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SEXUAL POLITICS

When one group rules another, the relationship between the two is political. When such an arrangement is carried out over a long period of time it develops an ideology (feudalism, racism, etc.). All historical civilizations are patriarchies; their ideology is male supremacy. Oppressed groups are denied education, economic independence, the power of office, representation, an image of dignity and self-respect, equality of status, and recognition as human beings. Throughout history women have consistently been denied all of these, and their denial today, while attenuated and partial, is nevertheless consistent. The education allowed them is deliberately designed to be inferior, and they are systematically programmed out of, and excluded from, the knowledge where power lies today—e.g., in science and technology. They are confined to conditions of economic dependence based on the sale of their sexuality for marriage, or a variety of prostitutions. Work on a basis of economic independence allows them only a subsistence level of life—often not even that. They do not hold office, are represented in no positions of power, and authority is forbidden them. The image of woman fostered by cultural media, high and low, then and now, is a marginal and demeaning existence, and one outside the human condition—which is defined as the prerogative of man, the male. Government is upheld by power, which is supported through consent (social opinion), or imposed by violence. Conditioning to an ideology amounts to the former. But there may be a resort to the latter at any moment when consent is withdrawn—rape, attack, sequestration, beatings, murder. Sexual politics obtains consent through the "socialization" of both sexes to patriarchal policies. They consist of the following:

1) the formation of human personality along stertyped lines of sexual category, based on the needs and values of the master class and dictated by what he would cherish in himself and find convenient in an underclass: aggression, intellectuality, force and efficiency for the male; passivity, ignorance, docility, "virtue," and ineffectuality for the female.

2) the concept of sex role, which assigns domestic service and attendance upon infants to all females and the rest of human interest, achievement and ambition to the male; the charge of leader at all times and places to the male, and the duty of the follower, with equal uniformity, to the female.

3) the imposition of male rule through institutions: patriarchal religion, the proprietary family, marriage, "The Home," masculine oriented culture, and a pervasive doctrine of male superiority.

4) the end of sex role and sex status, the patriarchy and the male supremacist ethic, attitude and ideology—in all areas of endeavor, experience, and behavior.

5) the end of the ancient oppression of the young under the patriarchal proprietary family, their chattel status, the attainment of the human rights presently denied them, the professionalization, and therefore, improvement of their care, and the guarantee that when they enter the world, they are desired, planned for, and provided with equal opportunities.

6) Bisex, or the end of enforced perverse heterosexuality so that the sex act ceased to be arbitrarily polarized into male and female, to the exclusion of sexual expression between member of the same sex.

7) the end of sexuality in the forms in which it has existed historically—brutality, violence, capitalism, exploitation, and warfare—that it may cease to be hatred and become love.

8) the attainment of the female sex to freedom and full human status after millennia of deprivation and oppression, and of both sexes to a viable humanity.

by Kate Millet

Women? I guess they ought to exercise Pussy Power.
— Eldridge Cleaver, 1968
ON WOMEN

ON FEELING SUPERIOR TO OTHER WOMEN

Most of us have a low opinion of women. We see women, as a group, as less able and less interesting than men. We’ve learned since childhood that women are seldom as important as men, that they’re dull, frivolous, and limited in their interests. Of course we don’t want to see ourselves in these terms, and we often avoid doing so by using two devices: 1) either identifying with men, adopting their values and interests and avoiding the company of women whenever possible, and/or 2) attempting to prove to ourselves our superiority to other women by outdoing them at things women do. Often these devices coincide (as when the most chic girl at the party can both partake in the men’s conversation about Viet Nam and make Cherries Jubilee for dessert), but the important point is that in using either device we see ourselves as “different” from other women, thus “better” than other women. And in both devices it’s necessary for us to find fault with other women in order to prove our own superiority. This vicious circle - having a low image of women, seeking to personally rise above the image by rejecting or outwitting and finding fault with other women, thus reinforcing the low image - affects all of us almost all the time. We may not realize or think about the motivations, but we go through the actions and their consequences over and over again. In every situation, we compare ourselves to other women and measure our success by their degree of failure.

I never knew a tolerable woman to be fond of her own sex.
— Jonathan Swift

SELF HELP CLINIC

Ever wonder what that infection you had is, how it got there and what it looks like? Have you hesitated to check on a discharge because of the money for the doctor or the medicine? Most of these are common questions for all of us — questions which the Self-Help Clinic is trying to deal with.

We’re based on the concept of helping each other and helping ourselves. What we’ve learned involves a very simple self-examination procedure. We’ve bought plastic specula (one for each woman) which allows us to open the vaginal cavity and see the vaginal walls and cervix. With a lamp and mirror, it becomes quite easy to examine yourself for irritations, infections, and discharges. Because we can detect these early in their development, we can also prevent and treat them before they get serious. Also, because we have observed the cervix at all times during the month, we know the changes it goes through and can tell when we get pregnant within a week after missing a period! No more difficult 5-6 week wait — which is a pretty mind-blowing thing. Even more so is a new method based on a technique being developed by Self-Help which will start “late” periods. All of this can be totally safe and effective when done properly. But the important thing is that they are simple procedures which any woman can learn to do. Think of the possibilities for the future: Control over much of the “female complaint” area — by women! Outside of the doctor’s office, outside of the abortion referral agency, without expensive medicine — no longer only vague ideas of what is wrong.

Considering the amount of mystery and mysticism our bodies are surrounded by, these were all simple discoveries. Many of us are still really modest and hung up in the notion that “women’s problems” are unmentionables and that things like periods are dirty and embarrassing. If we don’t relate to taking care of them, who else can? Since the needed knowledge is available and useful to all women, why isn’t it readily available to everyone? Why the endless visits to the doctor, pills to care what pills cause; why the outdated laws, the $100-$300 abortions using unnecessarily harsh methods; why the agencies which charge for giving out another phone number?

Our health and care will remain a money business as long as we leave it to the doctors and supportive agencies. Self Help Clinics are trying to combat this through better methods developed under the control of the women using them.

SEND FOR BIRTH CONTROL HANDBOOK
P. O. Box 1000
Station G, Montreal 130,
Quebec
Enclose One Quarter for Handling
In the beginning women were always pregnant. So men hunted while women gathered vegetables, planted, harvested, wove, hunted small game, built shelters, tanned and preserved leather, tamed animals and did other things.

Men would bring home meat... when they could find it. For a long time there was barely enough. But with domestication of animals men could stay closer to home. Men began to raise cattle and further develop techniques of agriculture.

They became the producers and women became the sustainers. There began to be more. In the new society men became the principal property owners. Some had more and some had less.

A man needed a wife to give him legal heirs so he could pass on his property and name to the next generation. This was the beginning of MONOGAMY.

And it was enforced by law and religion. From then on property was owned by the man... his wife and children became his servants.

White men came to America looking for more property.
English merchants, putting money into the colony, decided to send WOMEN to establish the community and bear children. But still more working hands were needed. Indentured servants volunteered for a seven-year period of slavery, or were kidnapped or sold from the prisons of Europe. Often mothers and their newborn children were thrown overboard because they were too much trouble to keep alive.

Twenty million black people were torn from Africa. Those that survived the voyage to America were sold as permanent slaves to the cotton and tobacco plantations.

ALL the slaves worked in the fields but the female slave was used for breeding new slaves for her owner. And she was used for his pleasure.

It was believed that women were inferior—their brains smaller, and that their “nature” kept them from rising to a state of equality with men.

It is this MYTH which has enslaved women. For centuries, women were barred from schools.

Women fought to get into schools if only to be able to teach their sons better. The first schools were the privilege of the wealthy.
But with the growing population more teachers were demanded. Women were needed for this job, so schools began to open up. But if white girls were considered mentally incapable of receiving an education, black girls had the least chance of anyone to learn. Today, more women go to school but they are directed away from analytical subjects like science and math, and into clerical courses, home economics, nursing and lower paying jobs.

All over the world women got together to fight for their rights: the right to property, the right to bear witness, the right to our earnings. Men laughed and argued that women were weak and helpless.

By 1850 women worked in more than 100 industrial occupations. Women and men came to America expecting a good life. Instead, in 1833 men were paid $5 a week, women $1.25 a week for the same work, and children even less.

The surplus labor made for competition and low wages. With the stamp of INFERIORITY women were barred from equal pay and training for more skilled work. And women had trouble organizing against intolerable work conditions. After a 14-hour day they had their houses to do. Many had to learn ENGLISH. And men considered them a threat to their jobs, and barred them from their UNIONS.

But women got together on their own and fought in the struggle against long hours and low wages. In 1846 women textile workers were part of attacking columns armed with sticks and stones that captured and silenced the looms. Struggle after struggle, women proved that they could organize and fight. During World War II the myths of women's weakness and inferiority had to be pushed aside again. Men went off to war and women were told their first responsibility was to leave the home.
They worked in machinery plants, in arsenals, drove heavy tracks, were riveters, and worked in all areas of heavy industry, previously man's domain. Day care centers were set up to care for the children. As the war ended women were reminded of their proper place.

"Yes sir! Yes sir!" "Coffee, tea or milk?" "Your number please!"
"ANYTHING you say, sir!"

**WOMEN ARE 1/3 OF THE WORK FORCE.**
1 OUT OF 8 WORKING
WOMEN IS THE SOLE SUPPORT OF HER FAMILY

Working women usually hold down two jobs. They are wage earners AND housewives. It is estimated that these women do almost 99.6 hours of work a week. If women were paid $2 an hour for their housekeeping and child care they'd make about $520 a month... before taxes. Instead of being paid, the housewife is seduced to buy. 75% of all advertising is aimed at women. (Is it true blondes have more fun?). Women are buying and crying, doped up and raped.

NO MORE! We claim the right and accept the responsibility to struggle in every way possible for our freedom. Because we know a

WOMAN'S WORK IS NEVER DONE!!
WHAT IS A WOMAN?

A woman is
pink booties
lacey underwear
curly hair
frilly dresses
patent leather shoes,
and white sox.
A woman is
first kisses
training bras
long nightgowns
always talking,
and a pain at that time of the month.
A woman is
first dates
back seats
formals
tears
indecisive,
and the guy she loves.
A woman is
white dresses
her first baby
cleaning house
candlelight dinners,
and canopy beds.

Have you really come a long way baby?
Questions:
1. Did you ever pretend to be dumb?
2. Are you hung up by being, or not being a virgin?
3. Should boys be more experienced sexually? Why?
4. Do you ask boys out? If not, why not?
5. Is education really more important for a boy? a husband?
6. Are girls with boyfriends winners? Are women with husbands winners? What do they win?
7. Did you ever lie about having a boyfriend?

2 CHOICES

Women today, as always, exist in society as second class citizens. They're paid lower wages for the same work as a man and are rarely allowed to be in positions higher than head bookkeeper or personal secretary. Even these women are somewhat fortunate because there are a lot of women whose husbands just won't allow them to do anything but stay home and make a pleasing environment for him.

As a result of this suppression a woman's struggle to appreciate herself as an individual is an almost impossible one. Her pencil pushing job gives her no more positive feedback than her broom pushing job. What does she do to establish herself as a worthwhile person, despite the mental tasks society has given her?
Baskally, a woman has two choices. She can either fight back by working for her liberation or she can try and make the best of her situation by trying to be the good little woman/slave society wants her to be.

In the latter case she can try to model herself after the kind of woman who is described in Helen B. Andelin's book Fascinating Womanhood. This is a kind of sexy, infantile, domestic goddess who gives up any hope of having an identity as an individual with potential of her own. Instead, she becomes an extension of the man who suppresses her. She becomes totally dependent on him for her identity and concentrates on making herself the perfect wife and lover. In return for her super supportive role she is to be worshipped for being the best wife, the best lover, and the best slave a man could have.
The sorry thing about this is that her happiness completely depends on how well she can manipulate another person. She ends up constantly trying to make him love her (sound familiar?).

But a woman does have two choices. She can fight back! She is an individual and she does have potential — plenty of it! With the help of her sisters she can work to set up a more permissive environment. This environment will be one where she can realize her potential, be it artist, carpenter or whatever. She will be able to experience her own creativity and love herself for herself, not for what others want her to be.

by Diane Hansen
The first consciousness raising group I ever went to was a course in women's liberation followed by group discussions — that was the name for what was to become a consciousness raising group. We split up into small groups — no more than 10 women — and tried to see how the evening's topic related to us. They were very hesitant; everyone was afraid to say what was really moving them, the things that really made them come to the course in the first place. We were all beginning to ask why — why we felt that things were wrong, why we hadn't been able to "adjust to our role as women" (that's what the first doctor I saw told me!), why we felt so alone. But it was a start and on the way home, my friend and I found ourselves crying, feeling really close to each other and to all the women who had been at the group. Maybe it wasn't something that was our individual problem; maybe it wasn't us at all. We felt very excited and by the third or fourth meeting, the excitement hadn't gone, the feeling of closeness was stronger and we were beginning to verbalize things that had been kept in so long.

Things we remembered from childhood — silly things (get down from that tree, that's for boys to do; no, you aren't the doctor, you're the nurse; you do the dishes, John is busy studying, etc., etc., — don't some of those ring a bell?) and some more important things (I really think you ought to think more in terms of a four year education — medicine is really too long for a woman; what do you mean you want to major in engineering — you'll never get married that way; a PhD? What in heaven's name does a woman want with a PhD — you'll only get married and quit anyhow). Many of us who were married started expressing problems we were having at home and it was amazing to watch everyone nodding — we'd thought for so long that the problems were only ours, something must be wrong with us along (for heaven's sake, I come home after a whole day's work, why do you expect me to do any of this shit; I really don't think you should leave the children, they're your responsibility; what do you mean you don't feel like it — what the hell do you do all day?). And so on ... women who had been brutalized, oppressed, dehumanized and somehow, on top of it all, made to feel that it was their fault!

Once our group got started outside the course we branched off into our own topics. Some groups wanted action — they worked on a day care center and established one that really did work — and commanded full participation from both parents. Hassles after hassle — women reached levels of strength that permitted them to stand up, to demand what they should have had so long ago — some were forced to leave their homes because they realized they couldn't remain any longer and really be the individuals they had become. In the beginning months some of the reactions from husbands and fathers were difficult to deal with. Many of us needed a great deal of support we weren't getting. Women had to go home and work out the feelings that had come out during the sessions which had grown more and more intimate. We really began seeing what had happened to us and it frightened some of the group into leaving for awhile. We had to learn to deal with the sort of things that were coming out at the meetings. We didn't want to start a "true confession" or pseudo psychiatric session. We really wanted to grow close to one another and help one another. We had to overcome the distrust that years of separation had bred. We really learned to reach out to each other and sometimes just the understanding helped us.

Most of the women that began with the group are living lives that are very different now. Several of the husbands quit jobs, took jobs that allowed them to be with their children, that allowed their wives to go back to school, to work, to paint, and to have some time to find out what they wanted. In other groups the women felt they could never really accomplish anything remaining under the same system they were fighting. A women's commune developed. We had to deal with our feelings about homosexuality. Some of us really had to face some pretty strong feelings. But most of us feel better and stronger now than ever, most of the men we were with feel good about the changes. We started with very understanding men — men who were really willing to work with us. I think it would have been hard for most of us — straight housewives with kids — to get involved in the movement if our men hadn't supported us. The group evolved into a mixed group experience because after a year or so the men felt they should be included. The first meeting was a disaster — the hostility on both sides was terrible. The men were uptight — wouldn't really communicate their feelings — maybe a little frightened. Why should big strong men talk about their — ugh — problems? But things moved fast after that and the men really began working out problems with us. The group really formed a whole. We started thinking of alternative life styles. It was tremendously exciting.

And that's where I left — really a little before. My work, the kids, finding a new job, moving to California, problems in the movement as a whole — all the pressures I was under at the time — forced me to drop out for awhile. But the group had really accomplished what I wanted and was one of the most valuable experiences I had.

Problems — some of our hassles were cross hostilities in the group — after living in the male dominated society for so long women come to believe they "don't work well together" — isn't that what we're told all the time? We had to trust and really love each other, and that was hard. We learned how to relate to each other in a way we had always feared. We grew really close. And it started to show in our relationships with other friends, outside the group.

Also, most of us were bothered and hurt by the sameness of all the members of the movement — no black women, few really poor — the really oppressed. We had to accept the knowledge that it was our oppression of them that made the black women stay away and finally, when they came, demand a separate meeting. We, the middle class women, had to adjust to a range of political and sexual beliefs we had never had to deal with. And we had to learn to love all the women who were in the struggle because we were all part of the same thing.

I recently attended the first meeting of a group which may become a consciousness raising session and it was strange to see so many of the women back where we had begun.

By Joan Arriaga
SEXISM

As women, parents, and teachers involved in the education provided by the public schools in this area, we would like to draw your attention to one of the problems faced by elementary teachers.

Several studies have shown that California elementary textbooks present closed social role models to the children. Specifically, they offer very few realistic or creative alternatives to young girls. The Ginn and Harper & Row series, for instance, depict girls and women as passive, irrational, "homy," and incapable when they are depicted at all. In both series, females comprise less than 8 percent of the main characters, males more than 75 percent. Boys and men are shown as competent, persevering, creative, explorative, and predominately successful in a multitude of endeavors.

Girls' options for the future are practically nonexistent insofar as what is shown in the textbooks. The only women shown are either mothers or teachers. This doesn't even reflect the occupations currently open to women, much less encourage girls to prepare for whatever new possibilities may be open in 1990. The textbooks are also unrealistic and alienating, in that they show no working mothers, even though 40 percent of elementary students have mothers who work.

Books are not the only medium in a school, but they are a crucial element of the curriculum. After years of reading nothing but negative feminine stereotypes, girls may be unable to recognize that any alternative exists for them. If the image these books present is not to be destructive, its inaccuracies and shortcomings must at least be pointed out, or better yet, counteracted with discussions and supplementary reading. As a teacher, you are already seen by your students as being different from the passive, non-creative, unimportant textbook females. Teachers can also present additional examples of female roles, whether they be artists or astronauts, scientists or skin divers.

We will be glad to talk with you personally, to offer documentation for this letter, and to send you another material on this subject. We also want to hear of innovative methods you're using to broaden girls' horizons, or of ideas you may have so that we may share them.

Sincerely,
Emily Ahern, teacher
Susan Bramson, mother and speech therapist
Lorna Buck, student teacher
Sally Hulbauer, mother and teacher
Aleen Holly, mother and student
Carolyn Janda, mother and student teacher
Anne Rogers, mother and teacher
Lynn Shank, student
Ellen Franch, YWCA program coordinator

Man for the field and woman for the hearth:
Man for the sword and for the needle she:
Man with the head and woman with the heart:
Man to command and woman to obey:
All else confusion.

Alfred, Lord Tennyson

Women are usually more patient in working at unexciting, repetitive tasks . . . Women on the average have more passivity in the inborn core of their personality . . . I believe women are designed in their deeper instincts to get more pleasure out of life — not only sexuality but socially, occupationally, maternally — when they are not aggressive. To put it another way I think that when women are encouraged to be competitive too many of them become disagreeable.

— Dr. Benjamin M. Spock, Decent and Indecent

RECOMMENDED READING LIST FOR POSITIVE FEMALE IMAGES

Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll
Where the Lilies Bloom by Vera and Bill Cleaver, (Lippincott, 1945)
The Motoring Millers by Albert Wilson Constant, (Crowell, 1969)
Rufus Gideon Grant by Leigh Dean, (Scribners, 1970)
From the Mixed-up Files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiller by E. L. Konigsburg, (Atheneum, 1967)
A Wrinkle in Time by Madeline L'Engle, (Farrar, 1967)
Strawberry Girl by Lois Lenski, (Lippincott, 1945)
Pippi Longstocking by Astrid Lindgren, (Viking, 1969)
Ann of Green Gables by Lucy M. Montgomery, (Grosset and Dunlap, 1908)
Island of the Blue Dolphins by Scott O'Dell, (Houghton Mifflin, 1960)
Rain Rain Rivers by Uri Shulevitz, (Farrar, 1969)
Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm, by Kate Douglas Wiggin, (Macmillan, 1903)

Also recommended for teachers:
Sex Stereotypes in School Readers, by Women on Words and Images.

HE IS PLAYING MASCULINE

He is playing masculine. She is playing feminine.
He is playing masculine because she is playing feminine. She is playing feminine because he is playing masculine.
He is playing the kind of man that she thinks the kind of woman she is playing ought to admire. She is playing the kind of woman that he thinks the kind of man he is playing ought to desire.
If he were not playing masculine, he might well be more feminine than she is — except when she is playing very feminine. If she were not playing feminine, she might well be more masculine than he is — except when he is playing very masculine.
So he plays harder. And she plays . . . softer.
He wants to make sure that she could never be more masculine than he. She wants to make sure that he could never be more feminine than she. He therefore seeks to destroy the femininity in himself. She therefore seeks to destroy the masculinity in herself.
She is supposed to admire him for the masculinity in him that she fears in herself. He is supposed to desire her for the femininity in her that he despises in himself.
He desires her for her femininity which is his femininity, but which he can never lay claim to. She admires him for his masculinity which is her masculinity, but which she can never lay claim to. Since he may only love his own femininity in her, she envies her his femininity. Since she may only love her own masculinity in him, she envies him his masculinity.
The envy poisons their love.
She, coveting his unattainable masculinity, decides to punish him.
He designates her femininity — which he is supposed to desire and which he really envies — and becomes more aggressively masculine. She feigns disgust at his masculinity — which she is supposed to admire and which she really envies — and becomes more fastidiously feminine. He is becoming less and less what he wants to be. She is becoming less and less what she wants to be. But now he is more manly than ever, and she is more womanly than ever.

Her femininity, growing more dependently supine, becomes contemptible. His masculinity, growing more oppressively domineering, becomes intolerable. At last he loathes what she has helped his masculinity to become. At last he loathes what he has helped her femininity to become.

So far, it has all been very symmetrical. But we have left one thing out.
The world belongs to what his masculinity has become.

The reward for what his masculinity has become is power. The reward for what her femininity has become is only the security which his power can bestow upon her. If he were to yield to what her femininity has become, he would be yielding to contemptible incompetence. If she were to acquire what his masculinity has become, she would participate in intolerable coarseness.

She is stifling under the triviality of her femininity. The world is groaning beneath the terrors of his masculinity.

He is playing masculine. She is playing feminine.

How do we call off the game?
Oh fate such fear
myself might find
If I should see
where I am blind
About the image roles we play
And hope to pass with each new day
The fear of casting off the mask
Of roles ourselves find but a task
The fear of starting out anew
And finding me
Instead of You!

I see soul pain eyes
hidden in blue shadow
fur lashes deny the real
hair / acceptable above the brow
not below the knee

i see your eyes, sister
i see your soul

you call your breasts wrinkled lemons,
hide them under \( \frac{1}{2} \) foam, learn
to like your thighs only to hear
you have ugly feet.
how long will we listen to men
who tell us they love us?
who call us frigid or maniac & turn away?

buy me buy me
one house & i'm yours
i'm mine, sister
how about you?

alta
Letters to women
HINDU WOMAN

Woman. A goddess. The symbol of earth, creativity, continuity, the very source of life. Woman. A slave. A body to be used, an unclean being, degraded and avoided. Woman, a being at once worshipped and despised, honored and ignored, a victim of man's ultimate attempt to free themselves forever from all desires of the body. It is in the Hindu culture that one begins to see clearly man's suppression of woman and her total spiritual submission. In following the exaggerated and oft-times perverted traditions, the Indian woman becomes, not her own being, but rather the ideal wife and mother through obedience, abnegation of self-will, tireless service and lack of initiative.

In Hindu society, unlike our own, the greater emphasis is placed on the group, not on the individual. Thus the social goals become harmony, conformity, and security; not independence and the risks involved in that. Family is the most important human tie. It is with the family that one forms his identity and esteem. This is particularly true of the Indian woman. She is normally financially, emotionally and spiritually dependent on the family - her father, her husband and her children. Her socialization process is geared towards her inevitable marriage and the ultimate honor of her life - motherhood. Her personality is molded and developed by her husband and their personalities mesh and become harmonious. The woman adjusts herself to the life of her husband, helping him all the ways that she can. She does not have her own personal ambitions and does not think of her own rights. The function of woman is threefold: to be an ideal daughter, an ideal wife, and an ideal mother - that is, to obey the father, to worship the husband, and to take care of the children. Her role in life is clear and she is secure in its surety. Generally speaking, the Indian woman is contented in her so-called submission and proud of her status as woman.

The crown of her womanhood is marriage and childbirth. With marriage she comes into her own as an especially valued member of the household. And yet in the most important relationship of her life, a woman is denied her husband's companionship by custom. Her husband cannot appear to take an interest in her, for any display of special interest is taken as a sign of a bond between the two that may disrupt the man's filial and fraternal duties. Indeed, the union of man and woman is less for their individual happiness than for perpetuating the newly joined families. The new couple rarely goes out in public together. If they do, the woman instinctively walks behind her husband a few paces. (So pervasive is this custom, that when I visited India not long ago I found myself involuntarily and quite naturally falling behind my escort.) Household duties are under the wife's domain and she seldom allows usurpation of these duties even temporarily by her husband. It is not unusual to see a heavily burdened woman walking behind her free-handed husband. This is due, not to laziness on the part of the man, but to the accepted division of labor. The woman is expected to sew, carry fuel, sweep, clean, carry water, prepare the food, work in the field, and care for the children and her husband's needs. It is not surprising, therefore, that the sexual relationship with her husband is often her only contact with him.

It is only in motherhood that a Hindu woman is wholly fulfilled. She has the unique power of motherhood, so revered in India. Her feminine power is that of creation and she alone can achieve it. Pride in a son, for many women, becomes the main consolation of their lives; in their son they seek the emotional fulfillment lacking in their marriages. As Mrs. Freida Das says in "Purdah, the Status of Women in India":

Never has man dug a deeper pit for himself than did the Hindu when he worshipped goddesses and degraded women, when he adored the mother and slighted the wife. His own hope of release can come only if this unreal mother worship makes room for the real and living respect of the female mate.

Women's talk is all chatter.
Intelligent women are emasculating.
If you're so smart why aren't you married.
Can you type?
A smart woman never shows her brains.
No man likes an easy woman.
Women executives are castrating bitches.
Don't worry your pretty dumb head about it.
Women are only interested in trapping some man.
Women are always off chattering with each other.
Some of my best friends are women . . .
HELL NO!

I was recently asked if I were married and I casually exclaimed: Hell No! To that reply I was then asked: Why? Please, write and tell us why... As each day passed during my childhood, I came to know that I would never marry. Maybe it was the underlying tones in my family life or maybe it was environmental and/or social influence that created this decision in the back of my mind, I don't know exactly. But I know that I never had thoughts about having a husband and a house and kids and all the other physical items that are an integral part of that thinking. Maybe I could just sense my mother's unhappiness. I just knew that there was no real sense in being married because it seemed to cause suffering and anguish. Webster says that: marriage is the institution (manstitution) whereby men and women are joined in a special kind of social and legal dependence for the purpose of founding and maintaining a family. In other words, marriage is a legal contract for sexual relationships. Phooey!

love creates security and marriage creates insecurity and selfishness. I am happy. Truly happy because I am free - independent - individual - secure - aware - and very much in love with TWO people and very much in like with 30 other people and hundreds of kids, AND I don't have a feeling of pain or drudgery or captivity or a feeling of obligation to the so-called master of the house. In my mind, marriage is a waste of humanness and the excuses for which are incorrigible. Think about it...

by T-Bear
KEEP STRUGGLING
Anthony Shaffer's smash hit thriller, "Sleuth," will open a six-week engagement for Center Theatre Group at the Ahmanson Theatre on Wednesday, January 12. Anthony Quayle and Donal Donnelly, who co-starred in the original London production, will star in the CTG presentation. The play, which has received high critical praise since its London opening, has repeated its success on Broadway where it has played to Standing Room-Only during its current year-plus run.

"Sleuth" is a melodrame par excellence of the type the English do so well, in the proud and blood-chilling tradition of "Angel Street," "Witness for the Prosecution" and "Dial M for Murder." Clive Barnes of the New York Times calls it "the best thriller I have ever seen — a super show, and one of the most purely entertaining plays of many a season." As marvelously taut and compact in its construction as a good watch or a fast racehorse, "Sleuth" won the Tony Award as "Best Play" of the 1970-71 season on Broadway.

Everybody loves a good thriller. "Sleuth" is one of the best. The Center Theatre Group presentation, the third in Managing Director Robert Fryer's 1971-72 subscription season, will play nightly except Sunday with matinees Thursday and Saturday. Tickets are on sale at the Music Center box office and all ticket agencies with student discount tickets available a half-hour before performances.

It wouldn't be fair to tell what "Sleuth's" about. Mr. Quayle plays a successful mystery writer and Mr. Donnelly an adulterous young wastrel, and they are up to some murderously brilliant games in a two-story, oak-paneled setting that exudes a fine air of richness and menace. In addition to its stars, the company also includes Philip Farrar, Harold K. Newman and Roger Purnell. Clifford Williams has directed the Helen Bonfils, Morton Gottlieb and Michael White production with the setting by Carl Toms and lighting by William Ritman.

The Sixth Faculty Senate will convene Tuesday, January 18 at 2:30 p.m. in PS-122.

SCHOLARSHIPS
The Financial Aid Office is now accepting applications for two special scholarships to be awarded in early January, according to Kate Wilson, Financial Aid Advisor. Two awards, $500 each, will be given to individuals preparing for teaching careers — one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level. The awards will be made by the state-wide P.T.A. organization for the first time at CSCSB, and will be awarded annually to qualified candidates. To qualify, an applicant must be enrolled in, or have completed Education 330, Psychological Foundations of Education, have need for financial aid, and have an above average academic record. The application deadline is Friday, January 14. Application forms are available in the Financial Aid Office, SS-118.

BRUSSELS, LONDON, PARIS by UV Air FRANCE
Many Charter Flights from $220 Examples: 6 mos. Feb 8 - Sept 1 $285 3 mos. June 16 - Sept 1 $259 Ask for info (213) 277-5200 or 879-3111 Prof. P. Bentler c/o Sierra Travel Inc. 9875 Santa Monica B. Beverly Hills I need help!!! Envelope stuffers - part-time. $25 guaranteed for every 100 envelopes you stuff. All postage pre-paid. Send stamped, self-addressed envelope, plus $1.00 for registration and handling to: Allen King Corp., P.O. Box 6525, Pittsburgh, PA 15212.

What's going on?

Anthony Shaffer's smash hit thriller, "Sleuth," will open a six-week engagement for Center Theatre Group at the Ahmanson Theatre on Wednesday, January 12. Anthony Quayle and Donal Donnelly, who co-starred in the original London production, will star in the CTG presentation. The play, which has received high critical praise since its London opening, has repeated its success on Broadway where it has played to Standing Room-Only during its current year-plus run.

"Sleuth" is a melodrame par excellence of the type the English do so well, in the proud and blood-chilling tradition of "Angel Street," "Witness for the Prosecution" and "Dial M for Murder." Clive Barnes of the New York Times calls it "the best thriller I have ever seen — a super show, and one of the most purely entertaining plays of many a season." As marvelously taut and compact in its construction as a good watch or a fast racehorse, "Sleuth" won the Tony Award as "Best Play" of the 1970-71 season on Broadway.

Everybody loves a good thriller. "Sleuth" is one of the best. The Center Theatre Group presentation, the third in Managing Director Robert Fryer's 1971-72 subscription season, will play nightly except Sunday with matinees Thursday and Saturday. Tickets are on sale at the Music Center box office and all ticket agencies with student discount tickets available a half-hour before performances.

It wouldn't be fair to tell what "Sleuth's" about. Mr. Quayle plays a successful mystery writer and Mr. Donnelly an adulterous young wastrel, and they are up to some murderously brilliant games in a two-story, oak-paneled setting that exudes a fine air of richness and menace. In addition to its stars, the company also includes Philip Farrar, Harold K. Newman and Roger Purnell. Clifford Williams has directed the Helen Bonfils, Morton Gottlieb and Michael White production with the setting by Carl Toms and lighting by William Ritman.

The Sixth Faculty Senate will convene Tuesday, January 18 at 2:30 p.m. in PS-122.
I CAN TAKE Women's Lib or leave it, but I do think they are starting to get a little too pushy. Why should they rate an entire issue when they only represent half of the human race? But, since this issue celebrates Women, let us praise great women of history: Eve, Cleopatra, Jeanne d'Arc, Elizabeth I, Tsarina Catherine, Florence Nightingale, Marie Curie, Kathe Kollwitz, Rosa Luxenburg, Anne Frank, and Indira Gandhi. That's all, folks.

THIS NEW YEAR finds the Vietnam War still with us and being pursued with the same ferocity abroad and the same mendacity at home (but keep protesting anyway). Someday, somewhere, somehow, someone will hear you; President Nixon is entering his 4th and, we can only pray, last year of office; the U.N. has a new ineffective Secretary-General; the latest war has just been concluded and nations are preparing the next; the Russians are planning on confirming the data given to them by the U.S. that the moon is made of green cheese; but through it all, the American dollar is worth as much now as it was in 1960 - as long as you don't try to spend it.

THE ADMINISTRATION is worried about the sparse enrollment at CSCSB. A high official in the administration confides that, "we're going to start giving away Blue Chip stamps to up enrollment." This same source reveals that, "we have a very sophisticated system of determining projected enrollment: we read the entrails of birds."

REPUTABLE SOURCES inform me that a certain girl in the drama department objects to this column. "If I wanted to be entertained, I'd go look in the mirror," she says reflectively. "I don't want to read about urinals and politics; I want something relevant, like drama and theatre."

I AM DEEPLY wounded, I see I have misjudged my audience. But we are always willing to please our readers (you have only to ask), and to the drama student I offer the following item from the Music Department:

as part of his course requirement in his Modern Dance class last month, Van C. Andrews performed a striptease act for the illumination and amazement of his classmates. While eloquently reciting Robert Frost's "Stopping By Woods on a Snowy Evening," he gracefully and discreetly discarded his clothing. However, the reputation of this staid and venerable institution was preserved - he stopped one garment short of completely illuminating the class. (Why did you stop, Van? A real artist would have gone all the way.)

REGISTRATION for the Winter '72 quarter begins Jan 3 - Don't forget! pass it on. This has been a typically current Pawprint public service announcement.

THE PAWPRINT FOOTBALL team is glad the basketball season is here. "We don't intend to lose a single game," team captain Branch Cohen says crookedly, "we made the hoops smaller than the balls. All I can promise you is that there are going to be a lot of overtime games."

SINCE I HAVE the last word, may I remind Women's Lib that if it weren't for men, there'd be no women.

SUPERMARKET RECYCLING

With the recent emphasis on recycling has come the efforts of the supermarkets to cut down on usable waste. Grocery stores receive virtually all of their merchandise cased in cardboard boxes, which night stocking crews cut open, mark prices on the cans or bottles, and stock them in shelves. In the past the cardboard boxes, weighing hundreds of pounds, were disposed of as trash.

Now, almost all of this cardboard is flattened and baled in burlap squares, each holding about one hundred pounds. These bales are then hauled back to the warehouse on the empty returning diesel trucks which bring the grocery load to the store. The cardboard is then shredded and made into new cardboard which cuts the amount of trash and saves the company on cost of new materials for packaging. In this way, about 1000 pounds of cardboard is recycled daily at the average supermarket.

More recently, stores have been taking in no-deposit, nonreturnable bottles, and returning them to industry. AlphaBeta Rialto accepts all glass - any color, even broken bottles. This glass is turned over to Pepsi Cola, who pays a cent a pound for it.

What can you do to help? Tell the friendly man at the store where you shop that you are concerned and want to know what his store is doing to cut waste and recycle usable materials.

As industry becomes more conscious of ecological problems, the public will see more and more actions taken along the lines initiated by the grocery stores.

Vera Padgett
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