editorial

WE SUPPORT SHIRLEY CHISHOLM'S CANDIDACY FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

We like her militant, irrepressible spirit and we like her feminism! And this is why we support her over all the other candidates.

In addition, we feel that the Shirley Chisholm nomination campaign is very important for the interests of women in particular, but of all oppressed and working people as well. Her candidacy strongly challenges the Democratic Party—the largest political party in this country—to make some moves toward actually representing the people and to make concessions to some of our needs. It also challenges all political parties to take feminism more seriously.

We think it is vital for all women to support her and we urge those who have a particular interest in this area of work to make haste to do everything they can to help. (FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE CAMPAIGN, SEE PAGE 2.)

OUR LIFE OF CRIME

The popular male version of the story defining women pictures us in our state of blessed motherhood suckling humanity at our breasts; we who are the vessel of the young, the protectors of the innocent, the heart and feeling of the union, so distant on the pedestal that sex must be something special for us, embodying moreover the spiritual, just all around femininity. That is, until we reject one of these special duties and slip off the pedestal. Then we are sinful, crazy and even criminal. The blessed and the fallen, and not a very far drop in between. But we don't take men seriously at this level anymore; we know what their interests are. We know because they never take responsibility for the kids we bear them and seem rather more concerned with their own gratification than with spiritual elevation. So they call us names when we play their games and refuse to be "blessed" (subservient to them). Their names don't bother us, it's their power over us which makes their definitions important; their power to define what they don't like as crime and punish us for it.

LIVING OUTSIDE THE LAW: PROSTITUTION AND ABORTION

There must be scarcely a woman alive who has not lived outside the law at one time or another, who has not resisted or flouted the state's rule over our sex, and rule of our sex.

In this issue we will concern ourselves with two such forms of rebellion and, therefore, criminal activity that masses of women have engaged in, abortion and prostitution. (There are others, too, of course, like libelanism and "illegitimate" motherhood, which also defy the powerful strictures on women to marry and bear children.)

In the case of abortion, there are few women calling themselves feminists who would doubt, that at the point a woman goes to seek an illegal abortion, (driven by a desire to retain what little bit of freedom she has) rebellion and crime are one and the same. It is a point that millions of women attain each year through their personal experience and political consciousness, knowing all too well the terrible fear of the illegal activity they are about to plunge into and their desperate need to do so.

Even the most conservative of feminists isn't going to talk about working through the system and waiting to change the laws at the point she needs an abortion.

As Florence Kennedy, feminist lawyer and activist, has so accurately pointed out, the friends-of-the-fetus by putting up signs that say "Abortion Is Murder" are actually telling us that women are murderers. The next logical step would mean that women would be found guilty of homicide, manslaughter, murder; which has already happened to Shirley Wheeler in Florida.

NATURAL AND UNNATURAL CRIME

There are differences between the two criminal situations for women—abortion and prostitution—dealt with in this issue, but they are similar in that they are both acts of rebellion against the male supremacist state. The prostitute is arrested for demanding a price from men for her body; the woman in need of an abortion is arrested for defying the state's effort to make an incubator of her body. Abortion is considered murder and a revolt against the maternal instinct, therefore, an unnatural crime. Prostitution, on the other hand, is distinctive just because it is regarded as such a natural crime for women. Both crimes interestingly enough revolve around men and sex with men. Actually it seems like all you have to be is a woman, to have a run in with the law sooner or later.

THE REAL CRIMINALS

This is a terrible irony because women hate crime, real crime, that is. We are against crime, how could we not be, we are so often the victims. But the real criminals go free. In previous issues of Woman's World we have run articles after articles of cases where rapists were let go scot free. The man who do go to jail are usually the petty thieves, cont'd p. 2.
THE FEMINIST PARTY
by Colette Price

The Feminist Party came into existence on November 3, 1971 through the efforts of some Queens College students with the encouragement of Florence Kennedy. It is already notorious however; it endorses Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm for the Presidency of the United States, which seems like a revolutionary act in itself these days. It seems that many of the established feminist groups are too caught up in their bureaucratic regulations and political contradictions to have enough nerve yet to officially endorse her.

Individual after individual in N.O.W. (National Organization for Women) - including National President such as Phyllis Schafheutle - are giving her enthusiastic and energetic support and urging her to run. And it seems that all it claims about working effectively within the system for women now, limits itself by a rule against endorsing any specific political candidates, from actually doing very much politically in the way of supporting feminists for office. Even The Women's Political Caucus, which sets as one of its main goals getting women into political offices, doesn't seem able to support a female Presidential candidate when she does run. In many cases, one's loyalties seem to be to her respective parties, Republican or Democratic, rather than to the good of women, apparently regard the endorsement of Ms. Chisholm as in conflict with their partisan aims. (You would think at least, the Caucus as a whole would find some kind of compromise like endorsing the best feminist in the race within each major and minor party.)

In the Women's Political Caucus, as in the others, this is a tremendous groundswell among the rank and file members to endorse Ms. Chisholm, which is being sat on by what would seem to be the leadership in control.

The Congressional Black Caucus also does not endorse political candidates, and some tried to ignore the Chisholm campaign.

The Feminist Party, made up of white and black women actively working for Shirley's campaign is the group to join if you want to get things moving put something militant feminist organization backing behind Chisholm as soon as possible. In addition the Feminist Party has plans to get into other feminist activities, leaving ideas for this up to each individual chapter. But their major effort right now is the Chisholm campaign.

Black support likewise is growing for Shirley amongst individuals. What seems to be lacking is organizational endorsement however. Some black men are giving Shirley a rough time as usual. Some thought she should be used to this by now. It doesn't seem to be dampening her spirits. For example, Percy Sutton, Manhattan Borough President, who is the only major political figure to come out in support of Ms. Chisholm so far explains his reasoning in an article in the Times of June 4th. "Shirley was out there and we had to make a decision," Mr. Sutton said. "She put us in the same position as if I found out in the 4th that Shirley was out there and we had to make a decision," Mr. Sutton said. "She put us in the same position as if I had to decide what to do next."

If Shirley isn't no one put her on the spot? Why was there any conflict involved in supporting Shirley if she was committed to a black Presidential candidate concept? Shirley is black. But then Mr. Sutton goes on to show us how he

The press hasn't given Shirley nearly enough coverage - despite this, the remarkable response she is getting from the people makes it clear that she too has made a mark in politics. We should all hope it continues. (The New Woman failed to include Shirley on the list of candidates running - what an oversight!)

The press seems to be different, it would seem, from the type of public circulation which would go to great lengths to say what were all the pros and cons of every candidate. If you want to know how Shirley feels about her campaign and what she is trying to do, you have to be the wife of so-and-so, if you're a woman, but certainly not the so-and-so yourself. But if black women would invest in a candidate for the Presidency we couldn't even imagine...

Barbara Leon, Colette Price, Kathie Sarnicki
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Crime cont'd

who rob us, yes, but rob us for less than the big thieves do - the Wall Street bankers, the Mafia kingpins, the international drug dealers, etc. These are the men who deny us jobs and pay us so little for the work we are able to get, whose laws force us to bear children for their purposes (war, cheap profitable labor), who tax us and not themselves to subsidize their economic and military ventures and adventures, and then deny us services.

THE BIG THIEVES AND LITTLE THIEVES:
WOMEN, THE VICTIMS

The big thieves send some of the little thieves to jail for their own purposes, not for ours, though they try to confuse us about that. The petty thieves may be a bother to them, as well as to us, but they also serve a useful function to them. The big thieves are siphoning off our paychecks every week while the petty thieves divide it up, keeping the worrying about being stabbed on the way home every night.

Our fear and hostility to the petty criminals is perfectly justified - they do hurt us in very real ways, and the poorest, most vulnerable women get hurt the worst. They are like all oppressed men who identify with and imitate the behavior of their fellow males on the top, rather than joining with the women who are fighting them, or even just going about their business without feeding off anyone else. Like all male supremacists, they help perpetuate the whole cycle which maintains the men at the top.

Still, to the big thieves who rule us all, the petty thieves aren't really any different from us women when they unhappy with their status as criminals. To the extent that the petty thieves try to rob the rich instead of the poor and try to rob for an irritation to those in power, just as rebellious women are. And that is why we are both called criminals, even though in the case of women this is mostly unjust and in the case of men it is more often accurate.

What is crime is obviously confused and defined by those in power. What they always define as crime is the poor trying to get up with the rich. What they always define as crime is women (like prostitutes) trying to get back some of what men take advantage of us, or women (like those seeking abortions) who are trying to escape another trap men have set for us.

Whenever revolutionary movements occur and revolution let us remember always involves the overthrow of the existing order of things (not to mention the lawlessness that is the revolutionary who is presented as the criminal, "the bandit in the hills." This is not to say that the poor and the police are not always revolutionary. It is just to say that women and others who are fighting for their freedom are defined as criminal because of the women's revolution.

THE POWER STRUCTURE MUST BE ATTACKED AND REPLACED

The women's movement so far is fighting these criminal definitions of women's activities by having the laws changed. This is good, laws need to be changed, but in a way that will guarantee that new laws will not crop up? Favorors are given and taken back rather quickly by the people in power. Unjust laws need to be challenged but if we are not to spend the rest of our days changing and passing laws, the power structure initiating those laws must be attacked and replaced.

We, as women, long for order; we wish to make sense of the chaos which surrounds us. But the question is: how are we going to do this when even the most words don't mean what they are supposed to? We will have to start by straightening out the definitions of what we know and really understanding that we are not the criminals that the men in power tell us we are (and that the laws of the state tell us we are). Then we must get together to figure out what we really want and how we're going to get it.

We are prepared to act on the abortion issue. We support the repeal of all abortion laws - that is, we speak whatever against abortion - as part of women's fight for freedom over our sexual and reproductive lives, as well as for power over our lives in general. On the issue of prostitution, we are not sure what our long-term strategy should be. We feel the urgent need for more ongoing investigation and discussion of possible approaches, some of which you will find in this present issue.

Barbara Leon, Colette Price, Kathie Sarnicki

cont'd p. 17
We decided to print the following articles as an illustration of new developments and old problems in the movement for abortion law repeal.

The L.A. Self-Help Clinic

The first article discusses the menstrual period and techniques developed by the Los Angeles Women's Self-Help Clinic. This approach has been applied to the radical and/or women's movement on the grounds that it provides do-it-yourself help for a small number of women, without challenging the state's power to maintain laws which lead to forced childbirth or the government's right, with which it has been in the medical care which is due us. We feel differently. The information uncovered by the Self-Help Clinic would seem to have such enormous implications for eventual widespread civil disobedience against abortion laws as to make them virtually unenforceable.

The Self-Help Clinic's technique, a technique developed by Lorraine Lomax, a "non-professional" woman inspired by the feminist movement is potentially better than all existing techniques. Because of Rotham's support of the work of the other women at the Self-Help Clinic, if she is a member, the existence of a safe, simple abortion procedure - the development of which is often in the medical establishment to suppress until now - would seem to be just around the corner. Such a achievement can only further highlight the contradiction between the technological possibilities of providing for people's health needs and the implacable imperialist state to develop and use that technology for the benefit of most of us.

Another article describes some of the difficulties encountered by a group of women in Gainesville, Florida (Alachua County), when they attempted to work with a local affiliate of the Women's National Coalition (WOMAAC) for repeal of the Florida abortion law.

WOMAAC and NARAL

There has been a great deal of controversy in the women's movement over the actions of WOMAAC and the connection of many of its members with the Socialist Workers Party. We feel that the only political restriction on people in the abortion rights movement should be that they not violate the social norm of repeal of the abortion laws, as well as of all laws prohibiting contraception, and that the trouble with the SWP is not that many socialists are members but that WOMAAC is not really working for abortion law repeal. Despite the organization's official position, in its actual work across the country, as the Gainesville example and Cindy Cisler's article on the tactics of the repeal fight illustrate, WOMAAC essentially demonstrated that it's too willing to stop at merely reforming the existing laws when ILLLEGAL restrictions, so-called "repeal" group has also been following this duplicictious policy.

NEW YORK STILL FAR FROM REPEAL

Of course, the conflict over abortion reform versus repeal of all abortion laws is a far cry from what New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal has been warning for a long time that the "vice-

IN FLORIDA...

by Margaret Reynolds with Carol Heinrich and Didi Anderson, Gainesville, Fla., Nov. 1971

We joined the Alachua County Abortion Action Coalition (then the Alachua County affiliate of WOMAAC), which was organized as a member of Women's Liberation, because we felt we could be of help to women at the Self-Help Clinic, if she is a member, the existence of a safe, simple abortion procedure - the development of which is often in the medical establishment to suppress until now - would seem to be just around the corner. Such an achievement can only further highlight the contradiction between the technological possibilities for providing for people's health needs and the implacable imperialist state to develop and use that technology for the benefit of most of us.

The Coalition proposed that abortions could be done with a midwife and only "under proper & licensed medical supervision." This meant that they considered abortion the function of a doctor. When we argued against this, they ended the 24-week limit and supporting infanticide. Their law would have left Shirley Wheeler, the Daytona Beach woman who is now appealing her conviction for conviction for having an abortion, and other women who might be in her same position, still liable to prosecution. One of the "experts" at her trial even admitted she would have performed an abortion when she had the abortion. (Of the other two "experts" who testified, their guesses about the age of the fetus varied from 5 months to 3 months.)

The Coalition charged that the Coalition made the abortion of the woman who would be prosecuted for having an abortion. But wanting to get in a time limit while at the same time maintaining that no woman can be prosecuted for having an abortion. But despite this, women themselves could somehow be exempt from prosecution under this type of law, many would be forced into having the abortion they need because they have no fear of prosecution. The Coalition coalition said they wanted to protect women and yet the very time limit that they have will force many women to seek illegal and dangerous ways of getting the abortion they want.

The only feminist coalition that the Coalition made was that no woman should be prosecuted for having an abortion. But wanting to get in a time limit while at the same time maintaining that no woman can be prosecuted for having an abortion. But despite this, women themselves could somehow be exempt from prosecution under this type of law, many would be forced into having the abortion they need because they have no fear of prosecution. The Coalition coalition said they wanted to protect women and yet the very time limit that they have will force many women to seek illegal and dangerous ways of getting the abortion they want.

The "liberal" faction of Friends of the Fetuses, who supported the rights of the fetus over the rights of women. It is questionable whether this group is seriously interested in fighting for their own rights. For example, the women from the Zero Population Growth (ZPG) were mainly interested in the idea of population growth. This had nothing to do with the right of a woman to control her own body but with the desire of ZPG to solicit women from having children. Other women who wanted to protect the "child." None of these women were saying that they opposed the present abortion laws because they did not think of them as right. It was always somebody else's rights they wanted to protect (or rather control). The Coalition coalition decided to include in their law the statement that no hospital or doctor should be required to participate in an abortion. It was. One woman was even allowed to turn away people in need of this one kind of medical aid, especially when their refusal to help inflicted years of suffering, hardship, and even death. The women in the coalition had to waste our precious time and energy to prove to men (doctors, legislators, maids, neighbors) how fair they were. The question has never been why OUR W.F.S.R.'s or OUR being unfair. We man have never yet had the power to do that - men have been able to do a lot of damage and still be right for what we want instead of what men want us to fight for. Whatever we stop to achieve seems to be up and running - ening the major weapon we have is the power we have when we are united.

In some ways the law proposed by the Coalition would be more restrictive than the present one, because it introduces a time limit and medical restrictions where none have existed before. The present law has no restriction on who can perform an abortion but the Coalition was proposing that abortions could only be performed "under proper & licensed medical supervision." This was an impossible situation and none don't even have under the present Florida law.

As far as a time limit is concerned, under the existing law a woman can get an abortion AT ANY TIME if her pregnancy endangers her life. Under their proposal, if she was over 24 weeks pregnant and found out that the pregnancy would endanger her life, she would be able to get a LEGAL abortion. Even if they changed their proposal to include this particular extreme case, it would still be true that they sought to decide for other women when an abortion would be murder, and when it wouldn't be. We don't want men to tell us when we think they think is "best." We are fighting for the right of each woman to decide these things for herself. Another major difference we had was whether or not we wanted to keep our own conditions. For example, the Coalition invited men to the meetings and gave them cont'd p. 8
For all practical purposes, men have probably had more intimate contact with the vagina than women ever had. The male organ, on the other hand, has always been exposed. Thus, when you see a woman, you see an external and we really do seem to feel that seeing is believing. Thanks to the Women's Self-Help Clinic of Los Angeles, however, the same possibilities are now available to women. This self-help clinic is a group of women who are dedicated to helping all women to assert their rights. The clinic also serves as a sort of feminist movement in Los Angeles. They began fighting the California laws against abortion and soon came to the conclusion that if women were ever going to win this fight, they would have to have a lot more knowledge about their bodies and their health, and the medical procedures themselves. In the course of doing this they have come up with some astounding results. They have been traveling around the country telling women of these researches, asking women to share their own private investigations and just generally blowing out the Mystery Medical Complex which insists that only your doctor knows for sure.

The conference in New York was held at Queens College, the 26th of November and Carolyn Berman, a New York City rabbi, originated the group, lost no time in introducing us first off to the vaginal speculum. The vaginal speculum is a $2 duck-billed bit of plastic technology which puts you in touch with yourself, i.e., it forces you to face yourself. I suspect it will do for modern women what the mirror did for primitive women — allow them to see. As I sat there at the conference handling my speculum and becoming familiar with the rather easy manipulation of the duck-bill, I suddenly began to wonder about the absurdity of male gynecologists. I mean what would motivate a man to spend the rest of his life absorbed in examining and palpating the vagina foreign to him as appendices to non-surgeons. I decided not to think about that, and instead began to recall my own rather sudden love for my female gynecologist, and returned to the conference.

They started off with slides of varying complexity, of the typical textbook position which would become more familiar as the day wore on. "Here's a slide of a cancerous tumor of the cervix," said Carol. The danger signs we're supposed to look for however are associated with late stages of the disease. If you could frequently check your own anatomy, you would notice any changes and very early, and in the next slide, you'll see what the speculum we've brought you here for. This slit-like opening is the entrance into the uterus; it's called the external os. The mass surrounding the os is the cervix, that part of the uterus which extends downward into the vagina.

"The vagina, you know, is not really an internal organ," she said, "it means 'it's about as much as the mouth.' The mouth — Goddamn, I thought, why hadn't anybody ever said that before? She went on, "We say, as in consciousness-raising, to stick to our own experiences and those of the women we come in contact with. For example, we've found that the typical textbook position of the uterus is not typical at all. The uteruses we've seen are tipped or flexed more commonly than not. The exact angle of the uterus is probably as relevant to allow entry into the uterus. A curette (sharp, scraping instrument) is then introduced to scrape away the uterine walls thus emptying the contents.

The aspiration method requires only local anesthesia. The cervix is dilated as above and a suction or vacuum curette attached to pressure empties the uterine contents. We found that abortion centers which stated they used this method were actually using the aspiration method as well as scraping the uterine walls with a curette, which is really a combination of both procedures. We'd like to demonstrate for you a technique we've sort of come across in our findings; we call it the period extraction method. By means of a tube or cannula (credited to Dr. Harvey Karmen, thus called the Karmen cannula) attached to a syringe and a air tight bottle which create a vacuum. It is possible to extract your period yourself and thus reduce it from a 5 day period to a 3 minute procedure. Quite simply what is involved is the following. By means of the cannula you can locate the external os. The cannula can then be gently inserted (that is, not to the key point, gently) without dilation. Manual rotation of the connected syringe will then exert the necessary suction effect and by means of the vacuum system set up in the air tight bottles, the uterine contents will empty into the bottles.

The equipment resembled what I had seen written myself of the abortion equipment used in China (see illustration). The method seemed very similar. Could you believe it, no more periods and we've really only just begun.

Of course, if you could extract a period you could also extract a 'late' period, up to 5 weeks 'late' I subsequently found out. Of course by means of the speculum it would be possible to know if you were pregnant as early as 2 weeks later. It was a brilliant discovery and I thought if I ever needed an abortion this is the way I want it to be done. Of course the method is not foolproof as of yet, still in its experimental stages and the suction technique can and can't be used by those with previous gonorrhea or endometritis — anything I guess which would cause bad scarring of the uterus. It was brilliant anyway just because it shows what we're capable of doing, and
are going.

The audience was stunned, awed, overwhelmed, shocked and eager. "Can
air get into the uterus with this method?" one woman asked. "No," said Carol, "the
air tight bottles make it a closed system." It was a legitimate concern
for, as one woman explained, air injected into the uterus can be fatal. "Isn't
this really an abortion technique," asked another. "No," said Carol, for political
reasons, "abortion is illegal; we deal only with period extractions." Sub-
sequently, LA self-help has been criti-

Sequent, LA self help has been criti-
ized for not being right up there and calling a thing what it is. This
is nonsense, you can't expect 2 people to take all the risks, we're not in the
martyr business.

"Now" said Carol, "we'll show you how to
to examine yourselves," and in the final
denunciation of 'feminine protocol' she
whipped off her pants, hopped up on the
desk and inserted the speculum. My God,
I thought, I'd follow her anywhere!
It suddenly occurred to me that in all
my nurses' training I had never done a
vaginal examination. I had never been
taught how to handle a speculum, let
alone use it on myself or anyone else.
And I had certainly never been presented
with such a frank discussion and dis-

closure. To think that by means of a
flashlight and hand mirror you can be
put into direct dialogue with your insides.
"You see the os," said Carol. Yes, we
all nodded in unison. "Well when you
got used to viewing your own bodies
you'll notice different changes. You'll
be able to see when the cervix softens,
and opens a little and the color becomes
darker or blotchy red - all of which means
you're pregnant in which case you'll
know before anyone else does - which is
the way it should be."

My reaction to the self-help clinic
was sheer joy and still is, despite the
unfavorable press reaction and severe
criticism launched in some radical and
women's movement press, in their
aftermath. They have since been accused of everything from being against pap
smears to helping the Catholic Church

turn back progressive abortion laws.
This latter attack appeared in the so-
called radical newspaper, The Guardian.
The radical press seems to have a
rather absolutized either/or approach
to things. They're all upset that do-


yourself medicine will stop the
revolution. "The way to get better
health care," they yell "is not through
small group do-it-yourselfism but through
struggle, demanding care from the institu-
tions that are supposed to give it." In
their dogma have they overlooked the
fact that the information uncovered by
the self-help clinic, information which
up until now has been suppressed, could
only further highlight the contradictions
between the technological possibilities
of providing for people's health needs
now and the unwillingness of the present
male supremacist state to do so. If
they think we have a naive approach to
the problems surrounding us in regard
to good health care, how sophisticated
is it to put down what is being done now
simply because the revolution won't be
here until tomorrow? Can't we encourage
the self-help clinic without giving up
our struggle against the hospitals,
the doctors and the male supremacist
powers that are holding us back. Or
does it bog it down flag because we're
in favor of self help, we're also
in favor of getting the power for more
medical help and self-help.

Or is the radical press itself so
mystified by the medical establishment
that it too believes only a doctor can
really give good safe health care. Why
is it that a procedure such as a D&C
which requires a blade in the hands of a
doctor or intern (after all how are they
going to learn) scraping away the walls
of a muscle with all its possible traumas
not to mention lacerations is accepted
with the medical seal of approval while
the insertion of a cannula into the same
organ brings the house down with cries
of "infection" and what about sterilize
techs and how do we get self help it's
also because it actually would seem to
be the better method. It is not perfec-
ted, true, but LA self-help didn't
tell women to go home and abort themsel-
ves either. Anybody who would attempt
the method on themselves given the in-
sufficient information about specifics
mentioned at the conference would have
to be terribly misguided. Throughout
the conference the self-help group
encouraged all those interested in their
techniques to get in further contact
with them and explore the possibilities.
They have disclaimed anything to do with
a do-it-yourself abortion described
in the article 'Menstrual Extraction',
which appeared in the October 26, 1971
issue of Everywoman, a West Coast
feminist newspaper. They implore women
to not attempt to use the items as
explained in that article. If you wish
to find out what they're really about
you should contact the Self-Help Clinic
at 1027 South Crenshaw, Los Angeles,
California 90019.

Many women's comments have been no
better - their big concern revolves
around safety and the fears that we're

... was where my
citoris is...

cont'd p.7

The best thing
I ever learned

off our backs
(newspaper)
The following was written as a letter to the editor of the University newspaper The Alligator in Gainesville, Florida (and never published). We think it illustrates and exposes the way in which many people and groups—in this case, the university press and a law professor—misstate the Florida abortion law.

Editor: Atty. Gen. Robert Shevin does not seek abortion law REPEAL as your front page headline in the Tues., Jan. 18, Alligator (Gainesville, Florida) proclaims. The "Repeal and replacement" explanation in the first sentence of the story is just a sneaky way of saying REFORM. REPEAL means nothing less than wiping off the books all laws which hinder a woman's right to an abortion. Shevin is for REFORM, not REPEAL. He wants, according to your article, a time limit of 12 weeks except for therapeutic purposes. It is irrelevant whether this incorrect headline appeared out of negligence or was an intentional effort to join those who are planning their political fortunes with the votes of women in mind. Either is inexcusable.

In other states, New York for one, the mass media has done its dirty work in muddying the distinction between abortion law REFORM and REPEAL. There is a very important difference. REPEAL allows the pregnant woman to make the decision of whether or not to bear her child. REFORM keeps this decision in the hands of others—doctors, legislators, husbands, fathers.

Shevin and others are out to get a reform bill passed but others who by "horrors of horrors" have Florida left in the hands of law, which would be the same as repeal. No fetus—no matter how many months old—is more important or has more rights than "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" than a woman. No husband, doctor, or panel of "experts" knows better than the pregnant woman how having an unwanted child will affect her life. An unwanted child ALWAYS infringes on a woman's rights.

The purpose of using REFORM and REPEAL interchangeably is to confuse women (and sympathetic men) into thinking they are getting REPEAL. We must see what's going on will fight all these reform bills because in the long run they make it more difficult for women to get what is our right—what we really should have. The issue is whether or not a woman shall be forced to bear a child. REPEAL makes abortion the woman's choice. REPEAL IS OUR RIGHT. Drop clouding the issue by calling REFORM REPEAL. Carol Hanisch Gainesville, Fla. for A Woman's Right to Choose.

NYALR Model Abortion Law:

This is the abortion law that every state will have when present abortion laws are repealed. Of course, this is only a first step. Once existing abortion laws are cleared away, it will be possible to go on to pass positive legislation: for example, legislation guaranteeing the right to abortion and contraception without compulsory consultation with parents or guardians, and establishing a network of public clinics to provide abortion and contraception to anyone requesting these birth-control services.

For more information, contact NEW YORKERS FOR ABORTION LAW REPEAL (NYALR), Box 240, Planetarium Station, New York City, N.Y. 10024

SAY WHAT YOU MEAN—

or, Abortion is Worth Being Petty About

BY LUCINDA CISLER

"General Action Proposal: That the conference call for a nationally coordinated abortion repeal/big campaign, for the repeal of all abortion laws, ending forced sterilization, and for the repeal of all contraceptive laws. . . . Legislative Action Proposal: . . . That the WOJMAIC not support legislation that restricts access to pregnancy, voluntary sterilization or contraception."—Proposals adopted by WOJMAIC conference #1 July 18, 1971; printed in first WOJMAIC newsletter, Summer 1971, pp. 1-2 (emphasis supplied)

"WOMEN: That WOJMAIC sponsor a week of local abortion activities, May 6-12...around the demand for repeal of all anti-abortion laws and restrictive contraceptive laws and an end to forced sterilization."—Proposal submitted by 15 women for consideration at WOJMAIC conference #2, Feb 11-13

As anyone can see, the words used in these two sets of resolutions are not the same. People use different words when they want to express different ideas. That is clearly what some people meant to do. Look up the second resolution. Despite WOJMAIC's repeated claim that it strictly abides by the "democratically-made" decisions of those who were at its founding conference, the literature at its out begins as early as page 15, not for repeal of all abortion laws but for repeal of all "anti-abortion" laws. In talking about "pro-abortion" laws and the 1971-72 conference, the resolution limits itself to abortion. The WOJMAIC's "anti-abortion" laws section was written at some time since July 1973 WOJMAIC suddenly found at least once pro-abortion law lying around somewhere—a law that positively guarantees every woman the right to terminate a pregnancy if she so wants to continue. Where is this marvelous law? Why haven't we heard about it before? Because it doesn't exist, of course.

"ANTI-ABORTION" LAWS

Most of us who've been working on birth-control issues for awhile thought that all states have "anti-abortion laws" because all forbid some women abortions, and that all states have "pro-abortion laws" because all allow some legal abortions. We also thought that our work was to get rid of every one of these inimical laws—to repeal them, leaving nothing at all on the statute books—and then to go forward to make sure abortion and other health services were really available in practice. But apparently we were wrong: "The fight to maintain and enact the pro-abortion law will be an important component of WOJMAIC's campaign." ("Building WOJMAIC," by Barbara Roberts, Carol Lipman, and Joan Grande, WOJMAIC newsletter, January 12, 1972, page 4).

A "PRO-ABORTION" LAW IN N.Y.?"}

Astonishing. Feminists and their sympathizers have been fighting doggedly for the repeal of New York's so-called pro-abortion law ever since its passage—and long before WOJMAIC's formation—through public education, demonstrations, and the drafting, introduction, & active support of repeal bills in the 1971 & 1972 New York legislative sessions. The New York law still contains more than a dozen sections making abortion a criminal act—some of which do not appear at all in the laws of even 10 other states! Women are still subject to a $1,000 fine and a year in jail if they dare to get abortions that the state considers "unjustifiable"—such as those done after 24 weeks gestation or by a non-MD—the same old penalties they risked under the old law.

Late in 1970 the opponents of abortion in New York started deliberately clouding the issue by calling their efforts to restore the old law "abortion law repeal." They were very loud & very rich, and so were able to get much of the media and a lot of the public to jump into their 1934 semantic bag. The New York Times (always a bad reporter on abortion
"We must not . . . be content with delving into the past of a people in order to find coherent elements which we could construct, or which would falsify and harm. We must work and fight with the same rhythm as the people to destroy the future and to prepare the ground where vigorous shoots are already springing up."  
Fanon, The Damned

Most of us will see our babies and not have an abortion when we are tied up with a 'cat.' We think we can keep this in check this way. A lot of us younger ones get pregnant by getting drunk and doing the boogie under romantic magazines and look at T.V. soap operas. We really and truly forget who we are. Yes, we make believe we are these white people. When we get so bored with our lives, we think, maybe we'll get a baby like our older sisters and their girlfriends. It looks like so much fun. Then our guy drifts off to some other bitch and we go hunting for another. The more babies we have, the harder it gets to keep up with 'em. And when we consider birth control which we use off-and-on. And then we get pregnant once too often.

We'll have an abortion by doing our own thing - taking something orally, going to our own mid-wives, who are our neighbors and friends, or doing our own abortion, with whatever tools and methods. We don't tell other women about it usually because we are ashamed. Down deep, we know it's against God's law. We don't want to kill our baby. People in the neighborhood will talk about us in a bad way if they find out. When we are younger, we lock keep on 'boogie' after a while. We consider birth control which we use off-and-on. And then we get pregnant once too often.

Irregular periods, an experienced woman doctor she knows agree that most women do not have conceived more than three and the first 3 out of 5 random friends I called had it too. It seems to affect women who have had children. I contacted it after the delivery of my first child as did most of my friends. I guess we just know different women. Her medical friend then informs us that if we use the period extraction device when we will get an infection and we will eventually require hospitalization and a 'BIC.' Lorraine is not hospitalized and they have protected their own periods many times. I'm sure they'll let us know if and when they are.

In another section from the same article, the renowned anthropologist Margaret Mead, is quoted as also finding some of the concerns about safety excessive, particularly those relating to infection during period extraction. "Do you think that a doctor's office is a sterile place," she quips.

The author repeats twice that Carol and Lorraine are finished with childbirth because their husbands have vasectomies, implying that they were asking other women to take risks they weren't prepared to take themselves. They performed the period extraction device on them selves first, didn't they; they were the guinea pigs. What do you want them to do, get pregnant to prove that they mean what they say about safety?

As far as we're concerned the Health Conference has been a tremendous success. It has done the job both of raising women's consciousness and providing an outlet for that consciousness, bringing us closer to a safe do-ityourself abortion method than we ever dreamed possible right now. It's only with technology like this that women will be guaranteed control over their own bodies. In addition, this technology is not only empowering; it is also non-violent, threatening to outdate all abortion laws, existing or future.

---

**Self Help Clinic**

on a trip back to nature. The period extraction method is actually an improvement on present technology. The method was discovered researching the medical field not from folklore and old wives' tales, but rather that there is nothing wrong with women's biology as a method, if it were better, from folklore and old wives' tales (see boxes). China's family planning program successfully incorporated traditional (folk) medicine with scientific medicine. What's all this nonsense about rebelling against technology?

Even the speculum got attacked in the press. Ellen Frankfort, in her article in the Village Voice, for instance, concludes that it's necessary to argue that the metal speculum (the doctor's speculum) is not inherently cold. "Since they should be boiled," states the author, "before each examination warning them should present no problem." Well they may not be inherently cold but they're cold all the same, at least the ones I felt. I just have to guess therefore how many of them were not boiled and how many infections I narrowly escaped. They won't do the exercises with their self-help clinic speculum because it's plastic (all of the anti-technological types argue against this). It melts on boiling. Any fool knows plastic doesn't hold heat. If you need to sterilize it, there's a cold solution spray on the market. According to no chart whatever requires washing not sterilizing, everything which goes into the vagina is not sterile your tampons.

The vagina is an external organ, remember, like the mouth. Frankfort then goes on to say that a medical student (male or female) and

---

**Grandma Bessie's Technique**

Among the many medical skills of some of the old time greedy women (read folk doctor) was aspiration. My grandmother-in-law, Bessie Wright, who lived and practiced in New Orleans and the surrounding bayous and countryside, was one such greedy-doctor and the device described by the sisters in Los Angeles Self-Help Clinic sound exactly like the one used so successfully by Ms. Wright for so many years. There probably were many others who used this technique and there may be women in isolated communities who, despite modern communications and the attempt to spread "modern medicine," are still using it.

I find it interesting that in China, folk medicine, including such techniques as herbalogy, acupuncture and aspiration, is fast becoming incorporated into modern medicine, while in this country folk medicine with many of the same herbs, treatments and applications has already been outlawed.

Can the reason be that the "folk" doctors in China are traditionally women while here they are traditionally men?

---

**Esther Croft**

---

Page 7
ARBITRATION
THE JOB AHEAD IN NEW YORK

The following is a brief synopsis of some recent assaults on the already restrictive New York abortion law. It is followed by some ideas from New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal on what you can do to strengthen still-pending laws and urge a positive response from the state legislature.

***A court suit has been instituted by Robert Byrn, bachelor law professor at Fordham University, on behalf of the "unborn" children whose right to live is being denied by the present New York law unconstitutional on the grounds that it violates the "right of life" to which all children are also being made, on the basis of the above case, to obtain a temporary restraining order that would block abortions in New York City's 18 public hospitals.

***The New York State Court of Appeals has upheld a directive issued last April by the state's Services Commissioner, George K. Wyman, which bans the use of Medicaid funds for abortions unless they are "necessary for medical reasons." The decision will be appealed by the city's Health and Hospitals Corporation, which said it would be "inconsistent with its own policy of protecting the health, welfare and safety of women in this area."

***In some local areas, such as Dobbs Ferry, zoning laws are being used to keep out abortion clinics.

***In both abortion and contraceptive campaigns have been organized by the Catholic Church to pressure the legislators into repealing the law or entirely eliminate the present reform law.

--- B.L.

Once again this year we have a chance to fight against the still-pending abortion bill by working for the good legislation. The New York Medical Society abortion bill repeal bill is being debated at this time and we should use all our efforts to influence the state legislature to pass a ban on abortion from state law. This true repeal bill will eliminate the licensed-40 limitation (which makes abortions illegal), the grotesque 6-month time limit (which violates women's rights to make individual decisions), the law against giving information (technology for which is being rapidly developed), & all the rest-clears the bill OK on wirthaups, and so on.

At the same time, renewed efforts will be made to repeal the restrictions on contraception through the von luther-Cook contraception law repeal bill? (Right now conservatives—even non-doctors—begin to realize that if they distribute contraceptives only to illegal abortionists, they will be distributed by a pharmacist or given to anyone under the age of 16.) This bill could pass this time. So let's telephone Albany and urge it, directly by letters and visits.

By sending S30 to New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal (212/216-7500), you can get a fat packet of political information on these repeal bills & on the issues generally; better yet, you'll get a 50% (STILL INCL. the repeal bills in '71 & '72, and with help from other groups we've got thousands of letters & a lot of local materials, including, if we do the same —or hopefully more—this year.)

If feminists act for what they want, we CAN keep New York from sliding back into the 19th century; if enough of us act, we can even move New York ahead in this basic area. We may even get the media to break its silence about the fight for reproductive freedom.

Some women may think the work we do for women while we talk among ourselves, we may wake up to find the old New York law with Let's work for what we want; we might get it.

*Bill number: 5-6671/4-10050

C.S.

THE OPPRESSED
MAJORITY
SPEAKS
ITS MIND

Sisterhood is Powerful
An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement edited by ROBIN MORGAN. Impassioned essays on every aspect of the struggle for women's rights, from the politics of housework to the politics of orgasm. "Tells the woman who hasn't yet found her head that there is something more authoritative than I am my nuclear family survival's purgatory." JOHN LEONARD, New York Times. 8 pages of illustrations. $1.95 Harcourt Brace Jovanovich paperbound paperback $2.95

Feminism
The Essential Historical Writings. Essays, fiction, memoir, and letters by the major feminist writers—Abigail Adams, Mary Wollstonecraft, Josephine Butler, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Emma Goldman, Margaret Sanger, Virginia Woolf, and many others. Tracing 150 years of women's struggles for liberation and with an introduction and commentaries by NORMA SCHNIE

Chic 69 Vintage paperbound paperback $2.95

RED EMMA SPEAKS
Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman, edited by ANITA THOMAS. The first comprehensive view of the theories and beliefs of "Red Emma" Goldman—a Russian-born anarchist and playwright in the United States during the 1880s and 1900s whose full impact is only now being felt in the demands of the new feminists of the 70's.

$1.90 Harcourt Brace Jovanovich paperbound paperback $2.95

Now at your bookstore!
Sex

I am not advocating sex for every girl in her teens, but a deeper understanding about the love that exists between a young man and woman may be pregnancy, V.C., mental depression, or maybe just a sort ofbottomless passion. You must choose your own morals. If you believe that sex before marriage is wrong, then fine, this is your feelings. You must find a way to be a virgin and not be shared by others. Others may feel you are wrong for thinking so.

But be truthful. There is a lot of sexual involvement going on among the young. The unmarried mothers are increasing. There is none, not even present, due to heartbreak and guilt feelings that go along with an unwanted pregnancy. A mother who is Single, a girl who has had sexual affairs, a daughter, can just hear the screams from mothers, fathers (and boyfriends). My daughter having sex! Give her birth control papers.

Yes, birth control is available to any girl who is physically able to have sex. An unwanted pregnancy may occur . . . all without parents consent. Yet, constantly, the girls seeking pregnancy tests greatly outnumber the girls seeking birth control information.

Young girls, quiet girls, loud girls, fat, short, skinny, tall, girls there is no one particular set of girls who engage in sex. We all have a natural instinct for physical attraction. Yet, in the female this drive is constantly being suppressed. Family, church, siblings—all have their heavy hand over a girl's physical attractions. Things, many of which take a hell of a lot to get over. From what I understand, the Lib is against birth control for females that feel that women should take chemicals into their bodies. I can understand this, but why is it that the Lib got to offer in the meantime? A zipper? No, people will continue to engage in sex which is at least 50% of all motivation in life.

I am not trying to sterilize our race (V.D. is doing enough of that). It is just to the make the load lighter on those who must now face the struggle. To make Azlans five noise drunkards, drugs, and poor children into slavery. We wear the chain, let us not increase the links.

Parents teach their children what values were taught to them. Through conditioning there is the hope that in later years, these values will guide us through life. Through these values and love, although, it is being chocked by over moralizing.

"Cherry" to him.

I so wish that evolution along with the dinosaurs would have taken the hymen (cherry) with it. This thin membrane would have saved women the trouble and the predicament of the virgin. I would like first to clear up the myth that goes along with it. There is no thick skin covering the opening to the vagina that will make a distinct pop, bleed all over the bed, cause intense pain, then a wild croli.

PRECAUTIONARY TIPS

The sperm cells are not killed or sterilized by they contact with the vaginal lining. If contact is made with the urine or by a sexual contact and the sperm cells are not killed, the sperm cells may cause fertilization. If the sperm cells are not killed or sterilized by they contact with the vaginal lining, they may still cause fertilization.

Sexual intercourse is the only way to prevent pregnancy. However, it is not always possible to avoid pregnancy. In addition, sexual intercourse is not the only way to prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs).STDs are caused by bacteria, viruses, or fungi. They can be spread by sexual contact, coming in contact with an infected person, or by sharing needles or other equipment used to inject drugs.

Sperm is not the only way to prevent pregnancy. However, it is not always possible to avoid pregnancy. In addition, sexual intercourse is not the only way to prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs).STDs are caused by bacteria, viruses, or fungi. They can be spread by sexual contact, coming in contact with an infected person, or by sharing needles or other equipment used to inject drugs.

Information about sexual health and consent is important for a healthy sex life. This includes understanding the importance of communication, consent, and safe sex practices. Communication is key to understanding and respecting each other's boundaries. Consent means that both partners agree to a sexual activity and are comfortable with it. Safe sex practices include using condoms or other barrier methods, avoiding sexual contact if you are sick, and getting tested for sexually transmitted infections.

The media often portrays sexual relationships in a way that ignores the importance of communication, consent, and safe sex practices. This can lead to misunderstandings and even harm. It is important to have open and honest conversations with partners about sexual health and consent. This includes discussing birth control options, the importance of regular check-ups, and the potential risks and benefits of different sexual activities.

It is important to prioritize sexual health and consent in all relationships. This includes taking the time to ensure that all partners are comfortable and consensual in all sexual activities. This means that consent should be ongoing, not just assumed. It is important to be aware of your own boundaries and to respect the boundaries of others. This includes understanding that some people may not feel comfortable with certain sexual activities and being open to having these conversations.

Education and awareness are key to promoting sexual health and consent. This includes understanding the importance of communication, consent, and safe sex practices. It is important to have open and honest conversations with partners about sexual health and consent. This includes discussing birth control options, the importance of regular check-ups, and the potential risks and benefits of different sexual activities.

The media often portrays sexual relationships in a way that ignores the importance of communication, consent, and safe sex practices. This can lead to misunderstandings and even harm. It is important to have open and honest conversations with partners about sexual health and consent. This includes discussing birth control options, the importance of regular check-ups, and the potential risks and benefits of different sexual activities.

It is important to prioritize sexual health and consent in all relationships. This includes taking the time to ensure that all partners are comfortable and consensual in all sexual activities. This means that consent should be ongoing, not just assumed. It is important to be aware of your own boundaries and to respect the boundaries of others. This includes understanding that some people may not feel comfortable with certain sexual activities and being open to having these conversations.

Education and awareness are key to promoting sexual health and consent. This includes understanding the importance of communication, consent, and safe sex practices. It is important to have open and honest conversations with partners about sexual health and consent. This includes discussing birth control options, the importance of regular check-ups, and the potential risks and benefits of different sexual activities.

The media often portrays sexual relationships in a way that ignores the importance of communication, consent, and safe sex practices. This can lead to misunderstandings and even harm. It is important to have open and honest conversations with partners about sexual health and consent. This includes discussing birth control options, the importance of regular check-ups, and the potential risks and benefits of different sexual activities.
THE MYTH OF FEMALE

It is generally agreed by those who study crime that the male, through aggression and action, acts out his masculine role and in crime this aggression assumes an antisocial behavior and violence; female crime, however, reflects woman's passive and submissive nature.

Authorities on the subject of juvenile delinquency claim that the female delinquent is a sexual delinquent. The fact is that more female juveniles are arrested for larceny than sex offenses (1) but even if picked up for shoplifting or robbery, the crime is sexually interpreted. Acting out an inner wish for her father, she suffers from penis envy or she is a deviant and unnatural female. Unlike her male counterpart, however, the legal behavior of the female juvenile is rarely related to rebellion against a repressive society, poverty, or racial discrimination. The term "juvenile delinquency" usually refers to males and countless studies discuss the male problem; school, family, unemployment, income, etc., have all been implicated (2) but there is no such interest in the problems of the female delinquent. (3) With little research concerning female delinquency, (4) authorities assume that the female delinquent acts out her feminine masochistic nature (5) and her crime is written in hollow words by some author, saying, "In a girl... delinquency is an overt sexual act or to be more correct, a sexual acting out." (6)

The juvenile delinquent of either sex suffers from public intolerance and discrimination but since the public is less tolerant of females than males, the female fares worse even in delinquency, for example:

1. More than 1/2 the girls referred to juvenile court in 1963 were referred for acts that would not be criminal if committed by adults; only 1/5 boys were referred for such behavior.

2. One girl was arrested for every 5 boys but girls were arrested for running away, ungovernable behavior and sex offenses while boys were arrested for larceny, motor vehicle theft and aggravated assault. (7) Females were arrested for misbehavior while males were arrested for breaking the law.

3. In many cities a girl, picked up for shoplifting, can be examined for pregnancy, venereal disease or sexual intercourse and then be charged with sexual delinquency rather than shoplifting, (8) even if she was only 12 years of age. (9) And it is often noted on a girl's record and not a boys (9) and boys are less likely to be referred for sex offenses. (10)

4. Although as prone to sexual promiscuity as girls, this behavior is more often noted on a girl's record and not a boy's (9) and boys are less likely to be referred for sex offenses. (10)

5. In New York, 1 in 100 child be in need of supervision can be imprisoned until 18 while the cut off age for boys is 16, and in some cities girls have been convicted of the crime of lascivious carriage. (11)

6. There is a great gift between the legal and practical view of what constitutes sexual delinquency in boys but in girls this line is less clear and particularly if she incurs the penalty of becoming pregnant. (12)

Here is a general public attitude: "We must never lose sight of the fact, clinically borne out, that the female delinquent is far more profusely self-destructive and irreversible in its corrosive consequences than is male delinquency. With the aggressive and restless male sex, reproduction exists to sustain and perpetuate the species, whereas in the female sex, reproduction functions, the delinquent girl deeply violates the protective and constructive role inherent in her sex role." (13)

The man who states this view is a prominent psychiatrist and an authority on female adolescence and delinquency. He speaks for what is an alternative wanton to unwanted pregnancies. In New York where abortions are legal, the adoption agencies are going out of business because when a woman under 21 who become pregnant can be institutionalized, and the fact that human life can be legislated away, it would be the majority and stigma and punishment not so cruel to the unmarried mother and her child. The only crime that concerns me here is the crime of forcing a woman to bear an unwanted child.

Total arrests for prostitution for 1970 were 28,000 and of this number only 726 females were under 18, we rarely prostitutes. They may have sex for affection, social acceptability, for a meal or protection but rarely for money. (21)

The general public seems to claim, "The Lolittas of American whoredom or baby prostitutes sometimes earn 20 to 30 thousand dollars a year sex free and tend to range in age from 10 to 15. Also known as the million dollar bitches, they usually work out of stables presided over by paternalistic panderers and enjoy all manner advantage. This is a small group of sex prostitutes and are unknown and unrecorded, but this man's contempt for female children and his claim that they profit from prostitution would be unbelievable were it not clearly and brazenly stated in print.

Prostitution, running away, promiscuity and illegitimacy are the general categories of female delinquency and applied to the female juvenile it means indiscriminate sexual behavior. One authority states that "the predominant expression of delinquency among girls in our society is promiscuous sexual behavior." (18)

In my experience, the female adolescent who could not be controlled was usually labelled as sexually promiscuous. Parents of a young girl who was truanting and stealing, petitioned the court to control their daughter from sexual promiscuity. Her parents and society, I despaired, unable to relate to acts of truanting and stealing. She ran away because she was more comfortable in blaming their lack of control of her life on sexual misbehavior no matter how false.

Illegitimacy is a term used to describe the illegal state of the unmarried mother and her child. In 1968 there were 340,000 illegitimate births and a little less than half were born to women under 19. (19) If one defies the concept of illegitimacy as a plot on the part of the mother to extract welfare money, her need for feminine fulfillment, hatred of her own father, godfather's incestuous desire for the father; she's oversexed, narcissistic, primitive and infantile. (20) It was my impression that the result of sexual intercourse but for some reason this does not seem to be a good enough explanation. Since someone has to be blamed, this is as logical process all kinds of evil and mystical motives are attributed to the woman. What about the man's motives? Does he hate his father, have incestuous desires for his mother, is he a homosexual, infantile, narcissistic and primitive? Since no one seems to notice his involvement in a pregnancy or hold him responsible, he is allowed to live his life.

The woman is not only alone responsible for her pregnancy, but is also blamed for it. Practically no discussion on illegitimacy is allowed. It is seen as an alternative to unwanted pregnancies. In New York where abortions are legal, the adoption agencies are going out of business for lack of business. In 1970 women under 21 who become pregnant can be institutionalized, and the fact that human life can be legislated away, it would be the majority and stigma and punishment not so cruel to the unmarried mother and her child. The only crime that concerns me here is the crime of forcing a woman to bear an unwanted child.

Mary, 16, was raped by her stepfather at age 8. Later her mother who never believed the story abandoned her and failed to say that Mary was not her daughter. She did fairly well until adolescence triggered off a repressed hostility and sexual acting out. She got the reputation for being "neat and clean" and it was rumored that she had been "bad" by five boys (gang bang). Mary denied this and she was raped on the last night she had been penetrated more than once. The foster parents could not tolerate local gossip and at age 15 Mary was sent to the Janes Dependent Home for Dependent Girls.

At first Mary was sullen and mastery but later she relaxed, became friendly and trusting and even became a drug material. Her fantasies revealed confused sexual identity so it was not surprising when the mother reported that Mary had not menstruated for two months. She was tested for pregnancy, found positive and despite her instance, her mother reported that Mary was pregnant, Mary was sent to Brown Memorial to have her baby.

One month later, Brown Memorial called to say that Mary was not pregnant and they sent her back.

Although everyone apologized, Mary
On television, women imprisoned for forgeries and robbery are interviewed and in a recent article in New York Magazine the following was stated:

"They (the prostitutes) don’t just dispense pleasure. These girls swindle, mug and sometimes murder their patrons and police drives against them are about as effective as a pacification program in Vietnam...."

We know that women are becoming criminals at a much faster rate than men....

The shocker lies within the category of girls under 18 (the age at which the prostitutes now turn out)....Their participation in violent crime - murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault is up 230%. (25)

In light of my earlier complaint regarding the stereotype of the female as a sexual criminal, it would seem I should be pleased by the recognition of our capacity to murder, assault and rob, but the fact is that we are still pitifully behind the male. Yes, female arrests have increased at a higher rate than male arrests in the past 10 years but so has the female population risen in this period; we are now 55% female to 45% male and still women are arrested once for every 6 males. Yes, violent and property crimes for female juveniles have increased 256.5% as compared with 79.5% for males but what do these percentages represent? In 10 years female juvenile violent and property crime went from 18,900 to 67,400, up 256.5% but in the same period and category, male juvenile crime went from 193,000 to 346,400, up 79.5%. No matter what the percentages, the female remains one out of four, female juvenile robbery has increased 366.1% but the female juvenile is still one out of 23 arrests for robbery and as for forcible rape, women are technically incapable of committing the crime so this complaint represents totally false reporting. No matter which way you slice it, we’re still far behind the boys.

Why are these sensational percentages now offered to us? Why is public opinion helped to associate prostitution and female delinquency with violence? Are women truly more violent or have we just become more uppity, assertive and aggressive? In any case, we are simply pointing a finger at our violators: the rapist, the pimp, the john and the man. Is it violence that men fear from women or their conferences on abortion health, rape and prostitution. Is it violent women or liberated women who have become so troublesome? This was copied from a popular paperback

"Kate Miller, Marguerite Dohrn, Angela Davis, Jane Fonda, Ti-Grace Atkinson, The Sharon Tate murderers - What do these women have in common? They are all representatives of the repressed and oppressed women. Here is a book that tells you what the truth behind this strange new cult of violence. Here is the shocker that names the gives you the facts, tells you the story behind the rising tide of feminine militants - the so-called Violent Women."

Footnotes for "The Myth of Female Sexual Delinquency" are available by writing to Florence Rush, c/o Woman’s World, P.O. Box 694, Stuyvesant Station, N.Y., N.Y. 10009

Footnotes for "The Myth of Female Sexual Delinquency" are available by writing to Florence Rush, c/o Woman’s World, P.O. Box 694, Stuyvesant Station, N.Y., N.Y. 10009

And later in the same book:

"It may seem extreme to extend the women’s liberation movement into the area of histrionic but the record is crowded with relevant examples."

And again New York Magazine:

"For in a crazy incoherent form the message of women’s lib has seeped through to prostitutes. Why give one’s body into the bargain when men go about crime much more directly. Why not attack the john, take his money and be done with it."

But men do not really fear our violence, because it is men who are violent and not women. Prevention by men from alternatives to child beating such as abortion, women are then punished by men for becoming pregnant; men initiate and perpetuate prostitution and yet prostitutes are punished by men; males are sexually assaulted by men and then are punished by men for sexual delinquency. No, men are not afraid of our violence but they are afraid of our thinking, talking, writing, articulating, demanding and changing. It is not our violence but the loss of control over our minds, our bodies and our lives that they fear and let us feel deeply and passionately hope that they have very good cause for such fear. A young woman in a correctional institution for delinquent girls, Susan, made this point in a simple poem:

I no longer use my mind
Nor think of anything,
For I am just a puppet
And my master pulls the strings.

There’s one thing about it
If fear he doesn’t know Strings can be broken
And then he’ll have to go. (28)
that one of the most important points of strategy for the feminist movement was that women should know and feel that they were not alone in their suffering. "And among other- women, service approach, it seemed, couldn't help but deflate women's militant energies and involve a serious danger of insulting, holding back, and even harming the women being helped."

For women who weren't actually prostituting themselves, the discussion was more involved. The "trade," seemed to risk doing more harm than good.

"Call girls had to come to the conference assuming that they were up against the radical feminist ideas about the common oppression of women sketched above, and which, in their opinion, was the general basis of the publicity pitch the sponsors had made when they advertised their event. They had come willing to take the risks of public expression in order to offer their special knowledge as women actually working as prostitutes — that is, earning their living by selling (for cash) their sexual services. The call girls believed that women at the conference did not have this experience could make a valuable contribution of their feelings about prostitution instead. Only from this central starting point, they felt, the conference could make some real headway. Not just understanding what prostitution really was and its need for suppression.

"The usury (money-lending) of the Jews and the usury of concubinage (sex outside of marriage) of the prostitutes were alike denounced by Church and State, but society could get along without financial speculation and extramarital love; these functions were therefore assigned to the black market, legitimized in gzhettos or in restricted quarters. The prostitutes like the Jews were obliged to wear distinctive signs on their clothing; they were helpless against the police; for most, life was difficult. But many prostitutes made a good living. As in the time of the Greek hetairas, the high life of gallant more or less voluntary submisions to feminine individualism than did the life of the "honest woman."

Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex, 1949

The call girls were being honest. They said they wanted to talk about their self-interest. The idea (one widely accepted in the feminist movement) that everyone talked about her self-interest, they would be able to figure out what exactly were their differences in this case, the more become and, "had," in order to understand better what common interest is and thereby forge a solid, united basis for some kind of program.

"You're talking about the employment of at least 50,000, maybe 100,000 women in New York, of the call girls. We too want to see prostitution eliminated but we need some better kind of alternative before we can initiate this one for all of us. We have to get rid of male supremacy, not just prostitution. Women need power. We have to talk about how we're going to get that."

Another spoke: "Before I went into prostitution, I was very much into radical politics. But I couldn't handle having very little money."

"There's such that we still need to learn about what prostitution is really all about," someone else from the group added. "It's a very complicated issue. It rests very deep into all of our fears and fantasies."

In comparison, other the panelists were being dishonest, or made a pretense of talking about their self-interest. One comment was: What do you degrade all women? The conference organizers had no idea how to stop. Other of the conference organizers preferred to go on with the same old moralizing about what they thought best, not for their own "dignity," but for the poor young girls . . . what will become of you in a few years, what you will be trained to do, etc. But this kind of political analysis (and understanding of the subordination of women) was at best very indirect, to say the least, focusing as it did on other women's behavior rather than on the very men the conference organizers complained about. It was an "analysis" that really missed the mark completely, in other words, a characterization of women that avoided confronting the oppression and endured attacking women instead. It suggested, really, that one could escape oppression by disassociating oneself from the oppression of one's class, pointing to one's own class as the obstacle to be overcome rather than the oppressor. (Men's) insults and abuses of women have nothing to do with what prostitutes do or say. Men call women (and feminists) whores, lesbians, frigid old maids, dumb, housewives, into the streets on local or national (or political) reasons, for what they can get out of doing so! It was, as we have learned, from the black man that makes the same kind of thing as when some in the black middle classes — not to mention most whites of any class — attribute the attitudes that white women have toward all black people to the "embarrassing" behavior of certain of "the race."

The call girls were opposed to the conference organizers ideas for what to do, opposed to their proposal for decriminalizing prostitution (the proposal for getting rid of all laws against prostitution, that is). They said it would just sanction and legitimatize prostitution like the massage parlors that were cropping up everywhere in Nevada and California, for instance, where women would not be able to command a high enough price for their services, thus lowering the pay for all "working girls," as they referred to women who worked in any way: helping prostitutes in their daily lives as well as help in terms of building power for women or helping in the fight against male supremacy and achieve our final goals. Although the call girls opposed decriminalization of prostitution on the basis of the reasons given by the organizers, the general political feelings of what would be effective, they did go on to point out how they had other sorts of conflict with streetwalkers' interests. It was the streetwalkers who had to face the police round-ups and arrests (call girls generally escape this) and, for them, maybe freedom from arrests would make up for the lower prices. The call girls
had talked too much about their feelings," they snarled. "We've heard enough experience, I think, from a few of you." But the program that the conference organizers were offering was political, as a substitute for all the alleged emotional garbage. "We" would actually have been funny if it wasn't so sad and dangerous. It was based on individual opportunism rather than on working together; it had proceeded to flail away at prostitutes and other women in general rather than at male suppression, and it was the old technique for pleasing men by disassociating oneself from other women; the familiar ploy of the man who seeks to impress men, gain favors from them, to advance herself in the man's world by demonstrating how different she is from the rest of her sex. Of course, with the advent of a new feminist consciousness and "sisterhood," it was being graciously offered what to the ordinary citizen is pathetic for liberation that all women should work on improving themselves so as not to be an embarrassment to each other.

The conference organizers believed as we have seen, that prostitution was the root of male supremacy itself. Their program for liberation was intended to work toward increasing the power of women in prostitution (as well as all women's power) and to improve the working conditions of whatever slave job we end up in, in the meantime working for our larger goal of freedom. What they wanted to do was to eliminate prostitution by eliminating prostitutes. What is more, the strategy they were advocating for this is a liberal one, a kind of political effort to open up more and more jobs for all women at higher and higher pay so that there might be a better economic alternatives than prostitution which women could then choose to go into. No, the program that the conference organizers were offering to the prostitutes, the program they were using their anti-woman insults to continue as "politics," was a one, pull-yourself-up-by-the-boots operation. It was American capitalism's Horatio Alger myth "Work hard and save and you, too, will get political power to open up more and more jobs for all women at higher and higher pay so that there might be a better economic alternatives than prostitution which women could then choose to go into."

If the conference organizers had admitted that they were oppressed (now) in this society and that what they had desires that weren't being expressed, needs and hopes that weren't being met, because they were in a male-supreme world, then they could have really talked with the prostitutes at the conference instead of sermonizing. They should have done more to understand the situation of the women in general and of their own particular situation compared to the "real working woman" (sexually and economically). Maybe they would have learned something about their needs, too, for instance that their needs aren't pay checks and a place to eat and a place to live... that love and security are in fact sacred human rights which, along with freedom, have been denied to them; privileges which we have not had too much of but which we have never had (It is these things that every woman, whether she admits it or not, is forced to scrounge for in her own particular way -- trying to beg, bluster ("simplex"), rip off or seduce some of the emotional (sexual) and material (economic) resources that are now reserved for himself. Do-gooder or pseudo-feminist politics is the begging or blustering kind of scrounging (blustering may seem better to you but it doesn't work for very long). Prostitution is the seducing or ripping-off kind. We all have some of each; sometimes nobody does and none of them ever gets us very much for very long.) Then they could have gotten together with the prostitutes and figured out how they were going to get all these things -- freedom, love and security -- not how to give them up.
NOTES cont'd

To get what we really want (freedom and love) and to keep it (security) we will have to take power, get it in some way. Of all the speakers on the panel only the prostitutes were talking about doing this and about a viable method for figuring out how to do it. The conference organizers were bogged down in trying to figure out some kind of psychological or "will power" method, so I somehow went over to her point to a self where she would then be ready, then be strong and developed enough to take power (or to fight for it).

What they were saying was: We are ready NOW. All we need to do is ORGANIZE. Women are ready and developed enough to govern. The job is just getting ourselves power, figuring out ways of doing that.

From the actions of the sponsoring groups, both of the above propositions are true. This conference, it would seem clear that all their breattheating and moaning about how "undeveloped" women aren't ready for a political movement either from fear or out of an effort to build individual strength, the kind of "strength" that may get you some slattery from certain men. They have chosen those women (most of us, that is) who are ready right NOW to go ahead with the fight. As an oppressed group moving into struggle it is unity organization. That will be the source of the power with which we wipe out male supremacy once and for all. For as individual development and our own organization, our feminist power, will release strengths that are already in us, and support, morality, takes a long time -- as we have been in the movement already know from experience. The more we organize, the more we fight, the more our power will grow and our movement will grow and develop -- that will be the fastest method of "self-development", each using what she has to the utmost now, and acquiring more power for women's freedom and for herself in the process.

The prostitutes were defending while the conference organizers were attacking what is probably the most basic axiom of feminism: that women are not inferior to men. What men have spoken, written and treated women for years is not what we are. The conference organizers had accepted men's arrogant and false assumption that what a woman is to them is for them to know. They believed, as we have seen, that because a woman is oppressed she is therefore degraded; in other words, is some kind of reflection on the oppressed person herself.

A conference organizer stood up from the audience and said to the prostitutes, "when you sell your vagina, you're selling your personality." None of the official "feminists" was selected by the conference organizers pointed out to their sister that she was not a "cunt". To the supremaist definition of woman as only a body, only a cunt, only a breeding machine. It was left to the prostitutes to have the last word and to defend all women with the above elementary point.

The prostitutes know the simple fact that they were not merely "cunts" (vaginas -- all, a clear biological-physical impossibility - even though they were only called "cunts" for men, the men who served them.

Similarly, they knew that as a whole are not mere "cunts" even though many refer often to women as that, treat us as that, though many of us earn a living through the use of our sexual organs as mothers, wives, and prostitutes. Anybody who serves someone else in order to live (the conference organizers included) should know that she is a different person when the boss is around them than when that one's seldom one's real self on the job but that the real self one saves for one's own time. To say that women actually are what their jobs are, that a charwoman, for instance, is a charwoman because that is the limit of her abilities, is to say that she is discriminated against, kept out of some options and forced into others; that we have a full range of options to choose from and therefore have only ourselves to blame if we 'end up badly. It is to deny another of the most basic feminist axioms: that women are equal; that we live under political, social, economic and military subjection to men -- a subjection which we all alleged inferiority on our part, but to men's political, social and economic and military power due to historic circumstances. These historic circumstances and underlying changes, it is true, changes which we must all help to speed up whenever there is a chance to move ahead, we are going to benefit from them as much as possible in our own life time. But the fact that we can change these conditions does not mean that we can be free from the power which men still wield due to them.

The conference organizers were saying that our ability to change these conditions is a personal ability, one due to choice. The prostitutes, on the other hand, were saying that women have plenty of personal ability; that what we need to change our conditions is political ability. In other words, though luck and connections, as well as work, may be able to make a big jump in improving the conditions of their lives. But changes on a national or international level or relatively a small number of women will require a program of taking power on a feminist basis.

The prostitutes were also challenging another of the basic axioms of male supremacist society; the myth that prostitutes are not only suffering, but were leading a more rotten degraded life than ordinary women. They were trying to explain in what ways women are suffering and discussing the myths about women's other alternatives. The conference organizers were literally horrified by the very idea of prostitution (and the implications of what it says about what's open to women - sexually and economically) and live in are horrifying. But rather than wanting to go deeper into this question said that we are all one - with the courage the prostitutes mentioned and their groups are always talking about or at least with curiosity (the search for truth will kill it) or sympathy (a mutual desire for liberation, in other words), the conference organizers froze in their tracks.

"Money buys power and men have the power because they not only have the money, but also that set up so that we are good when we give and bad when we are concerned about money. Women are not well treated in some ways, the housewife works as a slave; she receives no pay. One of the things she is required -- among others -- to do is to sexual intercourse for husband and to be the bearer of his children. Prostitution is "evil" because it threatens to limit his power. He fears we may all demand to be paid. That's why we have prostitution as the ultimate sin."

Dorothy Tenov, "Prostitution and the Emulation of Women"

"We came here today to eliminate prostitution. We are not to let anyone stop us," responded the conference organizers, as if they were the still unmade working-class/anti-military enemy attack. They attempted to twist the reality of what was being said to make it look as if the prostitutes were the ones saying things disparaging, because they were talking about (some) advantages in prostitution. The conference organizers were making it look as if the prostitutes were against the goals of the conference -- the elimination of prostitution -- and the goals and analysis of the women's liberation movement in general. In fact, the prostitutes never said they were against either of these things, nor again that they were for both.

The prostitutes at this conference were admitting that they were oppressed both as women and as prostitutes in particular. That their particular situation was in some ways different from that of the "ordinary" women (despite what the conference organizers said to this effect). And they were ready to join in the effort of figuring out what was going about it. What they actually said about the elimination of prostitution was that they felt that it couldn't be done until there was a social and economic alternative for the women in it. They themselves weren't going to "give it up" at no time soon (they didn't know anyone else who would. And they proposed that the best way now to work towards its elimination was:)(to) carefully study the problem at all levels of society. We must continue to work on the problem of devising individual and collective strategies for women as a whole. While the "women's liberation" girls were saying was making lots of sense for all women, the conference organizers too, and they should have at least listened. If they had stuck to their pre-ordained plan and dogma which was rapidly revealing itself to be more and more inadequate, with more and more of the theories of male supremacy rather than the interests of women. This was, after all, supposed to be a conference with a definite stamp. Maybe they could have learned something. (And anyway, women are supposed to be good at changing their minds. The conference organizers should have been well to see what is strong in what men hate about women.

They didn't listen, however, because they didn't want to. As the afternoon went on, they often seemed just totally deaf to what we were saying, as well as (ridiculously) unappreciative of the high caliber of ideas that were coming out of the mouths of these women who were, or had been to the sponsors - just whores, after all. Sometimes it was hard to decide whether the conference organizers were being threatened by their contempt for prostitutes who, they kept insisting, couldn't possibly know more than they themselves did and who, they added, were actually degraded women. Other times, it seemed as if the conference organizers were just unaware of the ideas and ideas of the prostitutes but were just terribly jealous of this strength, that they were just refusing to recognize, rather than really being unable to recognize, the prostitutes' contributions.

The conference organizers were ready enough to accept the "knowledge", the quotes and statistics, of already recognized, Establishment "scholars" the ideas of men, in other words, or of those women acclaimed by men. But they somehow became threatened when members of their own class and, worse yet, when women began to speak for themselves - than themselves showed signs of superior rather than inferior knowledge and spirit. It didn't mean that men have gained her knowledge at a ghastly price. It didn't matter that the woman - in this case, the prostitutes - might be putting her knowledge to the test to move forward in advance of the interests of all women, as well as of her own. The conference organizers were apparently too wrapped up in their own phony jealousies, and the problems of maintaining what position they had already been able to achieve and showing their "out of interest of a whole or was it or how they could work for real power for themselves by building power for women as a whole. They were going for the system of impressing people (however falsely) or of intimidating them (however momentarily) instead of for the long run benefits that an effective movement could bring about.
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As soon as it became clear at the conference that the prostitutes had captured the headlines, and by virtue of a petitio

That sections of the male supremacist pseudo-left would say such an involved and unsettling question of how to exploit women (and the women's movement) is certainly (and unfortunately) within the realm of possibility. The trouble with such an isolated question of how the conference, however, is that it safely avoids any of the issues raised at the conference itself.

We have already seen the sad story of how the conference organizers falsely called a conference in the name of a radical feminism that we do believe. And we have seen how the prostitutes -- whoever they were -- were the ones defending the ideas and methods of radical feminism. That which may not be on the Left does not in itself contradict that they are also feminist.

With all the talk the conference organizers indulged in about how they were providing the political analysis and theory while the working prostitutes were providing the experience, there was the division between politics and experience that the radical wing of the feminist movement had experienced in its first few years. And it was in fact the prostitutes who were providing the political analysis and theory, as well as the experience. It was they who talked about taking power, not giving things up, or lots of individual martyrdom or helping others with social work or charity reform. They talked about the struggle for sexual equality, and its forms of sexual and economic exploitation. The term "prostitution" must change in meaning. It could be stripped of its meaning of degradation and expanded to include all our business (money exchange) relationships. Unified we can create the production of the equal opportunity. United we can get a fair price for our services without being threatened with hellfire or ostracism. United, we will not be exploited whatever we are. It is a matter of fact calling of services (and whether I enjoy my work is none of anybody else's business).

"Maybe if they are available, no woman will elect to have sex for money. We'll find out," Dorothy Tenenv, "Prostitution and the Women." After the conference was over, the organizers switched to a whispering campaign to try to make it look as if the prostitutes didn't really mean what they said or that the contradiction it would seem to, the conference organizers' other claim that the prostitutes weren't saying anything at all.

The prostitutes weren't really the kind of feminists they were putting themselves forward to be," said the conference organizers. "Leftists who had been sent by their underground groups to disrupt the conference."
MALE PROSTITUTION

Prostitution is male: it is one of the few activities where those who practice it are universally referred to as "she" and not "he." This seems curious in the light of many estimates (including those of the Kinsey Institute) indicate that nowadays there are about as many male prostitutes in large American cities as there are female prostitutes. Like the women, the men also cater to a clientele which is in the vast majority male. Not of this the modern phenomenon. Male prostitution can be traced back as far as the Oriental empires of the third millenium B.C. and has existed alongside female prostitution throughout the centuries.

Of course you don't have to look too far back to find the function of this false identification of prostitution as a female profession - only as far as the arrest statistics which show the police persecution of the female prostitute and the relative hands-off policy applied to the men. According to the FBI Uniform Crime Report of 1970, females made up 79.3% of the total arrests for "prostitution and commercialized vice," while males constituted 20.7% of the arrests. Even this figure is misleading since the 20.7% males arrested for "vice" would include not only prostitutes - if any - but also pimps, pornographers, movie house operators and any other men involved in the sex business. What's more, the situation for women is getting worse. Between 1940 and 1970, a period when the overall population increase in the U.S. was 13%, male arrests in this category increased only 17.2% while female arrests showed a 73.2% increase.

The problem is not only one of selective enforcement of the laws. It is built into the prostitution laws themselves. A common legal definition of prostitution in some states reads as follows: "the practice of a female (my underlining) is offering her body to an indiscriminate intercourse with men for money or its equivalent" or "common lewdness of a woman for gain." Other states go further - they define a prostitute as a "promiscuous" woman, whether she is paid or not. In this way, a male prostitute cannot be legally accused of prostitution while a female non-prostitute (i.e., one who is not involved in a financial transaction for individual sex acts) can go to jail for prostitution.

Prostitution does exist, despite all the attempts to pretend otherwise, and in recent years it is considered to be steadily increasing in all the Western countries. What does this increase mean? In part it is only one aspect of a historical trend in prostitution - and in employment generally - which has sought to take away from women even the few limited and exploitative ways we have had of earning a living. Traditionally the only thing women have ever had to sell was our sexual functions and now men, including the male prostitutes are moving in to take over the hustle. Just as men wrested away from women their places in medical care (before it became a "profession"); just as they are now taking away teaching and (back) into clerical work, men are also attempting to take over pros-

titutions.

This trend began in earnest with the highly publicized "vice raids" of the early 20th century - the major effect of which was to transfer the management and profits of prostitution from the madam to the pimp. It is no coincidence that there was a longstanding rivalry between the madam and the pimp. As Polly Adler, a famous New York madam in the '20s put it, "I had two great enemies all the time I was in business. One was drugs, the other was pimps." Nell Kimball, a New Orleans madam, was even more direct: "There is nothing lower than a pimp, unless it's some politicians I have known." Many madams refused to even employ a woman who had a pimp. In the long run, however, the madams were driven out, and today the pimps are raking in the profits.

The trend toward male direction and profiting from prostitution has gone even further in those countries where prostitution has been legalized (brought under state regulation). In West Germany, for example, the pimps are now rich men in business suits.

Of course, female prostitution was never really considered respectable. The very fact that, with rare exceptions, the buyer is always male would rule out that possibility and show where the real power lies. As a large part of prostitution profits have always gone into the pockets of some men, whether through payoffs to police or government officials, through connections with organized crime, or whatever. The Importance of contemporary developments seems to be that the token female management of prostitution, which formerly existed in the form of the madam, has now been virtually eliminated. What was always a bad situation has gone from bad to worse.

With men now firmly in control of prostitution more and more of the jobs themselves are going to women. Some male prostitutes go the whole gamut in their competition with the female - makeup, frilly clothes, exaggerated feminine shuffles. But they are a minority. The majority of male hustlers are supermasculine - and in this male supermasculinity, therefore of even greater value than the "female" types.

A large number of male hustlers identify themselves as homosexuals. And that's where an important contradiction comes in: although these men have more power than their female counterparts, they are in an exploitable position with regard to the higher class men, the homosexuals who are able to buy them. The most comprehensive study of male hustlers was done in Copenhagen in 1953. Among the findings: 85% were under 21 years of age, 87.5% were lonely or mainly heterosexual in their private lives, only 30% came from economically stable backgrounds. Hustling for them was not a longterm career, as it is for many women, but it was a way of earning money when nothing else was available. Like female prostitution, the male variety too occurs in a less "official" more informal way. This is the case with the young man, for example, who is under pressure to keep with his boss as a way of obtaining upward mobility or even just keeping a job. Despite what the gay liberation movement might have us believe, there are lots of male homosexuals with considerable power in this country. In fact, there are whole fields which are already under almost complete homosexual control.

These seem to come in mainly two types: the fields whose major function is the maintenance of the status quo - fashion, cosmetics, and interior decoration, for example; and those which serve a general need of the community, notably the FBI, the CIA and the Catholic Church. The young man who wants to rise in any of these structures will have to bow to his "superior's" will.

And so the area of prostitution is a microcosm of the world as a whole: women oppressed by men; men oppressed by other men but kept from fighting by their own male supremacy; and all male ruling class jobs held in the hands of pimps. The problem is ultimately one of power - not just one area (prostitution) where that power is exercised, and the solution can only lie in taking that power away from those who are presently controlling our lives.
I'm walking from the subway against cold 2nd Ave. I've spent another day at work, and my feet are tired, so my mind is tired as well. Drudgery is what I do there, technical drudgery. I have small talk and jokes; the old techniques we use to make the time pass as quickly as possible when it's not our problem. This left me small; full of small thoughts and weariness, full of confidence in my small abilities but not in my large ones. To slip up and wring me out, but there's a lot left to do before it's over. I have a dance class to take, then the long subway-home ride, my dinner to make, the dishes to wash and a little straightening up to do - I live alone and I like it neat. Then perhaps I'll sit with the phone glued to my ear, or get in bed with a book, either way trying to repossess the day, make some sense out of it, make it a day that didn't live. (Because I know my life is passing.)

Now what, I wonder, could make it good? What, I wonder, could be able to say, "I love my work!" that statement I've seen men make, their faces brimming with confidence and enthusiasm, that statement which makes me a little and makes me feel smaller and left out. When I wonder, "What are those men that I'm not," my imagination refuses to answer, another way and ask, "What have they got that I don't," worlds whole appear.

Right away or not I could be a help-mates. My job pays pretty well, and it's a job which other people think must be "fascinating" in fact things do happen now and then which are interesting in a small way, and I get absorbed. Now supposing that after a day at my job I were to come home, tired feet and all, to a handsome man who would sit me down, take off my shoes and massage my feet tenderly, bring me nice comfy slippers (which I don't actually have) and then serve us up a beautiful dinner by candlelight. I could tell him everything that happened to me during the day, embracing it with some significance. He would laugh at the funny parts and hope sincerely for more. (Naturally: his well-being depends upon it.) Then, as I'm resting with my eyes half-closed, he soothes me with charming little stories of this and that, stories I don't need to take seriously and only half listen to. Let's say he's been home all day: he's glad for the news of the outside world, the sense of reality I bring into the here and now. He washes the dishes and runs my bath, and when I get out, all fresh and nice, we share a cup of cocoa. I love his little stories, so tender and nonsensical they tie me back into the creative, nonlogical, emotional part of life and set dreaming. Then he kisses me from my head to my toes. (Such as they are.) In his eyes, and in his hands, I'm transfigured. The man himself is extremely beautiful: tender and passionate - those are our watchwords and we do it right after night after night.

Not bad, right? But, job looks good to me - great to me. Yes, we could use more money, but I don't want him to work there. I want to work every day all worn out and shuffling like I do and he wouldn't be captivated by every-
THE PROFESSIONAL WOMAN

BY DOROTHY TENNOV

The professional woman is important because she is often cited as the exception, an exception which does not prove, but which defies, the rule that all women in our society are victims of prejudice and discrimination. She is held up to show that women can make it, because she has made it, a view sometimes expressed by professional women themselves. In fact, numerous studies show that in all professions women are represented more often in the lower ranks and that they receive lower salaries than males with comparable credentials.

Beyond the overall statistical picture, there are the day by day events of the life of the professional woman, the fine grain pattern, the details which make up the unequal position of the woman professional, wherever her field her rank or her salary. Until recently she has seldom perceived or admitted these details, but instead rationalized her environment by secretly blaming her situation on flaws in her own performance and personality. When her eyes open to the true nature of her situation she recognizes that despite her favored position relative to other women, she is crippled and victimized and often so blinded that she contributes to the victimization of her even less fortunate sisters.

The female professional is pursuing her career, even "successfully," still must walk about disguised, because her colleagues do not see the real person behind the mask of femaleness which she is unable to remove. She can never play it straight, must adopt one of the strategies through which professional functioning is permitted her, a functioning which is always limited compared to what would be possible for the person of her abilities who is male. However unconscious her protective reactions may have become, they are there, nevertheless. The woman lawyer, physician, academician, architect, must always damp her enthusiasm for her own ideas must always rank with less experienced or less capable males and be subordinate to her equals. To be assertive is to be vulnerable; to be less than perfect is to be vulnerable; to be an innovator is to be most vulnerable of all. The professional woman knows to inhibit all but the most logically sound and best-documented propositions. Only males are permitted to take unpopular positions without undermining their credibility.

If she is sexually attractive to her male colleagues, the professional woman may be the recipient of considerable flattery and attention, attention which may distract her, especially at the beginning of her career, from the true nature of their attitude toward her as a professional, and of the limited nature of the relationship which she may have with them. Although seemingly "one of the boys," she is more likely to be looked at than listened to when she makes a comment at a meeting; it is only if and when she comes to wield true power over them that she will really be heard. Advance- ment is more likely to result from hard work than from original thinking for when a woman attempts to put forth new ideas, she must overcome not only the resistance with which originality is always received, but also the added strength which the universal assumption of male superiority gives to her opponent. "We will not be free until all our sisters are free," is not empty dogma. So long as discrimination and prejudice against women is permitted, all women are at risk.

As she begins these days to incline toward the women's liberation movement, the professional woman already has several strikes against her; she is battle-weary and calloused, a tired veteran. She usually comes to the movement only when she recognizes defeat.

At 20, she is an outstanding student, far ahead of her fellows - male and female. The woman's movement seems to her a haven for those without will or ability to put out the slightly greater effort which brings success to one's gain. Perhaps discrimination against women prevailed in the past but she does not experience it. Besides, at this point, she likes men, and finds her relationship with them happy and rewarding, far more so than her relationships with women who are so often jealous and who have little interest in the theoretical and philosophical issues which concern her.

At 30, however, she is beginning to crack. The burdens are more than she bargained for. Usually, her career is temporarily suspended at this age while she "completes" her life by childbearing and responsibility. It is becoming clear that her best laid plans for professional accomplishment must be juggled with these other things. She was not prepared for this: she wonders what she has done wrong; she sees a psychiatrist (who blames her problem on "sex-identification conflict," or masculine protest); she throws herself into motherhood and domesticity with increased vigour; she stops reading her professional apps and bridge; she feels frustrated and guilty for having feelings of frustration and guilt, which in turn...

By 40, she has thrown off those conflicts, if she is to be a professional woman (many drop out) and given that she is competent, creative, and at least in potential, she achieves the professional status and recognition - if she has been industrious and fortunate - of an inferior and younger male. Her real potential contribution is still not welcomed; she has even been forced not to hear her ideas herself, unless they are put forth by others. At conventions she is no longer "one of the boys" but, unless she is sand's form, simply lonely. She has begun to need cronies, women who may be very unlike her in their interests within the profession, even in the hall of professional meetings, cannot talk shop with each other because their basis of communion is their exclusion from the cliques of those (males) who are their intellectual peers. The professional woman at 40 is rejected by the Couples Society as she does not understand that men and women can be comrades, or that for a man and woman to eat together does not mean they sleep together. Thus men have many excuses for not socializing with female colleagues; they may feel themselves obliged to go to a restaurant; they may become the victim of scandal and gossip; they may find themselves inferior to an inferior if they allow themselves to get on to serious topics; they fear that the woman's real aim is to capture a mate. But these "explanations" are often mere rationalizations.

In addition, professional men do not wish to waste their time with a woman colleague who has the beliefs who wield the political power within the profession through which their own careers can be advanced. As one male put it: "There are things a man can accomplish with a phone call (Hello, Charlie, old pal, how's the wife?) that no woman can possibly achieve, not through the writing of a hundred articles and well-thought-out letters. She is outside the network of friendly patronage, of backstairs and outright deals which make our world go round."

By 40 then, she understands her situation; she is aware of those rare token exceptions - which we will not take time to discuss - or she is broken. A restructuring, through striking off her ambitions has reduced the problem. But every time she reads that another Johnny Nothing, who asks questions back in Eng. Lit. and still barely got a C while she always had A's, has been appointed Director of some Institute which would have given her the time and position to get her ideas into practice and the credentials which would assure them an audience, every time she hears such she dies a bit more.

When she joins the Women's Movement
With a Bow to Women's Liberation

To the considerable embarrassment of all male chauvinists, seven of the eight medals awarded to the United States women in the concluded Winter Olympic Games were won by the female of the species. Less deadly by far were the statistics effort of a dozen and a half of them to produce one other medal, the one for hockey.

If the shrill voices of every Mt. who proclaims the glory of women's liberation don't ring out in triumphant chorus, someone is missing a process opportunity. The message is there for all to accept: Take a cat out of a kitchen and give her a chance to freeze to death in a wintry setting and she performs wonders. Even though all female medal winners were too young to have developed the complexities of Freudian intensity, so what?

It may be a shock to those in women's lib's in that dreams once were summarily barred from the Olympic Games in ancient days—even as spectators. If any courtyard was discovered, she was led forcefully from the area and placed in death off a huge rock in the vicinity. A couple of thousand years ago few dared break Olympic rules. The penalties were too severe. Times have changed. And now! Even of course, the damsels were admitted to the Olympic Festival as spectators and the point finally was reached when they also were allowed to compete. The first female Olympic champion of record was Belisane of Macedon, the driver of a winning chariot during the Olympics of 283 A.D. Do characters were to be found among our dust during the celebrated Olympics at Sporos over the last fortnight, however. They all moved on either skates or skis.

Short Shift Advice is hereby given to the women's libbers, though, to exist in female winners while they are fresh in mind because a sports-minded public normally pays mighty little attention to the downfall of the gifted. They are a ginch to go relatively unnoticed in the real Olympic Games at Munich in a field in which the superior performer will in every sport. Sorry about that, Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan.

For example, the track and field season will swing back to normal heretofore this when the Olympic Invitational Meet, the newest board floor spectacular, comes rolling in full color into the Madison Square Garden showcase Friday. There will be international fields in almost every event—at metric distances, too—and a notable cast of names to thrill them by Jesse Abramson, the man behind the scenes.

Because most track meets have events for women nowadays, this will have them too. Except for a few close friends and relations, though, the gals just don't draw customers through the turnstiles. The ones produce the brick ticket sale and the railroads at the indoor meets are a top-earning indoor track carnival. It is 2002 and it will be done without public. The gals was a disconcerting factor in the Winter Olympics, but in the main Olympic show this summer the men will get top billing, even if women's lib vehemently disapproves.

"We'll see! WOMAN'S WORLD"

Twenty-year-old Susan Corcoran of Ketcham, Idaho glows from winning a bronze medal in the downhill. Switzerland's Nadig took the gold.

SUBSCRIBE - WOMAN'S WORLD!

Some of the topics covered in the first three issues have been:

The Myth of Abortion Law Repeal - a long analysis revealing that, contrary to both establishment and pseudo-radical rhetoric, repeal of the abortion laws has been supported by The Establishment. Shows how in most states new legislation "reforming" the abortion laws (rather than repealing them) has actually been a step backwards. Challenges the genocide theory of some black nationalists, with respect to abortion and black control.

Faster Jobs for Women - an article on female unemployment that shows how the denial of jobs to women operates to keep women "in their place," dependent on men. It corrects a number of misconceptions about women in the job market - revealing that single women raise a harder time finding employment than married women, and providing further evidence against the myth of the black "matriarchy."

Race - articles in several issues analyzing different women's personal experience in their efforts to obtain justice - for a woman who beats up her attacker and gets arrested ... a woman who goes through the legal channels and loses ... a group which challenges the court's protection by raising the issue of rapists. Shows how rapists function as the extra-legal police force of male supremacy (male supremacy's demographics). Women Take Church to Court - an article exposing the Catholic Church's longstanding hatred of women and its protection by our "secular" government. A suit challenging the tax-exempt status of the Church, because of its political lobbying against abortion law repeal, is announced.

Male Psychology: A Myth to Keep Women in their Place - an article challenging the old and new psychological theories (such as "internalization" which blame women's problems on women, and which lead to an underestimation of the strength we possess right now to bring about change.

Black and White Women - an article covering problems such as the "naive" and special liberalism of white women towards black men, which undercuts black women's pioneering feminist struggles.

The Men's Page - a regular feature ... what men should be doing ... and the kind of "help" we don't want. Analyses of the politics of impotence and male homosexuality, etc.

WOMAN'S WORLD is a New York City based newspaper of feminist analysis, designed for activist distribution. Founded and edited by longtime members of the former Redstockings. As of now it is published irregularly but hopefully will soon be appearing on a monthly basis.
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Page 19
KATHLEEN CLEAVER

Cleaver: That question has a rather complicated and personal background. Work, with women were not to be as succinct as possible. I was involved in and have been involved in the struggle for the liberation of black people since I was approximately sixteen years old. The first thing that turned me on was the demonstrations and activities in the South under the leadership of James, 1966. As a result of my work in SNCC, I was involved in the bulk of the work of the Black Panther Party. From the beginning, we engaged in and were involved in the struggle. The basic question of the relationship between the party and the Black Panther Party was that of putting together a movement to liberate Huey Newton, that began to put together the Free Huey movement. We, myself, my husband and Emory. Three very close friends and the three people who were able to function. And I don't think that either of our roles can be considered superior or inferior to the other. We all worked for ourselves as long as was that done, and you must recognize that this is what's key in the liberation of women. That the form of assistance that women give in political movements to men is just as crucial as the leadership that men give to those movements. And this is something that is never recognized and never dealt with. Because women are always relegated to assistance and this is where I'm most interested in the liberation of women. Conflicts, constant conflicts came up, conflicts that would arise as a result of the fact that I was married to a member of the Central Committee and I was an officer in the Party. Things that I would have suggested myself would be implemented. But if I suggested them the suggestion might be rejected, if they were suggested by a man the suggestion would be implemented.

It seemed throughout the history of my working with the Party, I always had to struggle with this. The scene on my mind was never viewed objectively. The fact that the suggestion came from a woman gave her something of value. And it seemed that it had something to do with the egos of the men involved. I know that the first demonstration of that was in the courthouse for Huey Newton which I was very instrumental in organizing, the first time we went out on the soundtracks. I was on the platform in front of the courthouse. It was late, I got off the train and I was engaged and later married to Eldridge Cleaver. I began functioning, working with the Party, the Black Panther Party. Now after the attempted assassination of H. P. Newton the Party was in a state of disruption. Many people were very reasons here and there. The three functional members of the Party that began to put together a movement to liberate Huey Newton, that began to put together the Free Huey movement, were myself, my husband, and Emory. Three very close friends and the three people who were able to function. And I don't think that either of our roles can be considered superior or inferior to the others. We all worked for ourselves as long as was that done, and you must recognize that this is what's key in the liberation of women. That the form of assistance that women give in political movements to men is just as crucial as the leadership that men give to those movements. And this is something that is never recognized and never dealt with. Because women are always relegated to assistance and this is where I'm most interested in the liberation of women. Conflicts, constant conflicts came up, conflicts that would arise as a result of the fact that I was married to a member of the Central Committee and I was an officer in the Party. Things that I would have suggested myself would be implemented. But if I suggested them the suggestion might be rejected, if they were suggested by a man the suggestion would be implemented.

The Black Scholar, December 1971

Issue on "The Black Woman." Send $1.25 for a single issue, to Box 90B, Salinas, California 93945. Subscription rates are $10 a year, $8 to students and $2.50 for 3 years.

This issue is devoted to articles by and about the black woman. Of special interest are a new book by Angela Davis called "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves" and the interview with Kathleen Cleaver on the liberation of women reprinted here.

Angela Davis' article goes back to the time of slavery to refute the male supremacist myth that the black woman was a satriarch who collaborated with the slave master in keeping her family line. In the contrary, the she demonstrates that the black woman played a significant part in promoting resistance activities throughout the history of the black community. Davis sees the status of women within the black community as "a barometer indicating the overall potential for resistance," and male supremacy as an ideological weapon of the ruling class intended to defuse that potential.

The issue also includes, among other things, an annotated bibliography on black women in America, and an article by Shirley Chisholm in which she calls the white women who ask her "What can we do?" Her reaction: "In many ways it is a strange question - strange because the phrases: 'to help you people' is only implied. It is strange because of the implied assumption that they are free to help, work ... help ... I have always left only the implication of the real answer - that they not only might do - the only thing that they must do. Today I must state it. Free yourselves! And in order to help, you must help yourselves of the assumption that you are free now."
And I had to do a lot of thinking myself in order to be able to accept that because just the fact that any black man had anything to do with any white woman I become very hostile, irrational because of that historical relationship. However, there is the other aspect of that historical relationship that has to be regarded. In order for women to obtain liberation the struggles are not just in the basis of being women not on the basis of being black women or white women. But that relationship, I'm prone to being on a not separated and not on an integrated basis. Because the problems of black women and the problems of white women are so close and the political role can possibly be solved in the same type of organization or met by the same type of activity. We must remember that colonialist men, white policemen, white politician men, white business men... what white men have done to black women as women, my antagonism and hostility towards white men is unyielding and profound. I can understand how a white woman cannot relate to a white man because I cannot relate to a white man. And I feel sorry for white women who have to deal with that type of people.

The perpetuation of racism in the United States is that there is something that was developed as the need for a rationale to justify the participation exploitation as Africans, as slaves, as objects of property not even as human beings. For centuries and centuries – in fact up until this day in the United States – the laws that are maintaining the subjugation of black people have been the division between the man and the woman, has been the destruction of the family. From the very beginning of the slave system families were separated, this is the North American slave system. Marital sex was just a means for procreation it was an absurd notion, this is as absurd as the notion of horses and cows being mated. I'm from the State of Alabama and the plantations in Alabama were breeding livestock, they were breeding livestock to produce slaves. The men were housed in their quarters, the women were housed in their quarters, and a bull – this is what they called them – was selected by the slave master to impregnate the women to produce the best possible, the strongest slave. The black man was not interested in this. The white man was interested in the white man's animal. However, since this whole setup was run by white men they denied the black man access to the black woman. They denied the black man access to the black woman as a husband freely.

But they themselves had free access to the black women. They raped the black women, they killed the black women, in families, in communities they black women that raised their children. The inhumanities and torturers that black women suffered is something that is discussed, the inhumanities and torturers and inhumanities that women have been subjected to by the white men.

Now, there is a black woman who is carrying on these types of activities, it is impossible to conceive of that man as any form of a companion. So what this man has to do is not just the white woman, is not just the white woman essentially dehumanized by the white man, and that whole Western-European view of the woman as being placed as a pedestal, as being something pure, as being something like a statue, denies the

The white woman her humanity.

I think I'm being judgmental about sex, that sex was something that women were not supposed to participate in or enjoy only men, the white woman has been sexually dehumanized. That's one of the physical and mental and sexual freedom. The black woman was sexually exploited on the opposite scale by being raped and brutalized and tortured and used by the white man. Now a black man viewing this and knowing this can only feel revenge and take that out on the white man, and that's the black man's view of the white man. And that's very understandable, but understanding is not the most intense ingredient in a liberation struggle. Black people have been understanding too long for self-deception and any role understanding that understanding leads to political action that solves the problems.

Heaven: What are the origins of the present status of women?

Clever: Since our society is one that's Westernized, and since our view of the world is that of the European society, the Westernized society, we must deal primarily with the patriarchal elements of that society, the European society, which elevated the man over the woman. The basis of this elevation was more than likely the nature of that environment, and the need to have, and the need to develop, the ability of water, and the necessity of extreme fight over territory, terrain, etc., and to therefore perhaps the most important function for survival being performed by the man, the man was, considered a superior position a vis a vis the environment than the woman, and the woman was a sex slave. Now there's this whole thing that Freud gets into about the leader of the tribe have control over all the women – the old man. And in order for him to get the women, he has to destroy that father. Now, I don't agree with a lot of Freud's theory because it doesn't make to do with a postulated in a biblical period in the evolution of Western culture, with that viewpoint in the framework of a Jewish upbringing, but it might be relevant.

But the fact that women were considered objects and considered property just as African slaves during the slave system were considered objects and considered property they put them in an abject status. Even today in this area women, they have no rights, the Koran which is the Bible of the Islamic peoples is very oppressive of the rights of women. The Bible, the Old Testament and the New Testament are oppressive of the rights of women and the Roman Empire was a slave empire. We have to understand that when we talk about the cultural, economic and political organization of the Western European nations as well as the organizational structure of colonization, that we must take into consideration their so-called Judeo-Christian heritage, and the way in which the Roman Empire. And it's the role of women under those value systems and organizational conditions leads to the present status of women in colonial society. And that's where we have to get our beginning.

I think also that something is involved there, that the birth – giving birth – is a very mysterious process. Even to this day women are sheltered by their fathers and the man views his daughter as his own possession. When she is given to the husband she is then considered the husband's possession not to be shared with others. This attitude gave the men control over women. Although the woman produced the children, raised the children, reared the children, the economic sustenance of the family was provided by the man, the physical sustenance of the family was provided by the man, and since the man did that and the man controlled, and the man wrote, and the man dictated, and the man laid the laws, and the man controlled, it was the man who defined the position of the woman. It's a position very similar to that of the woman prior to World War II when all the European countries decided that the colonial nations should have the right to self-determination. But the colonialist nations say no say – there was no representative there – they were silent. As Fanon says, "They were not in history, they were outside of history."

What we see today in the development of the women's liberation movement is the beginning entrapment of the Westernized history, the woman beginning to speak for the woman. The woman beginning to understand, analyze the history of woman; the woman beginning to deal with the oppression of her oppression in order to be able to deal with this. Now, of course there are always, as in any historical case, exception in the laws. Cleopatra, who Europeans like to hold up as some kind of queenly sex symbol but who was, in reality, a political outside force and a military leader of the Egyptian people in their fight against the Roman Empire.

In particular, the history of Afro-American peoples in our struggle for liberation against slavery is laced thoroughly with examples of heroism and suffering and the courage, and tremendous action on the part of women. The most outstanding examples are Harriet Tubman who was a military general and led 300 slaves to freedom in the underground railroad. A black woman who could neither read nor write considered a soul-less human slave by her captors became determined to escape, fought, managed to have slaves escape, and fought with the Union Army against the Confederate. This is a tremendous example of Sojourner Truth. And on the other side we have the example of Harriet Beecher Stowe – not a very good example for us to bring up but to make a point – who wrote Uncle Tom's Cabin which created such a stir in the abolition movement that it really sparked the Civil War – a woman wrote this book. It is not these specific examples that we must deal with, what we have to deal with is the general situation of women in all countries, its entireity, its roots, its causes, and its elimination. It's not a personal struggle for the personal liberation of individual women, and it's not a class struggle for the liberation of women in individual classes. It's a struggle to totally alter and rearrange the value and organization of society altogether, which allows the women to be forced into position of submission, a position of secondary significance, a position of dependency, and a position where the inferiority via a variety of means has no concrete, irreversible actual basis in fact.

Sure. Perhaps we could now expand a bit more on the liberation, the oppression that's originating from her sexual role, her sexual function. That is, that she always has to look good, she always has to look attractive, that she's more of children, and that classically she does not have any initiative on that level.

I can see no reason why the mother who produces the children should have less say in their upbringing than the man whose role is to murder and to kill and to fertilization for nine months the child, the period of gestation, goes on inside the woman. The period of the time that the youth is taken by the woman. And this role is extremely crucial, in fact it is the most crucial factor in the reproduction of the species and the maintenance of society. But for some reason this most crucial work performed by woman is the basis for woman's position of inferiority. And if anything was rational, this should be the basis for her leadership.
For me the first "preview" issue of MS magazine turned out to be a gently ticking time bomb. The phrase "a woman's molotov cocktail that looked like a martini." Despite its fashionable appearance, MS's feminist, political content, in some instances, was in direct opposition to what the women's liberation movement has yet come up with.

The complete edition was confused with what must have been its decay - the diluted preview of the preview published in New York Magazine - because there is much encouragement and there was in that one, including some new information, ideas and evidence that even most women's movement "veterans" probably haven't heard of or responded to enough.

Even the problems of MS seem to stem from its very strengths. Its serious interest in feminist and militant analysis with a mass circulation sets up some contradictory elements which appear throughout the efforts of those who have had to require a certain amount of catering to well-connected people in positions of power who have their own interests to advance by pretending to support women's needs. The challenge for this magazine will be to sort out the best of what could make MS, useful for putting our hands on the worst from that could only feed the power of male supremacy.

The most important articles in the magazine - the interview with Daniel Ellsberg, the former high level government official who gave "The Pentagon Papers" to the press - seems to be a perfect example of this dilemma and not at all because Ellsberg happens to be a male contributor to a feminist journal. Ellsberg's article is vital because of the information it reveals and the evidence it contains about the radical political situation in the U.S. and women as a whole, taken on a wider, more general scale than we usually get to see. Even for those who "know all along" it will offer some encouragement and some confirmation for what has come to be known as "the pro-woman line" in the feminist movement.

This is the recognition of the great political insight of oppressed groups, and of women in particular, and the understanding that feelings and intuition from direct experience are the essence of an oppressed group's (personal-political) self-interest and an important way of arriving at the truth of a situation in spite of the lies women, for one, are, daily bombarded with by the oppressor.

Both Ellsberg's failures as well as contributions are really important to understand. The faulty conclusions Ellsberg draws from the pro-woman truths he has uncovered are equally understandable - truths which other male supremacists before him have also "come to" and used in their own interests - are no doubt one reason why women need to develop a sharper critical eye for the other clear of acknowledging female strengths, thereby avoiding what would otherwise be a great source of clarity for women, as well as a greater danger with which women can know no bounds until justice was done and our freedom finally won.

Ellsberg describes how he came to the realization that not only females, but other allegedly "inferior" groups (like black people and blue collar workers) who have had to fight the war in Vietnam than he did with all his "advanced" education. He reveals from polls and for first time to achieve a high government official that contrary to some official misconceptions widely spread by the media and other establishment sources, the lower income and less (formally) educated groups have to oppose the war in Vietnam, not support it. All along it has rather been (again, generally speaking) only the men like himself in relatively powerful, high status positions in the United States (with a drive toward improving or maintaining their status) who were the "hawks" blindly and relentlessly supporting this anti-communist crusade.

He notes of the powerful facts he regardless of their race or socio-economic connections with men, were always statistically connected to read less about Vietnam and a "lower level of awareness" about women, Ellsberg suggests that some "other" groups read less because "they share a skepticism about the information they read" and may "not even care" or "be interested" or "care less, but they know more, in other words."

This information is political data. It challenges some widespread myths about the Vietnam war, including the myth that women are in the U.S. and women as a whole, taken on a wider, more general scale than we usually get to see. Even for those who "know all along" it will offer some encouragement and some confirmation for what has come to be known as "the pro-woman line" in the feminist movement. This is the recognition of the great political insight of oppressed groups, and of women in particular, and the understanding that feelings and intuition from direct experience are the essence of an oppressed group's (personal-political) self-interest and an important way of arriving at the truth of a situation in spite of the lies women, for one, are, daily bombarded with by the oppressor.

Both Ellsberg's failures as well as contributions are really important to understand. The faulty conclusions Ellsberg draws from the pro-woman truths he has uncovered are equally understandable - truths which other male supremacists before him have also "come to" and used in their own interests - are no doubt one reason why women need to develop a sharper critical eye for the other clear of acknowledging female strengths, thereby avoiding what would otherwise be a great source of clarity for women, as well as a greater danger with which women can know no bounds until justice was done and our freedom finally won.

The information Ellsberg has shared, however, doesn't mean that if we are ever to act on these truths in our own way. No doubt ignorance, fear and some arrogant ("educated") blindspots of our own are part of what has been holding some females back from seeking the great strength of women (other than themselves) and men, and some forms of this understanding would produce. And that is why the magazine MS is making such an important contribution. In its own way, even with the kind of political ambiguities described above, MS, through a number of its specific articles and its general approach has taken a more straightforward, self put and the media does not treat the pro-woman stance most other feminist publications.

A much article, "Welfare is a Women's Issue," by (Ms.) Johanne Tillman, opens with a few slick, journalistes lines which seem designed to inspire pity rather than anger, but it soon straddles the case out and goes on to make one of the strongest feminist analyses I've seen anywhere.

Tillman doesn't stop for a minute to give any credence to the lies told about women in general in male supremacist society and welfare mothers in particular. And to her, the fact that some women may believe these lies or spout them doesn't make them any truer. "A welfare mother probably has a better head for money than Rockefeller," is her answer to the male supremacist notion that women in general and welfare mothers in particular are frivolous spenders and incompetents.

This is something akin to economic genius, she points out, for a woman and her kids to make sure they will survive on the pittance of a welfare check.

Tillman also illuminates some of the problems of general feminist strategy, discussing the dangers of fighting for single issues alone, like child care centers or abortions, rather than for what we really want, freedom and power for women across the board. Our minimum demands, she reminds us, must always advance and guarantee women's right to choose; otherwise, for instance, we may have to fight for care centers and be forced to send our children to them. (This is a particular danger now for the women on welfare.) Tillman suggests paying women for "women's work" as one, very important, short term step toward improving women's lives and bargaining power (a long term step is to break us out of slavery into wage slavery!)

Quite a few other articles in MS, including Anselma Del'Olio's "To the People of the Housewife's Moment of Truth" also make some really good connections and hard hitting, strong, full of praise. Celestine Ramey's on "Men's Cycles" (the male equivalent of women's monthly menstrual periods) also make some really new ones. The article on the woman for whom marriage could be a choice for action. Celestine Ware's conversations with New York City Human Rights Commissioner Eleanor Holmes Norton touches briefly on
sound more respectable. She takes such a
roundabout way of coming up with a straight-
forward insight into the matter. It's almost funny.
Gornick, it would seem, has to go visit a
big university to "discover" what most fe-
males on the street could have told her and
what she should have known all along if she
ever wanted to admit it: that women are punished in various ways when they don't behave as smart or smarter than men and, therefore,
steer clear of open success in competi-
tion with men — which, of course, in a male
world centers on open "success" in practicaly,everything.
Gornick actually ends up thanking Harvard for
providing time and space and money where
growing up with "new" understand-
3ings like this.
MS. also manages to avoid most of the
"be a star, be a star, and get us all out of
here" dishonesty and defensiveness which has
been a detracting undercurrent in so much women's
liberation writing. For the most part,
the MS. is true to the very real problems to
which the above is a reaction seems to be
to recognize the whole gamut of women's
feelings, both of need and of exploitation,
and to treat women's emotional needs seri-
ously instead of as "hang-ups" of some kind
or other.
Unfortunately, however, MS. does tend to
er at a bit in the opposite direction. It is
too often defensively and dishonestly pro-
ven to the point that it exaggerates our need.
The truth unfortunately seems to be a
very fine and difficult line to adhere to, with
definitions of women's moment lurking on
both sides of it. It seems "right".
But trying to find the truth and sticking to
with our real feelings as the guide — it is our only hope for getting what we
really want and eliminating all the
rubbish which stands in the
way.
As it is now, MS. seems to have dealt
with all the problems and difficulties of un-
covering the truth by being something of
a hodge-podge, though a good hodge-podge
because it has encouraged and brought
out some fine, beautiful, and
beautifully true writing that hasn't
appeared before, along with the medi-
ocre, run of the mill phoney stuff.
The question is, how long can this
make-everybody-happy approach go on
without becoming a source of confu-

tion?

ON "MS.", THE TITLE

A long time ago, before I went to
Mississippi as a civil rights worker,
I was in the south and would see the
honorable titles like Mr. or Dr. or
Miss before people's names were fussy
and pretentious and downright
snobbish — and just hold-over from the
days of kings and nobles and ancient
hierarchical societies in general. I
hardly saw them as deferential,
and even took some pride in the fact that
I would usually write down my return
address on an envelope without a Miss
before my name. I did this not in deference to a
title when I addressed a letter to an
acquaintance — male or female (or even
older people or teachers when they were
friends). I wasn't worried then about the
fact that men and women were dif-
ferentiated by these titles or even
that married women were differentiated from single women (and men were all
equal in comparison) I just didn't
like any of them — for the various
"idealistic" reasons above.

When I joined the SNCC Mississippi
Summer Project (1964), I was suddenly in a situation where people were literally risking their lives if they
made the simple request to the people in
power that they be addressed by these
same honorifics. One of the ways that
white racists in the South used —
and still use — to constantly remind
refugees to the South of our invidious past
should be and how low, low, low these
black folk better stay "if they know what
is good for them," was to refuse ever
to address them as anything but
how old or admired that person was — by
the titles of Mr., Mrs., or Miss. Even
local bill collectors neglected to put
Mr. or Mrs. before the names they
addressed to the wonderful family I was staying
with, not to mention judges in court
referring to a thirty year old civil rights
leader and the head of a church in the
community as "Robert." Little by little, after enough incidents like these, I
found myself getting really furious and
ignorant over an issue I had previously
thought rather petty; though, for a while
I must have given people I worked and
lived with some of the same irritation
while the realization was still
dawning on me. (When I would go
into my "idealistic" spiel about how


mail addressed to me as "Ms." for the
first time, however, was the day I really
understood the issue. Until then, I
think I had still been thinking not only
caring. I held the letter and looked
at that "Ms.," in front of my name and
suddenly began to feel a glow spread
through my veins at this new equal

tement. I guess as if I was actually
holding a weapon in my hand, a
weapon which I could use to smite that
horrible old distinction between married
women and single women, every time I sent a
letter. A weapon had come into my hand
which I could help use to counter that
powerful pressure on women — on
myself — to get married on such unequal
terms, with so little love and at such a
terribly unfair cost to our lives.
I still believe, of course, that a
time will come when people won't have
to fight against other people for their
status as human beings, and we won't use special titles anymore.
But I now see that the use of such titles
can't help me move toward that
time.

We are working now on elimin-
ating the differences between Miss and
Mrs. to create a Space to designate the
equality of all women. Our eventual
goal, of course, is to eliminate the
social distinctions between men and women, as well as other class distinctions.
Part of this will mean eventually
creating a term which designates
the equality of all people.
"Comrade" was such a term, used for
this purpose, in several (Communist)
revolutions. Although, words as we
all know are not everyday.
The use of "Ms." will get us to
the point where a word like "comrade"
between a man and a woman is really true,
is really felt. There may be a while
when on some occasions we feel it is
right for us to say Mr. and Ms. and on
other occasions we will know that it is
safe and true
and right to use "comrade" or else no
the same at all (as we do among
friends). There will also
use these words to trick and confuse us.
But we mustn't let them stop us from
fully utilizing what power we have,
even the power of words.

"Kathie Sarachild"
MS. review cont'd

sion instead of strength and one which dulls us for life. This is not to say that "tolerance" for everybody instead of sharpening distinctions and awakening us is the answer.

Ultimately, the success of MS. magazine as a weapon of feminism will depend on its relationship to the rest of the movement. Here, too, it will have a full relationship, revealing the whole spectrum of activity— even if it really means taking its positions and heeding its feelings and leading it when it is on the right track, and changing course to follow it when it is off the mark. Right now, MS. seems rather nervous about its association with the real, living, breathing women who comprise the movement. This is understandable, it is obviously on the basis of this movement and the feelings and hopes that it has awakened that people are so drawn to it. This is not for drawing its readership and power.

It is a little too vague about the history of some of its articles and projects and tends to emphasize "prominent" women too much. This seems to be a bad omen, for instance, the article called "We Have Nothing To Say About Abortion," seems as if the whole idea of women talking about their abortions publicly by an aid to breaking taboos and raising legal issues was the subject of this piece. In fact, the real story was that the whole idea of making abortion public was a wonderland development out of something the ragtag and not so "prominent" feminist groups called Redstocking had initiated and completed in the late 80's.

In a way, Cynthia Ozick's article "We Are the Crazy Lady and Other Felows Feminists" is a true statement of the possible motive for the kinds of omissions above and a dangerous type of self-interest of latching on to MS. Ozick tells the story of her hire as a university graduate student and how one of her professor a woman who would some how find the other woman in the class make herself known as the women's rights woman. To Ozick, the other woman was clearly as different as night and day because she was not a womanist. Ozick describes as "almost brilliant, only not actually on the point and frenetic with hostility" and simply white, while she, on the other hand, is perfectly rational and analytical. Nevertheless, somehow, the professor could not tell them apart and performances such as this, it would seem that some respectable type lady as Ms. Ozick have conspired to have a possible way out of the kind of dilemma described above for them to join the crazy, angry woman and try to civilize them so that such as they and by implication the feminist movement would be better able to meet the time and the respectable ones will try to fix the rest of us up so that we will no longer tarnish their credentials and reputation when men do these things either.

What Ozick didn't seem to realize in her story— or else failed to state in any kind of way that the idea of the crazy lady of her tale wasn't crazy. Rather she was probably onto something that the rest of these academic pedants were trying to realize that Ozick doesn't seem to realize is that there is no stopping "crazy" ladies like this one, nor can the movement that may "seem far out" to a few fancy women like Ozick but are really just far seeing and not in front, giving the rest of us the facts. There is always be at least some of these around to embarrass her, so she might as well let go and become herself or at least live and let live, or become a silent supporter— instead of pursuing her futile efforts at pacification.

Of course, genuine support from the "prominent" and "respectable" type of women could be a real aid to MS. and to the feminist movement in general. The defeat of male supremacy is, after all, in our common interests and such women may have access to sources of information and money that they otherwise be unavailable for feminist use. The strengths of MS. are right now coming from two directions: one is from women who are interested in feminism and the special contacts of the MS. staff with some of the men in positions of power. For instance, if you look for the interests of which group MS. is going to be the vehicle, who is going to be using what group's resources, MS. will be to represent the true interests of women. (For instance, unlike any other women's magazine designed for mass circulation, there is no story that goes about clothing fashions, or make up. But the publication does contain a number of such advertisements and will depend, no doubt, on getting more in order to survive in its present form.)

MS. could just possibly get a good deal better and even easier get no worse. A new publication takes some time while it settles into definite shape (with some changes in personnel), and even after that it can change. In its present form, MS. is no worse than most other women's liberation publications. It is in some ways, both theoretically and practically speaking, it is much better. Even if no more information is available, this fact alone would make one of the sharpest liveliest feminist anthologies printed to date.

Say What You Mean cont'd

...during the course of their development..."We have..." heard about this proposed bill, got hold of it late version (which those who called Ms. Abzug's office told that WOAHAC wanted), and was horrified by it—mainly because of all the abortion laws and for at least 3 years has shown its commitment by actually working for this goal in a legal way. After they and other consultation with attorneys around the country who are most active & knowledgeable in the abortion sphere, New York prepared & sent to Ms. Abzug a comprehensive criticisms of the first bill, but most importantly with the inaccurate, title, "Abortion Law Reform Act," and with the information which the letter which which my seals are still engaged—or even whether the version that incorporates NOW's ideas is in fact the version that will be filed. It may be that the committee will pay a fine if you speak up loud and clear for exactly what you want and why. As to the groups, the last few of which who simply dismissed this article & the serious issues it raises as " specious"—she was absolutely right. But those of us that do prefer to conform to the ways that language, thought, meaning, and action reflect and reinforce each other—for good or evil. We may never agree on what we want or how to get it, but at the very least we can try to talk about it in the same language. Otherwise, chaos and defeat are inevitable.

MARCH FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

A "Children's March for Survival" is being planned by a coalition of welfare rights, women's groups and other social action groups. On March 25th, to protest the Nixon anti-welfare Family Assistance Plan. Other groups are using it as a base for other free comprehensive child care and expansion of funding programs for children and pregnant women. For further information call the Women's Action Alliance at 212-972-0750.

MORE REVIEWS...

By Barbara Leon


In her introduction the editor states in compiling this anthology, I have bypassed writings which deal entirely with the outdated topics of suffrage and have tried instead to select materials which pertain to still-unresolved feminist problems. The collection is a most eye-opening anthology to come out of the present women's movement, providing glimpses of a 20th century feminist movement which I, for one, never knew existed. Whether it is Margaret Fuller advocating a period of celibacy to make "true women," the fine short story describing the function of female laborers under capitalism; Victoria Woodhull's argument for female or Emeline Pankhurst explaining why physical force and not education of men is needed to win women's freedom; the selections in this book explode many of the myths about the conservatism of the early woman's rights movement. Unfortunately, the articles are frustratingly short and sometimes choppy, just enough to whet the appetite. Nevertheless Schneider has made a good start in uncovering our suppressed history.