

Retailers developed a banner business in faded blue jeans, surplus army jackets, beads, incense, and sandals. Health-food stores and “head” shops appeared in shopping malls alongside Neiman Marcus and Sears. Rock-music groups, for all their lyrical protests against the capitalist system, made millions from it. The search on the part of alienated youth for a better society and a good life was strewn with both comic and tragic aspects.

FEMINISM The seductive ideal of liberation spawned during the sixties helped accelerate a powerful women’s rights crusade. Like the New Left the new feminism drew much of its inspiration and many of its tactics from the civil rights movement. Its aim was to challenge the “cult of female domesticity” that had prevailed since the 1950s.

The mainstream of the women’s movement was led by Betty Friedan. Her influential book, *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), launched the new phase of female protest on a national level. During the 1950s Friedan, a Smith College graduate, raised three children in a New York suburb. Still politically active but now socially domestic, she mothered her children, pampered her husband, “read *Vogue* under the hair dryer,” and occasionally did some freelance writing. In 1957 she conducted a poll of her fellow Smith alumnae and discovered that, despite the prevailing rhetoric about

the happy suburban housewife, many women were in fact miserable. This revelation led to more research, which culminated in the publication of *The Feminine Mystique*.

Women, Friedan wrote, had actually lost ground during the years after World War II, when many left wartime employment and settled down in suburbia. A propaganda campaign engineered by advertisers and women’s magazines encouraged them to do so by creating the “feminine mystique” of blissful domesticity. This notion that women were “gaily content in a world of bedroom, kitchen, sex, babies, and home” thus served to imprison women. In Friedan’s view the middle-class home had become “a



Betty Friedan

Author of *The Feminine Mystique*.

comfortable concentration camp” where women suffocated and stagnated in an atmosphere of mindless materialism, daytime television, and neighborhood gossip.

The Feminine Mystique, an immediate best seller, inspired many women who felt trapped in a rut with no way out. Moreover, Friedan discovered that there were far more women working outside the home than the pervasive “feminine mystique” suggested. Many of these working women were frustrated by the demands of holding “two full-time jobs instead of just one—underpaid clerical worker and unpaid housekeeper.”

In 1966 Friedan and other activists founded the National Organization for Women (NOW). It initially sought to end discrimination in the workplace on the basis of sex and went on to spearhead efforts to legalize abortion and obtain federal and state support for child-care centers.

In the early 1970s Congress, the Supreme Court, and NOW advanced the cause of gender equality. Under Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972, colleges were required to institute “affirmative action” programs to ensure equal opportunities for women. In the same year, Congress overwhelmingly approved the equal-rights amendment, which had been bottled up in a House committee for almost half a century. In 1973 the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade*, struck down state laws forbidding abortions during the first three months of pregnancy. Meanwhile, the educational bastions of male segregation, including Yale and Princeton, led a new movement for coeducation that swept the country. “If the 1960s belonged to blacks,” said one feminist, “the next ten years are ours.”

By the end of the 1970s, however, sharp disputes between moderate and radical feminists fragmented the women’s movement. The movement’s failure to broaden its appeal much



Feminist Awakenings

In 1967 Syracuse University student Kathy Switzer challenged the Boston Marathon’s tradition of excluding women. Officials tried to pull Switzer from the course, but with the aid of fellow runners she completed the race. Women did not become official entrants until 1971.

beyond the confines of the middle class also caused reform efforts to stagnate. The equal-rights amendment, which had once seemed a straightforward assertion of equal opportunity ("Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex") and assured of ratification, was stymied in several state legislatures. By 1982 it had died, several states short of passage. And the very success of NOW's efforts to liberalize local and state abortion laws generated a powerful backlash, especially among Catholics and fundamentalist Protestants, who mounted a potent "right-to-life" crusade.

Yet the success of the women's movement endured long after the militant rhetoric had evaporated. Women's growing presence in the labor force brought them a greater share of economic and political influence. By 1976 over half the married women and nine out of ten female college graduates were employed outside the home, a development that one economist called "the single most outstanding phenomenon of this century." Most career women, however, did not regard themselves as feminists; they took jobs because they and their families needed the money to achieve higher levels of material comfort. Whatever the motives, traditional gender roles and child-bearing practices were being changed to accommodate the two-career family and the sexual revolution.

THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION AND THE PILL The feminist movement coincided with the so-called sexual revolution, a much-discussed loosening of traditional restrictions on social behavior. Young people opposed to the conflict in Vietnam chanted "Make Love, Not War." Other members of the counterculture promoted "free love" as an alternative to what they claimed was a repressive, materialistic capitalist society. Activists promoting more permissive sexual attitudes staged rallies, formed organizations, engaged in civil disobedience, filed suits against prevailing laws, and flouted social norms.

The publicity given to the sexual revolution exaggerated its scope and depth, but the movement did help generate two major cultural changes: society became more tolerant of premarital sex, and women became more sexually active. Between 1960 and 1975 the number of college women reporting having had sexual intercourse doubled, from 27 percent to 50 percent. What facilitated this change was a scientific breakthrough in contraception: the birth-control pill.

Approved by the Food and Drug Administration in 1960, the pill, as it came to be known, blocks ovulation by releasing synthetic hormones into a woman's body. Initially birth-control pills were available only to married



Birth Control

In an effort to spread the word about birth-control options, Planned Parenthood in 1967 displayed posters like this one in New York City buses.

couples, but that restriction soon ended. Widespread access to the pill gave women a greater sense of sexual freedom than any previous contraceptive device. It also contributed to a rise in sexually transmitted diseases. Yet many women viewed the birth-control pill as a godsend. "When the pill came out, it was a savior," recalled Eleanor Smeal, president of the Feminist Majority Foundation. "The whole country was waiting for it. I can't even describe to you how excited people were."

The pill quickly became the most popular birth-control method. In 1960 the U.S. birth rate was 3.6 children per woman. By 1970 it had plummeted to 2.5 children, and since 1980 it has remained slightly below 2. Eight out of ten women have taken birth-control pills at some time in their lives. Clare Boothe Luce, the congresswoman, ambassador, journalist, and playwright, viewed the advent of the pill as a key element in the broader women's movement: "Modern woman is at last free as a man is free, to dispose of her own body, to earn her living, to pursue the improvement of her mind, to try a successful career."

changed and brought under control that there can be any hope for stopping the forces that create a war in Vietnam today or a murder in the South tomorrow.

...

If the people of this country are to end the war in Vietnam, and to change the institutions which create it; then the people of this country must create a massive social movement—and if that can be built around the issue of Vietnam then that is what we must do.

By a social movement I mean more than petitions or letters of protest, or tacit support of dissident Congressmen; I mean people who are willing to change their lives, who are willing to challenge the system, to take the problem of change seriously. By a social movement I mean an effort that is powerful enough to make the country understand that our problems are not in Vietnam, or China or Brazil or outer space or at the bottom of the ocean, but are here in the United States. What we must do is begin to build a democratic and humane society in which Vietnams are unthinkable, in which human life and initiative are precious.

Questions

1. Why does Potter challenge President Johnson's claim that the war in Vietnam is a defense of freedom?
2. What does he mean by saying, "we must name that system"?

171. The National Organization for Women (1966)

Source: National Organization for Women: "The National Organization for Women's 1966 Statement of Purpose," written by Betty Friedan. Reprinted with permission of National Organization for Women. This is a historical document and may not reflect the current language or priorities of the organization.

The civil rights revolution, soon followed by the rise of the New Left, inspired other Americans to voice their grievances and claim their rights. Most far-reaching in its impact on American society was the emergence of the "second wave" of feminism. A key catalyst in the public reawakening of feminist consciousness was the publication in 1963 of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*. At a time when the number of women attending college was expanding rapidly, her book painted a devastating picture of talented women trapped in a world that viewed marriage and motherhood as their primary goals. Somehow, after more than a century of agitation for access to the public sphere, and half a century after winning the right to vote, women's lives still centered on the home.

In 1966, Friedan was the leading figure in the creation of the National Organization for Women, dedicated to combating the inequalities that afflicted women in the workplace, legal system, politics, and education. Although the Statement of Purpose called for a more equitable division of labor within the family, NOW's main focus lay in the public realm. It was soon joined by more radical organizations that targeted inequalities in private life. Since 1966, NOW has been instrumental in winning legal gains for women. Today, it has over half a million members.

WE, MEN AND women who hereby constitute ourselves as the National Organization for Women, believe that the time has come for a new movement toward true equality for all women in America, and toward a fully equal partnership of the sexes, as part of the world-wide revolution of human rights now taking place within and beyond our national borders. . . .

NOW is dedicated to the proposition that women, first and foremost, are human beings, who, like all other people in our society, must have the chance to develop their fullest human potential. We believe that women can achieve such equality only by accepting to the full the challenges and responsibilities they share with all other people in our society, as part of the decision-making mainstream of American political, economic and social life.

We organize to initiate or support action, nationally, or in any part of this nation, by individuals or organizations, to break through

the silken curtain of prejudice and discrimination against women in government, industry, the professions, the churches, the political parties, the judiciary, the labor unions, in education, science, medicine, law, religion and every other field of importance in American society.

Enormous changes taking place in our society make it both possible and urgently necessary to advance the unfinished revolution of women toward true equality, now. With a life span lengthened to nearly 75 years it is no longer either necessary or possible for women to devote the greater part of their lives to child-rearing; yet child-bearing and -rearing which continues to be a most important part of most women's lives—still is used to justify barring women from equal professional and economic participation and advance.

Today's technology has reduced most of the productive chores which women once performed in the home and in mass-production industries based upon routine unskilled labor. This same technology has virtually eliminated the quality of muscular strength as a criterion for filling most jobs, while intensifying American industry's need for creative intelligence. In view of this new industrial revolution created by automation in the mid-twentieth century, women can and must participate in old and new fields of society in full equality—or become permanent outsiders.

Despite all the talk about the status of American women in recent years, the actual position of women in the United States has declined, and is declining, to an alarming degree throughout the 1950's and 60's. Although 46.4% of all American women between the ages of 18 and 65 now work outside the home, the overwhelming majority—75%—are in routine clerical, sales, or factory jobs, or they are household workers, cleaning women, hospital attendants. About two-thirds of Negro women workers are in the lowest paid service occupations. Working women are becoming increasingly—not less—concentrated on the bottom of the job ladder. As a consequence full-time women workers today earn on the average only 60% of what men earn, and that wage gap has been increasing over

the past twenty-five years in every major industry group. In 1964, of all women with a yearly income, 89% earned under \$5,000 a year; half of all full-time year round women workers earned less than \$3,690; only 1.4% of full-time year round women workers had an annual income of \$10,000 or more. . . . In all the professions considered of importance to society, and in the executive ranks of industry and government, women are losing ground. Where they are present it is only a token handful. Women comprise less than 1% of federal judges; less than 4% of all lawyers; 7% of doctors. Yet women represent 51% of the U.S. population. . . .

Until now, too few women's organizations and official spokesmen have been willing to speak out against these dangers facing women. Too many women have been restrained by the fear of being called "feminist." There is no civil rights movement to speak for women, as there has been for Negroes and other victims of discrimination. The National Organization for Women must therefore begin to speak.

We believe that this nation has a capacity at least as great as other nations, to innovate new social institutions which will enable women to enjoy the true equality of opportunity and responsibility in society, without conflict with their responsibilities as mothers and homemakers. In such innovations, America does not lead the Western world, but lags by decades behind many European countries. We do not accept the traditional assumption that a woman has to choose between marriage and motherhood, on the one hand, and serious participation in industry or the professions on the other. . . . Above all, we reject the assumption that these problems are the unique responsibility of each individual woman, rather than a basic social dilemma which society must solve. True equality of opportunity and freedom of choice for women requires such practical, and possible innovations as a nationwide network of child-care centers, which will make it unnecessary for women to retire completely from society until their children are grown, and national programs to provide retraining for women who have chosen to care for their children full-time. . . .

p between the sexes demands
an equitable sharing of the
en and of the economic bur-
at proper recognition should
al value of homemaking and

atus of women is declining, not

m for women?

from Delano" (1969)

" 1969. TM/© 2010 the Cesar
ion.org. Reprinted with permission.

gal rights had long flourished
1960s saw the flowering of a new
-class economic status. Like Black
zed pride in both the Mexican
d arisen in the United States.
S, it was closely linked to labor

on of migrant farm workers and
series of nonviolent protests
boycott of California grapes, to
cts with the United Farm Work-
Latino communities throughout
n to the pitifully low wages and
t laborers.

Chavez addressed a "Letter from Delano" to agricultural
it he defended his own movement's aims and tactics. In 19
growers agreed to contracts with the UFW.

DEAR MR. BARR [President, California Grape and Tre

I am sad to hear about your accusations in the
union movement and table grape boycott have b
because we have used violence and terror tactics. If
true, I have been a failure and should withdraw fro
but you are left with the awesome moral responsibi
and man, to come forward with whatever informat
that corrective action can begin at once. If for any re
come forth to substantiate your charges, then you
responsible for committing violence against us, al
the tongue. I am convinced that you as a human bei
what you said but rather acted hastily under pressur
lic relations firm that has been hired to try to counte
dous moral force of our movement. How many tim
have felt the need to lash out in anger and bitterness

Today on Good Friday 1969 we remember the life a
of Martin Luther King, Jr., who gave himself total
lent struggle for peace and justice. In his "Letter fro
Jail" Dr. King describes better than I could our hop
and boycott: "Injustice must be exposed, with all
exposure creates, to the light of human conscienc
national opinion before it can be cured." For our p
we have seized upon every tactic and strategy con
morality of our cause to expose that injustice and t
the sensitivity of the American conscience so that fa
have without bloodshed their own union and the dig
ing with their agribusiness employers. By lying abo
our movement, Mr. Barr, you are working against m

We believe that a true partnership between the sexes demands a different concept of marriage, an equitable sharing of the responsibilities of home and children and of the economic burdens of their support. We believe that proper recognition should be given to the economic and social value of homemaking and child-care.

Questions

1. Why does NOW believe that the status of women is declining, not improving?
2. How does the document define freedom for women?

172. César Chavez, "Letter from Delano" (1969)

Source: Cesar Chavez: "Letter from Delano," 1969. TM/© 2010 the Cesar E. Chavez Foundation www.chavezfoundation.org. Reprinted with permission.

As in the case of blacks, a movement for legal rights had long flourished among Mexican-Americans. But the mid-1960s saw the flowering of a new militancy challenging the group's second-class economic status. Like Black Power advocates, the movement emphasized pride in both the Mexican past and the new Chicano culture that had arisen in the United States. Unlike the Black Power movement and SDS, it was closely linked to labor struggles.

Beginning in 1965, César Chavez, the son of migrant farm workers and a disciple of Martin Luther King Jr., led a series of nonviolent protests including marches, fasts, and a national boycott of California grapes, to pressure growers to agree to labor contracts with the United Farm Workers Union (UFW). The boycott mobilized Latino communities throughout the Southwest and drew national attention to the pitifully low wages and oppressive working conditions of migrant laborers.

Chavez addressed
it he defended his
growers agreed to

DEAR MR. BA

I am sad to
union movement
because we have
true, I have been
but you are left
and man, to con
that corrective
come forth to
responsible for
the tongue. I an
what you said b
lic relations fir
dous moral forc
have felt the ne

Today on Good
of Martin Luth
lent struggle fo
Jail" Dr. King d
and boycott: "I
exposure create
national opinio
we have seized
morality of our
the sensitivity o
have without bl
ing with their a
our movement,

carried on by public groupings; that politics be seen positively, as the art of collectively creating an acceptable pattern of social relations; that politics has the function of bringing people out of isolation and into community, thus being a necessary, though not sufficient, means of finding meaning in personal life; that the political order should serve to clarify problems in a way instrumental to their solution; it should provide outlets for the expression of personal grievance and aspiration; opposing views should be organized so as to illuminate choices and facilitate the attainment of goals; channels should be commonly available to relate men to knowledge and to power so that private problems—from bad recreation facilities to personal alienation—are formulated as general issues.

The economic sphere would have as its basis the principles: that work should involve incentives worthier than money or survival. It should be educative, not stultifying; creative, not mechanical; self-directed, not manipulated; encouraging independence, a respect for others, a sense of dignity, and a willingness to accept social responsibility since it is this experience that has crucial influence on habits, perceptions, and individual ethics; that the economic experience is so personally decisive that the individual must share in its full determination; that the economy itself is of such social importance that its major resources and means of production should be open to democratic participation and subject to democratic social regulation.

Like the political and economic ones, major social institutions—cultural, educational, rehabilitative, and others—should be generally organized with the well-being and dignity of man as the essential measure of success.

In social change or interchange, we find violence to be abhorrent because, it requires generally the transformation of the target, be it a human being or a community of people, into a depersonalized object of hate. It is imperative that the means of violence be abolished and the institutions—local, national, international—that encourage nonviolence as a condition of conflict be developed. These are our central values, in skeletal form. It re-

mains vital to understand their denial or attainment in the context of the modern world.

* * *

Tragically, the university could serve as a significant source of social criticism and initiator of new modes and molders of attitudes. But the actual intellectual effect of the college experience is hardly distinguishable from that of any other communications channel—say, a television set—passing on the stock truths of the day. Students leave college somewhat more “tolerant” than when they arrived, but basically unchanged in their values and political orientations. With administrators ordering the institution, and faculty the curriculum, the student learns by his isolation to accept elite rule within the University, which prepares him to accept later forms of minority control. The real function of the educational system—as opposed to its more rhetorical function of “searching for truth”—is to impart the key information and styles that will help the student get by, modestly but comfortably, in the big society beyond. . . .

The very isolation of the individual—from

power and community and ability to aspire—means the rise of a democracy without publics. With the great mass of people structurally remote and psychologically hesitant with respect to democratic institutions, those institutions themselves attenuate and become, in the fashion of the vicious circle, progressively less accessible to those few who aspire to serious participation in social affairs. The vital democratic connection between community and leadership, between the mass and the several elites, has been so wrenched and perverted that disastrous policies go unchallenged time and again. . . .

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. According to Hayden, what two phenomena disrupted the complacency of his generation?
2. What factors did Hayden cite as impeding the formulation of new values and a larger social vision?
3. How did Hayden define the concept of participatory democracy?

GLORIA STEINEM

Equal Rights for Women—Yes and No (1970)

Like the civil rights movement, the women's rights movement developed a more radical wing as it matured. In the late 1960s, a younger generation of women activists began calling for a more comprehensive "women's liberation movement." Ohio-born Gloria Marie Steinem, a prominent journalist and social and political activist, emerged as one of the movement's most effective leaders. As a columnist for New York magazine, she published in 1969 a seminal article titled "After Black Power, Women's Liberation," which, along with her ardent support of abortion rights, helped cement her stature as a national feminist leader. In 1972 Steinem co-founded Ms. magazine, which soon became the leading national publication promoting feminism. Steinem was at the forefront of the nationwide campaign to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the U.S. Constitution. The proposed amendment stated that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United

worthier than money or survival. It should be educative, not stultifying; creative, not mechanical; self-directed, not manipulated; encouraging independence, a respect for others, a sense of dignity, and a willingness to accept social responsibility since it is this experience that has crucial influence on habits, perceptions, and individual ethics; that the economic experience is so personally decisive that the individual must share in its full determination; that the economy itself is of such social importance that its major resources and means of production should be open to democratic participation and subject to democratic social regulation.

Like the political and economic ones, major social institutions—cultural, educational, rehabilitative, and others—should be generally organized with the well-being and dignity of man as the essential measure of success.

In social change or interchange, we find violence to be abhorrent because, it requires generally the transformation of the target, be it a human being or a community of people, into a depersonalized object of hate. It is imperative that the means of violence be abolished and the institutions—local, national, international—that encourage nonviolence as a condition of conflict be developed. These are our central values, in skeletal form. It re-

Loneliness, estrangement, isolation describe the vast distance between man and man today. These dominant tendencies cannot be overcome by better personnel management, nor by improved gadgets, but only when a love of man overcomes the idolatrous worship of things by man. As the individualism we affirm is not egoism, the selflessness we affirm is not self-elimination. On the contrary, we believe in generosity of a kind that imprints one's unique individual qualities in the relation to other men, and to all human activity. Further, to dislike isolation is not to favor the abolition of privacy; the latter differs from isolation in that it occurs or is abolished according to individual will.

We would replace power rooted in possession, privilege, or circumstance by power and uniqueness rooted in love, reflectiveness, reason, and creativity. As a *social system* we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.

In a participatory democracy, the political life would be based in several root principles: that decision-making of basic social consequence be

itive awareness of pos-
curiosity, an ability and

ce does not mean ego-
ject is not to have one's
a way that is one's own.
nerely have faith in his

ould involve fraternity
pendence is contem-
hood must be willed,
future survival and as
of social relations. Per-
d man are needed, es-
artial and fragmentary
men only as worker to
ees, teacher to student,

nt, isolation describe
man and man today.
cannot be overcome by
ent, nor by improved
ove of man overcomes
ngs by man. As the in-
t egoism, the selfless-
-elimination. On the
erosity of a kind that
vidual qualities in the
to all human activity.
s not to favor the abo-
ffers from isolation in
according to individ-

rooted in possession,
y power and unique-
ness, reason, and cre-
seek the establishment
al participation, gov-
at the individual share
termining the quality
t society be organized
in men and provide
participation.

cracy, the political life
root principles: that
social consequence be

carried on by public groupings; that politics be
seen positively, as the art of collectively creating an
acceptable pattern of social relations; that politics
has the function of bringing people out of isolation
and into community, thus being a necessary,
though not sufficient, means of finding meaning in
personal life; that the political order should serve
to clarify problems in a way instrumental to their
solution; it should provide outlets for the expres-
sion of personal grievance and aspiration; oppos-
ing views should be organized so as to illuminate
choices and facilitate the attainment of goals; chan-
nels should be commonly available to relate men to
knowledge and to power so that private problems—
from bad recreation facilities to personal alienation—
are formulated as general issues.

The economic sphere would have as its basis
the principles: that work should involve incentives
worthier than money or survival. It should be ed-
ucative, not stultifying; creative, not mechanical;
self-directed, not manipulated; encouraging inde-
pendence, a respect for others, a sense of dignity,
and a willingness to accept social responsibility
since it is this experience that has crucial influence
on habits, perceptions, and individual ethics; that
the economic experience is so personally decisive
that the individual must share in its full determi-
nation; that the economy itself is of such social
importance that its major resources and means
of production should be open to democratic
participation and subject to democratic social
regulation.

Like the political and economic ones, major so-
cial institutions—cultural, educational, rehabilita-
tive, and others—should be generally organized
with the well-being and dignity of man as the es-
sential measure of success.

In social change or interchange, we find vio-
lence to be abhorrent because, it requires generally
the transformation of the target, be it a human be-
ing or a community of people, into a depersonal-
ized object of hate. It is imperative that the means
of violence be abolished and the institutions—
local, national, international—that encourage
nonviolence as a condition of conflict be developed.
These are our central values, in skeletal form. It re-

mains
in the

Tragic
source
modes
tellect
disting
cation
the ste
somev
but ba
litical
the in
dent
withi
cept l
tion o
more
is to i
help
in the
T

unresolved; one with an intuitive awareness of possibilities, an active sense of curiosity, an ability and willingness to learn.

This kind of independence does not mean egoistic individualism—the object is not to have one's way so much as it is to have a way that is one's own. Nor do we deify man—we merely have faith in his potential.

Human relationships should involve fraternity and honesty. Human interdependence is contemporary fact; human brotherhood must be willed, however, as a condition of future survival and as the most appropriate form of social relations. Personal links between man and man are needed, especially, to go beyond the partial and fragmentary bonds of function that bind men only as worker to worker, employer to employees, teacher to student, American to Russian.

Loneliness, estrangement, isolation describe the vast distance between man and man today. These dominant tendencies cannot be overcome by better personnel management, nor by improved gadgets, but only when a love of man overcomes the idolatrous worship of things by man. As the individualism we affirm is not egoism, the selflessness we affirm is not self-elimination. On the contrary, we believe in generosity of a kind that imprints one's unique individual qualities in the relation to other men, and to all human activity. Further, to dislike isolation is not to favor the abolition of privacy; the latter differs from isolation in that it occurs or is abolished according to individual will.

We would replace power rooted in possession, privilege, or circumstance by power and uniqueness rooted in love, reflectiveness, reason, and creativity. As a *social system* we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.

In a participatory democracy, the political life would be based in several root principles: that decision-making of basic social consequence be

carried on by public groupings; that politics be seen positively, as the art of collectively creating an acceptable pattern of social relations; that politics has the function of bringing people out of isolation and into community, thus being a necessary, though not sufficient, means of finding meaning in personal life; that the political order should serve to clarify problems in a way instrumental to their solution; it should provide outlets for the expression of personal grievance and aspiration; opposing views should be organized so as to illuminate choices and facilitate the attainment of goals; channels should be commonly available to relate men to knowledge and to power so that private problems—from bad recreation facilities to personal alienation—are formulated as general issues.

The economic sphere would have as its basis the principles: that work should involve incentives worthier than money or survival. It should be educative, not stultifying; creative, not mechanical; self-directed, not manipulated; encouraging independence, a respect for others, a sense of dignity, and a willingness to accept social responsibility since it is this experience that has crucial influence on habits, perceptions, and individual ethics; that the economic experience is so personally decisive that the individual must share in its full determination; that the economy itself is of such social importance that its major resources and means of production should be open to democratic participation and subject to democratic social regulation.

Like the political and economic ones, major social institutions—cultural, educational, rehabilitative, and others—should be generally organized with the well-being and dignity of man as the essential measure of success.

In social change or interchange, we find violence to be abhorrent because, it requires generally the transformation of the target, be it a human being or a community of people, into a depersonalized object of hate. It is imperative that the means of violence be abolished and the institutions—local, national, international—that encourage nonviolence as a condition of conflict be developed. These are our central values, in skeletal form. It re-

mains vital to understand their denial or attainment in the context of the modern world.

* * *

Tragically, the university could serve as a significant source of social criticism and initiator of new modes and molders of attitudes. But the actual intellectual effect of the college experience is hardly distinguishable from that of any other communications channel—say, a television set—passing on the stock truths of the day. Students leave college somewhat more “tolerant” than when they arrived, but basically unchanged in their values and political orientations. With administrators ordering the institution, and faculty the curriculum, the student learns by his isolation to accept elite rule within the University, which prepares him to accept later forms of minority control. The real function of the educational system—as opposed to its more rhetorical function of “searching for truth”—is to impart the key information and styles that will help the student get by, modestly but comfortably, in the big society beyond....

The very isolation of the individual—from

GLORIA STEINEM Equal Rights for Women—Y

Like the civil rights movement, the women's rights movement began calling for a more comprehensive "women's liberation" as it matured. In the late 1960s, a younger Gloria Marie Steinem, a prominent journalist and social activist, emerged as one of the movement's most effective leaders. York magazine, she published in 1969 a seminal article "Women's Liberation," which, along with her ardent support, helped cement her stature as a national feminist leader. Ms. magazine, which soon became the leading national women's magazine, was at the forefront of the nationwide movement. Rights Amendment (ERA) to the U.S. Constitution. That "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied

power
mean
With
and I
critic
tenu
circle
who
The
mini
sever
that
again

1. Ac
dis
2. Wh
for
visit
3. Ho
pat

any State on account of sex." In early May 1970, a Congressional committee held hearings on the ERA, and Steinem appeared before the committee to support of it. Two years later, both houses of the Democratic-controlled Congress passed the ERA and sent it to the state legislatures for ratification. By 1982, the ERA had fallen short of gaining the necessary ratification by thirty-eight states, and the proposed amendment died.

U.S. House of Representatives, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *The "Equal Rights" Amendment: Hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary*, 91st Congress, May 5-7, 1970.

... Gloria Steinem. I am a writer and I am currently a member of the National Council of the Democratic Women's Forum. I work regularly with the lowest-paid workers in the country, the migrant workers, the children both in California and New York. . . .

... working for a living, I have experienced the legal and social discrimination against women in this country. I have been refused service in public restaurants, ordered to leave bars and clubs, and turned away from job interviews; all for the clearly-stated reason that I am a woman. And all without the same discrimination against blacks and other minorities. I have been excluded from professional groups, and from the so-called "unfeminine" subculture of male participation in the Democratic Party and even from such small details as airline fares. . . .

... years of researching the status of women, I have discovered that in reality, most women, both housewives and career women, routinely suffer more injustice than I do.

* * *

... silent for too long. But we must speak. Our problems stem from the fact that we may appear before you as middle-aged middle class or we are all sisters in fighting the same myths. Like racial myths, they are laws. Let me list a few.

That woman are biologically inferior to men. In fact, an equally good case can be made for the reverse. Women live longer than men, even when the men are not subject to business pressures. . . .

* * *

Another myth, that some are already treated equally in this society. I am sure there has been ample testimony to prove that equal pay for equal work, equal chance for advancement, and equal training or encouragement is obscenely scarce in every field, even those—like food and fashion industries—that are supposedly "feminine."

* * *

Women suffer this second class treatment from the moment they are born. They are expected to be, rather than achieve, to function biologically rather than learn. . . .

* * *

Another myth, that children must have full-time mothers. American mothers spend more time with their homes and children than those of any other society we know about. In the past, joint families, servants, a prevalent system in which grandparents raised the children, or family field work in the agrarian systems—all these factors contributed more to child care than the labor-saving devices of which we are so proud.

The truth is that most American children seem to be suffering from too much mother, and too little father. Part of the program of Women's Liberation is a return of fathers to their children. If laws permit women equal work and pay opportunities,

nt of sex." In early May 1970, a Congressional com-
RA, and Steinem appeared before the committee to
s later, both houses of the Democratic-controlled
ent it to the state legislatures for ratification. By 1982,
ort of gaining the necessary ratification by thirty-eight
ed amendment died.

on the Judiciary, *The "Equal Rights" Amendment: Hearings
tional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary*, 91st

a writer
member
nocratic
lowest-
workers,
nia and

That woman are biologically inferior to men.
In fact, an equally good case can be made for the
reverse. Women live longer than men, even when
the men are not subject to business pressures. . . .

* * *

Another myth, that some are already treated equally
in this society. I am sure there has been ample testi-
mony to prove that equal pay for equal work, equal
chance for advancement, and equal training or en-
couragement is obscenely scarce in every field, even
those—like food and fashion industries—that are
supposedly "feminine."

* * *

Women suffer this second class treatment from the
moment they are born. They are expected to be,
rather than achieve, to function biologically rather
than learn. . . .

* * *

Another myth, that children must have full-time
mothers. American mothers spend more time with
their homes and children than those of any other
society we know about. In the past, joint families,
servants, a prevalent system in which grandparents
raised the children, or family field work in the
agrarian systems—all these factors contributed
more to child care than the labor-saving devices of
which we are so proud.

The truth is that most American children seem
to be suffering from too much mother, and too lit-
tle father. Part of the program of Women's Libera-
tion is a return of fathers to their children. If laws
permit women equal work and pay opportunities,

men will then be relieved of their role as sole
breadwinner. Fewer ulcers, fewer hours of mean-
ingless work, equal responsibility for his own chil-
dren: these are a few of the reasons that Women's
Liberation is Men's Liberation too.

After all, we won't have our masculinity to prove.

* * *

Women are not more moral than men. We are only
uncorrupted by power. But we do not want to im-
itate men, to join this country as it is, and I think
our very participation will change it. Perhaps
women elected leaders—and there will be many of

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What forms of sexual discrimination had Steinem personally experienced?
2. Which "sexual myths" does Steinem highlight?

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

What's Wrong with "Equal Rights" for Women? (1972)

During the 1970s social conservatives launched a concerted counterattack against the feminist movement, arguing that traditional gender roles were the foundation of human civilization. To these conservatives, the essential elements of social well-being—the family, religious belief, patriotism, respect for authority—depended on men and women knowing their place and working together to promote social cohesion. One of the most effective leaders of the anti-feminist movement was Phyllis Schlafly, a conservative Roman Catholic Republican activist living outside of St. Louis. An attorney by training and a talented grassroots organizer as well as Congressional candidate, Schlafly in 1972 founded a national organization called STOP ERA (Stop Taking Our Privileges) in an effort to reaffirm the primacy of marriage and motherhood for American women. Feminists, she asserted, were striving to "remake our laws, revise the marriage contract, restructure society, remold our children to conform to liberalist values instead of God's values, and replace the image of woman as virtue and mother with the image of the prostitute, swinger, and lesbian." In 1972 Schlafly explained her anti-feminist stance in her influential national newsletter, the Phyllis Schlafly Report.

From "What's Wrong with 'Equal Rights' for Women," *Phyllis Schlafly Report* 5, No. 7, Feb. 1972. Reprinted by permission of the author.

Of all the classes of people who ever lived, the result of a fortunate combination of circumstances. the American woman is the most privileged. We have the most rights and re- wards, and the fewest duties. Our unique status is in a civilization which respects the family as the

1. We have the immense good fortune to live in a civilization which respects the family as the

basic unit of society. This respect is part and parcel of our laws and our customs. It is based on the fact of life—which no legislation or agitation can erase—that women have babies and men don't.

If you don't like this fundamental difference, you will have to take up your complaint with God because He created us this way. The fact that women, not men, have babies is not the fault of selfish and domineering men, or of the establishment, or of any clique of conspirators who want to oppress women. It's simply the way God made us.

* * *

The Greatest Achievement of Women's Rights

This is accomplished by the institution of the family. Our respect for the family as the basic unit of society, which is ingrained in the laws and customs of our Judeo-Christian civilization, is the greatest single achievement in the entire history of women's rights. It assures a woman the most precious and important right of all—the right to keep her own baby and to be supported and protected in the enjoyment of watching her baby grow and develop.

* * *

The Financial Benefits of Chivalry

2. The second reason why American women are a privileged group is that we are the beneficiaries of a tradition of special respect for women which dates from the Christian Age of Chivalry. The honor and respect paid to Mary, the Mother of Christ, resulted in all women, in effect, being put on a pedestal.

... In America, a man's first significant purchase is a diamond for his bride, and the largest financial investment of his life is a home for her to live in. American husbands work hours of overtime

to buy a fur piece or other finery to keep their wives in fashion, and to pay premiums on their life insurance policies to provide for her comfort when she is a widow (benefits in which he can never share).

* * *

The Real Liberation of Women

3. The third reason why American women are so well off is that the great American free enterprise system has produced remarkable inventors who have lifted the backbreaking "women's work" from our shoulders.

* * *

The real liberation of women from the backbreaking drudgery of centuries is the American free enterprise system which stimulated inventive geniuses to pursue their talents—and we all reap the profits. The great heroes of women's liberation are not the straggly-haired women on television talk shows and picket lines, but Thomas Edison who brought the miracle of electricity to our homes to give light and to run all those labor-saving devices—the equivalent, perhaps, of a half-dozen household servants for every middle-class American woman. Or Elias Howe who gave us the sewing machine which resulted in such an abundance of ready-made clothing. Or Clarence Birdseye who invented the process for freezing foods. Or Henry Ford, who mass-produced the automobile so that it is within the price-range of every American, man or woman.

* * *

The Fraud of the Equal Rights Amendment

In the last couple of years, a noisy movement has sprung up agitating for "women's rights." Suddenly, everywhere we are afflicted with aggressive females

on television talk shows yapping about how mistreated American women are, suggesting that marriage has put us in some kind of "slavery," that housework is mental and degrading, and—perish the thought—that women are discriminated against. New "women's liberation" organizations are popping up, agitating and demonstrating, serving demands on public officials, getting wide press coverage always, and purporting to speak for some 100,000,000 American women.

It's time to set the record straight. The claim that American women are downtrodden and unfairly treated is the fraud of the century. The truth is that American women never had it so good. Why should we lower ourselves to "equal rights" when we already have the status of special privilege?

* * *

What "Women's Lib" Really Means

Many women are under the mistaken impression that "women's lib" means more job employment opportunities for women, equal pay for equal work, appointments of women to high positions, admitting more women to medical schools, and other desirable objectives which all women favor. We all support these purposes, as well as any necessary legislation which would bring them about.

But all this is only a sweet syrup which covers the deadly poison masquerading as "women's lib." The women's libbers are radicals who are waging a total assault on the family, on marriage, and on children. Don't take my word for it—read their own literature and prove to yourself what these characters are trying to do.

The most pretentious of the women's liberation magazines is called *Ms.*, and subtitled "The New Magazine For Women," with Gloria Steinem listed as president and secretary.

Reading the Spring 1972 issue of *Ms.* gives a good understanding of women's lib, and the people who promote it. It is anti-family, anti-children,

and F high-women wife e bers, dry. (up t coura lesbia

The " to see to wo fical "mov role c and c V moth that slaver stead moti inste inste T vote telev to pr 1. H w m p 2. A p

par-
the
can
...
nce,
God
that
t of
ish-
t to
us.

to buy a fur piece or other finery to keep their wives in fashion, and to pay premiums on their life insurance policies to provide for her comfort when she is a widow (benefits in which he can never share).

* * *

The Real Liberation of Women

3. The third reason why American women are so well off is that the great American free enterprise system has produced remarkable inventors who have lifted the backbreaking "women's work" from our shoulders.

* * *

The real liberation of women from the backbreaking drudgery of centuries is the American free enterprise system which stimulated inventive geniuses to pursue their talents—and we all reap the profits. The great heroes of women's liberation are not the straggly-haired women on television talk shows and picket lines, but Thomas Edison who brought the miracle of electricity to our homes to give light and to run all those labor-saving devices—the equivalent, perhaps, of a half-dozen household servants for every middle-class American woman. Or Elias Howe who gave us the sewing machine which resulted in such an abundance of ready-made clothing. Or Clarence Birdseye who invented the process for freezing foods. Or Henry Ford, who mass-produced the automobile so that it is within the price-range of every American, man or woman.

* * *

The Fraud of the Equal Rights Amendment

In the last couple of years, a noisy movement has sprung up agitating for "women's rights." Suddenly, everywhere we are afflicted with aggressive females

on television talk shows yapping about how mistreated American women are, suggesting that marriage has put us in some kind of "slavery," that housework is menial and degrading, and—perish the thought—that women are discriminated against. New "women's liberation" organizations are popping up, agitating and demonstrating, serving demands on public officials, getting wide press coverage always, and purporting to speak for some 100,000,000 American women.

It's time to set the record straight. The claim that American women are downtrodden and unfairly treated is the fraud of the century. The truth is that American women never had it so good. Why should we lower ourselves to "equal rights" when we already have the status of special privilege?

* * *

What "Women's Lib" Really Means

Many women are under the mistaken impression that "women's lib" means more job employment opportunities for women, equal pay for equal work, appointments of women to high positions, admitting more women to medical schools, and other desirable objectives which all women favor. We all support these purposes, as well as any necessary legislation which would bring them about.

But all this is only a sweet syrup which covers the deadly poison masquerading as "women's lib." The women's libbers are radicals who are waging a total assault on the family, on marriage, and on children. Don't take my word for it—read their own literature and prove to yourself what these characters are trying to do.

The most pretentious of the women's liberation magazines is called *Ms.*, and subtitled "The New Magazine For Women," with Gloria Steinem listed as president and secretary.

Reading the Spring 1972 issue of *Ms.* gives a good understanding of women's lib, and the people who promote it. It is anti-family, anti-children,

and pro-abortion. It is a series of sharp-tongued, high-pitched whining complaints by unmarried women. They view the home as a prison, and the wife and mother as a slave. To these women's libbers, marriage means dirty dishes and dirty laundry. One article lauds a woman's refusal to carry up the family laundry as "an act of extreme courage." Another tells how satisfying it is to be a lesbian.

* * *

Women's Libbers Do Not Speak for Us

The "women's lib" movement is *not* an honest effort to secure better jobs for women who want or need to work outside the home. This is just the superficial sweet-talk to win broad support for a radical "movement." Women's lib is a total assault on the role of the American woman as wife and mother, and on the family as the basic unit of society.

Women's libbers are trying to make wives and mothers unhappy with their career, make them feel that they are "second-class citizens" and "abject slaves." Women's libbers are promoting free sex instead of the "slavery" of marriage. They are promoting Federal "day-care centers" for babies instead of homes. They are promoting abortions instead of families.

* * *

Tell your Senators NOW that you want them to vote NO on the Equal Rights Amendment. Tell your television and radio stations that you want equal time to present the case FOR marriage and motherhood.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How does Schlafly justify the traditional role of women as being centered on marriage and motherhood?
2. According to Schlafly, what role has "free enterprise" played in reinforcing traditional gender roles?

at, tracked down by white degenerates in our own pitiable, poverty-stricken and prideless neighborhoods.

We are the women whose hair is compulsively fried, whose skin is bleached, whose is "too big," whose mouth is "too big and loud," whose behind is "too big and broad," whose feet are "too big and flat," whose face is "too black and shiny," and whose suffering and patience is too long and enduring to be believed.

Who are just too damned much for everybody. . . .

We are the women whose husbands and fathers and brothers and sons have been plagiarized, imitated, denied, and robbed of the fruits of their genius, and who consequently we see as emasculated, jailed, lynched, driven mad, deprived, enraged and made suicidal. We are the women who nobody, seemingly, cares about, who are made to feel inadequate, stupid and backward, and who inevitably have the most colossal inferiority complexes to be found.

And who is spreading the propaganda that "the only free people in the country are the white man and the black woman"? If this be freedom, then Heaven is hell, right is wrong, and cold is hot.

Who will revere the black woman? Who will keep our neighborhoods safe for black innocent womanhood? Black womanhood is outraged and humiliated. Black womanhood cries for dignity and restitution and salvation. Black womanhood wants and needs protection, and keeping, and holding. Who will assuage her indignation? Who will keep her precious and pure? Who will glorify and proclaim her beautiful image? To whom will *she* cry rape?

...

In the era before the *Roe v. Wade* decision by the Supreme Court (January 22, 1973), abortions were illegal in the United States. Women were forced to carry unwanted pregnancies to term or to seek illegal abortions under dangerous and degrading circumstances, at great risk to themselves. In many cases, women died from back-alley abortions. The battle for abortion rights became a central part of the women's liberation movement. In the pre-*Roe* era, a number of women created their own networks to provide support and medical assistance to women who wanted to end their pregnancies. One of the most important of these efforts was the Chicago-based Abortion Counseling Service of Women's Liberation, or "Jane" as it came to be known. Here the feminist journalist and activist Susan Brownmiller, author of *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, recalls her own experience of having an abortion in the era before *Roe*, and describes how the women's movement successfully campaigned to overturn the federal ban on a woman's right to choose.

Susan Brownmiller, "Abortion Is a Woman's Right" (1999)⁶

Women's Liberation found its first unifying issue in abortion, and abortion became the first feminist cause to sweep the nation. From 1969 to 1972 an imaginative campaign—rash, impudent, decentralized, yet interconnected by ideas and passion—successfully altered public perception to such an extent that a "crime," as the law defined it, became a "woman's constitutional right." Its capstone was *Roe v. Wade*, the monumental Supreme Court decision of January 22, 1973.

Nineteen sixty-nine was a precisely defined moment, the year when women of childbearing age transformed a quiet back-burner issue promoted by a handful of stray radicals and moderate reformers into a popular struggle for reproductive freedom. The women had been dubbed the Pill Generation, and indeed, earlier in the decade many had heeded the persuasive call of the sexual revolution, only to be disenchanted. Exploring their sexual freedom with an uncertain knowledge of birth control and a haphazard employment of its techniques, they had discovered the hard way that unwanted pregnancy was still a woman's problem.

Unlike the isolated women of their parents' generation who sought individual solutions in furtive silence, they would bring a direct personal voice to the abortion debate. They would reveal their own stories, first to one another and then to the public. They would borrow the confrontational tactics of the radical-left movements from which they had come. They would break the law, and they would raise a ruckus to change the law, devising original strategies to fight for abortion through the courts.

Before the new militance erupted, abortion was a criminal act in every state unless a committee of hospital physicians concurred that the pregnancy endangered the woman's life. Three states had extended the largesse to women whose health was threatened—broadly interpreted, health could mean mental health, if two psychiatrists so attested—but no more than ten thousand "therapeutic" abortions were performed in a year. To the general public, abortion was the stuff of lurid tabloid headlines that underscored its peril: A young woman's body found in a motel room; she'd bled to death from a botched operation. A practitioner and a hapless patient entrapped in a midnight raid on what the police dubbed "an abortion mill." There were shining exceptions like the legendary Robert Spencer of Ashland, Pennsylvania, who ran a spotless clinic and charged no more than one hundred dollars, but venality ran high in an unlawful business in which practitioners were raided and jailed and patients were pressured to be informers. Money was not the only commodity exchanged on the underground circuit; some abortionists extorted sexual payment for their secret work.

One million women braved the unknown every year, relying on a grapevine of whispers and misinformation to terminate their pregnancies by illegal means. Those lucky enough to secure the address of a good practitioner, and to scrounge up the requisite cash, packed a small bag and headed for San Juan, Havana, London, or Tokyo, or perhaps across town. The less fortunate risked septic infection and a punctured uterus from back-alley amateurs willing to poke their insides with a catheter, a knitting needle, or the unfurled end of a wire hanger. Still others damaged their health with lye or Lysol, the last-ditch home treatments. *Life* magazine estimated in 1967 that "five thousand of the desperate" died every year.

The writer Jane O'Reilly's story gives the lie to the too simple myth that "rich" women could always find a connection. In the summer of 1957, she was a Catholic debutante from St. Louis who was looking forward to her senior year at Radcliffe when she discovered she was pregnant. Dr. Spencer was in one of his periodic shutdowns, Cuba sounded unreal and scary, and the trusted family doctor to whom she appealed insisted that she tell her parents. A classmate finally came up with an address in New York and lent her the six hundred dollars. O'Reilly recalls that a man with a mustache placed her on a kitchen table, prodded her with a knitting needle, and gave her some pills.

A month later she fainted in her college dormitory shower. Whatever had been done to her in New York, Jane O'Reilly was still pregnant. Moving out of the dorm, she joked about putting on weight and took her finals shrouded in a raincoat. The next day she gave birth at a Salvation Army hospital and signed away her baby daughter. For the next thirty-four years on every May 10, her daughter's birthday, O'Reilly plunged into a sobbing depression. In 1991 the pain partially lifted when her daughter found her through an adoption search.

Women of my generation still need to bear witness; we still carry the traumas. For my first abortion in 1960 I took the Cuba option that had scared O'Reilly. Here's what I remember: Banging on a door during the midday siesta in a strange neighborhood in Havana. Wriggling my toes a few hours later, astonished to be alive. Boarding a small plane to Key West and hitchhiking back to New York bleeding all the way. Bleeding? I must have been hemorrhaging. In which state did I leave the motel bed drenched with my blood?

• • •

Assata Shakur (Joanne Chesimard) was a member of Black Panther Party and the Black Liberation Army, and a target of repression under the FBI's counterintelligence program (COINTELPRO). On May 2, 1973, she was stopped by state police on the New Jersey Turnpike, along with two other people, and subsequently shot twice. In the confrontation, one of the state troopers and one of her two compan-

ions were killed. She was charged with the murder of both. Shakur was convicted in 1977 to a 33-year sentence, but escaped in 1979. She has been living since the 1980s in Cuba, where she wrote her autobiography, *Assata*. Here Shakur describes the conditions in Riker's Island Correctional Institution for Women, where many of the prisoners "come from places where dreams have been abandoned like the buildings." The use of the lower-case "i" for the first-person pronoun and other deliberate misspellings are from Shakur's original article, published by *The Black Scholar*.

Assata Shakur (Joanne Chesimard), "Women in Prison: How We Are" (April 1978)⁷

We sit in the bull pen. We are all black. All restless. And we are all freezing. When we ask, the matron tells us that the heating system cannot be adjusted. All of us, with the exception of a woman, tall and gaunt, who looks naked and ravished, have refused the bologna sandwiches. The rest of us sit drinking bitter, syrupy tea. The tall, fortyish woman, with sloping shoulders, moves her head back and forth to the beat of a private tune while she takes small, tentative bites out of a bologna sandwich. Someone asks her what she's in for. Matter of factly, she says, "They say I killed some nigga. But how could I have when I'm buried down in South Carolina?" Everybody's face gets busy exchanging looks. A short, stout young woman wearing men's pants and men's shoes says, "Buried in South Carolina?" "Yeah," says the tall woman. "South Carolina, that's where I'm buried. You don't know that? You don't know shit do you? This ain't me. This ain't me." She kept repeating, "This ain't me" until she had eaten all the bologna sandwiches. Then she brushed off the crumbs and withdrew, head moving again, back into that private world where only she could hear her private tune.

Lucille comes to my tier to ask me how much time a "C" felony conviction carries. I know, but i cannot say the words. I tell her i will look it up and bring the sentence charts for her to see. I know that she has just been convicted of manslaughter in the second degree. I also know that she can be sentenced up to fifteen years. I knew from what she had told me before that the District Attorney was willing to plea bargain: Five years probation in exchange for a guilty plea to a lesser charge.

Her lawyer felt that she had a case: specifically, medical records which would prove she had suffered repeated physical injuries as a result of beatings by the deceased and, as a result of those beatings, on the night of her arrest her arm was mutilated (she must still wear a brace on it) and one of her ears was partially severed in addition to other substantial injuries. Her lawyer felt that her testimony, when she took the stand in her own defense, would establish the fact that not only had she been repeatedly beaten by the deceased, but that on the night in

question he told her he would kill her, viciously beat her and mauled her with a knife. But there is no self defense in the state of New York.

The District Attorney made a big deal of the fact that she drank. And the jury, affected by t.v. racism, "law and order," petrified by crime and unimpressed with Lucille as a "responsible citizen," convicted her. And i was the one who had to tell her that she was facing fifteen years in prison while we both silently wondered what would happen to the four teenage children that she had raised almost single handedly.

Spikey has short time, and it is evident, the day before she is to be released, that she does not want to go home. She comes to the Bing (Administrative Segregation) because she has received an infraction for fighting. Sitting in front of her cage and talking to her i realize that the fight was a desperate, last ditch effort in hope that the prison would take away her "good days." She is in her late thirties. Her hands are swollen. Enormous. There are huge, open sores on her legs. She has about ten teeth left. And her entire body is scarred and ashen. She has been on drugs about twenty years. Her veins have collapsed. She has fibrosis epilepsy and edema. She has not seen her three children in about eight years. She is ashamed to contact home because she robbed and abused her mother so many times.

When we talk it is around the Christmas holidays and she tells me about her bad luck. She tells me that she has spent the last four Christmases in jail and tells me how happy she is to be going home. But i know that she has no where to go and that the only "friends" she has in the world are here in jail. She tells me that the only regret she has about leaving is that she won't be singing in the choir at Christmas. As i talk to her i wonder if she will be back. I tell her good bye and wish her luck. Six days later, through the prison grapevine, i hear she is back. Just in time for the Christmas show.

We are at sick call. We are waiting on wooden benches in a beige and orange room to see the doctor. Two young women who look only mildly battered by life sit wearing pastel dresses and pointy-toed state shoes. (Wearing "state" is often a sign that the wearer probably cannot afford to buy sneakers in commissary.) The two are talking about how well they were doing on the street. Eavesdropping, i find out that the both have fine "old men" that love the mess out of them. I find out that their men dress fly and wear some baad clothes and so do they. One has 40 pairs of shoes while the other has 100 skirts. One has 2 suede and 5 leather coats. The other has 7 suedes and 3 leathers. One has 3 mink coats, a silver fox and a leopard. The other has 2 minks, a fox jacket, a floor length fox and a chinchilla. One has 4 diamond rings and the other has 5. One lives in a duplex with a sunken tub and a sunken living room with a water fall. The other describes a mansion with the revolving living room. I'm relieved when my name is called. I had been sitting there feeling very, very sad.

There are no criminals here at Riker's Island Correctional Institution for Women, (New York), only victims. Most of the women (95 percent) are black and Puerto Rican. Many were abused children. Most have been abused by men and all have been abused by "the system."

There are no big time gangsters here, no premeditated mass murderers, no godmothers. There are no big time dope dealers, no kidnappers, no Watergate women. There are virtually no women here charged with white collar crimes like embezzling or fraud. Most of the women have drug related cases. Many are charged as accessories to crimes committed by men. The major crimes that women here are charged with are prostitution, pick-pocketing, shop lifting, robbery, and drugs. Women who have prostitution cases, or who are doing "fine" time make up a substantial part of the short term population. The women see stealing or hustling as necessary for the survival of themselves or their children because jobs are scarce and welfare is impossible to live on. One thing is clear: amerikan capitalism is in no way threatened by the women in prison on Riker's Island.

One gets the impression, when first coming to Riker's Island that the architects conceived of it as a prison modeled after a juvenile center. In the areas where visitors usually pass there is plenty of glass and plenty of plants and flowers. The cell blocks consists of two long corridors with cells on each side connected by a watch room where the guards are stationed, called a bubble. Each corridor has a day room with a t.v., tables, multi-colored chairs, a stove that doesn't work and a refrigerator. There's a utility room with a sink and a washer and dryer that do not work.

Instead of bars the cells have doors which are painted bright, optimistic colors with slim glass observation panels. The doors are controlled electronically by the guards in the bubble. The cells are called rooms by everybody. They are furnished with a cot, a closet, a desk, a chair, a plastic upholstered headboard that opens for storage, a small book case, a mirror, a sink and a toilet. The prison distributes brightly colored bedspreads and throw rugs for a homey effect. There is a school area, a gym, a carpeted auditorium, two inmate cafeterias and outside recreation areas that are used during the summer months only.

The guards have successfully convinced most of the women that Riker's Island is a country club. They say that it is a playhouse compared to some other prisons (especially male): a statement whose partial veracity is not predicated upon the humanity of the correction facilities at Riker's Island, but, rather, by contrast to the unbelievably barbaric conditions of other prisons. Many women are convinced that they are, somehow, "getting over." Some go so far as to reason that because they are not doing hard time, they are not really in prison.

The image is further reinforced by the pseudo-motherly attitude of many of the guards; a deception which all too often successfully reverts women to children. The guards call the women inmates by their first names. The women address the guards