities, Howland, Deery, and Owen, 1885. (From A.K. Owen, Integral Cooperation, New York, 1885.)


14. View of tenant's dining room, Homesgarth. (From Purdom.)

15. H. Clapham Landor, Homesgarth, plans. (From Purdom.)
More efficient domestic work

The major achievement of both utopian socialist communities and cooperative housekeeping societies was ending the isolation of women and their children. Women and men worked together in a communal bakery. Women were seen as experts in cooking and cleaning. Men were involved in the production of goods for the community.

The Harmony Society constructed floors which could be removed so that it was necessary to carry furniture up and down stairs, and they devised special insulation and ventilation for their houses. The Onedia Perfectocrats installed gas light, steam baths, and steam heat in their communal Mansion House in the 1860s. This last comfort was achieved through the use of new technologies:

- "Good-bye wood sheds, good-bye wood stoves, good-bye coal stoves, good-bye wood ashes, good-bye wood fires, good-bye wood dust, and good-bye coal gas. Hello to the one fire millenium!"

Economies of scale in domestic life provided an obvious justification for better design and equipment: 50 private families might need 50 kitchens and 50 stoves, but a communal family, with one large kitchen and one large stove, had the resources to invest in additional, more sophisticated labor-saving devices. Both utopian socialist communities and cooperative housekeeping societies took pride in providing themselves with the latest in heating, lighting, and sanitation devices, designed to ensure the health of their members and lighten domestic labor. And what they didn't acquire, the men and women of the group might invent.

16. Shaker ironing room, showing conical stove to heat flaxlons, 1872; New Lebanon, N.Y. (From Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly Newspaper, Sept. 13, 1873.)

Commercial extensions of domestic work

Utopian socialist communities often found it profitable to manufacture and market their domestic inventions, such as the Shakers' improved washing machines, their sash balance, and the Bradshofer's toys, but this was not the only commercial extension of their domestic life. Once domestic "women's" work was officially recognized, timed, and cost, it became a source of revenue to extend these domestic services to customers outside the community. Thus a communal sewing room might begin to manufacture clothes, or a communal kitchen might also function as a restaurant. Among the Shakers, well-equipped facilities for spinning, dyeing, weaving, sewing, and ironing made it possible to fill a demand among outsiders for their goods. And the Oneids, by the 1870's, were serving hundreds of visitors meals every week. Members of the Woman's Commonwealth, a committee in Belton, Texas, actually made hotel and laundry management their major source of income, taking over a hotel in their town as both a communal residence and a profit-making venture.

17. Note preparing a cradle, Familistere, Guise, France; from Edward van Buresse-Neele, Associated Homes, London, 1880.
Women's confinement to domestic industries

If the first goal of domestic reformers was to emancipate women from domestic industries, the second was ending the confinement of women to domestic work. This could be achieved by providing women with more time to themselves, but full achievement required the involvement of women in many traditionally "masculine" areas of work. In most of the experiments described, cooking, cleaning, and child care remained "women's work," despite some limited participation by men in these activities. But, because of the division of labor and the introduction of labor-saving devices, women's overall hours of work were limited. Rather than being on call day and night, like the average wife and mother, most utopian socialist women had leisure to develop their interests—reading, writing, participating in musical or theatrical performances, developing friendships, enjoying amorous relationships. This gave them a degree of freedom unimaginable in the larger society. Women involved in cooperative housekeeping societies enjoyed increased leisure as well, especially if their organization provided day-care facilities, but many urban and suburban societies did not develop such programs.

Although most experiments managed to achieve some work for women, utopian socialists did not always grant equal pay for domestic work compared with other communal industries, and they did not always encourage women to enter other areas of work. The celibate Shakers kept all areas of work restricted by sex; men and women never worked together. Other communes, like Oneida, the North American Phalanx, and the Llano del Rio community, made gestures toward encouraging women to enter administration, factory work, and other nondomestic jobs.

18. Children learning to walk. Pandurang, Gilea, France. 1877. (Detail of fig. 9.)

Other groups did include male participants. Many cooperative domestic societies, however, accepted hierarchical organizational structures which put educated, middle-class managers at the top and paid less skilled dishwashers and laundry workers rather poorly. As a result, there was often much conflict among the cooperative housekeepers than in the communal "families" of the utopian socialists.

What, in the end, did all these efforts to develop convincing domestic alternatives actually achieve? The typical houseworker today, in Europe or the United States, is still isolated in the home, a workplace relatively unchanged since the 1860s. A recent sociological study estimates that the housewife puts in, on average, 70 hours of work per week, experiencing monotony, fragmentation, and speed-up in work which exceeds that of factory workers. Yet most assembly-line workers at least have labor unions which can demand that their labor be recognized and compensated; the housewife works on an invisible assembly line, and she is expected to deliver a "labor of love." Some of the experiments described in this book did not have much influence because these plans were not suitable for a socialist, feminist society, the like of which we have not yet seen. In every experiment, every innovation, every tool was painted light pink, that "feminine" color. These arts and architectures are extending men's and women's consciousness of the home, where women are traditionally exploited as unpaid workers. The historic plans and experiments of previous generations of domestic reformers may not seem particularly practical now, but they are part of a long history of revolt against the single-family home. They suggest our power to imagine something better; they revile a sense of possibilities, urgencies, and priorities. We can no longer take the housewife, or the house, for granted. The angry refrain of the patronized, unpaid woman echoes through a ballad composed of worker's demands: "I'm not your little woman, your sweetheart or your dear, I'm a wage slave without wages, I'm a maintenance engineer!"
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Footnotes

13. See "Communes Within Communes," in Hayden, Seven American Utopias.
In 1905 Dr. Sigmund Freud presented the world with his theory on infant sexuality. He informed a society still deep in Victorian prudery that very little children had strong erotic drives. His theory shocked middle-class sensibility at first, but eventually this same middle-class society came to find Freud to be quite right. Today it is almost generally agreed that children have erotic zones and sexual feelings, but, since Freud’s interest focused on the psycho-social aspects of human development, he gave little attention to other infantile endowment. He chose not to notice that just as children are sexually aware, so are all their other faculties intact, and therefore they know when they have been humiliated and exploited. So when Freud claimed that children who reported sexual abuse by adults had imagined or fantasized the experience, he was quite wrong. Children know the difference between reality and fantasy, often with more accuracy than adults, and sexual advances are in fact made to children in the course of everyday life. To insist that these advances are imagined is to under-
perceptions that were failing. Gradually she became unsure and unsteady, and soon was so shaken that she could barely function. Bayer pretended concern, suggested a doctor, a rest cure, but just as she was on the brink of total collapse, Joseph-Cotten (always vaguely in the background) arrived to expose the scandal and rescue Bergman's reality, confidence, and sanity.

Because so many identified with the victim, this movie enjoyed great popularity. Personally I know I have been "gaslighted" frequently in my lifetime, not the least traumatic instance being the denial of my own molestation. I recognize, however, that as the gaslighting procedure, as it applies to the subject of sexual abuse, is far more serious than a Victorian suspense story and more effective than one man's treachery. It evolves from widespread indoctrination. Sigmund Freud's theories have enormous influence on modern thinking, knew that the sexual abuse of children existed, but he could not reconcile the implications of that abuse with either his self-image or his identification with other men of his class, and thus he altered his telling of reality. Eventually he succeeded in gaslighting an age into ignoring a devastating childhood reality and a very serious social problem.

A Freudian discretion

Early in his career Freud believed that little girls often experienced sexual abuse because his patients, predominantly women, consistently reported childhood instances of sexual molestation. Many of Freud's patients suffered from hysteria, a common Victorian ailment affecting middle-class women. The symptoms included loss of voice or appetite, convulsive vomiting, sneezing, coughing, temporary blindness, deafness, paralysis, or epilepsy, and these symptoms, with no discernible organic base, were resistant to medical treatment. * * Since his hysterical patients repeatedly reported sexual abuse, most often naming their fathers as the abusers, Freud drew a causal connection between sexual abuse and neurasthenia. * * Before he formulated his better-known theories he framed the "seduction theory," in which he pointed to a direct connection between sexual abuse in childhood and adult hysteria. But this repeated and persistent incrimination of fathers by his patients made him uneasy, and, never quite comfortable with the seduction theory, he mentioned it publicly only in the year 1896 and not again until much later (1933), when he was able to reassess the abuse to female fantasy and disavow it as erroneous:

* Almost all my women patients told me that they had been seduced by their father. I was driven to recognize in the end that these reports were untrue and to come to understand that the hysterical symptoms are derived from phantasms and not from real occurrences. (Ref. 1, p. 584.)

More at ease with the fantasy rather than reality of sexual abuse, Freud was even more comfortable when he could name the mother rather than the father as the seducer. When he implicated the mother, he assured us that maternal seduction was based on reality:

* It was only later that I was able to recognize in this phantasy of being seduced by the father the expres-

sion of the typical Oedipal complex in women. And now we find the phantasy of seduction once more in the pre-Oedipal pre-history of girls; but the seducer is regularly the mother. Here, however, the phantasy touches on the ground of reality for it was really the mother who by her activities over the child's bodily hygiene inevitably stimulated and perhaps even provided for the first time, pleasurable sensations in her genitals. (Ref. 1, p. 584. Emphasis added.)

Before Freud could conclude that seduction by fathers was a fantasy, he had to be rid of his earlier theory. Since men did not complain of maternal seduction Freud limited the "imagined" abuse to a specific female problem: "I was able to recognize in this phantasy of being seduced by the father the typical Oedipal complex in women." To remove the onus from fathers, Freud's theories have enormous influence on modern thinking, knew that the sexual abuse of children existed, but he could not reconcile the implications of that abuse with either his self-image or his identification with other men of his class, and thus he altered his telling of reality. Eventually he succeeded in gaslighting an age into ignoring a devastating childhood reality and a very serious social problem.

It is customary in all professional relationships to protect a client or patient by disguising individual identity in a public presentation, and Freud adhered to this practice meticulously. He carefully changed his name, places, and some revealing clues, but to camouflage an entire group such as parents or "fathers" was not required or necessary, and such alteration could change the essence of the dynamics in the case history. In evaluating a case, whether it is the father or uncle who molests a child is of utmost importance, since a child's relationship with her father has much different meaning than that with an uncle; by altering this fact, Freud altered the case itself. Freud claimed to have made this significant change in the name of discretion, to protect fathers from unfair bias, but he was not moved to exercise this discretion in the same manner for other families. In an age in which the sexual feelings of women were considered unseemly or even revolting, Freud freely emphasized the sexual emotions of his female patients. In his presentation of "Dora" (1905), he did not hesitate about who would get hold of those old papers." (Ref. 2, p. 11.) But even in later life, when fortified by success and prestige, he was still unable to trust a scientific and interested public, and so the story of Freud's childhood is unknown to us. And if little is known about his childhood, less is known about his sex life.

Freud formulated the Oedipal complex, the theory of innate erotic attraction of children to parents of the opposite sex, and he gave us the "libido theory," or sex energy as a vital life force. Yet this man who saw the sex drive as a dominant factor in personality development, and the struggle to sublimate sexual gratification as essential to practical survival, to the mature psyche, and to all of civilization, for that matter, told us nothing of his own sexual impulses, sexual conflicts, or experiences. What makes this concealment even more surprising is the fact that Freud used his life, his conscious and unconscious being, as a prime tool for understanding and explaining all of human sexuality. His theories evolved from self-analysis and the interpretation of his own dreams, yet he never once revealed a masturbatory fantasy, or a sexual passion, nor did he ever associate "none of his dreams with an erotic desire or a woman." (Ref. 2, p. 63.)

And Breton, French poet and essayist, criticized Freud for the stubborn and illogical silence that surrounded his own sex life, and even ventured to call him dishonest, but Freud never took up the challenge nor addressed himself to this issue. It should come as no surprise, then, that Freud also saw fit to censor what he thought was other ill-advised information. In a

* * * *

Footnote to the 1924 edition of his Studies on Hysteria and the 1938 edition of his Studies on Hysteria, he confessed that he had altered some studies for reasons of discretion. In two cases he had substituted an uncle for a father as sexual abuser: * I venture after the lapse of so many years to lift the veil of discretion and reveal the fact that Katharina was not the niece but the daughter of the landlady. The girl fell ill, therefore, as a result of sexual attempts on the part of her own father. (Ref. 3, p. 174.)

And he added a similar footnote to the case of Fraulein Rosea H. * In this instance, too, it was in fact the 'girl's father, not her uncle," who was the seducer. (Ref. 3, p. 211.)
to examine, in print, the reaction of a 14-year-old girl to the "exact member" of the man who accosted her. Freud described a detailed discussion of oral sex with Doris at 18 and even recorded his suggestion that she enter into a relationship with the man, who also happened to be the husband of her father's mistress. In the light of Freud's rather arbitrary employment of discretion, his conclusions regarding female fantasy or the female personality can reasonably be questioned. (Ref. 4.) And were it not for the accidental recovery of Freud's correspondence with his one-time friend and colleague, Wilhelm Fliess, the story of his very subjective need to cover for the sins of the fathers and reconcile the seduction theory would have been lost to us.

The Fliess case

The account of the Fliess letters is a lively and exciting tale in itself. From 1888 to 1902, when they quarreled, Sigmund Freud and his good friend, W. Fliess, a Berlin nose-and-throat specialist, engaged in prolific correspondence. Central to their friendship was a mutual interest in the sexual aspects of the human condition, and Fliess had developed his own sex theory, which he felt would "explain the phenomena of life and death." Fliess claimed Freud tremendously and found in his friend a man of supreme intellect and impeccable judgment. He welcomed his comments and criticisms of his theories, findings, and even his writing style. But as Freud became more secure in his work, he looked to Fliess less, and finally the men separated over scientific differences. Freud destroyed all his correspondence from Fliess, but his own letters, which included elaborate and detailed drafts and notes, were retained by Fliess. After Fliess's death in 1929, his widow sold a packet of 284 pieces of correspondence to a Berlin bookseller, Rudolf Stahl. Knowing that Freud would destroy the letters if given the chance, Frau Fliess gave Stahl instructions that they were not to fall into Freud's hands. Later, when the Nazi regime forced Stahl to flee to France, he offered the letters to Mme. Marie Bonaparte, a student and disciple of Freud, who perceived their value and happily purchased them for 100 pounds. She took the packet to Vienna and approved Freud of the letters' existence and of the transaction, but, ingenuous that they had been bought to light, he ordered them destroyed, and even after Bonaparte read portions to him to convince him of their scientific importance, he was adamant. "I don't want any of them to become known to so-called posterity," he said. (Ref. 5, p. 2.)

Bonaparte defied this order and deposited the correspondence in a safe deposit box at the Rothschild bank in Vienna during the winter of 1937-1938. When Hitler invaded Austria, she employed her status as a Greek princess and was permitted, under Nazi guard, to remove the contents of the box. She then placed the documents with the Danish legation in Paris, where their security was again threatened by Nazi invasion, the letters, wrapped in waterproof, booty material (in case of a mine explosion), finally crossed the Channel and reached England in safety. There they were transcribed and edited by Anna Freud and Ernst Kris, and finally a volume of 168 letters and notes, selected from a total of 284 pieces of correspondence, was published in 1950 under the title *Origins of Psychoanalysis* - eleven years after Freud's death.

As a result of access to the Fliess letters, Freud's early biographer, S. Herbert, described the "Fliess period" as the most extraordinary experience in Freud's life, and others have thought it to be his most creative time. The reviewers of *Origins* felt that the documents amplified the early history of the psychoanalytic movement and offered insights into Freud's intellectual process, but to justify his reluctance to have them revealed, they explained that it was Freud's habit to publish personal material only to demonstrate unconscious connections. (Ref. 6, editors' note, p. x.)

I found the correspondence, more than any history or intellectual process, the work of an extremely complicated, imaginative, and talented human being. Nowhere does a novel reveal as artistically the ambition, ambition, courage of a man in a personal struggle. These letters, more than any information officially released by Freud, precisely demonstrated his unconscious connections, and from beginning to end tell why he could no longer abide his own seduction theory.

Father Freud and Oedipus Rex

During the early years when he published *Studies on Hysteria*, in collaboration with Joseph Breuer, Freud was already well into the exploration of the human unconscious in search of the secrets of the neuroses. Having discovered "free association," a method whereby both he and his patients could explore hidden emotions in an atmosphere free of judgment and censure, Freud listened carefully and intently to his patients. But however clearly he recognized the existence of repressed thought and feeling, he did not, at that time, doubt that a real experience was the cause of hysteria. "It is not to the opinion that anxiety is to be connected, not with a mental, but with a physical consequence of sexual abuse," he wrote to his friend Fliess. (Ref. 6, pp. 79-80.) Freud later pinpointed vulnerability to sexual trauma as occurring before "puberty" accompanied by revulsion and fright. (Ref. 6, p. 126.)

In the year 1896 Freud presented his seduction theory in a group of three papers broadly titled "The Antiquity of Hysteria." This work was a public challenge to heredity as the cause of hysteria, and, in bold opposition to general medical opinion, Freud named social rather than biological causes of neurosis. He identified the specific excitant of the genitals resulting from sexual abuse in childhood as the trauma that brought on hysteria and cited 18 cases, not one lacking in a sexual experience, to support his theory. (Ref. 7, p. 203.) Moreover, in addition to this case evidence, Freud certainly realized that his Victorian world was notorious for its sexual license, particularly in the sexual abuse of children. He could not have avoided news scandals exposing the existence of large numbers of children in the brothels of Europe, the active international slave traffic in children, or the available statistics on increased sex crimes against children. Hardly ignorant of the social climate, Freud cautioned, "It seems to me certain that our children are far oftener exposed to sexual aggression than we should suppose." (Ref. 7, p. 203) To Fliess, Freud continued to present case material to further substantiate his hypothesis. He named seduction by fathers as the "essential point" in hysteria, and in one particular case uncovered a veritable nest of incestuous abuse. After persuading one patient to speak, he related her story to Fliess:

Then it came out that when she was between the ages of 8 and 12 she allegedly erotically admired her father and high-minded father used regularly to take her to his bed and practice external ejaculation (make love with her). Even then she felt anxiety. A six-year-old sister to whom she talked about this later admitted that she had had the same experience with her father. A cousin told her that at the age of 15 she had had to resist the advances of her grandfather. Naturally she did not find it incredible when I told her that similar and worse things must have happened to her in infancy. In other respects hers is a quite ordinary hysterical with usual symptoms. (Ref. 6, pp. 195-196.)

Despite continued evidence, Freud never again, after the 1896 presentation, publicly promoted his seduction theory. True, his theory was poorly received, and Krafft-Ebing ridiculed it, but Freud's seduction was hardly the result of adverse opinion; even then he was prepared to create a disturbance. (Ref. 8, pp. 303-304.) It was Freud's own filing conviction that prevented risk of further exposure. Though staunch on sexual trauma as the cause of neurosis, he was extremely unhappy with the father as seducer, and though able to name him in the privacy of the

* Freud sent Fliess elaborate drafts, diagrams, and theories in which his theories on infant sexuality, repression, the unconscious, and libido were developing. For example, he suspected that "hysteria is conditioned by a primary sexual experience (before puberty) accompanied by revulsion and fright that observational neurosis is conditioned by the same accompanied by pleasure." However, for the purposes of this article, the simple relationship between early sexual abuse and neuroses is sufficient.
Fliss correspondence, he was unable to do so publicly. Consequently, his 1896 papers were weak on identifying the perpetrators of the sexual trauma; he cited almost as many categories of sexual abusers as he cited actual cases, and created a series of unlikely contradictions. The greatest abuser as sexual abuser was the most infrequent offender, he said; nuns, maids, governesses, teachers, and near relations were more often responsible. But children of the same age (or very close) and of the opposite sex, such as brother and sister, must frequently created sexual trauma. (Ref. 7, p. 203-204.) This large category of predominantly female offenders did not fit the illness in question, Hysteria was primarily a female affliction (a "male hysteria," Fliss said), hard to find); and the sexual assaults Freud mentioned were heterosexual. Furthermore, in general discussion of sexual assault and trauma, he has always referred to the abuse of children by adults. Suddenly to claim that the largest number of offenders came from among children of the same age was a contradiction. The only credible abuser was the "near relation," whom Freud mentioned in passing but did venture to say "initiated sexual intercourse" more often than one thinks. (Ref. 7, p. 202-203.) That Freud's inconsistencies reflected his need to protect female patients to the same extent as more than a possibility by the editors of the Standard Edition (a collection of Freud's work). They noted that in his 1896 papers on hysteria, Freud intentionally omitted and suppressed the role of "Hysteria, derived from the Greek word meaning suspended, was then a strictly female disease; Freud did manage to come up with an example of a "male hysteric," but medical opinion of the day related this disease only to women.

Fliss's father's death evoked in Freud such intense conflict and suffering that he felt compelled to examine himself to search inward for the cause of his extreme reaction. This journey resulted in self-analysis, interpretation of his dreams, and the beginning of the psychoanalytic method. It brought him to his own unconscious motives and drives by taking him back to memories of childhood experiences. It was these memories that made him aware of his own early sexual feelings. He told Fliss that at age two he had seen his mother naked and recalled that his "libido towards matron was aroused." (Ref. 6, p. 219.) The knowledge of his own youthful sexual feelings destroyed for him forever the myth that children were sexless; children, he now knew, had erotic feelings.

As he traveled further into his past, he found that his desire for his mother had led (in part) toward his father, and when he looked at this complex of infantile sexuality—desire for his mother and hatred for his father—he understood his own extreme anxiety as guilt resulting from an unconscious paternal death wish. Conscious now that he harbored deep paternal antibacterial, Freud confided to Fliss in an unpublished letter (dated February 11, 1897) that the number of fathers named by his patients as sexual molesters had truly alarmed him; with the father as prime abuser he had "inferred from the existence of some hysteric features in his brother and several sisters that even his father had been thus incriminated." (Ref. 9, p. 211.) But when it was later revealed to him in a dream that he was feeling overly affectionate toward Mathilda, his daughter, he understood that "the dream of course fulfills my wish to pin down a father as the originator of neurosis and put an end to my persistent doubts." May 31, 1897

I do not want to do any more work. I have laid even dreams aside. Not long ago I dreamt that I was feeling over-affectionately towards Mathilda, but her name was "Hella," and then I saw the word "Hella" in heavy type before me. The solution is that Hella is the name of an American niece whose photograph we have been sent. Mathilda may have been called Hella because she had been weeping so bitterly recently over the Greek defeat. She had a passion for the mythology of ancient Hellas and naturally regarded all Hellest as heroes. The dream of course fulfills my wish to pin down a father as the originator of neurosis and put an end to my persistent doubts.

And in some notes included in this letter, he added:

Horrific impulses against parents (a wish that they should die) are also an integral part of neurosis. It seems as though in sons this death-wish is directed against their father and the daughters against their mothers. (Ref. 6, pp. 206-207.)

Freud was becoming convinced that the suspicion he directed against his own father and himself and his acceptance of his patient's stories of seduction were prompted by his need to "pin down the father as seducer." Based on personal inclination, he presumed that all his patients had the same need and therefore came to suspect that their stories of fathers as seducers were "defensive fictions." Freud continued to debate, stir up the discussions, and finally, he concluded, the evidence against him was ample; he had been guilty of cruel acts toward Mathilda, his daughter, he understood that "the dream of course fulfills my wish to show the origin of his problems, however, he simultaneously rebuked his patient's testimony against, discarded his seduction theory, and replaced it with the incipient Oedipal complex. He was not at all unhappy to make these changes, and, in October 1897, one year after his father's death, he wrote to Fliss that his conviction of his patients' seduction as fantasy left him feeling triumphant:

September 21, 1897

Let me tell you straight away the great secret which has been slowly dawning on me in recent months. I no longer believe in my neurosis. That is hardly intelligible without an explanation. . . So I shall start at the beginning and tell you the whole story of how the reasons for rejecting it arose. The first group of factors were the continuous disappointment of my attempts to bring my analyses to a real conclusion, the running away of people who for a time had seemed my most favorably inclined patients, the lack of the complete success on which I had counted, and the possibility of explaining my partial success in other, familiar ways. Then there was the astonishing thing that in every case . . . blame was laid on perverse acts by the father, and the realization of the unexpected frequency of hysteric, in every case of which find the same thing that in every case of which find the same thing.

He was bewildered. He was caught up in a compilation which everyone recognized because he had felt traces of it in himself. Everyone of the audience was once a budding Oedipus in phantasy, and bisphal.finall fulfilled played out in reality caused everyone to recoil in horror, with the full measure of repression which separates his infantile from his present state. (Ref. 25, pp. 223-224.)

So, as the loved mother and hated father, so did the daughter love the father and hate the mother, he said. But he found the daughter's desire and need for the father so much more powerful than those of the son for his mother so that the daughter's wish to be seduced has meant fulfillment in fantasy and fictitious seduction stories.
A far more dominant theme in Greek mythology is parental fear, hatred, and slaughter of children. Oedipus, the cosmic sky god, imprisoned his children in a cave until his son Kronos castrated and supplanted him. Kronos, fearful of competition from his children, ate them all as soon as they were born. Rhés, unhappy mother, rescued Zeus; Zeus conquered and supplanted Kronos, but took the same precautions as his father and swallowed Metis, whom he had impregnated. Laius pierced the feet of his son Oedipus and left him exposed to die; Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter to the gods: Medea slew her children to avenge her husband’s infidelity, and the daughters of Cadmus, founder of Thebes, also violently destroyed their children.

If Freud had been inclined to view neurosis as the result of the unconscious wishes of parents to eliminate their offspring, he might have suggested the "Heracles complex." Heracles, famed Greek hero, in a period of temporary madness, killed his beloved wife and their six children. When he regained his sanity, he took upon himself the "Heraklès" challenges of the Twelve Labors in repentance. Although I hardly advocate this story as an example of universal parent-child relationships, it would seem that anxiety growing out of childhood dependency and fear of adult authority and destructive powers is a much more plausible cause of neurosis than guilt from the questionable unconscious wishes imparted to children by Freud.

As long as Freud held to his own experience and unconscious motives, his discoveries were credible. That he desired his mother, competed with her father, and found this conflict at the root of his neurosis, I believe. But to suppose from these personal insights that the testimony of his patients was fictitious requires more creative imagination. It is more reasonable to attribute Freud’s denial of the reality of female sexual abuse to his own subjectivity, which he projected into his concept of infantile-paternal equality and discrimination. I am as weary as anyone of belaboring Freud’s misogyny, but his theories on sexual abuse of children and female sexuality are so closely allied that his bias cannot be avoided. The female – without a penis – was biologically inferior, Freud contended, and therefore she could only achieve an approximation of human completion by the “acquittal” of the penis through sexual intercourse and by eventually bearing a child (preferably male). When the male child matured, no matter how severe his castration anxiety, with his penis still intact he could manage to overcome castration fears, but the female, forever peniless, must always look to a man to achieve any degree of human status; her fantasy of being induced therefore represented an actual biological need to make up for her natural deficiency. The seduction fantasy represented her overactive desire for the coveted penis and was implicit in her biology. Therefore, Freud found that the incestuous wish of little girls for their fathers was a “predisposition into trauma giving rise to excitation and fixation.” (Ref. 8, p. 300). As the child was biologically ready, any extreme emotions toward human growth and achievement, sex play with other children, a dream, or a wish could trigger the seduction fantasy, or the wish for a penis.

With the elimination of the seduction theory and the adoption of the Oedipal complex in females, Freud had come full circle. The seduction theory maintained that hysteria was a neurosis caused by sexual assaults, and it incriminated insensate fathers, while the Oedipal theory insisted that seduction was an illusion, an invention, not a fact – and it incriminated daughters. When Freud replaced the seduction theory with the Oedipus complex he relieved himself of his “misogynia” and venerated equality and discrimination. I am as weary as anyone of belaboring Freud’s misogyny, but his theories on sexual abuse of children and female sexuality are so closely allied that his bias cannot be avoided.

A Freudian glasight

The Western world, America particularly, took Dr. Freud very seriously and, in compliance with sexual abuse and social injustice, did not overestimate a real seduction – or the importance of any concrete reality, for that matter. In fact, the complex of inner drives gained such ascendency in the public mind that the psyche was considered capable of dominating the external world. One psychiatrized oriented man I knew claimed that he “licked cancer” because he had been able to deal with his “death wish.” A student, sluggish, tired, and unable to work, was diagnosed as depressed when he was in fact suffering from hepatitis.

His therapist later explained that it was actually depression and deep self-destructive tendencies which rendered the young man susceptible to the disease in the first place. The work of D.ury Perren, seeing a young woman, was a “revolution of fantasies” to her psychiatrist – particularly the lyrics of her song “With My Daddy in the Attic.” Perren was surprised by her doctor’s interpretation. She explained that her father really did live in the attic of their home because that was where he wanted to be. “He thinks I took a metaphor but I took a reality . . . I lived through it,” she says. (Ref. 12.) And a reviewer of Quentin Bell’s biography of Virginia Woolf praised the Freudian “fantasy” interpretation of Wool’s molestation by her older half-brother, George Duckworth: “Though Mr. Bell does not, for me at least, settle the question of the fantasy component in Virginia Woolf’s memories of
The reasoning is illogical. It categorically assigns a real experience to fantasy, or harmlessness at least to the offender — the one concrete reality — is ignored. With reality sacrificed to nebulous, unconscious, the little girl has no recourse. She is trapped within a web of adult conjecture and is offered no protection, but treatment for some speculative ailments, while the offender — Uncle Willie, the grocery clerk, or the dentist, or the child's father — is permitted further to indulge his predilection for little girls. The child's experience is exoticized as the worst horror of a Kafkaesque nightmare: her story is not believed, she is declared ill, and, worse, she is left at the mercy and the "benevolence" of psychologically oriented "child experts." The extent of Freudian influence can hardly be ignored, and the length to which some of the followers will go to conform — even at the expense of reality — can be, if not frightening, amusing. I can scarcely resist telling of a small delusion by one of Freud's devoted followers. Freud, of course, attracted a coterie of notables. In his circle was one Dr. Hermine Hug-Helmuth, whom in 1915 anonymously published A Young Girl's Diary, and the master enthusiastically endorsed it. "This diary is a gem," he wrote to her publisher. "Never before has anything been written enabling us to see so clearly into the soul of a young girl. . . . We have a description at once so charming, so serious, so artless, that it will not fail to be of supreme interest to educators and psychologists. It is certainly incumbent on you to publish the diary. All students of my own writings will be grateful to you." (Ref. 17, p. 300.)

"Freud was . . . more comfortable when he could name the mother rather than the father as the seducer . . ."

What can be the consequences of such thinking? Only confusion, resulting in a distortion of reality, total misunderstanding of female sexuality, and extensive damage to the confidence, pride and self-worth, and dignity of children.

There is the incontrovertible fact, very hard for some of us to accept, that in certain cases it is not the man who inaugurates the trouble. The novel Lolita . . . describes what may well happen. A girl of 12 or so, is already endowed with a good deal of sexual desire and also can take pride in her "conquests." Perhaps, in all innocence, she is the temptress and not the man. (Ref. 19, p. 118.)

In 1968 a book entitled Vulnerable Children, by Cindy Burton, discussed some 30-old studies on the sexually assaulted child from the mid-1930's to the mid-1960's. The conclusion emphasized the prevalence of victim participation and the harmless nature of the assaults. As a matter of fact, one soon could be convinced that the molester was the real victim and, further, that the victims were not victims at all, but juvenile delinquents acting out their pathology. Burton suggested that the pathology found in the delinquent girl "may also account for the participation sometimes apparent in sexual assault cases." (Ref. 20, p. 98.) Since the sexually abused child could so easily be classified as delinquent, her victimization could be viewed not as a social injustice, but as her deviant and anti-social behavior. And those trained to understand and help are ground- and generate an inordinate amount of anti-female bias: Every therapist is aware of emotional reactions that work against spontaneous sympathy with the delinquent girl. Her behavior is conducive, impulsive, fickle, moody, corny, vengeful and capricious, hard to take, difficult to understand, impossible to predict and frustrating. This behavior fits the American delinquent girl. In contrast, the boy's aggression, his negativism and offenses are tolerated by the therapist with far greater equanimity . . .

We must never lose sight of the fact, clinically borne out, that female delinquency is far more profoundly self-destructive and irresponsi-ble in its corrective consequences than is male delinquency. With the aggressive and retaliatory use of her body and her reproductive functions, the delinquent girl deeply violates the protective and caring attributes of her maternal role. (Ref. 21, pp. 103-109.)

It is indeed strange how psychology is used not to help, but to trap and ensnare the female. The myth of consent — that is, the female desire to get a man, to have a penis — is used to explain victim participation and therefore accepts as inevitable the sexual abuse of children. The tragedy is that this myth is believed and that so often the victims are punished. Once a child has been raped or molested, no matter how impressive the psychological nomenclature describing her plight or how sophisticated her caretakers, the little girl is an outcast, a pariah, a whore.

I worked as a social worker with children for many years and during one period in a home for dependent and neglected girls. The children were between 7 and 17, and not one had escaped sexual abuse. If a child showed no visible scars, it was assumed that the experience was harmless, but if she had problems, was difficult, angry, failed in school, attracted boys, or got pregnant, she was diagnosed as acting out her incest-uous wish for her father or other sexual fantasies. Here, in very con- densed form, is a case history, cited from my records, of a girl who was sexually violated all her life, but, because she was abused, was presumed to be sexually promiscuous and finally, for absolutely no fault of her own, was sent to a reformatory.
Mary, 16, was raped at 8 by her stepfather. Later, her mother—who never believed the story—abandoned her, and Mary was placed in a foster home. She did fairly well until adolescence triggered repressed hostility and sexual acting out. She got the reputation for being "sassy"; it was also rumored that she had been "had" by five boys (gangbang). Mary denied the story, but a local physician found that she had been penetrated more than once. The foster parents could not tolerate local gossip, and at age 15 Mary was sent to the Jane Bloomington Home for Dependent Girls.

At first Mary was sullen and nasty, but later she relaxed, became friendly and trusting, and brought in dream material. Her fantasies revealed confused sexual identity, so it was not surprising when the cottage mother reported that Mary had not menstruated for two months. She was tested for pregnancy, was found positive, and despite her insistence that she could not be pregnant, was sent to Brown Memorial to have her baby.

One month later, Brown Memorial called to say that Mary was pregnant and sent her back. Although everyone apologized, Mary was angry, fought, broke a chair, and became otherwise physically destructive.

Diagnosis: Adjustment reaction of adolescence with tendency to act out hostility and repressed sexual fantasies.

Recommendation: As a result of increased depression, hostility, and sexual aggression, Mary must be moved to a closed institutional setting where she can be controlled—an institution for delinquent girls.

Although women—women and even children—do not talk freely about their molestation, there are few who consciously, or otherwise, avoid the subject. For women who have not been believed or had the opportunity to confront their molester (with adult support), there is always a sense of unfinished business; there is always the rancor of boiling humiliation and rage that remains after an unchallenged insult. When the subject of sexual abuse of children received some media exposure as a result of feminist discussions on the radio, in lectures, and in articles, many women approached me and finally found an opportunity to ventilate their long-festering secret. In their stories, the psychic conspiracy of avoidance or distortion of the sexual-abuse problem was prevalent. One young woman, 15 years old, gave the following account:

"From 9 to 14 I was constantly "felled" by my orthodontist on my breasts during my weekly visits. He tried to be friendly and pretend that he was wiping the instruments off—but I knew. The day of the last visit, after five years, I told my mother. She didn't call the orthodontist, but sent me to a therapist. I told my therapist, but he hardly talked about it, and finally I was disturbed because deep down I didn't talk about it any more. I discovered that women were as shocked and disturbed by the lack of sympathy and acknowledgment of the problem as by the incident of sexual abuse itself. When Sigmund Freud ventured to explore the cause of his neurosis, and uncomfortably suspected his father to be his seducer, he took great pains to ferret out the reality of something he vaguely remembered. He checked into his past and was relieved to discover that "my father played no active role," but that an elderly, ugly nursemaid "was my instructress in sexual matters." This supposedly took place when Freud was under age 2, but Max Schur, in his study of Freud, found the possibility of any actual seduction very unlikely. (Ref. 22, pp. 125-136.) Freud's effort to verify the cause of his own anxieties has been hailed as courageous, whereas a similar investigation by a child or a woman is today discouraged.

Alice B., with the same driving curiosity as Freud, and with much greater cause and anguish, tried to reach the roots of her "neurosis" and anxiety, but her psychiatrist would have none of it. By the age of 25, without the ego or status of a Dr. Freud, she was rebuffed: "I don't remember when it started. I was so little. My father was always putting his hand under my dress and messaging around, and he would come into my bed at night and fondle me. He never had an erection, but I could feel his wetness. He was gentle and he never lied. I mean if it hadn't been for him I wouldn't have survived, but I suppose if it hadn't been for him I wouldn't have had to worry so much about surviving. Everything was destroyed because of him. I didn't know what he was trying to do. School was destroyed because I couldn't learn. When I was 13 I actually had an orgasm, but at first I thought he was trying to kill me.

I'm sure my mother knew. Since I've grown up, my aunts have told me he was always feeling them, and my cousin had an experience with him too. I used to try to scare him away, make noises and stuff. I felt dirty and my mother didn't like me; she liked my brothers better.

My father is now dead. Before he died I wrote him a letter about what happened. I wanted to confront him with it, to talk to him and ask him why he did it. And he wrote me this incredible letter. He said he didn't know what I was talking about and that it wasn't nice for a girl to write a letter like that to her father. I really feel that this thing with my father destroyed my life. I have no confidence, I never did. At 24 I went to a psychiatrist, but you know they don't talk. But I was upset and talked about it so very much that he finally said that what happened to me was very common, but he said, 'I think your most important problem is your mother. Your father didn't have anything to do with your unhappiness.' (This and the following testimony are cited from personal interviews conducted by the author over the past four years.)

With no less courage than Freud and brave enough to confront her father-molester, Alice tried to rescue herself and her sanity. But, with the exception of her aunts, she was engulfed in a world bent on covering up for fathers, no matter what the cost to human reason and dignity. In another testimony, told in the third person in an attempt to keep distance from the trauma, another child actually groping for protection who also found only indirect rejection at the hands of her psychiatrist and family:

A girl of 10 is alone in a quiet hut. The front door slams and her father enters—a handsome man with a redny smile. She runs to hug him. He sheds soggy gloves and a flight suit, and they talk of trivial things. How nice to have a warm, affectionate father.
Later he stops her in the narrow hallway and hugs her again. It feels different. But why? This happens several times, always when they are alone. One morning he kisses her on the mouth. Why does it seem so different than the kiss on the cheek? He tells her not to mention this to her mother. She can’t understand why it must be a secret.

Late one night she is sleepily aware of him slipping into her bed. His large warm hand gently rubs her stomach, caressing her beneath the flannel nightgown... her chest, her thighs, her genitals. Something is wrong. Would he do her harm? Not daddy! She wakes alone. Was he there?

This occurs regularly for two years. She wants to tell her mother but cannot. It has been going on for so long, and she is ashamed. She does not know why. She tries to avoid her father. She is 12 now. When he touches her it makes her sick.

She is 13. She is taking a bath. When she comes out her father comes near her. She is very frightened. She hates him, hates him. She runs and hides under the house. When her mother returns she tells her. She tells how her father had sexually molested her for three years. Her mother turns quite pale.

“Do you realize what you are saying?”

“Yes.”

“Don’t tell your grandmother.” A week later, the girl is sent to the Navy psychiatrist. He puts his hand on her leg and tells her that all little girls attempt to seduce their daddies. The next morning she is sent to live with her grandmother in Alabama.

Is Freud to blame?
To hold Freud responsible for 70-year "galloping" edidic is pointless. He lived in an age in which logic, reason, and science supposedly supplanted religious mysticism—an era which required scientific rather than religious authority to justify brutal social injustice and inequities. Freud filled the bill. His theories, surrounded by scientific aura, allowed for the suspension and concealment of the sexual exploitation of the female child.

Bronislaw Malinowski, the noted anthropologist, discovered that among the Trobriand Islanders sex relationships between members of the same kin and clan were regarded with horror. But he was surprised to learn that despite the incest taboo, affairs that were carried on in public and with decorum might provoke gossip but did not demand punishment. However, should the affair be exposed by a jealous lover, perhaps, the public disgrace was answered by the suicide of those who broke the taboo. (Ref. 23, pp. 77-80.) Just as in Trobriand custom, the Freudian cover-up—the refusal to name the offender—was more than one man's attempt to hide illegal or immoral sex practices. Victorian men were permitted to indulge in forbidden sex provided they managed to keep their activities hidden. Adultery, practised with impunity, was kept under wraps, and prostitution, which operated with police sanction, simply had to avoid public exposure and scandal. Within Freud's own circle, his biographer Ernest Jones was implicated in sexual adventures with his patients and little girls, but he managed—after some financial cost and the resignation of a job—to avoid public scandal. (Ref. 18, p. 355.) The excesses of the loving and exuberant Ferenczi, known to be intimate with his patients and his wife's daughter, were tolerated by Freud and his circle. (Ref. 18, p. 359.) Freud, who regarded the incest taboo as vital to the advance of civilization, appeared to demand only that forbidden sex be practiced with tact and discretion so that surface Victorian respectability was in no way disturbed.

The little girl, then, with her intimate passion for a penis, is—as in Christian doctrine—the temptress Eve, and, if she is violated, the nature of her sexuality renders her culpable. Any attempt on the part of the child or her family to expose the violator also exposes her own alleged innate sexual motives and shames her more than the offender; concealment is her only recourse. The dilemma of the sexual abuse of children has provided a system of foolproof emotional blackmail: if the victim incriminates the abuser, she also incriminates herself. The sexual abuse of the child is therefore the best-kept secret in the world.
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Faces surround me that have no smell no colour no time
only strange laughing testament vomiting promise like love
but look at the skeleton children
advancing against us
beneath their faces there is no sunlight
no darkness
no heart remains
no legends
to bring them back as women
into their bodies at dawn.

Look at the skeleton children
advancing against us
we will find our womanhood
in their eyes
as they cry
which of you love me
will love me
will claim my blindness as yours
and which of you marches to battle
from between our legs?

Sister I have seen  you
spit on my image behind your mirror
but you screamed for me
as the knife cut out your young
we stand convicted
of asking each others' name and age
before we give blood.

II

On the porch outside my door
girls are lying
like felled maples in the path of my feet
I cannot step past them nor over them
their slim bodies roll like smooth tree trunks
repeating themselves over and over
until my porch is covered with the bodies
of young girls.

Some have a child in their arms.
To what death shall I look for wisdom?
Which mirror to break or mourn?

Two girls repeat themselves in my doorway
their eyes are not stone.
Their flesh is not wood nor steel
but I cannot touch them.

Shall I war them of night
or offer them bread
or a song?

They are sisters. Their father has known
them over and over. The twins they carry
are his. Whose death shall we mourn
in the forest
unburied?
Winter has come and the children are dying.

One begs me to hold her between my breasts
Oh write me a poem mother
here, over my flesh
get your words upon me
as he got this child upon me
our father lover
thief in the night
do not be so angry with us. We told him
your bed was wider
but he said if we did it then
we would be his
good children if we did it
then he would love us

oh make us a poem mother
that will tell us his name
in your language
is he father or lover
we will leave your words
engraved on a whip or a golden scissors
for our children
to tell them the lies
of their birth.

Another says mother
I am holding your place.
Do you know me better than I knew him
or myself?

Am I his daughter or girlfriend
am I your child or your rival
you wish to be gone from his bed?
Here is your granddaughter mother
give me your blessing before I sleep
what other secrets
do you have to tell me
how do I learn to love her
as you have loved me?
This is a pivotal moment for the women's movement.
The mass enthusiasm of the early 1970's has ebbed,
and instead we now face considerable backlash against
feminism. Internal fragmentation of many
of our feminist organizations has been accompanied
by the withdrawal in anger or exhaustion
of some of our most talented spokeswomen.
Yet, in this same period we are also
building new, more inclusive structures
and contexts in which we can utilize our best
energies, sort out our ideas, and implement
our strategies in a unified feminist movement.

Feminist artists make a vital contribution
to the current concerns of the women's movement.
The art process
A feminist artist is a new artist, because her
experience has been radically transformed by the
choosing another,
emancipatory process available in feminist activity.
(Formerly art life or art/politics dichotomy
and creating a third entity.

*Mary Beth Edelson, in conversation with
is an instance of the total compartimentalization of tasks, feelings, people, in life in a patriarchal culture."

Mary Beth Edelson is a New York-based visual artist who has exhibited widely on the East Coast and in the Midwest and who has been the basis of all of our active in the women’s art movement since its inception. She participated in organizing the conference for Women in the Visual Arts (Washington, D.C., 1972), is a member of A.R.L. has to be turned around. The women’s spirituality movement now works with the new Heresies magazine collective. In her work, she announces the death of the overtone. How it will evolve, the ascendency of the Goddess— it will be a different kind of political action. A sense of primitivism underlines the ritual of which she communicates with the Goddess through ritual photography outdoors, the medium of her own naked body, then adored.

The Goddess—

The concept of woman as the spiritual visual artist who has exhibited widely on the head is a political concept. God/MAN head, then all of civilization has to be turned around. The women’s spirituality movement now works with the new Heresies magazine collective. In her work, she announces the death of the overtone. How it will evolve, the ascendency of the Goddess— it will be a different kind of political action. A sense of primitivism underlines the ritual of which she communicates with the Goddess through ritual photography outdoors, the medium of her own naked body, then adored.

The concept of woman as the spiritual visual artist who has exhibited widely on the East Coast and in the Midwest and who has been the basis of all of our active in the women’s art movement since its civilization, laws, daily functioning.

In a radical departure from women’s experience, Edelson regards woman’s experience of herself to be the first premise of all interpretation of events and issues. Her images, ritual, poem, participatory assemblages, and other art forms synthesize political and spiritual feminist subject matter.

Happy Birthday America exemplifies this synthesis by combining through collage the arch-enemy enormous stumbling blocks.

Turkish Bath by Ingres and the face of feminism I feel right in my gut that who are working to create a culture which honors our history has been erased, a leap of consciousness out from the patriarchal mindset — to sense the present situation in light of which our conversation and productive work have been developed, and simultaneously to see ourselves mediative oral history, respectfully and understand the intimate, revolutionary nature of our communication.

Happy Birthday America is an original image created especially for Chrysalis and the sisterhood it represents.
Happy Birthday America is an ad hoc guerilla action on the rigid design of patriarchy,
a daring offense to celebrate the new time.

Mary Beth Edelson transforms, through collage, the sloe-eyed faces of harems.

Ingres's 1863 Le Bain Turc: portraits of contemporary feminist workers.

Ingres's women, kept naked and idle for the sexual diversion of a Turkish potentate,
and our own interpretation of these events.

Are they not the authors of their own sexual experience?

Ability to create the sensual world by looking at the image,
socially prominent women who earned money for Her temples.

Has been explicitly given by the (male) artist to the primary spectator,

the female (male) buyer (female coin passed from man to man).

Some remember their ancient posture, pleasuring in the company of

Happy Birthday America is for feminist spectators.

The Goddess had sacred prostitutes—highly regarded and

the lascivious images of our century-old harems.

We recognize that replacing them with us

is not an "after-the-revolution" dissociation from those women but

whorish and mute, trapped in the roundel by circumcision

a bond with them. The Matriarchal Second Age of the Goddess

is here, and we and our sisters are still cast as the culture's whores.

We are speaking brilliantly, sensuously, intimately, gleefully together

as we weave the cloth for a new pattern.

Happy Birthday America expresses our aspiration to build

we are taking our energy and giving it back to ourselves

a woman's culture in honor of ourselves.

What will the world be like when it is, all of it, made in our image.

We can see the Turkish Bath as a complete world in and of itself.

a woman's culture in honor of ourselves.

According to our nature and design?

We hunger to taste, touch, smell, feel, see our own unique

creative forms, a language and territory in which our visions materialize

Our visions are for every woman.

--Collage in letters, poems, and conversations between Arlene Raven and Mary Beth Edelson
A simple thought runs through this writing: that is that the predominant civilization of the West, this patriarchy, has always regarded and treated women and nature in the same way. We are less than human men, in the regard of patriarchy, less intelligent, less spiritual, less rational. And under the sway of this regard, the fathers have decided that we cannot decide for ourselves (and, yes, that we are even dangerous when, by chance or struggle, we break free of their control). And so patriarchy accepts our existence as legitimate only when we are subjected to male power, a power in the word which objectifies us, both women and nature, and a power in the act which dominates us.

Women and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her is a record of this relation of patriarchy to woman and nature; and in the telling of this record the metaphors by which nature is so often compared to or personified by a woman, and with which women are revealed as more a part of nature, or closer to the earth than men, are used to a different purpose, because now the old story is retold by a woman and so turns around to face its origins.

The book begins in a parody of the objective voice - I call it the voice of patriarchy - that voice which rarely uses pronouns as the subject of any sentence and thus utters sentences and phrases such as, “It is decided...” or “It is declared...” or “It is discovered that...” In this voice a history of scientific opinion about the nature of matter (or ultimately the nature of nature) is traced and woven in chronologically with a history of opinions (from Saints, philosophers, poets and psychoanalysts) about the nature of woman.

Slowly in the midst of this “objective” unravelling of history another voice, faint and muffled, begins to appear. This is the object herself, the dominated one speaking out, and in the course of the book, her voice becomes stronger, but that is the dramatic plot of the story: now, in this book, woman and nature, formerly shamed by our mutual association, become allies, assume a voice and question the inquisitors (I shall not reveal who wins).

The writing in this book is less linear than it is constructed or made, like a poem is made, and is not analytical but moves by the force of echoes and counterpoints and harmonics, and sings more than argues. Several small dramas or records proceed after the history of matter, and these reflect what has happened to woman and nature under patriarchal power. Still in the section called “Matter,” one of three sections in the book, I write of the Land, of Timber, of the Wind, of Cows, of Mules, of Show Horses, and of “woman’s body” (or “Her Body”).

In the second section of the book, called “Separation,” I juxtapose all the separations patriarchy has imposed: mind from body, emotion from intellect, mother from daughter, wilderness from the city (“The Zoological Garden”), soul from flesh (“The Anatomy Lesson”).

The third and last part of this book - called “Her Vision” - mirrors back all that preceded it, but now in a different voice and from a different angle of perception. Timber becomes again trees and the trees talk as a forest. “Her Body” becomes “The Years” in which the story of woman’s resistance to domination is brought back from silence, “The Zoological Garden,” a story of a caged lion, is reflected back as “The Lion in the Den of the Prophets.” Like the cycles of nature, of which this writing is only one reflection, all the old materials of our past are reshaped into something new, as nitrogen, oxygen, carbon, soil, plants and flesh are reformed in birth and death, yielding to one another, and nothing is lost.

Susan Griffin, Berkeley, January 5, 1977
1585 Witch-burnings in two villages leave one female inhabitant each.
1589 Francis Bacon is made clerk of the Star Chamber.
He says that nature herself must be examined.
1801—1801 Nineteen witches are burned in Lorraine.
That nature must be bound into service, he persuades.
1800 Gilberte publishes De Magistre.
1603 William Harvey serves as physician to King James I and assists at the examination of the witches.
1609 Galileo, on hearing a rumour of the invention of a glass magnifying distant objects, constructs a telescope.
It is urged that nature must be bound in her wanderings before leading her and driving her.
1609 Kepler publishes Astronomica Nova.
1664 The whole population of Navarre is declared witches.
He says that the Earth should be put on the rack and tortured for her secrets.
1615 William Harvey lectures on the circulation of the blood at the Royal College of Physicians.
1667 Rouen witch trials are held.
She confesses that every Monday the Devil lay with her for fornication.
She confesses that when he copulated with her she felt intense pain.
1382 Thomas Bradwardine, in Treatise on the Proporions of Velocities in Moving Bodies, proposes a mathematical law of dynamics universally valid for all changes in velocity.
1431 Joan of Arc, age 22, “placed high on the fire so the flames would reach her slowly,” dies.
She is told why she wears male costume.
1468 Pope defines witchcraft as crime except in removing all legal limits to torture.
1482 Leonardo da Vinci moves to Milan and begins his notebooks on hydraulics, mechanics, anatomy; he paints the Madonna on the Rocks.
Does she see the body of Saint Michael, they ask him? Did he come to her naked?
1500—1525 1000 witches are burned every year in the diocese of Como.
1543 Vesalius publishes De Humani Corporis Fabrica.
1546 Copernicus publishes De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium.
She is asked if she is in a state of grace.
She is asked if Saint Margarets speaks English.
1571 Johannes Kepler is born.
1572 Augustus Pous issues Consultations Saxoconig, stating that a good witch must be burned because she has made a pact with the Devil.
She confesses that she falsly pretended to have revelations from God and his angels, from St. Catherine and St. Margaret.
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EXCEPT that it is said we are closer to the earth and take more of its nature. Because we put our hands in shit, we are more like shit. Because the stench of urine rises up our noses, we are like urine. And all the apertures of our bodies leak. Despite all the solutions we are taught to apply and all the scrubbing of cloth and wood and porcelain and skin, still we make stains. Red on the sheets, white and yellow in our clothing. And because of this we are fit only for brute labor and not for thought. And because we cannot think, we obey the thoughts of others not so filled with the stench of excrement, because we clean their excrement from them, and from their clothes. And then we clean the smell of their excrement from our hands. Because we provide them with food, and clean the table, and then we clean the smell of their food from our hands. And thus we roll constantly, laboring and by that labor creating only more labor, such is the very sign of our stupidity, of our entrapment in the flesh, of our singular obsession with survival, of our dumb repetition, our mute cycles, our bestial comprehension, that we labor, and do nothing else, we labor like mules.

But the mule has a certain grace. She is sure-footed. She can turn, with the plow harnessed to her, her weight pulling the blade through the soil, on the steep side of a mountain, not sliding or stumbling at the incline. She can follow men up through the steepest mountain pass, carrying food and water. (So that the mule never is as necessary to an army as is the gunman.) And is this grace bred into her?

Breed or not, it is the grace of labor. It at least is a strength and has that spare beauty of function, of things that are what they are, the definition, the line, the movement, essential.

AND if we find this grace through our labor, with our fingers finding the loose thread in the garment, our ears late at night hearing the cries no one else hears, catching the milk in the pot as it begins to boil, the body bent over rocking, rocking, the pieces of cloth sewn together in patterns, the taste of rhyme with rosemary and the different shade of oregano, or the grace, the grace of crisis, the fever, the steady application of cold cloths, the grace of economy, the soup of leftovers, the muck of the bed covering in a skirt, or the seeing of the barely visible, the unmasked, the slight difference in the expression of the eyes, the mood, the slow opening, the listening, the small possibility, barely audible, nodding, almost inarticulate, yet allowing articulation, words, healing, the eyes acknowledge edge, this grace of the unspoken, spoken in movement, she reaches, the blanket is wrapped around, the arm held this muddled daily grace, without which we do not choose to continue, and if we find this, we have something of our own.

This is our secret grace, unnamed, invisible, surviving. Yet for outward show, the mule is not considered graceful or beautiful apart from her labors. But the genus called Equus can in a different breed, he taught to make movements pleasing in themselves. And she is known as the Show Horse.

Show Horses

The Bit

"He ye not like to horses and mules which have no understanding: whose mouths must be held up with bit and bridle, lest they fall upon thee."

The Book of Common Prayer

The right thumb of the rider holds the center of the bridle in front of the horse's face and above her head so that the bit is in front of the horse's mouth. The right hand is placed under the horse's head. If the horse does not open her mouth when the bit touches her teeth, if she clenches her teeth, the rider presses his left forefinger on the toothless bar of the lower jaw which will make the horse open her mouth and accept the bit. The thicker the bit the milder its effect on the mouth of the horse. The bit should neither pull up the corners of the mouth nor touch the teeth. The nose-band must be tight but not so tight that the horse cannot breathe. And she must be able to accept tidbits from the rider's hand. The throat latch however should be fastened loosely.

Nature

"[The horse] is by Nature a very lazy animal whose idea of heaven is an enormous field of lush grass in which he can graze undisturbed until his belly is full, and after a pleasant doze can start filling himself up all over again."

Captain Ewlyn Hartley Edwards, From Padlock to Saddle

"A perfect hostess in a household with servants gives the impression that she has nothing whatever to do with household arrangements, which apparently run themselves. In a servantsless household, she has the cleaning, marketing and as much cooking as possible done in advance, so that an absolute minimum of her time is spent on these chores while her guests are with her."

Emily Post, Etiquette

It is the horse's extreme sensitivity to pain, especially in the mouth but also all over her body which allows the rider to control her with the pressure of his own weight, the movements of his legs, and with the aid of the bit, the bridle and the reins, the riding whip, long whip and the spur.

It is the timorous nature of the animal coupled with this sensitivity that allows her to be trained. The horse is not aggressive; her only defense is to flee. Therefore the horse reacts to pain by running away from the pain. If the rider stands at the horse's head and taps her flank with a long whip, the horse will move away from the discomfort.

In addition the horse has a prodigious memory, is a social animal, has a desire to please and a need for security, and all these qualities are used in her training. Her faults are nervousness, laziness and an excitability that is at times unpredictable.
“To train horses, it is essential that we have a very clear understanding of the way in which their small minds work and appreciate how limited they are in this department.”

Captain Elwyn Hartley Edwards, From Paddock to Saddle

“Oh how lovely is her ignorance!”

Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emilius

The horse is not designed for carrying weight; he has a structure similar to a rectangular box with a log at each corner, and the rider places his weight on the weakest part, the unsupported center. Her legs and feet are not designed for trotting on hard roads or galloping. And jumping is entirely unnatural to the horse. But through an arduous process of training the body ill-designed for this task can become a carrier of weights and learn to adjust her own balance for that purpose.

Therefore the body of the horse must be reshaped. A horse in the correct form has a rounded top line accompanied by a lowered head and neck and hindlegs engaged beneath the body; to achieve this form the teacher uses exercise, strapping, and encourages higher head carriage. Thus formed the horse carries weight and can develop paces, balance and movements at the bidding of the teacher and then the rider.

The horse has a natural curvature of the spine perhaps as a result of the foetal position of the unborn foal. This curvature prevents the animal from moving on a straight line so that the hindfeet follow exactly the track of the forefeet. Therefore the horse is trained in exercises to correct this natural crookedness by increasing the flexibility in the lumbar vertebrae. This straightening improves the mechanical efficiency of the horse.

Grooming

SHE is brushed all over her body with a dandy brush in the direction that the fur grows. She is brushed with the body brush in round, scrubbing movements. She is polished with a linen cloth until she shines.

Her eyes, her lips, her nostrils, under her tail are washed. Bits of sand, dust, manure, pebbles, mud, grass, weeds are taken from her hoofs with a pick. Oil is rubbed into her foot.

She is clipped. (So that she does not have the naked look of a fresh cut, this is done before the show.) The scissors move against the fur leaving only her mane, her tail and a saddle mark.

(The groom places a saddle on her back and clips around it so that when the saddle is removed, a saddle of fur remains on her back.)

And now that she is clipped her rider must protect her. The grease that was natural to her, that protected her from the cold and the wet, has been removed. She is vulnerable to the weather. She must provide for her a warm wooden blanket to put under her and a lined rug to put over her.

She may have her fetlocks clipped for showing in summer.

On certain occasions, good form requires that her mane and her tail be braided. Her hair is sewn or tied with ribbons.

Dressage

“Girls ought to be active and diligent; nor is that all, they should also be early subjected to restraint. This misfortune, if really one is inseparable from their sex; nor do they ever show it off but to suffer worse cruel evils. They must be subject, all their lives, to the most constant and severe restraint, which is that of decorum: it is, therefore, necessary to accustom them early to such confinement, that it may not afterwards cost them too dear; and to the suppression of their caprices, that they may the more readily submit to the will of others.”

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Émile

“She must not swing her arms as though they were dangling ropes, she must not twitch her self this way and that; she must not shout and she must not, while wearing her bridal veil, smoke a cigarette.”

Emily Post, Etiquette

“The teacher should insist that the horse stand still and on all four legs during the process of mounting and until asked to move on by the rider. Fidgeting on the spot or moving without command must not be tolerated.”

Alois Podhajsicky, The Riding Teacher

The movements which the show horse executes have no use in themselves but exist as part of the show of dressage, manifesting how obediently she is, how well she keeps her balance, how complete is the mastery of her rider.

To “go large” she rides straight along the walls of the riding school, taking the corners precisely on an arc of a circle of three steps’ diameter.

The “circle” is performed in either half sector of the school by inscribing a circle of 16 to 18 meters.

A “volte” is the smallest circle the horse may perform; it is six steps in diameter and may be done in the corners, along the walls or on the center line. The volte is performed only once.

The “volte and change” consists of a half circle and a straight line on which the horse is led at an angle of 45 degrees back to the wall where her position is changed.

“Serpentine all along the wall” may be ridden as single or double loops. For the single loop, the horse, after passing the second corner of the short side, is taken on a single track approximately 5 meters from the wall, thus describing a flat arc, and half-way through the school she is taken back in the same manner. For the double loop the curve of the single is repeated but the horse does not move from the wall more than 3 meters. Both arcs must be of the same size.

The “half-pass” is performed on parallel tracks, usually on a diagonal of the school. The horse’s head is bent slightly to the poll in the direction she is going. The rest of her spine is held straight. If her shoulders move laterally more than her haunches, she will move on circular tracks, and this is classic direct rotation. If her haunches move more than her shoulders and on circular tracks she does a classic inverse rotation.

A common fault in the half-pass occurs when the horse’s quarters are pushed ahead of the shoulders. Another occurs when the horse falls onto the leading shoulder in loss of balance owing to her not being straight.

Temperamental difficulties in training a horse to perform are these: nervousness or laziness, qualities which may be developed in part, or the nature, calmness and patience are recommended for the former. For the latter, the long whip.

Physical problems may be a long back or weak hindquarters, making it either difficult or painful for the horse to carry a rider or train for long hours. These may be eliminated partially by gymnastic training. Another difficulty is the oversensitive mouth of most high-spirited horses: this necessitates a light use of the bit.

If the horse lets her tongue hang out this is counted as a serious fault. This may be prevented by a manipulation of the bit. Whenever the horse performs well, the rider offers her a lump of sugar.

The collaboration of horse and rider is essential to performance. When it is possible, a nervous horse should be led by a calm rider and a phlegmatic horse by a nervous rider.
The Zoological Garden

Love

"Wild, wild things can turn on you
And you get to set them free."

Cris Williamson, Wild Things

The Stable

"... the stable and the return to it after work is the greatest reward we can give our horse."

Captain Elwyn Hartley Edwards, From Paddock to Stable

Love gets its name (amor) from the word for hook (anus) which means to capture or to be captured.

Andreas Capellanus, The Art of Courtly Love

The lookout should have the impression that two creatures are fused together, one thinking, the other executing the thought."

Aleko Podhajsky, The Riding Teacher

The rider loves his horse. He dreams of her at night. He sees her sometimes in a fury of wildness, her excitable frenzies pouring over his body in waves; his head tossing becomes her head, a silky black mane on the pillows, large nostrils flaring, the long neck flailing back and forth throwing the sheets to the floor, hoofs kicking at the walls, and one eye, wild staring, unknowing, hurling raw, seven hundred pounds, crashing through the wall, galloping blood bright at the teeth where the bit has been torn away, a white frothy sweat, running through the dark night, all night: he is not the rider but the horse, riding, riding, riding. But in the morning she is calm. She is his mate. He speaks softly to her. She is supple. She responds quickly to his least movement. They have developed a silent language. If he presses with his left chig, a subtle movement imperceptible to the lookout, she moves immediately to the right, her feet graceful, her head high, executing with exquisite grace his barely whispered will. It is as if she reads his mind and peacefully lets his thoughts enter and guide her body. They are beautiful together, seemingly effortless, artful, her back seems part of his, her legs are his legs, they ride as one.
**The Anatomy Lesson**

The medical student is overcome with feeling. She vomits when she ought to be lifting the corpse's arm, breaking it against the stiffening of death. She associates her own body with the coldness of this one, trembles before it. No measure is taken to relieve her fear. No one asks her to describe it or to sing it out. No ceremony exists to reveal it. She is told instead she must learn to move about the human body without feeling. She must leave feeling behind. No one wonders if there might have been a use for that feeling—it is discarded before it is examined. She shall never know about death. The anatomy lesson becomes lifeless. And now this probing of the dead body gives her no help against her fear of death. Yet, isn't that why she wanted to see the body, despite her teaching, despite her fear, because of the fear itself, the feeling.

"It is only real feelings that possess this power of transferring themselves into inert matter." — Simone Weil, *First and Last Notebooks*

**Naming**

BEHIND naming, beneath words, is something else. An existence named, unnamed, unnamable. We give the grass a name, and earth a name. We say grass and earth are separate. We know this because we can pull the grass free of the earth and see its separate roots — but when the grass is free, it dies. We say the inarticulate has no souls. We say the cow's eye has no existence outside of ourselves, that the red wing of the blackbird has no thought, the roe of the salmon no feeling, because we cannot name these. Yet for our own lives we grieve all that cannot be spoken, that there is no name for, repeating for ourselves the names of things which surround what cannot be named. We say Heron and Loon, Coot and Killdeer, Snipe and Sandpiper, Gull and Hawk, Eagle and Osprey, Pigeon and Dove, Oriole, Meadowlark, Sparrow. We say Red Admiral and Painted Lady, Morning Cloak and Question Mark. Baltimore and Checkerspot, Buckeye, Monarch, Viceroy, Mayfly, Stonefly, Cicada, Leafhopper and Earwig, we say Sea Urchin and Sand Dollar, Starfish and Sandworm. We say mucus membra, uterus, cervix, ligamentum, vagina and hymen, labia, orifice, artery, vessel, spine and heart. We say skin, blood, breast, nipple, taste, nostril, green, eye, hair, we say vulva, hood, clitoris, belly, foot, knee, elbow, pit, nail, thumb, we say tongue, teeth, toe, ear, eye, we say ear and voice and touch and taste and we say again love, breast and beautiful and vulva, saying clitoris, saying belly, saying toes and soft saying ear, saying ear, saying ear, ear and hood and hood and green and all that we say we are saying around that which cannot be said, cannot be spoken. But in a moment that which is behind naming makes itself known. Hand and breast know each one to the other. Wood in the table knows clay in the bowl. Air knows grass knows water knows mud and know beetle knows frost knows sunlight knows the shape of the earth knows death knows not dying. And all this knowledge is in the souls of everything, behind naming, before speaking, beneath words.

**The Lion in the Den of the Prophets**

She swaggers in. They are terrifying in their white hairlessness. She waits. She watches. She does not move. She is measuring their moves. And they are measuring her. Cautiously one takes a bit of her fur. He cuts it free from her. He examines it. Another numbers her feet, her teeth, the length and width of her body. She yawns. They announce she is alive. They wonder what she will do if they enclose her in the room with them. One of them shuts the door. She backs her way toward the closed doorway and then roars. "Be still," the men say. She continues to roar. "Why does she roar?" they ask. The roaring must be inside her, they conclude. They decide they must see the roaring inside her. They approach her in a group, six at her two front legs and six at her two back legs. They are trying to put her to sleep. She swings at one of the men. His own blood runs over him. "Why did she do that?" the men question. She has no soul, they conclude, she does not know right from wrong. "Be still," they shout at her. "Be humble, trust us," they demand. "We have souls," they proclaim. "We know what is right," they approach her with their medicine. "for you." She does not understand language. She devours them.
Introduction
One of the most revolutionary aspects of feminism — revolutionary in the context of modern American culture — is the self-help concept: the struggle to end the dependence and passivity which have characterized so much of women’s lives. We see this idea applied concretely in areas of life as disparate as breadwinning and automobile care; but perhaps its most dramatic manifestation is in the field of health care, where indeed the language of “self-help” was coined. “Taking control of our bodies” started with Carol Downer daring to use “their” equipment — a speculum — to examine those core parts of our femaleness that had been kept from our view.

Vaginal self-examination, which has enabled thousands of women to become acquainted with their bodies in such a way as to lessen their dependence on (predominantly male) medical professionals, was the beginning of a slow but steady movement toward taking back our bodies. Naturally, this movement initially focused on the female organs and functions of reproduction: birth control, birth, female diseases. But it has gradually extended to encompass the whole body.

In learning about our bodies, sharing information, penetrating the professional mystifications, women have become particularly sensitized to the negative aspects of modern medicine in general and medicine in a profit-oriented system in particular: the heavy technologizing of medical care; the disinterest in preventive medicine, including almost total neglect of diet and nutrition as the foundation of a well body; treating sick people as “consumers.” But most of all, we have become aware of the dangerous dependence for the treatment of almost all symptoms on drugs, many of which have side effects known and unknown that frequently result in disease worse than the original condition.

These discoveries have catalyzed in many feminists the search for more natural and humane methods of preventing and dealing with illness, methods which are accessible to individuals and which further the concept of self-dependence and responsibility. The search has put us in touch with alternative methods of healing, some of which have existed on what we have been taught to regard uncritically as the “quack fringes” — homeopathy, herbology, acupuncture, reflexology, chiropractic, psychic healing — and other more recent additions to the health scene, such as
foot reflexology, megavitamin therapy, the therapies of the "cancer Underground." Of course, in some cases we have discovered that these systems represent the underground survival of traditional female knowledge; so, in fact, by revealing them we are simply reappraising our historical role as healers.

In moving toward alternative methods of healing, we are also attempting to reestablish the ancient wholeness ("holiness") of body and mind, which gradually disintegrated under the impact of the mind-versus-body dualism that has appeared to be such an essential characteristic of patriarchy. This dualism is perhaps nowhere more exaggerated than in modern medicine, which, with scalpel-like precision, segments psyche from physiology — and then ruthlessly compartmentalizes physiology: consider the bone doctors and brain doctors and ear doctors and bowel doctors and eye doctors and skin doctors and gland doctors and heart doctors. In search of more natural, organic perspectives from which to approach sickness and maintain well bodies, feminists are allying themselves with the "alternative" health movement, which sees healing as a holistic process. A recent national women's health conference held in Los Angeles amply demonstrates the inclusiveness of feminist health concerns. The program lists workshops ranging from self-help, home birth, menopause, and bladder and vaginal infections to herbal healing, yoga, acupuncture, meditation with cancer, and psychic massage.

Holistic healing may be defined as "balanced integration of the individual in all aspects and levels of being — body, mind, and spirit — including interpersonal relationships and our relationships to the whole of nature and our physical environment." Disease may be seen as an imbalance, then, or a conflict between the different aspects of the self. It may also be seen as a tool for growth, confronting us with the results of poor diet, negligence toward the body, or negative self-concepts. On the larger social levels, disease forces us to deal with such issues as the polluted environment, imbalanced distribution of resources, and an oppressive medical establishment and food industry.

The holistic health movement has developed dramatically in certain areas of the country, and particularly in California. Within its folds we find a wide range of practitioners ranging from highly trained male specialists to lesbian separatist witches calling themselves "holistic healers."

In this directory, we have searched for feminists and women as healers based on proven expertise and knowledge. In certain areas where women are not yet prominent, we list male practitioners and authors. We do this to give women access to maximal information, skills, and technologies of healing.

How to use this directory? We urge first of all an attitude of patience and self-reflection. Too often we feel overwhelmed by what seems to be huge amounts of information in a new area. This attitude is especially prevalent among women in the subject of health and healing. Before thumbing through this directory, consider your own point of entry:

1. Women's Health and Healing Conference, held October 8-11, 1976, sponsored by Herself Health Clinic, 4164 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles; and Westside Women's Clinic, 1711 Ocean Park Blvd., Santa Monica.

2. Pamphlet of Association for Holistic Health.

1. Are you experiencing acute physical and/or emotional problems? You may then want immediate recourse to your regular doctor, "got guidance, and support for alternative solutions to the immediate crisis is over.

2. Are you dealing with a long-term, chronic, but nonemergency condition? You may wish to investigate gradual self-healing techniques including diet, creative visualization, and acupuncture treatment.

3. Are you recovering from major surgery or large doses of drugs, radiation treatments, etc.? You may want to pursue a general detoxification program by means of clay, diet adjustment, fasting.

4. Are you in relatively good health and wanting to maintain it? You may wish to learn shiatsu for rejuvenation and tension release or study homeopathic first-aid remedies.

At whatever level we choose to deal with our condition — the physical, emotional, or spiritual — positive ripple effects will be experienced throughout our system. We do not have to do everything all at once. For example, improving our diet can drastically improve emotional balance; experiencing the profound relaxation of massage can accelerate spiritual growth. What is important is starting and committing ourselves to some aspect of our self-healing.

Certain issues are crucial in the holistic healing movement: How do we evaluate practitioners, their modes of therapy, and the appropriateness of that therapy for our condition? We offer a few guidelines to the "healing consumer" in approaching a practitioner: Is she/he willing to be questioned, to give information, to be accessible? Is she/he concrete, specific in preliminary explanations? Does she/he seem to practice what she/he preaches? Does she/he charge reasonable fees for services rendered?

This directory represents a beginning effort to spread and coordinate information on alternative healing modes. There is need for much work in this area. We hope to see the development of: A comprehensive work dealing with in-depth analyses of various healing therapies, noting how they can be used together and where they may conflict; local directories enabling women to easily locate practitioners of the various healing arts in their own areas; coordinated health education projects, building on the self-help concept to make this information available to large numbers of women; health-maintenance education for people of all ages and backgrounds.

Herbs
Herbalism, the use of flowers, shrubs, grasses, trees for the prevention of disease and the correction of illness, is a subject large enough to fill an entire catalog, not least because it is the most ancient of the healing arts. The 2000-year-old Ebers Papyrus discovered in the Thebes Necropolis contains herbal recipes, many of which include herbs in use today (长征, mint, myrrh, elderberries), and documents the practice of herbal medicine by several thousand doctors. The earliest existing herbal was compiled 1800 years ago by a first-century Greek physician, Dioscorides; but there are records indicating the existence of Chinese herbs as far back as 3000 B.C. Herbalism has been a primary healing technique in cultures on a worldwide scale.

In Western history, the traditional healer was the village wise woman or witch. From a formidable pharmacopeia she provided herbal remedies."

"Which derives from the Anglo-Saxon "wisce" or wise;thus, witchcraft referred to the "craft of the wise."

Books
A Modern Herbal, by M. Grieve, two volumes, Dover Books, $5.00 per volume. Originally published in 1931 and subtitled "The Medicinal, Culinary, Cosmetic and Ecoholic Properties, Cultivation and Folklore of Herbs, Grasses, Shrubs and Trees with Their Modern Scientific Use," this is the definitive modern herbal. In 888 pages Ms. Grieve overfowled and, from the common to the more exotic — it's a delight just to read some of the names: auld, housewife, spurge, yarrow, tree of heaven, water soldier. She provides a spectacularly thorough and utterly fascinating account of the history and folk beliefs surrounding the plants;
for everything from warts to rheumatisms; but, of course, her most widely renowned herbal skills had to do with the reproductive function of women, where herbal preparations for infertility, fertility, menstrual problems, abortion, and—in her function as midwife—she augmented her delivery skills with herbal medicines which relieved pain, relaxed muscles, hastened contractions, stopped hemorrhaging, as the situation demanded. She used her herbal knowledge to such effect, particularly in relieving labor pains, that the possession of this skill was used as a principle rationale for the destruction of the wise women in the great burnings between the 15th and 17th centuries. (It was deemed unChristian and heretical by Church Fathers to abridge the Biblical injunction that women should bring forth their issue in pain.)

As Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English point out in Witches, Midwives, and Nurses, the liquidation of women healers coincided with a more intense medicalization of care. And, from the time of the "Enlightenment," male practitioners of medicine and men of science steadily rejected herbalism—although it remained the most widely practiced form of medicine.

There have always been two sides to the traditional practice of herbal lore: one purely medicinal, dealing with the healing properties of plants; the other concerned with their magical powers. Mugwort, for example, an herb with special connections to the Goddess Diana (the Latin name of this herbalism is Artemisia vulgaris), supposedly increased one's power of clairvoyance. And we are all familiar with the use of herbs as love potions. It was this latter aspect of herbal lore which was used to discredit confidence in the medicinal properties of herbs. It is an association which still colors our attitudes. "Old wives' tales," we sneer at our mothers' and grandmothers' suggested remedies. Why use witch hazel for hemorrhoids when one can get Preparation H from the local drugstore, or, better yet,contres from our doctors?

The easy dismissal of herbology as unscientific superstition overlooks the fact that wise women and traditional herbiers built up their pharmacopoeia based on hundreds of years of empirical observation. Today, Italian physicians still use some of the herbal remedies of Trotula, a 14th-century woman healer famous throughout Europe in her lifetime.

Herbology commands respect in many quarters of the Soviet medical establishment and is integrated into much of regular Soviet medical practice. Alma Hutcheson (see below) reports that in 1967 there were 19 specialized medical botanical farms with over 250,000 acres under cultivation by the Soviet state medical industry.

Indeed, some of the most crucial drugs in regular use in medical practice today have their origin in the curers used by wise women for centuries. One of the most famous examples is digitals, commonly used to treat certain cardiac conditions.

William Withering, the English doctor who discovered and documenting digitals for the treatment of heart disease, brought knowledge of an old village wise woman in Shropshire. He had noticed that the village midwife recommended a tincture of foxglove plant. Digitals is, of course, the key element of foxglove, or witches' bells, as the plant is known in English folklore. This story is, in itself, a paradigm of the relationship between modern medicine and the ancient art of herbal healing: Doctor Withering has a monument—ornamented with foxgloves—erected to his memory; the anonymous wise woman and her herbal healing art seems disappeared into the mists of old west tales.

The wholesale destruction of wise women's properly lost us priceless healing knowledge. Luckily, much survived in the innocuous household remedies handed down from mother to daughter and in the old herbals, now being rediscovered and reexamined. The recent upsurge of interest in natural and holistic healing has resulted in the renaissance of many of the traditional herbals, as well as the publication of modern herbals and a growing body of empirically backed information on the medicinal properties of various herbs.

Modern herbology is based on the belief that herbal remedies—derived from natural organic substances—form an active or living medicine which builds up the general health at the same time as it cures specific disease. While healing the body, most herbs supply it with essential nutrients. For example, alfalfa, an herb used, among many other purposes, to control bowel irregularity, includes in its constituents vitamins A, E, D, K, eight enzymes, iron, magnesium, sulphur, sodium, potassium, silica, and trace elements—none exactly what you get in one of the more common patented laxatives. Herbal healing has several other advantages over drug-oriented medicine. It aims at curing itself, not just the symptoms of disease—a slower, but ultimately more effective procedure than the alleviation of symptoms, the course of action followed by modern doctors in the treatment of disease. Herbs do not subject the body to the dangerous, not to say disastrous, interferences with so many commonly used drugs. Hundreds of thousands of Americans, especially women, use Valium regularly as a tranquilizer and soporific. According to the Physician's Desk Reference, the side effects of Valium include kidney and liver damage and the lowering of the white blood cell count, as well as "acute hyperexcited state, anxiety . . . and fatigue," the latter being symptoms the drug is supposed to relieve. When I need to relax, or have trouble going to sleep, I drink a tea made of catnip, hops, lobelia, peppermint, skullcap, and valerian root. This is just one of many natural, very effective, and harmless herbal services.

Herbal remedies are most effective in treating a range of minor illnesses: colds, flu, headaches, menstrual cramps, small infections, allergies, intestinal disorders, etc. But they are also crucial as an adjunct in treating serious diseases such as arthritis, asthma, anemia, heart disease, liver ailments, cancer, cysts, gallstones, diabetes, hypertension. I personally have been able to depend on my "heavy" and ultimately system-damaging drugs for an astringent condition by the use of therapies that include herbal remedies. Quintessentially, however, herbs, like all natural foods, act as a preventative. Even if alone is well worth the exploration of their use by anyone seriously concerned with maintaining physical well-being.

Finally, herbal healing is accessible to any interested person at a cost of a small library and/or enrollment in one of several herbal schools offering pernicious courses directly or by correspondence. Herbs are legal, cheap, and easy to obtain (until the AMMA identifies creeping herbism as a threat to the American health-care "consumer").
Homeopathy

Homeopathy is a medical discipline concerned with the total condition of the patient "as expressed through her emotions, mental outlook and physical condition..." Homeopathy seeks the one single medication (at a minimum dosage) for each individual which will stimulate her own healing forces to bring about a state of health. It is based on the work of an early 19th-century physician named Samuel Hahnemann. He rediscovered Hippocrates' Law, which states that "Like cures like..." Homeo means like, similar; pathos means feeling, suffering—i.e., having like feelings or affections. The medications used by homeopathic physicians are made from selected mineral, vegetable, and animal substances that have been highly diluted and prepared by a process known as "dynamization." Hahnemann found that a very small amount of a substance had the effect of curing the symptoms brought on by a large amount of that substance.

A simple example is Homeopathic Coffee: Coffea Cruda, which cures that increase sensitiveness, tight head pain, excessive wakefulness, etc., which large amounts of coffee cause. Homeopathics stimulate the body on a very basic level, probably on an immune level, to begin to function healthfully for itself. Hence the body will throw off the condition which led to the manifestation of the symptoms. Homeopathy assists the body in helping itself.

The remedies are in such small amounts that they can be sold over the counter. These medicines have been tested on healthy people. Many people prescribe for themselves with the aid of manuals and some trial and error. Drug store workers who work at homeopathic drugstores can be very helpful.

6. Joyce Keene, op. cit.

Journals

Layman, Speaks, published by National Center for Homeopathy (address below), 6xly.

This small, delightful periodical is written in a homey style for the general reader (not a substitute for homeopathy). Staple articles include: "Chamomilla, One of the Safer Medicines?"; "The Fear of Flu (and How To Deal With It)"; "Why Homeopathic Cures?"; etc. Listed in each issue are the principles of homeopathy, which includes:

"...never confuses symptoms with disease; has a clear scientific conception of symptoms, what they mean, and how to use the totality of symptoms to find the one individual remedy...understands the differences between cause and effect, suppression and cure, understands the consequences of that difference for the cure and welfare of the sick..." Drawings of herbs appear on each cover.

Organizations

National Center for Homeopathy 0231 Leech Pike East, Tennessee 37244

This organization provides information on literature and referrals to homeopathic physicians, homeopathic drug stores, and professional courses in homeopathy.


Another central organization providing information, publications, etc.

Drugstores

Santa Monica Drug Co. 1513 Fourth Street Santa Monica, CA 90401

Kiehl Pharmacy, Inc. 1031 Third Avenue New York, N.Y. 10022

Boericke and Tafel, Inc. 1031 Third Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19107

Mylands Homeopathic Pharmacy 2220 2nd Street San Francisco, CA 94102

A reasonably priced catalogue of homeopathic remedies and the conditions they are useful for. For the serious student of homoeopathy.

Chiropractic

Chiropractic is a branch of the healing arts concerned with health and disease processes. It is a system employed by physicians who consider the person as an integrated being, giving special attention to spinal mechanics and muscular and vascular relationships. Documented history of tissue manipulation goes back to cave paintings in southeastern France, dated 17,500 B.C.

Chiropractic is based on the premise that:

...the nervous system controls all other systems and all physiological functions of the human body; that interference with the nerve control of these systems impairs their vital functions and by rendering the body less resistant to infection or other stimuli, induces disease.

Therefore, the chiropractor does most of her work on the spinal column, the central railway of the nervous system. Deborah Karrish, a feminist chiropractor, pointed out that "structural misalignments are at the root of most physical problems. Most conditions are affected by or have their effect on the spine."

What kinds of conditions is chiropractic most effective for? Many people initially go to a chiropractor for back problems. They often find that other conditions clear up at therapy continues. Various chronic conditions such as allergies, asthma, diabetes, psoriasis, and hypotension have all been successfully treated by chiropractors.

Chiropractic methods include interviews, physical examination of the spine and affected body parts. X-rays, and lab tests. Treatments vary, but they exclude prescription drugs or major surgery. The most characteristic treatment is the chiropractic adjustment—that is, the correction of off-centered vertebral or pelvic segments in order to balance the spine. Other treatments may include dietary and nutritional supplements, phytotherapy, and professional counseling in such areas as diet, nutrition, safety habits, posture, rest, and work.

Chiropractors, like naturopaths and homeopaths, were an important part of the American medical scene until drug medicine (often referred to as "allopathy") began to predominate. All States now have statutes recognizing and regulating the practice of chiropractic as an independent health service. Insurance companies will compensate for chiropractic treatment. Chiropractic can be an important part of health maintenance and disease prevention. Deborah Karrish commented that a yearly spinal checkup could help most of us maintain correct spinal posture and remedy minor problems before they become major. "It's at least as effective as some nurse taking your blood pressure, weighing you and then having the doctor come in and say, 'Does anything hurt?' Women are looking into chiropractic as a career more and more. While sexist attitudes are probably as prevalent as in the conventional medical establishment, it is still an option which some women interested in health care may wish to pursue.


Books

NOTE—Books on chiropractic are not readily available. You may need to order them from the publisher. Visit your local chiropractic book store or library for best results.


Chiropractic Speaks Out by Chester A. Will (Wolf Publishing Co., P.O. Box 250, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068, $6.95). A reply to medical propaganda and bigotry in osteopathy.

The Chiropractic Adjuster by Dr. D. D. Palmer (available from Palmer College, 1000 Brady St., Davenport, Ia 52803, $26.00).

Written by the founder of chiropractic, this book tells everything you would want to know about the art, history, techniques, and theory of chiropractic—possibly available in your public or university library.

Treatment of Neurosyphilis and the Encyclopaedia of Physical and Manipulative Therapies, compiled by Thomas T. Lake (Health Research, 70 Lafayette St., Middletown, N.Y. 12545, $18.95). Another fascinating reference work with loads of information.

Journals

Chiropractic Economics includes a variety of articles on chiropractic as well as kinesiology, acupuncture, nutrition, etc. (Chiropractic Publishing Co., 39385 W. 16-Mile Rd., Farmington Hills, Michigan 48024)

International Chiropractic Association 714 Brady St. Davenport, Iowa 52808

American Chiropractic Association 2200 Grand Ave. Des Moines, Iowa 50312

Both of these groups will send information on request.