This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

A-Mazing World-Traveling:
The Pluralist Future of Racical Feminism

presented by

Amber L. Katherine

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PhD. degree in Philosophy

Marilyn Frye
Major professor

Date Feb 10, 1997

A-MAZING WORLD-TRAVELING: THE PLURALIST FUTURE OF RADICAL FEMINISM

By

Amber L. Katherine

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Philosophy

1997

ABSTRACT

A-MAZING WORLD-TRAVELING: THE PLURALIST FUTURE OF RADICAL FEMINISM

By

Amber L. Katherine

Contemporary white U.S. feminist theorists have not, to date, responded adequately to the challenges of racism and ethnocentrism in feminism raised by U.S. feminists of color in the late seventies and early eighties. To understand this widespread failure I suggest a return to a critical moment of exchange between Mary Daly and Audre Lorde. In 1978, philosopher Mary Daly published *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, in which she argued, the contemporary radical feminist movement must be understood in historical context as a global, ontological, epistemological, metaethical, "Metapatriarchal Journey." In Part I, I present Daly's project in *Gyn/Ecology*, from the perspective of the Western gynocentric tradition of Matilda Joselyn Gage and Virginia Woolf. In response to *Gyn/Ecology*, poet and essayist Audre Lorde published "An Open Letter to Mary Daly," in which she argued, the white European perspective of *Gyn/Ecology* erased and distorted the traditions of nonwhite, noneuropean women. Daly never responded in kind to Lorde's letter. In Part II, I read Lorde's letter, drawing insights from her other writings and from the political writings of other radicals at the time, including Stokely Carmichael, Angela Davis, and Robin Morgan. I conclude that Lorde's letter is an attempt to effect a shift in Daly's thought which would strengthen *Gyn/Ecology* and help realize the radical

feminist vision they share. Daly's failure to respond in kind has left the misguided impression with many that Lorde's challenges call for the abandonment of *Gyn/Ecology* and radical feminism generally. In Part III, drawing from Lorde's criticisms, I argue that while the racial and ethnic politics of the text are "color evasive" and ethnocentric, Lorde's challenges call for a "reconstruction," rather than an abandonment of *Gyn/Ecology*. Part IV charts a new "Metapatriarchal Journey" which I call "Radical *White Western* Feminism." My contribution to this reconstruction, what I call "A-mazing World-Traveling," is offered toward the development of an anti-racist, anti-imperialist radical feminism that can be practiced by white Western women in complex consciousness of their/our historical, cultural and racial locations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to all the radical thinkers, in the academy and on the streets, living in the present and the past, who have inspired me to want, above all, radical change. Especially, Mary Daly, Audre Lorde, María Lugones and Marilyn Frye. There are four womyn who made it possible for me to give shape to that inspiration in the form of this dissertation. Since 1988, Marilyn Frye has been my ally, teacher, advisor, mentor, respectful critic, colleague and model of how to *do* philosophy. As my advisor, Marilyn's most awesome act was to encourage me to think for myself and to discover what I would in my philosophical investigations. Kathryn Phillips, my friend, mother and model of how to quest, has been there for me since my beginning. Martha Gass, my friend, first love and model of lesbian-loving perception, has supported me in multiple and profound ways. My *soul*mate, my lover, intellectual and political comrade, Kim Leverton, has taught me more about integrity, perseverance, how to play instead of stress, how to be a radical mother, and how to think theory and "real life" together, than anyone in my life.

INTRODUCTION

In the introductory essay of *Feminist Epistemologies* (1993) Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter offer the following story about the development of the field.

> Feminist philosophers began work in the applied areas because feminism is, first and last, a political movement concerned with practical issues, and feminist philosophers understood their intellectual work to be a contribution to the public debate on crucial practice issues. At first, the more abstract areas of philosophy seemed distant from these concrete concerns. But from the applied areas we moved into more central ones as we began to see the problems produced by androcentrism in aesthetics, ethics, philosophy of science, and finally and fairly recently, in the "core" areas of epistemology and metaphysics. (2)

"The history of feminist epistemology is," they write, "the history of the clash between the feminist commitment to the struggles of women to have their understandings of the world legitimated and the commitment of traditional philosophy to various accounts of knowledge -- positivist, postpostivist, and others -- that have consistently undermined women's claim to know." (ibid.) With regard to the feminist epistemology of Mary Daly, as presented in *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (1978), the story offered by Alcoff and Potter strikes me as both accurate and inaccurate in certain respects. While it is true that Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* was, first and last, an intellectual contribution to the political movement of women, her commitment was most definitely *not* to gaining legitimacy for women's understandings of issues being debated in the public

sphere. On Daly's view, a movement committed to deep social change must be a quest, not for legitimacy on the patriarchal terms assumed in public debate, but rather for criticism and refusal of patriarchal standards of legitimacy altogether. According to Daly, women have no privileged epistemological position as women: to be a woman is to have been made a patriarchal subject. Daly argues, as feminists, our first task must be to change our womanly ways of knowing and being, that is, to re-make ourselves something "Other" than women. Hence, her feminist philosophy *began* in the late seventies with epistemology and metaphysics in order that we might realize this metapatriarchal possibility.

The year after *Gyn/Ecology* was published, Audre Lorde published an "Open Letter to Mary Daly," criticizing the white Western perspective of Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*. On most feminist interpretations of the letter, Lorde's critique called for a complete dismissal of Daly's project. However, as Lorde herself notes in the letter, she agreed with much of what Daly was up to in *Gyn/Ecology*. They shared the vision that feminism must be about liberatory transformations starting with how we think and live. If we are going to survive, they agreed, we must expand our epistemological possibilities, which necessarily involves becoming something Other than patriarchal women. On my reading, Lorde's letter calls not for a dismissal of Daly's feminism, but for a reconstruction. In this dissertation I bring Mary Daly's "A-mazing" epistemology together with María Lugones's idea of "world-traveling" in an effort to respond constructively to the challenges raised by Audre Lorde. My contribution, what I call "A-mazing World-

Traveling," is offered to further the development of an anti-racist, anti-imperialist radical feminism that can be practiced by white Western women in complex consciousness of their/our historical, cultural and racial locations.[1]

We must, Daly insists, make ourselves something Other than patriarchal women because our survival depends on it. The practices which have made us women condition us to think and imagine in ways which draw us into complicity with our own thingification, that is, self-destruction. Daly argues that for women in the patriarchal "foreground," our thinking is conditioned both through language -- specifically, "the all-pervasive language of myth, conveyed overtly and subliminally through religion, 'great art,' literature, the dogmas of professionalism, the media, grammar," and scholarship -- *and* by rituals of bodily violence; with each promoting our acceptance of the other. (3)

For example, she says in a chapter on African genital mutilation, that the perpetual pain experienced by women subjected to the rituals of excision and infibulation so effectively preoccupies their minds, emotions, imaginations, and

---

[1] In the dissertation I name this politic "Radical *White Western* Feminism." This reconstruction of radical feminism entails a shift which I describe using Ruth Frankenberg's (1993) language of racial discourses. Whereas the dominant race discourse operative in *Gyn/Ecology*, and in other theory generated by white Western feminists in the seventies and eighties, was "color and power evasive," I argue for the development of a radical feminism which emerges from and creates a "race cognizant" discourse. I add to Frankenberg's framework "colonial cognizance." I propose operationalizing this discourse through the practice of A-mazing World-Traveling. I italicize the word "white" in the title to signal it is not functioning *descriptively*, i.e. *not* referring to a feminism that can only be practiced by white women, or that feminism is white. Similarly, "Western" is italicized to indicate that I am *not* describing a feminism which affirms a Western standpoint in the same way, for example, "Chicana Feminism" affirms a Chicana standpoint or "Black feminist thought" affirms a politicized African-American standpoint. Rather, the italics should be read as a *performance* of awareness in a world where "white" and "Western" are unmarked cultural categories. "Radical" and "Feminist" describe the critical perspective and practice which take shape from and give shape to this awareness. Hence, the title announces something like, "This is a radical ***hi, I'm aware and critical of my racial and imperialist placement and it's significance to my activity of theorizing*** feminism."

sensations, it prevents a sense of Self.[2] (159) Similarly, she argues, gynecologists and psychiatrists in America "keep many women in the state of perpetual patients whose bodies and minds are constantly invaded by foreign objects -- knives, needles, speculums, carcinogenic hormone injections and pills, sickening self-images, festering fixations, [and] debilitating dogmas." (230) Under these conditions it is almost impossible to think critically about what is happening and creatively about how to resist it. To make matters worse the language of myth used to represent patriarchal rituals constitutes a maze of deception leading women to believe that participating in such rituals is the pathway to sacred existence. Daly points out, for example, that according to Mircea Eliade, myths express "intuitive insights" about meaningful human activity which "open up depths of reality and the self otherwise closed to us." (44) In her chapter on sati Daly shows how Joseph Campbell employs this language in his description of the Indian widow. The woman who "throws herself" on the funeral pyre of her husband is, in his words, "the female who really *is* something in as much as she is truly and properly a player of the female part: she is not only good and true in the ethical sense but true and real ontologically. In her faithful death, she is at one with her own true being." (118) In these terms, "to be killed is 'good and true,' and to cease to exist is to be." (119) Hence, Daly argues, the "insights" expressed through patriarchal myth actually close off depths of reality

---

[2] Daly explains, "Self is capitalized when I am referring to the authentic center of women's process, while the imposed/internalized false 'self,' the shell of the Self, is in lower case. In writing of the deep *Background* which is the divine depth of the Self, I capitalize, while the term *foreground*, referring to surface consciousness, generally is not capitalized." (26) Where appropriate I follow Daly's capitalization practices.

and of the Self otherwise opened to women, by "deceiving us into believing that these are the only doorways to our depths and the fathers hold the keys." (46)

To endure the physical pain of the various patriarchal rituals which make one a woman and to think the experiences through the language provided by such scholars as Eliade and Campbell requires, Daly argues, a radical "splitting" of one' self-perceptions. Following Monique Wittig, Daly argues, women are "broken" by the fact that we must enter patriarchal language in order to speak or write. "As the 'I' is broken," says Daly, "so also is the Inner Eye, the capacity for integrity of knowing/sensing." (19) Dazed in the maze, in this epistemological state of "brokenness," the possibility of autonomy/integrity -- of thinking for oneself, of acting on one's own initiatives -- is not apparent.

On Simone de Beauvoir's view, the situation of being made a woman has included "the temptation to forgo liberty and become a thing." If women are to become free subjects, she insists, we must assume, like men, the metaphysical risks of transcendent existence. But Daly follows Virginia Woolf, who argued twenty-five years before Beauvoir, that following in the processions of educated men makes one, not a free subject, but "only a cripple in a cave."[3] Becoming a man cannot be the path to that something Other we must seek to become. On Daly's view, there is no difference in kind between thinking like a patriarchally

---

[3] In *Three Guineas* (1938) Woolf writes, "if people are highly successful in their professions they lose their senses. Sight goes. They have no time to look at pictures. Sound goes. They have no time to listen to music. Speech goes. They have no time for conversations. They lose their sense of proportion -- the relations between one thing and another. Humanity goes. Money making becomes so important that they must work by night as well as by day. Health goes. And so competitive do they become that they will not share their work with others though they have more than they can do themselves. What then remains of a human being who has lost sight, sound, and sense of proportion? Only a cripple in a cave." (72)

constructed man and like a patriarchally constructed woman. "Robotitude," Daly's name for the state of the modern patriarchal subject, is living reduced to mechanical motion. We are all programmed to think -- without our emotions, imaginations, and sensations -- like machines. Patriarchal men parading in their sartorial splendor -- "spacesuits, priestly and judicial robes, professional and surgical gowns" -- Daly argues, are robotized, the sons of their own machines, more controlled than controlling, and above all, not free. (52) The only difference Daly claims is that "fatherly fixes are essentially ego-inflating for men, whereas those administered to women are depressants." (54) Following in the transcendent processions of educated men, then, cannot be the path for women with genuine Otherly ambitions.

Still, Daly acknowledges, the "kingdom of male-authored texts" has appeared to many of us "an appealing escape" from the "realm of the distaff which has literally been the sweatshop and prison of female bodies and spirits." (5) What is not immediately apparent to would-be Others who pursue this avenue of "escape" is the relationship between the ritual atrocities of patriarchy and the rituals of patriarchal scholarship. In the order of Western scholarship, at least since Descartes, thinking clearly about something has meant distancing oneself from *it*, separating *it* from its context, and breaking *it* down into analyzable parts. One consequence of this "objective" process is to make objects of subjects.[4] Not coincidentally, she argues, this is the objective of the

---

[4] Recently Lorraine Code has argued, along these lines, "Women and other 'others' -- are *produced* as 'objects of knowledge-as-control' by S-knows-that-p epistemologies and the philosophies of science/social science that they inform." See "Taking Subjectivity Into Account," in Alcoff and Potter (1993), 32.

ritual atrocities. What connects Campbell as a representative Western scholar with the perpetrators of sati and other patriarchal violences, argues Daly, is their failure to identify with the victim. Like the traditional Indian patriarch, the Western patriarchal scholar emotionally distances himself from the victim, separates the materiality of the ritual from its "soul" or symbolic meaning, and attaches all value to the latter. The problem, from Daly's perspective, is that this way of thinking makes it appear as if there are no victims. Western patriarchal scholarship -- which both generates and legitimates patriarchal violence -- constitutes a maze of deception which keeps those of us who are trained and practiced in this mode of thinking from knowing the women who are erased by the ritual atrocities. (131) When we participate in the "meta-rituals" of scholarship we run the risk, Daly warns, of "shrinking into the mold of the mystified Athena, the twice-born, who forgets and denies her Mother and Sisters, because she has forgotten her original Self." (8)

Becoming something Other than women or pseudo men, Daly argues, must begin with "Spinning" our minds and bodies back together. "Spinning" is the way "through" and "beyond" the phallocratic mazes of deception within which self-destruction and objectifying other women make sense. As a cognitive mode of resistance "Spinning" begins from the "Gyn/Ecological principle that everything is connected with everything else." (11) In contrast with the mechanical thinking which separates things from their contexts and break them down into independent parts, Spinning involves dis-covering and repairing the lost threads of connectedness within our Selves and the cosmos. "It erases

implanted pseudodichotomies between the Self and "other" reality, while it unmasks the unreality of both "self" and "world" as these are portrayed, betrayed, in the language of the father's foreground." (6) Insofar as this holistic process of knowing enables one to "see through" the mazes which obscure the possibilities of Self-affirming metapatriarchal movement, it is what Daly calls an "A-mazing" process.

The Second Passage of *Gyn/Ecology* is intended to engage the would-be Other in this A-mazing process, making of her a Spinster. The Spinster who traverses the mazes within the "kingdom of male-authored texts" is, in Daly's lexicon, the "Searcher." In the Second Passage the Searcher examines five patriarchal rituals, including Indian sati, Chinese footbinding, African genital mutilation, European witchburning, and American gynecology with the intention of making it possible to see the victims through the mazes. As the Searcher moves through the passage she connects these practices which are represented in the texts of Western scholars as apparently disparate and isolated phenomena by identifying the basic patterns among them. For example, she finds in all the rituals an obsession with purity, a total erasure of responsibility, compulsive orderliness, obsessive repetitiveness, a fixation upon minute details which divert attention from the horror, and a readjustment of consciousness, so that otherwise unacceptable behavior becomes normative. (130-3) Together the patterns constitute a global phenomenon which she names the "Sado-Ritual Syndrome." Within this gyn/ecological analysis which she has spun she is able to see with her "Inner Eye" the horror patriarchal violence on a global scale.

In this A-mazing process the Searcher is transformed from one who is split or broken within the mazes of mechanical thinking to one with a growing capacity for integrity of knowing/sensing. In her discussion of the process she quotes Adrienne Rich, "in bringing the light of critical thinking to bear on her subject, in the very act of *becoming more conscious* of her situation in the world, a woman may feel herself coming deeper than ever into touch with her unconscious and with her body." (6) This is exactly what happens to the Searcher as she becomes increasingly knowledgeable about the gynocidal implications of patriarchal practices. Her sensory perception is enhanced enabling her to see/hear/feel the deceptive tricks of patriarchal texts. She develops, according to Daly,

> a kind of multidimensional / multiform power of sensing / understanding her environment. This is a Self-identified *synaesthesia*: it is a woman-identified *gynaesthesia*. It is a complex way of perceiving the interelatedness of seemingly disparate phenomena. It is also a pattern-detecting power which may be named positive paranoia. (316)[5]

This mode of knowing, Daly argues, enables the Searcher to "find the focus of her anger, so that it fuels and no longer blocks her passion and her creativity." (112) Unlike the Western scholar who assumes the "objective" standpoint and fails to identify with the victims of patriarchal violence, the Searcher is outraged

---

[5] "Synaesthesia" refers to the experience of the concomitance of disparate sensation. For example, in one published case wall-paper patterns were read as syllables and words. These "unusual and idiosyncratic" phenomenal experiences are thought to be caused by "an aggressive and persistent association dominated in some cases by a community or analogy of emotional tone." They are related to the associations at work in the personification of inanimate objects. *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, Edited by James Mark Baldwin (NY: Macmillian, 1928).

on their behalf! Because she identifies with them as victims she is compelled to stand up and speak out against the practices which make them women.

In "Poetry is Not A Luxury" (1977) Audre Lorde argues, along the same line as Daly, that our survival depends on fundamental transformations in our ways of knowing. She condemns the mode of living "defined by profit, by linear power, by institutionalized dehumanization," which she claims, is the historical result of acting on the white Western belief that "the head will save us, the brain alone will set us free." (38) She proclaims,

> The white fathers told us: I think, therefore I am. The Black mother within each of us -- the poet -- whispers in our dreams: I feel, therefore I can be free. (ibid.)

In response to charge that she is contributing to the dualist construction of the rational white male and the emotional dark female, Lorde responds, if such a dualism exists it is the white man who has constructed it by taking "a world position, a position throughout time" against what is not strictly rational within themselves and others. (101) Like Daly, Lorde calls for an holistic knowing process which fuses thinking and feeling. Since, in Lorde's words, "poetry coins the language to express and charter this revolutionary demand" it must not be dismissed as a luxury. (38) Thus Lorde's work suggests that Daly's rejection of a Cartesian starting point puts the Searcher on the right track to becoming that something Other than a patriarchal subject.

So what does Lorde mean, in her "Open Letter to Mary Daly," when she claims that in *Gyn/Ecology* Daly is "dealing only out of a patriarchal western european frame of reference"? (68) Some interpreters find in the letter a

postmodern sort of critique. For example, Christine DeStephano reads it as an attempt to undermine gender as an analytic category. And Nancy Fraser and Linda Nicholson read it as a challenge to metanarratives. I do not think these readings can be supported by Lorde's work.[6] As I read the letter, Lorde is attempting to push Daly's gyn/ecological thinking further in order to strengthen her work and help realize the radical vision of transformation they share.

Lorde is concerned, on my reading, that despite Daly's best efforts to subvert the "objective" standpoint of Western scholars, she does make objects of subjects in her studies of sati, footbinding and genital mutilation. In the chapters which deal with nonEuropean women, Lorde points out, Daly represents them "only as victims and preyers-upon each other." (67) It is not enough, Lorde is saying, for the Searcher to identify with African women as victims of genital mutilation. And while Lorde acknowledges that the "inclusion of African genital mutilation was an important and necessary piece in any consideration of female ecology," she wonders, "Where was Afrekete, Yemanje, Oyo, and Mawulisa? Where were the warrior goddesses of the Vodun, the Dahomeian Amazons and the warrior-women of Dan?" (67) By analyzing the rituals of excision and infibuation out of the context of the heritage and mythic traditions represented by these symbolic figures, Lorde argues, the Searcher did the what the Western patriarchal scholar does. In Lorde's words, she "denied the real connections that exist between all of us." (68)

---

[6] In my view these readings make the same mistake in their use of Lorde's work that Lorde finds in Daly's use of her work in *Gyn/Ecology*. In the letter Lorde asks, "Did you ever read my words, or did you merely finger through them for quotations which you thought might valuably support an already conceived idea concerning some old and distorted connection between us?" (68)

One might argue, in Daly's defense, that in all of the chapters of the Second Passage, including those which deal with European and American rituals, Daly represents the women subjected to the rituals as victims; that one of the tasks of the Searcher is to make it possible to see the victims of patriarchal violence through the deceptions of Western scholarship. While it is true that Daly reveals European and American women as victims of patriarchal violence in the last two chapters of the passage, there is an asymmetry which distinguishes Daly's representations of Western and nonWestern women.[7] In chapter on the European witchburnings the woman who is burned as a witch is represented as a victim of patriarchal violence, but also as a symbol of female knowledge and power which threatens the patriarchal order. The European witch in this chapter -- unlike the victims of the previous chapters who believed ritual participation was a path to sacred existence -- is represented as a menace who threatens patriarchy by acting on her own initiative. Here, for the first time in the Second Passage, Daly addresses the question, just *who* were the women who were tortured, maimed or killed? (193) According to Daly,

> The situation of those accused of witchcraft was somewhat different from that of the footbound Chinese girls and of the genitally maimed girls and young women of Africa, for these were mutilated in preparation for their destiny -- marriage. It was also somewhat different from the situation of the widows of India, who were killed solely for the crime of outliving their husbands. For the targets of attack in the witchcraze were not women defined by assimilation into the patriarchal family. Rather, the witchcraze focused predominantly upon women who had rejected marriage (Spinsters) and women who had survived it (widows). The witch-hunters sought to purify their society (The Mystical Body) of these

[7] Taken together the chapters on European and American rituals (114 pages) offer the reader almost twice as much analysis as the chapters on Indian, Chinese, and African rituals (64 pages).

> "indigestible" elements -- women whose physical, intellectual, economic, moral, and spiritual independence and activity profoundly threatened the male monopoly in every sphere. (184)

On Daly's analysis, the witches were victimized not to make them into patriarchal women, but because they threatened the foundations of modern patriarchal society. (185-193) Those accused of witchcraft were, Daly argues, herbalists, healers, alchemists, midwives, and counselors who "earned the respect of the people" on the basis of their spiritual and medical practices and knowledge. (193)[8] The witchcraze differs from other atrocities in the Second Passage in that it was a "primal battle of principalities and powers [which] was at heart concerned with the process of know-ing." (194) Hence, in this chapter Daly presents the victims of the witchcraze in a context which reveals that they were not only victims, but also wise warriors.

In the final chapter of the Second Passage on American gynecology, Daly clearly intends to present the American woman who believes "doctor knows best" and who faithfully follows his orders as another victim of patriarchal violence. (224) However, unlike the other chapters of the Second Passage, which all begin with the first element of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome (obsession with purity), this chapter begins with a section entitled, "A Brief Crone-ology." It is useful to note that Daly developed her "Crone-ological analysis" during the years Foucault was developing his first genealogical analysis in *Discipline and Punish* (1977). Their analyses are similar in several respects, perhaps most notably in their efforts to reveal the emergence of modern subjectivities at the

---

[8] Carolyn Merchant (1980) makes a compelling case along the same lines.

intersections of knowledge and power. Daly argues that patriarchy in the West has taken different shapes in connection with struggles for power in three different historical moments: early modern, nineteenth century, and late twentieth century. It is no coincidence, on Daly's Crone-ology, that "the massacre of the wise women/healers during the witchcraze was followed by the rise of man-midwives who eventually became dignified by the name "gynecologist." (224) Neither was it a coincidence, she argues, that the specialized treatment for women known as gynecology arose in the nineteenth century at the same time first wave feminists began the struggle for women's rights. (227) Finally, she argues, "there is every reason to see the mutilation and destruction of women by doctors specializing in unnecessary radical mastectomies and hysterectomies, carcinogenic hormone therapy, psychosurgery, spirit-killing psychiatry and other forms of psychotherapy as directly related to the rise of radical feminism in the twentieth century." (228) This Crone-ology provides a context for seeing the victimization of European and American women as part of an historical struggle. The Searcher comes to understand the crimes against Western women as responses to female knowledge and power, rather than crimes perpetrated against helpless victims. A connection is established for the first time in the chapters on the European and American rituals between the Searcher and victims of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome. In *Gyn/Ecology* the feminist Searcher is *unrelated* to the Indian woman, the Chinese woman and the African woman, but she is the symbolic *descendent* of the witch. The Searcher does epistemological battle with Western

scholars today in the tradition of her ecologically-minded foresisters who did battle with the Cartesian mechanists of the early modern period.

Daly is dealing out of a Western patriarchal frame of reference insofar as she views the ritual atrocities she dis-covers in India, Africa and China as "barbarous" attacks on helpless victims rather than patriarchal responses to buried gyn/ecological traditions and Other knowledge/power relations. Because the Searcher separates the nonEuropean women subjected to patriarchal rituals from their own gynocentric contexts she fails to see and identify with them as subjects. On my reading, then, the "Open Letter to Mary Daly" identifies two related epistemological problems in *Gyn/Ecology*. First, the Searcher fails to know herself in *relation* to the Indian, Chinese and African women who are the objects of patriarchal rituals and scholarship. In the A-mazing process of her individual transformation she becomes in significant ways a gyn/ecological knower, and yet she does not recognize that she has denied the connections between her Self and Others from India, Africa and China. Second, the Searcher fails to know the Indian, Chinese and African women in "Crone-logical" contexts which reveals their full subjectivity. In "Playfulness, 'World'-Traveling, and Loving Perception" (1987) María Lugones offers a strategy which, I will argue, is helpful with regard to both problems.

"World-traveling," Lugones explains, is a way of being and living which involves shifting one's self-perception and perception of others as one moves among various socially constructed "worlds." As she defines a "world," a "world" may be an "actual society given its dominant culture's description and

construction of life, including a construction of the relationships of production, of gender, race, etc." (10) Or, a "world" may be "such a society given a non-dominant construction." (ibid.) In the "world" within which one feels most at home, or "at ease," -- that is, confident because she is fluent in the language and norms, and because she is bonded with others in virtue of a shared history -- one is constructed, and knows oneself, as a person with a particular set of character traits. In a "world" within which one is not at ease, Lugones explains, one may be constructed, and know oneself, as a different person who lacks some or all of the particular traits she had at home. "The shift from being one person to being a different person" is what Lugones calls "travel." (11) For example, Lugones suggests, one who "travels" can be sure that she is a playful person and simultaneously positive that she is not playful based on her self-perceptions in two different worlds. Similarly, one who travels can know someone from another world as a playful person and a serious person depending on whether she sees them from the perspective of her world or theirs. In order to grasp Lugones's idea of a single individual being different people, one must abandon the Western idea that each of us is a unified self, for the idea that we are plural. Those who experience an underlying "I," on this view, are people who have never been required, or inclined, to "travel" beyond the "worlds" within which they feel completely at ease. The willingness to give up the singular self and animate constructions of ourselves in different worlds is a move in the direction of identification across differences because, according to Lugones, "by traveling to their 'world' we can understand *what it is to be them and what it is to*

be ourselves in their eyes." (17) Only then, she says, are we fully subjects to each other." (ibid.)

Notice there is a sense in which Daly's Searcher has been doing something akin to traveling. In the patriarchal foreground she was a woman complicit, dazed and broken; she becomes critical, Self-affirming, and enraged -- in Daly's words -- a Positively Revolting Hag. This should count as "a shift from being one person to being a different person." What made this shift possible was the A-mazing process of spinning mind and body together in a pattern detecting project which provided a new feminist understanding of social reality and the motivation to act out of this knowledge. However, I want to suggest that the shift from patriarchal "foreground" to feminist "Background" does not constitute "travel" in an important sense. While it is true that "foreground" and "Background" constitute dominant and non-dominant constructions of life, it is also true that even on Daly's view they are intertwined *Western* constructions of life. One of the central arguments of *Gyn/Ecology* is that androcentric myth and ritual are constructed out of "stolen" and, in complex ways, "reversed" antecedent and suppressed gynocentric traditions. (47) Therefore, in Lugones' sense, "foreground" and "Background" constitute two dimensions of one "world." This explains why the Searcher who moves through the Second Passage a-mazing the lies in the texts of the Western scholars is able to discover among the representations of Western women a buried gynocentric tradition of knowers and resisters, but finds no similar traditions in the cases of nonWestern women: she never really leaves home.

Traveling beyond this Western patriarchal frame of reference to nonWestern worlds means, for the Searcher, willfully shifting her self-perception and perception of others. She has come to understand herself as a radical feminist who stands against patriarchal oppression and for *all* women including her nonWestern "sisters"; she must also come to recognize the person she is in one or more nonWestern worlds -- an ethnocentric racist or imperialist whose practices and views alienate nonWestern women. In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly refuses the latter construction.

> I have chosen to name these practices for what they are: barbaric rituals/atrocities. Critics from Western countries are constantly being intimidated by accusations of "racism," to the point of misnaming, non-naming, and not seeing these sado-rituals. The accusations of "racism" may come from ignorance, but they serve only the interests of males, not of women. This kind of accusation and intimidation constitutes an astounding and damaging reversal, for it is clearly in the interests of Black women that feminists of all races should speak out. (154)

From Daly's white Western radical feminist perspective, "[i]t is truly *racist* to keep silent in the face of these atrocities, merely 'studying' them, speaking and writing deceptively about them, applying different (male-centered) standards to them, failing to see and name the connections among them." (172) Like Daly, Lorde held that it was the responsibility of all feminists to transform the silence shrouding oppressive rituals into the language and action of resistance and new feminist creation.[9] She explicitly names circumcision a crime against Black

---

[9] On this point, see the papers presented by Lorde (1978b) and Daly (1978b) on the 1977 Modern Language Association Convention panel entitled "The Transformation of Silence into Language and Action."

women and acknowledges that a critique of it belonged in *Gyn/Ecology.*[10] But it seems to Daly, as it does not to Lorde, that the rituals are *either* patriarchal crimes committed against women, in which case the women subject to them are victims, and the Searcher is a feminist on their side; *or* the rituals are ethnic, religious or national customs, in which case Indian women make themselves good and true through participation in the rituals, and the Searcher who speaks out on their behalf is an agent of racism and/or imperialism. Daly's refusal to understand her self as plural makes it impossible for her to see how both are true. World-traveling enables the Searcher to recognize that she might speak out about patriarchal violence against African women in a racist or ethnocentric manner.

Consider Daly's chapter on Indian sati. The primary source behind this account is Katherine Mayo's *Mother India* (1927).[11] From Daly's perspective Mayo is the "startling exception among scholars who have written about women in India" because of her courage to condemn the murdered and mutilation of Indian women and young girls. (127, 121) Certainly she is unlike of patriarchal Western scholars like Campbell. Mayo's account enables the Searcher to break through the deception of foreground scripts, scholarly and religious, to see the victims of sati. However, Mayo (or Daly) looks rather different from the eyes of Indian nationalists struggling for self-rule against British imperialism. Indian

---

[10] In the "Open Letter" Lorde says to Daly, "Your inclusion of African genital mutilation was an important and necessary piece in any consideration of female ecology, and too little has been written about it." In another essay, she asserts that female circumcision "is not a cultural affair as the late Jomo Kenyatta insisted, it is a crime against Black women." (1984, 120)

[11] For compelling account of the debate over widow-burning in early colonial India from a feminist post-colonial perspective see Sinha (1994).

nationalists see white Western feminists such as Mayo and Daly in the context of British imperialism.[12] From this perspective, the Searcher's stand for the Indian woman, victim of "barbarous" violence, bears a close family resemblance to the "white man's burden." Hence, Gayatri Spivak (1985) argues Daly's analysis situates her squarely in the tradition of "white men saving brown women from brown men." (121) Shifting to this construction of the Searcher means recognizing that in her efforts to make herself Other than a patriarchal woman she has employed, inadvertently, what Lorde calls "the Master's Tools" against her "sisters" in nonWestern worlds. The Searcher, grown up in an (unmarked) imperialist world, easily assumes that by saving her "sisters," by standing up for them, she acts in their interests. Because she never really leaves home she does not see how her interest in making herself something Other than the "objective" scholar gets intwined with an imperialist interest in constructing a nonWestern world full of victims in need of missionaries, rulers, and "enlightened" Western ideas. If she could grasp this, it would make less sense to her to talk about the "barbaric" nature of circumscision and the "ignorance" of those who would accuse her of racism in the same breath. World-traveling provides the insight which enables her to see that she must be vigilantly and self-consciously critical about the bridges she attempts to build with women from other worlds lest she inadvertantly serve the interests of Western racists and/or imperialists, not women.

---

[12] For a comprehensive study of Mayo's intimate relationship with the British *Raj* see Manoranjan Jha's *Katherine Mayo and India* (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1971).

The point of traveling, however, is *not* to just to understand the construction of oneself as racist and/or imperialist, but to see it in order to *change* it. As feminists committed to the liberation of *all* women it becomes clear that our first task must be making ourselves something Other than white Western women. We must become Radical *White Western* Feminists.[13] Toward this end I recommend the process of A-mazing World-Traveling. For the white Western feminist, "A-mazing" adds to "World-traveling" a process for moving from foreground constructions of self and others *in a particular world* to Background constructions, that is, to genuinely Other ways of thinking and living. World-Traveling enables the A-mazing Searcher to know herself in *relation* to the Indian, Chinese and African women. By getting out of the texts of the traditional Western scholarship and into the texts of those in other worlds the Searcher comes to see how in the process of discovering victims and standing up on their behalf she has faithfully carried out the agenda of those she most wants to resist, re-establishing oppressive relations. Traveling to the world of Indian women also enables her to see how their interest in resisting Western imperialism gets intwined with their thinking about what it means to be a good woman. Writing about this complex Indian construction, Mrinalini Sinha (1994) points out, "Women, as the preservers or guardians of tradition or 'culture,' became the embodiments of that inner spirituality which lay at the core of national identity." (7) The Searcher who world-travels also comes to know more about those in other worlds who are, in historical process, making worlds where

---

[13] See footnote 2.

they can become something Other than colonized patriarchal women. Only from the perspective of these relations will the A-mazing World-Traveler be able to see and hear with her "Inner Eyes and Ears," as Daly would say, the connections among apparently disparate patriarchal phenomena and to spin a context within which she can know nonWestern women as plural, as survivors, resisters and descendants of gynocentric traditions, as well as victims of patriarchal violence.

If the white Western feminists' project of knowledge and liberation is to be global in scope and significance, we must find our way through the mazes of androcentric language which distorts our thinking, resist the self-destructive practices which language generates and masks, and seek with the "Inner Eye" the possibility of becoming something Other than patriarchal women. The practice A-mazing World-Traveling enables us to recognize that one cannot become Other in an anti-patriarchal sense without simultaneously becoming Other in an anti-racist and anti-imperialist sense. An essential part of transforming this possibility into feminist language and action must be connecting with other Others. In order to connect we must come to know ourselves not only as victims and resistors, but also as agents of oppression, and we must come to know nonWestern women and women of color not only as victims, but as resisters in struggle against complex systems of domination. We must come to know ourselves and others as plural. This is pluralist future of radical feminism.

Part I

THE RADICAL FEMINIST TRADITION BEHIND MARY DALY'S *GYN/ECOLOGY*

Daly's Radical Feminist Theory in Historical Context

Today in the United States, radical feminist theory is commonly associated with the theses that patriarchy, a socially constructed sex-class or castelike system perpetuated through ideologies of male supremacy, is the root and model form of oppression; and that women's liberation will be achieved through a revolutionary feminist struggle to overthrow the system which begins with the reclamation and revaluation of women's experience. Robin Morgan identified herself as a radical feminist along these lines. She explains,

> I call myself a radical feminist, and that means specific things to me. The etymology of the word "radical" refers to "one who goes to the root." I believe that sexism is the root oppression, the one which, until and unless we *uproot* it, will continue to put forth the branches of racism, class hatred, ageism, competition, ecological disaster, and economic exploitation. This means, to me, that the so-called revolutions to date have been coups d' états between men, in a half-hearted attempt to prune the branches but leave the root embedded -- for the sake of preserving their own male privileges. This also means that I'm not out for us as women to settle for a "piece of the pie," equality in an unjust society, or for mere "top-down" change which can be corrupted into leaving the basic system unaltered. I think our feminist revolution gains momentum from a "ripple effect" -- from each individual woman gaining self-respect and yes, power, over her own body and soul first, then within her family, on her block, in her town, state, and so on out from the center, overlapping with similar changes other women are experiencing, the circles rippling more widely and inclusively as they go. (Morgan 1977, 9)

It is possible to think of Mary Daly's radical feminism in *Gyn/Ecology* (1978) along these lines too. Daly does argue that patriarchal gynocide is "the root and paradigm for genocide," (Daly, 298) and she is explicit that "the oppression of women knows no ethnic, national, or religious bounds." (111) On her view ethnicity, nationalism, religion, and race are patriarchal phenomena which serve to keep women separated from each other.[1] She provides a systematic critique of patriarchal ideology, including an analysis of masculinity and femininity as constitutive elements in a patriarchal symbolic, which legitimates and perpetuates women's oppression. (65-69). Like Morgan's, Daly's vision of "a world other than patriarchy," is not an effort "to buy another ticket for women of the world on the merry-go-round of feminine constructions."[2] Rather it is an effort to break out of the "Playboys' Playground" through the creation and discovery of a multitude of radical feminist constructions. (7)

Despite the fit between Daly's work and Morgan's formulation of radical feminism, I believe that a reading such as this obscures the radical dimension of Daly's feminism. In this chapter I propose Daly's theory be read in historical context rather than as a categorical instantiation. Of course, the category "radical feminism" sketched above emerged out of a particular historical moment. Sara Evans locates the origins of second wave feminism in the civil

---

[1] She says this explicitly in the thirteenth statement of "The Qualitative Leap Beyond Patriarchal Religion," "13. The ethos of Judeo-Christian culture is dominated by The Most Un-holy Trinity: Rape, Genocide, and War. It is rapism which spawns racism. It is gynocide which spawns genocide, for sexism (rapism) is fundamental socialization to objectify 'the other.'" In *Quest*, vol.I, no.4, Spring 1975.

[2] I am contesting this position attributed to Daly by Linda Alcoff in "Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory," Signs, 1988, vol.13, no31, p.414.

rights movement and the new left. (Evans, 1980) Josephine Donovan argues that radical feminist theory has its theoretical roots in Marxist theory as it was elaborated in the United States during the sixties. (Donovan, 1992) On these sorts of historical readings radical feminism becomes a category built on a theoretical analogy. Like Marxists who argued that capitalism was the root and model form of oppression and that only workers constituted a revolutionary class capable of ushering in a revolutionary society within which all oppressed people would be free, radical feminists argued patriarchy was the root and model form of oppression and that only a feminist struggle could usher in a revolutionary society within which all oppressed people would be free. Daly's work was not immune to the construction of "radical feminist" in this particular historical moment. Quite the opposite, I think radical feminist theoretical projects of the seventies had a big influence on the development of Daly's thought, and this point will be treated in depth in chapter 4, "The Racial and Ethnic Politics of *Gyn/Ecology*."

A classic attempt to articulate a radical feminist theory by importing a leftist theoretical framework is Barbara Burris's 1970 appropriation of Franz Fanon's work in her essay, "The Fourth World Manifesto." (Burris, 1971) Burris argued, "women are a colonized group in relation to men all over the world, in all classes and races, including the Third World." (325) Within this theoretical framework, women's bodies are the territory colonists subjugate and control; rape is an imperialist act which defies women's self-determination; marriage is a colonial institution designed to turn women's bodies into property; advertising

and pornography are exploitation of raw materials for the colonizer's sexual gratification; and the denial of women's culture and history is the destruction of their indigenous culture and history. (335) It cannot be denied that Burris, with skill and imagination, used Fanon's framework to give shape to a strong radical feminist analysis. However, it is not difficult to see the problems with appropriating this framework.

Robin Morgan was aware, as were other radical feminists at the time, of the problems associated with trying to stuff women's experiences into conceptual frameworks developed to articulate very different experiences. The problem, as Morgan noted, was that radical feminism badly needed conceptual resources to articulate a theory of patriarchy and women's liberation. The need was most pressing among activists. As late as 1977, Morgan reports radical feminists were seeking "a handle, a lever, a way of translating into generally understood and accepted terms of political philosophy 'what it was we wanted'." (Morgan, 160) Borrowing from available theoretical frameworks seemed to offer the additional promise of legitimizing the highly suspect claims radical feminists were attempting to advance on behalf of women. However, Morgan laments, "borrowing" also created the dilemma of "trying to communicate hitherto unspeakable truths about our condition in the very language and concepts of the patriarchal culture (of the Left or Right) which caused that condition." (xii) This story helps explain, I will show in chapter 3, how it is that radical feminism has come to be identified with a category of thought which bears a such a strong family resemblance to radical leftist theories.

On my view, this sort of historical reading of Daly which seeks to illuminate Daly's radical feminism in terms of its roots in the male-dominated political thought of the period is fundamentally misguided. It presupposes in typical patriarchal fashion that all history is patriarchal history. Daly claims this "time-honored trick of patriarchs," i.e. expropriating memory through possession by "the past," effectively deprives women of a past. (Daly, 348) But what other history might radical feminism have grown from? After all, French feminists since Beauvoir have insisted that women have no past, no history of thought. If this were true there would be no other history through which Daly's radical feminism might be read. Daly suggests that it not true. There is, however, rich common ground beneath Daly and the French from Beauvoir to Cixous, Kristeva and Irigaray. They share the view, that women's silence/erasure has been the condition of men's history. However, Daly parts with her French sisters who find in this position a feminist absence or void, leading to the imperative that they trace their own intellectual roots through the patriarchal genealogy of the Western Fathers. Daly argues for what might be called a "Copernican revolution" in our thinking about the relationship between patriarchal time and Women's Time. Without denying that patriarchal genealogies have been created through the systematic use, abuse, distortion and erasure of women, Daly insists that her thought must be read in the historical context of a gynocentric tradition which exists "behind" patriarchal traditions, that is, the "Tradition of Great Hags and Crones." (Daly, 14-17) In order to see "through the Dirty Joke" that women have no past, women must travel into "feminist space/time" which is "truly

Prehistoric in relation to patriarchal history." (16) Hence, I propose the following strategy for drawing out the "radical" project of Daly's feminism. Rather than attempting to fit Daly into a feminist category constructed in patriarchal time, I will read Daly's radical feminism through an exploration of its roots in the gynocentric tradition Daly uncovers in feminist time/space. This strategy makes especially good sense in view of Daly's central claim, "the process of inventing/creating our Selves and our works *is* re-membering the past." (350)

Re-membering Daly's Radical Feminism in Woman's Time

Reading Daly's feminism in the tradition of Matilda Joselyn Gage

In Josephine Donovan's study of the intellectual traditions of American feminism, the feminist theory of Matilda Joslyn Gage is remembered as part of the nineteenth-century feminist project of "cultural feminism," which grew up out of the anti-Enlightenment tradition of European Romanticism. (Donovan, 1992) In contrast, Daly re-members Matilda Joslyn Gage as "a major radical feminist theoretician and historian whose written work is indispensable for an understanding of the women's movement today." (Gage, 1980, vii) In her forward to the Persephone Press edition of Gage's *Woman, Church and State*, Daly makes the following case,

> Gage is one of the great foresisters of contemporary feminists. In her writing she transcends the boundaries of time and becomes our contemporary. The qualities which make this possible are the depth of her daring and the a-mazing scope of her analysis. She made the connections which others feared to make. She prophesied, and she named the enemy. Consequently, of course, her stature has never been acknowledged. (ibid.)

In this section I proceed under the assumption that an understanding of what Daly finds radical about Gage's work is indispensable for understanding what is radical about Daly's feminism in *Gyn/Ecology*.

On Daly's view, one of the radical aspects of Gage's work is evident in the "a-mazing" scope of her analysis. In Daly's lexicon, "a-mazing" is a process of breaking through or decoding patriarchal "mazes" of thinking, speaking and acting. An "a-mazing" analysis is one which "brings together apparently disparate phenomena, unveiling an astonishingly coherent pattern." (Daly, vii-viii) Gage's book brings studies of matriarchal societies, female sexual slavery, witchcraft, and marriage, together with critiques of civil and ecclesiastical law in order to reveal the systematic nature and the consequences of patriarchal oppression. Her analysis unveils a pattern which suggests, in her words,

> The most stupendous system of organized robbery known has been that of the church towards women, a robbery that has not only taken her self-respect but all rights of person; the fruits of her own industry; her opportunities of education; the exercise of her own judgment, her own conscience, her own will. (Gage, 238)

It is interesting to note, contra Donovan's categorization of Gage as a romantic, the central value in Gage's theory of independent thought. Because she understands the relationship between independent thought and agency, she dedicates the book to "all Christian women and men, of whatever creed or name who, bound by Church or State, have not dared to Think for Themselves." (2)

It is not difficult to see how Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* developed in the tradition of Gage's a-mazing analytic method. In this text Daly brings studies of Indian

Sati, Chinese footbinding, African genital mutilation, European witchburings and American gynecology together with critiques of scholarship and christian myth in order to "expose the atrocities perpetrated against women under patriarchy on a planetary scale and to show the profound connections among these Goddess-murdering atrocities." (Daly, xxv) Her analysis connects these seemingly disparate atrocities in order to reveal a pattern she calls the "Sado-Ritual Syndrome." This syndrome is a set of seven interconnected components of patriarchal practices, or "sado-rituals," around the world. Among the interconnected components of the sado-rituals Daly studies are, for example, (I) obsession with purity, (II) erasure of male responsibility, (IV) use of women as scapegoats and token torturers, and (VI) normalization of otherwise unacceptable behavior. The pattern Daly reveals suggests that sado-rituals

> recreate and reinforce the primordial patriarchal mythic event --the murder/dismemberment of the Goddess within women and all be-ing; rituals devised to accomplish and legitimate the dis-spiriting and devastation of the Wild; rituals designed to destroy the integrity of Life and creative divine powers in women. (Daly 1987, 94)

Throughout *Gyn/Ecology* Daly develops this thesis that sado-rituals are intended to effect a condition of "mind/spirit/body pollution" which breaks down and destroys women's capacity for independent thought and judgment. One of the radical effects of the practice of a-mazing is transformation of the a-mazer, who becomes more and more capable of independent thought and action. Hence, Daly opens the book with the claim that "this book is about the journey of women becoming, that is, radical feminism." (Daly, 1) Through making sense of the

world from the a-mazer's life experience a radically new way of looking at and being in the world becomes possible. What connects the work of Gage and Daly, and makes their work radical, is a method of thinking about the diverse experiences of women under patriarchy which is transformative. Radically, the practice of a-mazing transforms and empowers the a-mazers, contributing to the creation of a context within which new possibilities emerge, enhancing agency.[3] (Daly, 2) As Bonnie Mann points out in the "Appendix to the New Introduction" to *Gyn/Ecology*, "a cultivated practice of making connections" enables a woman to "weave a new context in which to understand her life and live it." (Mann in Daly, xxxvii, xxxv)

The other "radical" dimension of Gage's feminism is "the depth of her daring." In her analysis, Daly points out Gage "made the connections others feared to make." A good illustration of an a-mazing analysis which is also deeply daring is Gage's chapter, "Witchcraft." In this chapter Gage draws from a variety of sources including Michelet's *La Sorciere*, scientific and psychic literature of the late 19th century, church documents including the *Bible* and *The Malleus Maleficarum*, as well as juridical documents in an effort to re-member a coherent and compelling account of "witchcraft." Gage's project in this chapter is to a-maze (again, to decode, reveal what is beneath) the commonly held view of a witch. On the common view, a "witch" was,

> a woman who had deliberately sold herself to the evil one; who delighted in injuring others, and who, for the purpose of enhancing the enormity of

---

[3] "Our game is pattern perception." (Marilyn Frye) "A paradigm for the turning of women to women may be articulated by a reflective description of one mode of female existence: sinuosity. Sinuosity is a pattern of connectedness that constitutes women's experiences of being in the world." (Jeffner Allen)

> her evil acts, choose the Sabbath day for the performance of her most impious rites ..." (94)

Among the connections which others feared to make are, first, the connection between the fact that it was women who were accused of witchcraft and the christian doctrine of Original Sin. Prior to christianity, she claims, witches might have been women or men, "but as soon as a system of religion was adopted which taught the greater sinfulness of women [...] the persecution for witchcraft became chiefly directed against women." (97) Second, she connects the accusation that witches sold themselves to the devil and delighted in harming others with dominant economic and political interests. The persecution of witches, she points out, proved a great source of emolument to the church, which grew enormously rich by its confiscation to its own use of all property of the condemned."[4] (98) In addition, she reports on a multitude of other ways in which the state and malicious individuals grew fat on the burning of witches. And third, she connects the knowledge and practices of many of the accused with the church's interest in maintaining its unqualified authority. Gage supports her claim that "the so-called 'witch' was among the most profoundly scientific persons of the age," with evidence that many of the accused were practicing healers, midwives, physicians, and chemists. The idea that the church

---

[4] In addition, forfeitures of the property and wealth of all who were related to the accused were common. It is interesting to reflect on the connection between this practice and the recent supreme court decision on forfeitures in which the Justices ruled against a woman who was the co-owner of a car which was confiscated by the state in conjunction with the arrest of the woman's husband, the other owner, who had engaged in illegal activiteis with a prostitute in the car. The Supreme Court suggested that it is a good reminder that everything which is just is not always desirable. National Public Radio, March 4, 1996.

perceived this knowledge, in women's hands, as a serious threat is seen, claims Gage, in the fourteenth century decree that "any woman who healed others without having duly studied, was a witch and should suffer death." (Gage, 104) So what is "daring" about this a-mazing analysis? There are two dimensions to her daring, epistemological and political. First, she dares to break with patriarchal traditions of thought, looking instead at these disparate phenomena with "fresh eyes" giving shape to a gynocentric perspective. And second, she takes a stand, on the basis of what she uncovers, against church and the state which have robbed women of our "Self-centering" capacities. In her own words, Gage is committed to the bold idea that "woman herself must judge of woman." (Gage, 238) In Daly's terms, this is the Courage to identify with the Other.

Gage is probably the single most important source in Daly's chapter on the European witchburnings. Among the scholars of the witchcraze who Daly surveys in this chapter, only Gage's exemplifies a "Hag-identified vision." [5] (Daly, 216) In this chapter, Daly develops Gage's claim that many women were persecuted as witches because of the threat they presented to the church in her thesis: the witchcraze was a "primal battle" between "an aspiring 'intellectual' elite of professional men" and "a spiritual/moral/know-ing elite cross-section of the female population of Europe," which "was at heart concerned with the process of know-ing." (194) Daly suggests, Gage "names the game correctly": because the church feared and hated women's knowledge and power it tried to

5 According to Donovan, Gage is "the first to see the witches as bearers of alternative feminine traditions, which established them as community powers feared by the church," p. 41.

erase their healing power "not only by killing them, but by denying that they healed *of their own power*," attributing their power to a pact with the "devil."[6] (217-8) Hence, following Gage's a-mazing insight about the knowledge and "scientific" practices of those accused of witchcraft Daly argues, the witchcraze "masked a secret gynocidal fraternity, whose prime targets were women living outside the control of the patriarchal family, women who presented an option -- an option of "eccentricity" and of "indigestibility." (186) This is not to say on either Gage's or Daly's view, however, that the only women persecuted were eccentric or scientifically minded. On the contrary, the threat of being accused of being a witch functioned to keep all women inside the control of the patriarchal family. Hence, Daly pulls a genealogical thread from "witchcraft" through woman-identified time/space to radical feminism.[7] (186) This a-mazing analysis exemplifies the "daring" that makes Daly's work radical. What Daly found daring about Gage's *Woman, Church and State* was her will to think critically about women's history and experience from the perspective of a "new woman-identified time/space."

Not only does Daly devote a chapter to the European witchburnings, witches are *everywhere* in *Gyn/Ecology*. They are in the "acknowledgments" for *Gyn/Ecology*, right after Matilda Joslyn Gage and Virginia Woolf, and right before

---

6 A difference between the patterns Gage and Daly a-maze: Gage finds the mythic script of the sado-ritual in the doctrine of Orignal Sin, whereas Daly locates it in the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ.

7 It is interesting to note that Daly is not alone in making this connection. Witness the American Civil Liberties Union case in defense of "a library aide in Montana who was fired for helping students with an approved project because parents believed the books she loaned them 'reflected feminism and satanism.'" ACLU letter recieved March 1996.

the last to be thanked, "her Self." (Daly, lii) They are among the central symbolic figures in the text. Witches (among other Hags and Crones), together with Amazons and Goddesses constitute most of the population of *Gyn/Ecology*'s symbolic Background. The life activities of witches provide metaphorical resources throughout the book. "Spooking," "Sparking," and "Spinning," the titles of the last three chapters which constitute the Third Passage of the book, were among the daily practices of "witches" during the middle ages. Daly explains in her preface that the "[entire book] is an invitation to the Wild Witch in all women who long to spin." It is an *invitation* to those Selves within each of us who can identify, through re-membering and inventing, with the myth and symbol of the women who were called witches. Deeply Daring, indeed.

Reading Daly's feminism in the tradition of Virginia Woolf

Virginia Woolf was probably the single most important influence on Daly's thought in *Gyn/Ecology*. Woolf, 1882 - 1941, was the radical feminist who lived between Matilda Joslyn Gage and Mary Daly. Interestingly, Woolf was eleven years old when *Women, Church and State* was published in the United States; Daly was ten years old when *Three Guineas* was published in England. It is notable that the index of *Gyn/Ecology* contains fifteen reference to Virginia Woolf, three time as many as for Simone de Beauvoir, who is considered by many to be the most important feminist philosopher of the twentieth century. More significant, Daly repeatedly identifies Woolf along with Gage as her

Foresisters in feminist time/space.[8] Plainly evident in *Gyn/Ecology* are the roots of Daly's thought in *Three Guineas* (1938), *A Room of One's Own* (1929) and *Moments of Being* (1976). In this section I will outline Woolf's philosophy and feminism in order to reveal how Daly's radical feminism in *Gyn/Ecology* is rooted in Woolf's a-mazing gynocentric method and her revolutionary feminist strategy.

Consider the context within which Woolf wrote *Three Guineas*. Mid-thirties, England. Throughout the book Woolf provides insight into this time/space by drawing from daily news examples which inform and support her arguments. For example, in support of her claim that men and women share the same sensations, specifically "horror and disgust," when faced with the "barbarity" of war, she offers the following "crude statement of fact addressed to the eye."

> Here then on the table before us are photographs. The Spanish Government sends them with patient pertinacity about twice a week.* They are not pleasant photographs to look upon. They are photographs of dead bodies for the most part. This morning's collection contains the photograph of what might be a man's body, or a woman's; it is so mutilated that it might, on the other hand, be the body of a pig. But those certainly are dead children, and that undoubtedly is the section of a house. A bomb has torn open the side; there is still a bird cage hanging in what was presumably the sitting room, but the rest of the house looks like nothing so much as a bunch of spillikins suspended in mid air.
>
> * Written in the winter of 1936-7. (21)

Clearly this was a time/space of war and holocaust. It was also the end of Victorianism and European Empires, the dawn of psychoanalysis. And it was a time -- 20 years after women secured the right to vote and "mysteriously" along

---

[8] Recall that, with the exception of women burned as witches, they are the only Foresisters to be thanked in the acknowledgements of *Gyn/Ecology*.

with it "the right to earn one's living" -- when the daughters of educated men, such as Woolf, were beginning to ask themselves questions which had only come to make sense through their own struggles and those of their foresisters. As Woolf describes this moment, the educated man's daughter "issues from the shadow of the private house, and stands on the bridge which lies between the old world and the new, and asks, as she twirls the sacred coin in her hand, 'what shall I do with it? What do I see with it?'" (30)

In order to get a sense of the place Woolf was writing from and the philosophical views which she developed out of reflection on her life experience consider her autobiographical essay, "A Sketch of the Past." (Woolf, 1976) In this essay she explicitly names as her "philosophy" the idea that "behind the cotton wool is hidden a pattern; that we -- I mean all human beings -- are connected with this; that the whole world is a work of art; that we are parts of the work of art." (72) "Cotton wool," she tells us, is her term for "non-being," that level of existence constituted by the moments "one does not remember," moments "not lived consciously." For example,

> One walks, eats, sees things, deals with what has to be done; the broken vacuum cleaner; ordering dinner; writing orders to Mabel; washing; cooking dinner; bookbinding. (70)

In contrast, Woolf describes "moments of being" as engaged, satisfying, highly conscious experiences which are "embedded" in the "nondescript cotton wool." For example, she offers the activities of her previous day, including enjoying her writing, walking along the river, noticing the country very closely, reading Chaucer with pleasure, and starting a book of memoirs that interested her.

Taken together, Woolf is saying, there is a pattern to these moments in one's life which constitute what she calls the "scaffolding in the background;" that is, the "conceptions" one lives one's life in relation to; and, the "intuition" of what one should be doing which is "far more necessary than anything else." (73)

Since these moments are embedded so deeply in the cotton wool, Woolf suggests, it is difficult to remember "things that must have been, one would have thought, more memorable." (70) The significant moments she can remember vividly have often come with a "sudden violent shock." She gives several instances from her youth. One was a fight on the lawn with her brother Thoby, which as she put it, involved "pommelling each other with our fists." When she raised her fist to hit him she was struck with the question, "why hurt another person?" followed by a blow of "hopeless sadness." (71) In another instance, she experienced a shock at the discovery of the interconnectedness of flower and earth when looking upon a flower in the bed by the door and said to herself, "That is the whole." Analyzing these instances, she identifies a difference: the former ended in a dis-empowering state of despair due to her inability "to deal with the pain of discovering that people hurt each other," while the latter ended in an empowering state of satisfaction due to her intuitive grasp of a discovery which seemed "likely to be very useful to [her] later." As a writer, she explains, she has developed a capacity to receive these shocks, which from the perspective of a child, seemed like "a blow from an enemy hidden behind the cotton wool of daily life." In her words, she now receives these shocks as,

> a revelation of some order; it is a token of some real thing behind appearances; and I make it real by putting it into words. It is only by

> putting it into words that I make it whole; this wholeness means that it has lost its power to hurt me; it gives me, perhaps because by doing so I take away the pain, a great delight to put the severed parts together. Perhaps this is the strongest pleasure known to me. (72)

It is through this "shock-receiving capacity" Woolf explains that she has reached her philosophy about the foreground and background dimensions of experience.

In contrast with "the scaffolding in the background" Woolf describes the "foreground" as a life populated with people who "were very much like the characters in [a novel by Charles] Dickens." (73) To return to Woolf's idea that the world is a work of art, one might think of the "scaffolding in the background" of our lives as one thinks about the formal elements of a work of fiction, including narrative structure, voice, character development, plot and so on, in contrast with the "foreground," which might be thought of as its representational content. Her analogy should not be confused with the view of God as a master artist and the world as his canvas. Woolf is explicit on this point,

> Hamlet or Beethoven is the truth about this vast mass that we call the world. But there is no Shakespeare, there is no Beethoven; certainly and emphatically there is no God; we are the words; we are the music; we are the thing itself. And I see this when I have a shock. (72)

Moments of being, on this view, are windows to the multidimensional cosmos, access to the matrix of the whole. They are the insights which A-mazing makes possible.

In the midst of writing *Gyn/Ecology*, the publication of this riveting sketch must have appeared to Daly as time capsule from a radical feminist past! In this essay Woolf illustrates her practice of "putting the severed parts together" by a-

mazing her Self,[9] offering a view of her life from the perspective of her philosophy, a view she notes, which "is left out in almost all biographies and autobiographies, even of artists." (73) After laying out this philosophy she offers a series of "scenes" through which she reconstructs her past. The fact that these scenes have stayed with her, she suggests, is an indication that they are clues to a bigger picture. In her words, they confirm her sense that "we are sealed vessels afloat in what it is convenient to call reality; at some moments, the sealing matter cracks; in floods reality; that is, these scenes." (122) The first scenes she reconstructs revolve around her mother, Julia Jackson. Now it becomes more obvious why Woolf is concerned with the question of why we forget the seemingly more memorable things in life. Julia Jackson -- mother to seven children and wife to a Victorian man who was "fifteen years her elder, difficult, exacting, [and] dependent on her" -- died at the age of forty-three without leaving a particular impression of herself on Woolf's mind, and "without leaving a book, or a picture, or any piece of work" through which Woolf might get such an impression. (83, 85) In an effort to grasp her mother in some concrete sense Woolf searches for clues from the facts and relationships of her life. Julia's only education was received in the home, where she was taught "to take such part as girls did then in the lives of distinguished men; to pour tea; to hand them their strawberries and cream; to listen devoutly, reverently to their wisdom." (88) Since Julia died when Virginia was a child of thirteen, Virginia reports she

---

[9] Following Daly's practice, I have capitalized "Self" in order to indicate that Woolf is a-mazing a Background Self, rather than a foreground self, in this essay.

can only remember a mother who seemed "typical, universal, yet our own in particular" (82), but cannot remember her as an individual. (83) In her search for a particular impression of this woman in her memory, Woolf is straining to find her behind in the cotton wool. Julia Jackson was, according to her daughter,

> Very quick; very definite; very upright; and *behind the active*, the sad, the silent. And of course she was central. I suspect the word "central" gets closest to the general feeling I had of living so completely in her atmosphere that one never got far enough away from her to see her as a person. (83, my emphasis)

Woolf remembers her embedded in the crowded foreground as the "generalized; dispersed; omnipresent;" as the keeper of "the panoply of life" in the private world of their home; as the "creator of that crowded merry world which spun so gaily in the centre of [her] childhood." (84) Without some concrete artifact -- a book, a picture, some evidence of work -- the only trace of her background is in Woolf's memory, "but there is nothing to check that memory by; nothing to bring it to ground with." (85) Julia Jackson, the person, is "the sad, the silent" in Woolf's memory.

Next Woolf turns to her memories of her sister, Stella Duckworth. Stella, who took on her mother's duties in the years following her death, was the one who "lifted the canopy again" letting a little light creep back into their house. Woolf knows nothing of her sister's youth, since she was born when Stella was in her teens. What she can recall revolves around Stella's suitors and her engagement to Jack Hills, who she eventually married. Upon their return from a honeymoon in Italy, Stella took ill, and died pregnant in 1897, of a "mismanaged" case of appendicitis. Following completely in her mother's footsteps all the way

to an early grave, Stella left nothing to remember her life by. Significantly, Woolf notes in the midst of her memoir, "How many people are there still able to think about Stella on 20th June 1939? Very few." (95) This pattern of sad and silent, which emerges from Woolf's efforts to connect her memories, sheds light on the world Virginia was born into. It was a world circumscribed by the private house and Victorian conceptions of womanhood. The only tradition handed down to her by the women of her family was a ruling-class tradition of marriage and motherhood. The fact that neither Julia nor Stella left behind any work through which Virginia might glimpse the scaffolding of their backgrounds provides a clue about the struggle Woolf would face in the project of creating her Self: it would be a struggle which called for a method or practice of pattern identification and creativity capable of reconstructing a past through which she might discover and invent her present and future Self.

A different story emerges from Woolf's memories of her brothers and her father. The first thing she says about her brother Thoby, who was almost two years older than her, is that he "dominated" his four younger siblings. This role, on Woolf's view, followed from his birthright. His education, the finest money could buy, offered him Shakespeare, a symbolic figure which gave him a "measure of his daily world" and his bearings for a journey into a world beyond the private house. As Woolf remembers, Thoby the schoolboy had the look

> of one equipped, unperturbed, knowing his place, relishing his inheritance and his part in life, aware of his competence, scenting the battle; already in anticipation, a law maker; proud of being a man and playing his part among Shakespeare's men. (119)

He, "aloof, judicial, conventional" and she, "sequestered," shared "no confidences; no compliments; no kisses; no emotional scenes." (120) While she spent long days at home with her sister Vanessa, he "passed from childhood to boyhood and from boyhood to manhood under [their] eyes." (ibid.) Had he not died an untimely death at twenty-six, Woolf speculates about the future he might have had. He would have been,

> privately a lover, a husband, a father; and publicly a Judge for sure: Mr. Justice Stephen he would have been today; with several books to his credit, I suppose: some on law; one or two on birds; [...] some essays on literature; and history; public matters; some attacks on abuses; and by this time he would have been a figure much liked, a typical Englishman? (120)

This is not an unlikely speculation based on Woolf's observations. Every day, she reports, she and her sister, Vanessa witnessed their male relatives coming from and going to their respective worlds beyond the private house. (123) In the end, she observed, they all learned to play the game. They earned the grades, the honors and degrees with very little effort because it was expected of them. Each one was "stamped and moulded by the patriarchal machinery." (132) Each one was "shot into that machine and came out the other end, at the age of sixty of so, a Headmaster, an Admiral, a Cabinet Minister, a Judge." (ibid.)

Woolf's eldest step-brother, George Duckworth, on her view, was a paradigm of Victorian manhood. Unsuccessful in his efforts to gain admittance to the machine, he mastered the game of Victorian high society, from which "he emerged at age sixty with a knighthood, with an aristocratic wife, with a sinecure, a country house and three sons." (132) In her youth George took over what

would have been their mother's role, bringing the family out in society. This meant attending parties which evoked in Woolf a "dazed, elated, frozen feeling," the effect, she explains, of the "paralysis" and "unreality" she experienced in the limelight of the parties. (133) At one such party George criticized the dress she had worn. She remembers,

> He was thirty-six when I was twenty. He had a thousand pounds a year and I had fifty. Those were reasons that made it difficult to defy George that night. But there was another element in our relationship which affected me as I stood there that winter's night exposed to his criticism in my green dress. I was not wholly conscious of it then. But besides feeling his age and his power, I felt too another feeling which I later called the outsider's feeling. When exposed to George's scowling, I felt as a tramp or a gypsy must feel who stands at the flap of a tent and sees the circus going on inside. (131-2)

Interestingly, in this encounter, Virginia identifies not only the structural features of her situation which made it difficult for her to defy her brother, but also the seeds of her adult radical feminist Self, the founder of the "Outsider's Society."

Woolf's father, Leslie Stephen, was a "failed" philosopher and writer, who she describes as "the most imminent obstacle and burden" in her and her sister Vanessa's attempts to make a world for themselves "inside the big world." Among the scenes she reconstructs in remembering him was his Wednesday afternoon breast-beating tirades over the accounting books. The direct brunt of these "brutal" rages was felt by Vanessa, who he -- in typical Victorian fashion -- expected to play her assigned role, "part slave, part angel of sympathy." When she would not play, Woolf reports, his exacerbation led him to "barbarous violence." (125) Woolf attributed his brutality to his consciousness of his professional failure as well as "the crippling effect of Cambridge; and its one-

sided education." (125-6) This, then, was the private face of Victorian manhood, the side only women saw because confessing a need of sympathy would have meant for a man of his stature, utter shame. From the perspective of the men of his class, women were their dependents; that the reverse was often the case was unspeakable. And her economic dependence on him made it impractical, if not impossible, for her to speak this truth to anyone outside the house and be heard. (ibid.)

By putting together the disparate memories of her family members a sketch of Woolf emerges. With no tradition or symbolic figures to help her get her bearings and make a life, she forged an identity for her Self through her resistance to the patriarchal world that threatened to crush her. She locates the roots of this identity in her "conspiracy" with Vanessa. From the world they made for themselves, the two began to look at "the big world" through outsider's eyes. At the end of her life, remembering her Self then, she names that Self and her sister "explorers, revolutionists, reformers." (126)

With this context in mind, consider *Three Guineas.* This book is addressed to a gentleman who, according to Woolf's sketch, is a greying, balding, middle-aged lawyer who, despite appearances, has not "sunk into the contented apathy," but rather who solicits Woolf's aid "with the sound of guns in [his] ears." (8-9) His solicitation (for a signature, membership in his society, and funds) presents itself to her as a request for her opinion on how to prevent war. This is the larger question which directs the development of her thinking about how she and the women of her class might have a radical influence in the world.

The fact of this man's question is of great historic significance. His letter is, in Woolf's words, "unique in the history of human correspondence, since when before has an educated man asked a woman how in her opinion war can be prevented?" (8) More significant than the question, however, is the possibility that she and the other daughters of educated men, may for the first time have some influence with their response.

Woolf explores the revolutionary potential of this new influence in some depth. Up until twenty years ago (1919) she argues the only influence women of her class might have exercised on the men of their class amounted to a form of "prostitution." The systematic exclusion of women from participation in the Army and Navy, the Stock Exchange, the Press (insofar as "the decision what to print, what not to print -- is entirely in the hands of your sex") the Civil Service, the Bar, and the Church meant that whatever influence women might have, they did not have the means of force, negotiation, money, law and God at their disposal. (23) Women of the educated class had only the "indirect influence," described by Sir Ernest Wild, secured by the fact that "every man who had a woman to care about him liked to shine in her eyes." (28)[10] If this is the real nature of women's influence, Woolf proclaims, "many of us would prefer to call ourselves prostitutes simply and to take our stand openly under the lamps of Piccadilly Circus rather than use it." (29) But with the right to earn a living, Woolf suggests, women no

---

10 Woolf argues that winning the vote accomplished little since it only kept women "trudging in processions." (27) It did not amount to a qualitative change in women's influence because practically, influence is "only fully effective when combined with rank, wealth and great houses." (28)

longer needed to use the influence described by Sir Ernest Wild. (31) Now, for the first time,

> The word "influence" then has changed. The educated man's daughter has now at her disposal an influence which is different from any influence that she has possessed before. It is not the influence which the great lady, the Siren, possesses; nor is it the influence which the educated man's daughter possessed when she had no vote; nor is it the influence which she possessed when she had a vote but was debarred from the right to earn a living. It differs, because it is an influence from which the money element had been removed. She need no longer use her charm to procure money from her father or brother. Since it is beyond the power of her family to punish her financially she can express her own opinions. (32)

This new "weapon" is the "sacred coin" which the educated man's daughter stands on the bridge twirling and pondering. It is not a powerful weapon since twenty years is not a long time, "nor is a sixpenny bit a very important coin." (30) Nevertheless, the distance between compulsory acquiescence and the unfettered expression of opinion is considerable. On Woolf's view, economic independence from men is *the* condition enabling women to think for themselves, and express their point(s) of view. Freedom from prostituting their minds is won with "the weapon of independent opinion based upon independent income." (73)

The radical potential of this weapon becomes apparent from consideration of Woolf's theory of sexual difference. While Woolf is not an essentialist, she insists, there is a difference between the sons and daughters of educated men which makes a difference. This difference arises first as a "difficulty of communication" which must be acknowledged in conjunction with her response to the question of preventing war. It is not a class difference since she and the

letter writer both earn their own livings and come from "the educated class," and therefore, "speak with the same accent, use knives and forks in the same way; expect maids to cook dinner and wash up after dinner; and talk during dinner without much difficulty about politics and people; war and peace; barbarism and civilization." (9) It is a sexual difference apparent in the fact that "when we look at the same things, we see them differently." (11) For example, women and men see education differently. Woolf makes this point by comparing the what she and the letter writer see when they look at "that congregation of buildings there, with a semi-monastic look, with chapels and halls and green playing-fields." He and his brothers see their old school, Oxford or Cambridge, "the source of memories and of traditions innumerable." (11) She and her sisters see the education they were denied, but expected to make sacrifice for; they see "petticoats with holes in them, cold legs of mutton, and the boat train starting for abroad while the guard slams the door in their faces." (12)

Another difficulty arises, again the result of looking at the same things differently, which bears more directly on her response to the question of how women might help with preventing war. Although, she asserts, "many instincts are held in common by both sexes, to fight has always been the man's habit, not the woman's." (13) The fact that "scarcely a human being in the course of history has fallen to a woman's rifle" makes it plain that women and men see war differently. Here she comes the closest to asserting an essentialist position, but stops short at an agnostic position, qualifying her statement about "instinct" with "whether innate or accidental." (ibid.) When women look at war they are led,

Woolf claims, to the question, "Why fight?" Like Virginia on the lawn in her tussle with Thoby, women see the pointlessness of hurting of other people. When, on the other hand, men look at war, Woolf claims on the basis of evidence in their biographies, they see "a profession; a source of happiness and excitement; and [...] an outlet for manly qualities." (15-16) They also see war as a an expression of "patriotism" which means, according to the Lord Chief Justice of England,

> "Englishmen are proud of England. For those who have been trained in English schools and universities, and who have done the work of their lives in England, there are few loves stronger than the love we have for our country. When we consider other nations, when we judge the merits of the policy of this country or of that, it is the standard of our own country that we apply. ... Liberty has made her abode in England. England is the home of democratic institutions. ... It is true that in our midst there are many enemies of liberty -- some of them, perhaps, in rather unexpected quarters. But we are standing firm. It has been said that an Englishman's Home is his Castle. The home of Liberty is in England. And it is a castle indeed -- a castle that we will defend to the last." (Quoted in Woolf, 17)

The distance between what women see when they look at war ("why fight?") and what men see when they look at the same ("we will defend [our castle] to the last") illustrates well Woolf's point that the daughters and sons of educated men see the same things quite differently. She marks this difference in "point of view" throughout the book with the metaphor of the bridge between the old world of the private house and the newly opened public worlds. What the daughters can see from the perspective of the bridge is radically different than what is visible to their brothers and fathers from the(ir) Castle.

What, on Woolf's view, explains the fact that women and men view the world, and think about it, differently? As I noted at the start, this difference is not

a matter of *feeling* differently when looking at the photographs of dead bodies and ruined houses, rather it is a matter of how those feelings are experienced or interpreted. In order to "prove this" Woolf asserts,

> we need not have recourse to the dangerous and uncertain theories of psychologists and biologists; we can appeal to facts. Take the fact of education. Your class has been educated at public schools and universities for five or six hundred years, ours for sixty. Take the fact of property. Your class possesses in its own right and not through marriage practically all the capital, all the land, all the valuables, and all the patronage in England. Our class possesses in its own right and not through marriage practically none of the capital, none of the land, none of the valuables, and none of the patronage in England. That such differences make for very considerable differences in mind and body, no psychologist or biologist would deny. (33)

This difference in outlook, then, is the combined effect, on "body, brain and spirit" of different historically constituted life experiences. The daughters of educated men have not had "paid-for" educations in English schools and universities. Rather they have had what Woolf names "unpaid-for" educations. As a result, they have not had Shakespeare's scripts to get their bearings and chart their courses in life. The only scripts they have had are those provided by the Church which have led them only into to the service of men and children. They have not done the work of their lives in the House of Liberty. Rather they have done the work of their lives in the private house. They have no tradition of participating in judgments concerning the policies of other nations. Nor have they participated in England's "democratic" institutions. In fact, on the grounds enumerated by the Lord Chief Justice women have no life experience at all which would qualify them as English citizens. This difference in point of view boils down to the effects of having almost no investment in "civilization." Why

fight? Indeed. If the daughters of educated men can help prevent war at all, Woolf argues, it will only be through the influence they can exert through the free expression of the perspective they have developed in virtue of this sexual difference.

At this point she commences an a-mazing analysis of patriarchy. "Let us," she says, "by way of a very elementary beginning lay before you a photograph [...] of your world as it appears to us who see it from the threshold of the private house; through the shadow of the veil that St. Paul still lays upon our eyes; from the bridge which connects the private house with the world of public life." (34) From the bridge she reports on a "queer" and "enormously impressive" world constituted by "the processions of educated men." She observes them, as they have been for hundreds of years, "mounting those steps, passing in and out of those doors, ascending those pulpits, preaching, teaching, administering justice, practicing medicine, transacting business, making money." (111) From the bridge, she moves in to "survey the scene in greater detail," and reports that in the midst of the disparate phenomena she identifies a common thread in the clothes worn by educated men in their public capacities. She describes in elaborate detail the "extremely ornate" and "dazzling splendour" of their public attire, and notes the "comparative simplicity" of their dress at home. (35-6) She observes, "every button, rosette and stripe seems to have some symbolic meaning." (36) In contrast, she points out, among the functions of women's clothing is not this effort "to advertise the social, professional, or intellectual standing of the wearer." (38) She finds, in the midst of her a-mazing

investigation, a connection between the dead bodies and ruined houses and the "sartorial splendours" of educated men:

> Obviously the connection between dress and war is not far to seek; your finest clothes are those that you wear as soldiers. (ibid.)

Military uniforms, she suggests, present such an impressive spectacle in order to advertise and promote the profession of war. This love of symbolic distinction is apparent across the professions. Among the men of the schools and universities she finds the will to mark their superiority over other people "by dressing differently, or by adding titles before, or letters after their names," which, she argues, rouses the very emotions -- competition and jealousy -- which encourage "a disposition towards war." (40, 43)

From these "surface" insights she returns to her station on the bridge to a-maze patriarchal education. Drawing facts from history and biography she makes the following case. All the men who have ruled England in 500 years have received a university education. Despite the immense wealth of the universities the poor as well as privileged women have been systematically denied an education therein. All the evidence, including the segregation, specialization and coercion of testing and degree-granting, suggest that the aim of this education is not learning for its own sake or to prevent war, but to instill and pass down the arts of domination, ruling, killing and acquiring capital. In her words, "all attempt to influence the young against war through education must be abandoned" because "education, the finest education in the world, does not teach people to hate force but to use it." (54)

Plunging even deeper in her a-mazing analysis of the Society of rocessions she moves on to another bridge where she addresses the rofessions. From here she proceeds into one of their good libraries to examine ıe books, particularly the biographies for any light they can shed on the lives of rofessional men. In the midst of all of the diversity she identifies a common ıread in the fact that most of the biographies she reads by professional men in ıe nineteenth century are largely concerned with war. (115) In her investigation ıe finds that,

> They were great fighters, it seems, the professional men in the age of Queen Victoria. There was the battle of Westiminster. There was the battle of the universities. There was the battle of Whitehall. There was the battle of Harley Street. There was the battle of the Royal Academy. Some of these battles, as you can testify, are still in progress. (115-6)

ıe notes that while the combatants in these battles "did not inflict flesh wounds" ey belonged to professions which "seemed to be as bloodthirsty as the rofession of arms itself." (116) The wounds they did inflict were "upon the ıman spirit which no surgery can heal." (ibid.) What is common to all these ıttles, claims Woolf, is the plan and the enemy. The enemy of professional en, according to the testimony of the biographies, was, in all cases, "their sters and daughters."[11] (117) The plan of the "authorities encamped within ıe sacred gates" was to keep women out in the name of God, Nature, Law and roperty. (119) All the reasons they gave for excluding women indicate, Woolf ıncludes, a pattern of repetition, rather than progress.

This point is developed by Daly in "The Radical Enemy of the Patriarchal World War," apter 9 of Gyn/Ecology, p.355-367.

> We can almost hear them if we listen singing the same old song, "Here we go round the mulberry tree, the mulberry tree, the mulberry tree," and if we add, "of property, of property, of property," we shall fill in the rhyme without doing violence to the facts." (120)

The fact that all of the processions of professional men are leading to the accumulation of capital and the possession of property is significant, in Woolf's view because it points to the effect on the practitioners: it makes them "possessive, jealous of any infringement of their rights, and highly combative if anyone dares dispute them." (121) Hence, Woolf makes the connection between the war against the daughters and sisters and what she later names "the money motive." It pays to kill the spirit in women.

Interestingly, Woolf argues, it also kills the spirit in men.[12] Using the same biographies, she points out that professional men are enslaved by the pursuit of money. Among the conditions for participation in the professions she names are: the sacrifice of time with family, performing "arduous" and "barbarous" duties, and wearing uniforms which profess your loyalties. *Each one will be stamped and moulded by the patriarchal machinery.* "If you succeed in your professions," she argues, "the words 'For God and Empire' will very likely be written, like the address on a dog collar, round your neck." (127) Not only do those who succeed in the professions pay with their ability to think for themselves, she argues, they also lose their senses.[13]

---

12 Daly argues this same point in *Gyn/Ecology*, only she adds the following distinction: "While men also receive false molds and follow-up fixes to reinforce their supernatural, that is unnatural, state in patriarchal society, the grace/serum injected is different. Fatherly fixes are essentially ego-inflating for men, whereas those administered to women are depressants." (54)

13 Compare with Daly's argument that monodimensional foreground existence "numbs" the senses making it difficult to find the "door to our depths."

> Sight goes. They have no time to look at pictures. Sound goes. They have no time to listen to music. Speech goes. They have no time for conversation. They lose their sense of proportion -- the relations between one thing and another. (131)

Each one ends up, in the end, she says, no more than "a cripple in a cave." (132)

In the process of her investigation of the battle to keep women out of the professions, she considers the discrepancy of income among male and female civil servants by examining quotations of men in the newspapers on the issue. She attributes the problem to an "atmosphere" which is alluded to in the quotations, taken from the newspapers, on the reasons for this discrepancy. And in the process of a-mazing this atmosphere, she comes across "an egg" which helps explain the connection between different forms of domination.

> There, in those quotations, is the egg of the very same worm that we know under other names in other countries. There we have in embryo the creature, Dictator as we call him when he is in Italian or German, who believes that he has the right whether given by God, Nature, sex or race is immaterial, to dictate to other human beings how they shall live; what they shall do. (96)

The voice which compels women to accept less in wages for their work or to stay home and leave the jobs for the men, she argues, bears an unmistakable family resemblance to those Fascist and Nazi voices the Englishmen profess to abhor. Making this connection leads Woolf to ask the author of one quotation, "what right have we, Sir, to trumpet our ideals of freedom and justice to other countries when we can shake out from our most respectable newspapers any day of the week eggs like these?" (98) It seems that Woolf has identified one of those "enemies of liberty," which the Lorde Chief Justice had admitted were among his

fellow Englishman, unexpectedly in the father's quarters of the Castle. What hatches from the egg, says Woolf, is the enemy of the "great principles of Justice and Equality and Liberty." (187)

To examine the nature of this "egg," and uncover the "roots" of the Society of Processions, Woolf turns to the project of a-mazing the Church. She says here that "some ancestral memory prophesying war" directs her to "lower the veil of St. Paul" between herself and the letter writer, that is "to take shelter behind an interpreter." (219) She finds her interpreter in the report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Ministry of Women, a published response to the request by the daughters of educated men in 1935 to have the profession of religion opened to them. This document provides, Woolf suggests, an opportunity to examine "that profession which, since it is the highest of all may be taken as the type of all, the profession of religion." (ibid.) Using this interpreter to help a-maze religion provides insight into "the soul or essence" of all the professions because unlike the others which can appeal to statutes and charters to justify the exclusion of women from the professions, the Church is compelled to provide "spiritual and not merely historical reasons for its actions." (226) What the report reveals is that there are no spiritual reasons for excluding women in the teachings of Jesus Christ. (221) So the Archbishops substituted the interpretation and ruling of St. Paul that women be debarred from teaching the gospel as a rationale for the exclusion. In addition, Woolf points out, in the absence of a spiritual justification the Church fathers sought a psychological justification from Christian philosopher who admitted there is no psychological or

rational evidence which suggests "man has a natural precedence of woman," however, he does find a practical justification for the exclusion in the strong feelings and hostility which are aroused by the suggestion of admitting women. The source of these "irrational" emotional responses he claims is in a "powerful and widespread subconscious motive" deriving from "ideas of woman as 'man manqué', to which he gives the name "infantile fixation."

The insight provided by this interpreter into all the professions, according to Woolf, is that among the "roots" of the efforts to exclude women from the professions is what the professor calls an "infantile fixation," and what Woolf says, "without a scientific education," she named "an egg." (231) Developing the professor's point, she asserts,

> "Strong feeling is aroused by any suggestion that women be admitted" -- it matters not to which priesthood; the priesthood of medicine or the priesthood of science or the priesthood of the Church. (231)

In addition to this "powerful and widespread subconscious motive" Woolf names two other motives that appear to have escaped the professor. The first is the "money motive": "To pay women more would be to pay men less." (231) And second is the "psychological motive": "To be able to set aside all worldly cares and studies and lay them upon another person." (232) This is the motive that led Virginia's father to bury Vanessa under his concerns about the weekly account books. This egg hatched in Victorian families as the will of the fathers of possess the energy and secure it with the loyalties of the daughters. The effect that the uninterrupted exercise of these motives has on the daughters and sisters is, of course, devastating. It amounts to little more than a living death as

s evident from the biographies of the sisters and daughters which Woolf draws
n for testimony. Hence, she concludes this a-mazing analysis of patriarchy,
Society it seems was a father, and afflicted with the infantile fixation." (245)

The implications of all of this for the daughters of educated men was a
iant dilemma which Woolf presents from the bridge.

> Behind us lies the patriarchal system; the private house, with its nullity, its immorality, its hypocrisy, its servility. Before us lies the public world, the professional system, with its possessiveness, its jealousy, its pugnacity, its greed. The one shuts us up live slaves in a harem; the other forces us to circle, like caterpillars head to tail, round and round the mulberry tree, the sacred tree, of property. It is a choice of evils. Each is bad. (135)

he choice of returning to the private house is bad because dependence on
ather amounts to possession by Father. In the home, Woolf argues, a woman
as "forced to use whatever influence she possessed to bolster up the system
hich provided her with maids; with carriages; with fine clothes; with fine
arties." (71) Choosing the private house involves coerced identification with the
ather. Hence, it seems that to escape his coercive grasp, she must get an
ducation to obtain the appointments she needs to earn her own living which is
ne condition of her new weapon. But the choice to follow in the processions of
ducated men is also bad because, Woolf points out, it means merging with the
lentities of the professional men and so losing that difference of perspective
hich is what distinguishes her new weapon from his old one. This seems to be
ne of those situations where "the strategies [the system] requires to survive it
om day to day are exactly the opposite of what is required to change it."

(MacKinnon, 1987, 16) It is a classic example of the "double bind" analyzed by Marilyn Frye in her "Oppression" essay. (Frye, 1983, 2)

After briefly considering a suicidal plunge from the bridge into the river, she sets out to pave a third way, bringing us face to face with the questions of strategy. Here Woolf begins to reveal the normative implications of her theory of sexual difference. First, it is important to note that the possibility of a third way is rooted in an anti-determinist position which, in some popular theoretical quarters at the moment, is unfashionable. Woolf operates on the assumption that,

> men and women, here and now, are able to exert their wills; they are not pawns and puppets dancing on a string held by invisible hands. They can act, and think for themselves. (13)

Even if men have become "cripples in a cave" and women are paralyzed with fear at the prospect of resistance, our independence qualifies us as agents capable of acting to change our situations. Hence, there is some hope that the daughters of educated men can answer the questions which confront them on the bridge, "do we wish to join that procession, or don't we? On what terms shall we join that procession?" (113) After establishing that the processions are leading directly and indirectly to the dead bodies and ruined houses it is clear that if the daughters join it must only be on the basis of grave reservations and firm anti-war and anti-patriarchal commitments, that is with the intention of breaking the circle and making off on a third, heretofore unexplored path.

The original impetus for Woolf's strategzing effort, you might recall, was the request of the liberal lawyer for, among other things, her help in preventing war by joining his anti-war society. In her response to his request she thinks

through what the relation of the daughters to their more progressive brothers ought to be. She insists they share the same goals, Liberty, Equality, Justice and Peace. However, Woolf hesitates at the prospect of joining them in any formal way. She locates the source of her hesitation in the "reasons and emotions" which have their "origin deep in the darkness of ancestral memory." (189) Joining a "society" is a very different thing than choosing an individual relationship, says Woolf, because "the very word 'society' sets tolling in memory the dismal bells of a harsh music: shall not, shall not, shall not." (190) This is another matter of seeing the same things differently. The daughters look on societies as "an ill-fitting form that distorts the truth; deforms the mind; fetters the will." (191) She elaborates on how being members of fraternal societies effects even the men who may deserve respect as individual allies in struggle. In her words, "societies" turn them into "monsters" who are,

> loud of voice, hard of fist, childishly intent upon scoring the floor of the earth with chalk marks, within whose mystic boundaries human beings are penned, rigidly, separately, artificially; where, daubed red and gold, decorated like a savage with feathers he goes through mystic rites and enjoys the dubious pleasures of power and dominion while we, "his" women, are locked in the private house without share in the many societies of which his society is composed. (191)

Women should not join because to do so would be to risk identification with this "monster," and lose the critical distance afforded by sexual difference. Hence, Woolf concludes, the daughters must work for the goals they share with their progressive brothers autonomously, by different means, from outside their societies. (192)

The outsiders must create a society of their own, to which she gives the now infamous name, the "Outsider's Society." (193) She is explicit on this point. The new society must "consist of educated men's daughters working in their own class -- how indeed can they work in any other?" (ibid.) In her first sketch of the "Outsider's Society" she provides a decidedly anarchist picture. It would have no honorary treasurer, for it needs no funds. "It would have no office, no committee, no secretary; it would call no meetings; it would hold no conferences." And, of course, it would have no oaths, nor ceremonies, nor pageantry. The Outsider's would make their first duty to live by the lessons of their own traditions.

The traditions upon which the Outsider's Society would be founded are the "unpaid-for" education and professions which are the legacy of the daughters of educated men. In order to reconstruct a collective memory of this legacy Woolf draws from the biographies of Florence Nightingale, Ann Clough, Emily Brontë, Christina Rossetti and Mary Kingsley among others. From these disparate sources she makes the connections among their lives and thoughts which constitute what she names "that ancestral memory which lies behind the present moment." (149) Of course, she acknowledges, "that this education and these professions were in many ways bad in the extreme, both for the unpaid themselves and for their descendants." (143) However, it must also be acknowledged, she argues, that "biography is many-sided" and that as a guide to these traditions they admit of "great virtues as well as great defects." (144) Hence, she suggests,

> We cannot, when we consider the lives of our uneducated mothers and grandmothers, judge education simply by its power to "obtain appointments," to win honour, to make money. We must if we are honest, admit that some who had no paid-for education, no salaries and no appointments were civilized human beings -- whether or not they can rightly be called "English" women is matter for dispute; and thus admit that we would be extremely foolish if we threw away the results of that education or gave up knowledge that we have obtained from it for any bribe or decoration whatsoever. (ibid.)

According to Woolf, this tradition offers "four great teachers" which she names, "poverty, chastity, derision, and freedom from unreal loyalties." (145) What is more important than their names is the unconventional interpretations which Woolf gives them. Accordingly, poverty teaches that one must earn enough money to maintain one's independence, but not a penny more. (ibid.) Chastity teaches one must to refuse to sell her brain for money. (146) Derision teaches to "refuse all methods of advertising merit, and that ridicule, obscurity and censure are preferable, for psychological reasons, to fame and praise." Finally, freedom from unreal loyalties teaches one *not* to identify with others on the basis of nation, religion, college, family, sex, and others that spring from them. (ibid.) Together the lesson of these teachers is "do all in your power to break the ring, the vicious circle, the dance round and round the mulberry tree." (179) Living by these lessons, Woolf promises, means one "can join the professions and yet remain uncontaminated by them;" be rid of "their possessiveness, their jealousy, their pugnacity, their greed;" and use them to exercise a mind and will of one's own. (151)

The strategy of forming an autonomous society made up of the daughters of educated men is, on Woolf's view, both "critical" and "creative." It is critical

insofar as it calls on the daughters to think for themselves, from the point of view of their difference, about the forces which contribute to war, including traditional education and professionalism, to name them and to resist them. The attitude which Woolf argues this critique calls for is one of "indifference." (194) Outsiders must neither "incite" nor attempt to "dissuade" their brothers from fighting. This attitude is based on the facts of her situation and "the special knowledge" of what makes the educated man tick. Her situation as an outsider provides her with no rational grounds for supporting war, even in the name of her country, because she announces,

> "in fact, as a woman, I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the whole world." (197)

The "special knowledge" Woolf refers to is the insight about her brother: being in the limelight of the war machine, in the name of his country, makes him tick. This knowledge suggests to her that indifference will be an effective critical move because it will involve dimming the light considerably since women have been, in the state of economic dependence, among the most enthusiastic supporters of "what Lady Lovelace called 'our splendid Empire.'" (71) Psychology, Woolf points out, shows that humans find it harder to act in the face of indifference. (198) Hence, Woolf advises, the daughters "should give their brothers neither the white feather of cowardice nor the red feather of courage, but no feather at all." (199) Through maintaining such an attitude, Woolf suggests, the daughters will be able to actively discourage war.

In order to reveal how the outsider's strategy is not only critical but creative Woolf employs an analogy. Consider, she says, a rabbit or other little creature which runs out of the darkness on to a country road where it is "caught in the glare of a head-lamp." Like the glazed and rigid animal, the human in the limelight is paralyzed; inhibiting, she says, the "power to change and create new wholes." (208) Putting this point together with the insight about how the limelight makes her brothers tick, it becomes clear what Woolf is saying when she insists that the processions are leading only in a repetitive circle around the mulberry tree. By actively discouraging their brothers from choosing the limelight, the daughters are encouraging movement which is not going in circles, but rather, which is creative engagement in the world.

"The power to change and create new wholes," which Woolf argues, emerges from attention to the "darkness" of women's ancestral memories, brings us back to Woolf's philosophy. Recall the shocks which she experienced as revelations about the matrix of the whole. Only when one breaks through the cotton wool, the frozen foreground populated by Dickens-like characters, does one experience life as a fully conscious, engaged, inner-directed individual. Putting the severed parts together, the critical work of the outsider, is the strongest pleasure known to Woolf; it is the "ecstasy" of creative movement which getting out of the light enables. What she is suggesting here, in Daly's terms, is that the practice of a-mazing is integral to the strategy which makes her feminism radical: a-mazing leads one to the conclusion that choosing to be an Outsider is the most effective strategy for women in her situation. She is

suggesting something which is very similar to what Angela Davis (1971) and Adrienne Rich (1978) argued in the seventies, namely, that being disbarred from "civilization" endows one with a particularly unique and useful political perspective, ground for agency, and set of possibilities.

The question which fuels Woolf's analysis -- what will keep the daughters of educated men from adding their sixpence to their brothers' guinea and using their influence in the same way? -- is a matter of whether or not the Master's Tools (in this case the "sacred coin") can dismantle the Master's House. Hence, *Three Guineas* is really a book about means or strategy insofar as Woolf is thinking about how women of her class should use their new weapon. It is important to note that this book is *not* addressing the question of the *relation* between the liberation strategies of women in the ruling class and the liberation strategies of women in other classes, a point which will be discussed in chapter four. The unquestioned assumption of this work is that *the* condition for the liberation of ruling class women is getting out of their Father's House, and the only *conceivable* way out is through economic independence. Everything turns on this point. The only way women are going to be able to a-maze patriarchy, create new wholes, and thus, help prevent war is through economic independence. Active participation in the Outsider's Society is the third way she envisions for the women of her class to move on in a positive direction from their station on the bridge. In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly carries on in this tradition of radical feminism.

As is already obvious to the reader of *Gyn/Ecology*, Woolf's influence on Daly is comprehensive. The thesis of *Gyn/Ecology* is that radical feminism is "the journey of women becoming." Following Woolf, Daly is interested in the process through which women come to be fully conscious, engaged, inner-directed individuals. This process of radical becoming, or be-ing, Daly announces on the first page is an "Otherworld Journey." As Daly charts the journey, one moves from the world of the phallocentric "foreground" to the "Otherworld" which is the gynocentric "Background." Daly's concept of a "foreground" has its roots in Virginia Woolf's concept of "cotton wool" which takes the concrete form in *Three Guineas* of the processions of educated men. Daly's concept of a "Background" as the "realm of the wild reality of women's Selves" is related to Woolf's idea of "the scaffolding in the background" as the constitution of the writer. A subtle and illuminating difference is revealed in their respective Background metaphors. For Woolf, the reality behind the cotton wool is a "work of art;" for Daly, the reality behind the foreground realm is the "Intransitive Verb." (23) What Woolf finds in art, Daly finds in language. What they share is a view of reality and "really living" which does not revolve around God, Nature, or Law, but rather which unfolds as this process which humans choose to create and participate in.

In the Introduction to *Gyn/Ecology* Daly singles out Woolf's *Three Guineas* as a particularly important source of inspiration in the charting and describing of the "Metapatriarchal Journey of Exorcism and Ecstasy." (33) Daly charts the journey from the foreground to the Background on the basis of Woolf's strategic

attempts to think about how the daughters of educated men can at once, maintain their economic independence and break with the processions of their fathers. On Daly's development, radical feminism is about independence from the fathers in all its dimensions -- mind/body/spirit as well as economic -- in the midst of the ever present invitations of assimilation and tokenism. Woolf's insistence on sexual difference, rooted in a duplicitous historical situation which is both depraved and a valuable source of ethical lessons, manifests itself in Daly's insistence that radical feminism is a "Metapatriarchal" journey in the "Tradition of Hags" which is not given, but chosen. The work of *Three Guineas* and *Gyn/Ecology* is the same in the sense that both are seeking strategies for resisting "the condition of women caught on the Wheel of Processions, clutched by the clockwork hands that circle the surface of the Time Keepers clocks." (42) Daly's radical feminism rests on the knowledge which was passed down to her from Virginia Woolf, namely,

> that patriarchy is itself a continual resurrection of the past, a series of processions. No social revolution, however "radical," that falls short of metapatriarchal movement can break the circles of repetition. (Daly, 42)

This is the knowledge she takes from Woolf's insistence that the daughters of educated men must break the death march around the mulberry tree.

Consider how Daly's radical feminism, as it is revealed (1) in the method of a-mazing from an Outsider's perspective and (2) in the strategy of maintaining independence from the patriarchal processions of the foreground, evolves from Woolf's feminism. The theme of the Second Passage in *Gyn/Ecology*, "Processions" has its origins in Woolf's thought. Woolf's radical

insights about the connections between patriarchal processions, professions, and possession of women's spirit unfold as the "foreground" journeyers must a-maze. The voyage is charted around the Sins of the Fathers , which Daly conceives of as "incarnated" in institutional and individual demons who guard the gateways to women's "Background." These demons are personifications of the traditional "Deadly Sins" which Daly renames, the "Eight Deadly Sins of the Fathers." The basic Sin of phallocracy claims Daly is "deception," revealed by Woolf's analysis of processions, and so named by Daly, "Processions." The task of the Journeyer who has internalized patriarchal deceptions, then, is to free herSelf from their death grip, a task Daly names "exorcism." (2) The practice or method of "A-mazing," or "Metapatterning Movement" which Daly also finds in Woolf's work is the way to identify and relieve oneSelf of patriarchal deceptions. The work of the Second Passage, a-mazing the Society of Processions, makes Journeyers aware of the universal intent of patriarchal rituals to destroy "the divine spark in women." "The Know-ing of this intent," says Daly, "has been necessary for our a-mazing process of exorcism." (315) By "putting the severed parts together" the dormant senses of the Journeyer are awakened and strengthened. Daly suggests that through pattern detecting her way to the intent of foreground practices a Spinster begins to develop "a kind of multidimensional/multiform power of sensing/understanding her environment," which she names "Positive Paranoia." (316) In the Third Passage the Journeyers pattern-detecting powers are further refined as she breaks out of the patriarchal processions and begins Spooking, Sparking, and Spinning. The

theme of this final Passage, "Gyn/Ecology: Spinning New Time/Space," names "the patterns/designs of the moving Female-identified environment which can only be heard/seen after the Journeyer has been initiated through The First and The Second Passages." (ibid.) In this Passage Daly develops Woolf's argument that a historically constituted sexual difference of perspective can provide the basis for a feminist politic which is both critical and creative. Following and developing the radical feminist insights of Woolf's work, Daly argues in this Passage that everything turns on the Voyagers "growing integrity of vision and purpose." (112)

It is significant that each of the chapters which make up this Passage are introduced with epigraphs taken from Woolf's work. The chapter entitled "Spooking" begins with Woolf's description of the "great delight" she experiences from putting the "severed parts together" in order to reveal the order of the Whole behind the "cottonwool of daily life." (Daly, 322) "Spooking" is the name Daly gives to this Metapatterning which enables women to Dis-possess their Selves of the internalized patriarchal demons and dis-cover the female Self. Spinster-Spooking, which involves Re-membering the Witches' powers, has a cognitive dimension and a tactical dimension. Cognitively, Daly argues, it involves pattern detection which identifies "the time-warps through which women are divided from each other -- since each woman comes to consciousness through the unique events of her own history." Tactically, it involves "learning to refuse the seductive summons of the Passive Voices that call us into the State of Animated Death." (318) The symbolic figure which the Passive Voices call

women to identify with is the "Painted Bird." The Painted Bird is, according to Daly, the man-made "Woman" who is allowed to participate in the foreground as a "Token" on the condition that she sell out her Sisters, playing the part of the Token Torturer, as an expression of her loyalty to patriarchal civilization. (Daly, 333-336) Spooking is "Unpainting," which is according to Daly, Re-membering her Sisters through Re-membering her Self as a healing environment within which, echoing Woolf,

> She pledges allegiance to no flag, no cross. She sees through the lies of the alleged allies. She re-veres no one, for she is free-ing herself from fears. This space, the Self's holy environment, is the opposite of the re-covery room of the unnatural physicians of soul and body. It is dis-covery room. (338)

The Labyrinthine Journey of Ecstasy requires in this Passage that the Journeyer a-maze the deceptions of the Passive Voices of patriarchy in order that she resist the temptations of symbolic placement in the Father's foreground Processions. Through choosing this process a new task becomes apparent, "the task of seeing/sensing/Self-moving in the directions which our dis-covering senses open out to us," which is the "Self-conscious, Self-directed movement" Daly names "Enspiriting." (339-40) "To enspirit," explains Daly, is

> to be an expressive active verb, and Active Voice uttering the Self utterly, in a movement/Journey that spirals outward, inward. In this Active Voicing, the Self Spooks the spookers. She affirms the becoming Self who is always Other. She dis-covers and creates the Otherworld. (340)

Hence, Daly's practice of a-mazing leads to the creation of a world Other than patriarchy in the same way that Woolf's efforts to makes "wholes" from the severed parts led her to need for an Outsider's Society. The effectiveness of this

radical feminist practice, therefore derives from the fact that "as we A-maze, we are amazed." (341) [There is a bit more to say here.]

The theoretical relation between Daly's feminism and Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*

Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* reflects an intimate and complex engagement with Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949). Here I will only highlight some points of agreement between the two and indicate a sense in which Daly's radical feminism was a critical response to Beauvior's theory of women's liberation. This brief examination of the theoretical relation between Daly and Beauvoir is also intended to provide a contrast which helps define the parameters of the radical feminist tradition out of which *Gyn/Ecology* grew. I suggest that in spite of the a-mazing analysis in *The Second Sex*, especially her analysis of patriarchal myth, Beauvoir does not work from a gynocentic perspective. And she is explicit on this point, insisting that her work must be read in the tradition of existentialism. (xxviii)

Beauvoir holds that human subjects, individually and collectively, make themselves through their choices. We tell stories and make art, build and discover things, explore and (unfortunately) exploit the natural world, all the while interacting with others in ways which establish our identities. Women, like all other humans, are autonomous beings capable of self-creation. However, Beauvoir notes, women have failed to lay claim to the status of Subject. The identity Woman, she argues,

> is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is Subject, he is the Absolute -- she is the Other. (xxviii)

Women have been compelled to conform to the fixed and unchanging transcendental Idea of Woman projected by men in myth, science and juridical discourses. [Reference to chapter on Myths.] This situation, she explains, is the result of a history of "bad faith" efforts on the part of men attempting to make themselves supreme. (xxxv-xxxvi) Men have found "Othering" women to be in their metaphysical, as well as material interests. According to Beauvoir, they have refused to recognize women's subjectivity, refused, that is, to "share the world in equality." (xxxii) Instead, "Legislators, priests, philosophers, writers, and scientists have striven to show that the subordinate position of women is willed in heaven and advantageous on earth." (xxxiv)

Beauvoir claims women, as a class, have submissively accepted their status as Other, or at least, failed to challenge male sovereignty. (xxx-xxxiii) In part, she argues, this failure is due to the fact that women lack the means for organizing themselves for resistance, or lack what she calls, "organic" solidarity. (xxxi, 597) Women are not segregated from their oppressors, they share no solidarity on the basis of work or interest, and furthermore, they have neither a religion, nor a past. (xxxi) As a result, she explains, women have no myth, no poetry, no history and no dreams of their own. (143) Unlike other oppressed groups which can struggle collectively for their autonomous existence, women cannot even *imagine* life without men. (xxxi) It follows that women's liberation depends, in large part, on a collective decision and effort by men to share the

world. Despite Beauvoir's admission that oppressors cannot be expected to choose the moral life, her case against the possibility of woman-identification makes *The Second Sex* a plea toward that end. In fact, the tone of many passages reflects Beauvoir's resignation that men must be convinced. For example, she writes at the end of Book One, "*what must be hoped for* is that the men for their part will unreservedly accept the situation that is coming into existence; *only then* will women be able to live in that situation without anguish." (263, emphasis is mine)

Daly following Woolf, shares Beauvoir's rejection of any strong form of determinism and affirms the view that humans make themselves through their choices. In addition, she agrees with Beauvoir that women's oppression has entailed practices designed to bring women into conformity with essentialist Ideas of Woman. Furthermore, while Daly's radical feminism rejects the dichotomy and the language of immanence and transcendence, she agrees with Beauvoir that women sometimes choose to conform to the normative identities of Womanhood, that is, women make "false" choices.[14] Daly quotes Beauvoir on this point,

> to exist ... is to cast oneself into the world. Those who occupy themselves restraining this original movement can be considered as sub-men [read sub-women]. They have eyes and ears but from childhood on they make themselves blind and deaf, without love and without desire. (Beauvoir in Daly, 54)

---

14 The argument for the claim that Daly's philosophy successfully refuses the transcendence/immanence dichotomy is provided by Wanda Warren Berry in her excellent essay, "Feminist Theology: The 'Verbing' Of Ultimate/Intimate Reality in Mary Daly," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning*, vol. 11, 1988.

Even though many "false" choices reduce one's life to that of a "sub-man", or what Daly calls, the "depthless state of robotitude," she follows Beauvoir in her insistence that decisions can always be *reconsidered.* (Daly, 53-4) According to Daly "reconsidering" for women means, "acknowledging that a spell has been cast upon us, that we have been framed by the pictures of patriarchy, robotized by its processions and rituals;" it means "breaking the casts into which we have been molded," and "reclaiming our original movement." (55) Reconsidering requires "roboticide" requires acting on our "Prehistoric questing power." (55-6)

Notice that Daly parts with Beauvoir on the options for reconsidering available to women. For Beauvoir women are necessarily bound to men in a "fundamental unity" or "primordial Mitsein," within a "masculine universe." (Beauvoir, xxxi, 597) As a result, women's efforts to liberate themselves can only be individual efforts, while they wait for men to stop their incessant "Othering." On Daly's view, the story that *it's a man's world* is the story men tell about the world, but it is only partially true. Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*, a critical response to Beauvoir's repeated claim that women lack the means to make their own world, tells the rest of the story. Daly argues, women have a past, which has been buried, and a mythical tradition, which has been stolen and twisted, both of which constitute means to make a world. In Daly's view, nothing less than a collective World-making effort will enable women to reconsider, i.e. to realize their ability to make themselves through their choices.

From the perspective of this discussion, Daly's definition of radical feminism as "the Otherworld journey of women becoming" is, at once, an

affirmation of Beauvoir's insistence that women's liberation must involve the "good faith" efforts of women re-creating themselves and a denial of Beauvoir's unqualified claim that it is and has always been a man's world. The "Otherworld Journey" is "the discovery of a world Other than patriarchy." (Daly 1987, 87) It is significant that Daly retains the capitalized "Other" in her definition of radical feminism. For Beauvoir, being "Other" meant being marked by men as *different* and inferior. Feminism, on her view, was therefore, a struggle for women to become free subjects, *like men*. For Daly, being Other means refusing to be the *same* as men [i.e. wo-men], who are "the sons of their own machines" and, above all, not free. (Daly 1978, 52) Feminism, on her view, is women's struggle to define and name, for ourselves, our difference, that is, to be free. Daly's point is that radical feminism is a radical departure from assimilation and tokenism in this man's world. Choosing to identify with the witches and the Outsiders is the radical feminist strategy for "be-ing" out of *his* world. This is not a strategy which Beauvoir was able to imagine from the perspective of existentialism.

Part II

AUDRE LORDE'S "AN OPEN LETTER TO MARY DALY" AND DALY'S DECISION NOT TO RESPOND IN KIND

In 1978 Mary Daly published *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. In 1979 Audre Lorde published an "Open Letter to Mary Daly" challenging the white Western European standpoint of Gyn/Ecology. (Lorde, 1984) Lorde wrote to Mary Daly during the early years of the "second wave" U.S. women's movement in the hope that they might interrupt the history of separation between black and white women with conversations about sisterhood and difference.1 Lorde depicts this history as one marked by a pattern of relating in which white women have not heard black women or tried to maintain dialogue with them, and in which black women have assumed they would not be heard. (Lorde 1984, 66) The significance of Lorde's letter, in view of this history, is underscored by a silence she had imposed on herself in 1977. When her

---

[1] Audre Lorde privileges black/white dynamics in both in her poetry and rhetoric, in part, as a result of the moment she was writing. The late 1970s and early 1980s was a time in the U.S. when race and racial conflicts were mostly understood in the context of civil rights and black power movements' challenges to the white establishment. As a result, most discussions of race were cast exclusively in terms of black and white. A case in point is *Common Differences: Conflicts in Black and White Feminist Perspectives*, (Joseph, 1981). However, even at this time, feminists were pushing the limits of dualistic construals of race. For example, *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, Moraga and Anzaldúa, (1981). Today, many feminists insist that discussions of race which fail to consider the spectrum of racial identities and racist practices, as well as the varieties of ethnocentrism and imperialism, are simply inadequate. In an effort to signal the historical context of Lorde's writings I have chosen to retain her use of the terms, black and white. However, at points my interpretation of her work takes account of the more multiple understandings of race and racism today.

previous attempts at dialogue were consistently met with white guilt and defensiveness she decided never again to talk with white women about racism. (70) In addition, the self-imposed silence was a commitment to leave the education about white racism in white hands. (113) Her letter to Daly broke Lorde's self-imposed silence in the name of feminist sisterhood. Lorde affirms Daly's good faith toward all women, her vision of a future in which all women can flourish, and her "commitment to the hard and often painful work necessary to effect change." Then she invites Daly to a critical dialogue about the implications of their differences, as black and white women, for the radical feminism of *Gyn/Ecology*. (67) To date, Daly has not responded in kind to Lorde's letter.

It is remarkable that Lorde's letter, the paradigmatic example of challenges to white feminist theory by feminists of color in the 1980s, has received so little systematic analysis and criticism. Footnotes in some feminist writings suggest that Lorde's challenge should be read as a postmodern critique of feminist theory. For example, Christine DeStephano finds in Lorde's work the argument that understanding "gender as basic merely serves to reify, rather than to critically contest, transform, and escape the imposed myth of difference." (DeStephano 1990, 65) On this sort of reading, Lorde's letter suggests that *Gyn/Ecology*, in particular, and radical feminism generally, are fundamentally flawed theoretically and politically. Nancy Fraser and Linda Nicholson read Lorde's work as a challenge to "quasi-metanarratives" in feminist theory which hinder, rather than advance, sisterhood. (1990, 27) Linda Alcoff, in her widely read essay, "The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory" argues radical feminist

theories, like Daly's, are "essentialist." (1988) In contrast, she reads Lorde's work, along with other work by feminists of color, as consistent with the anti-essentialist inclinations of postmodern feminism. On these readings, Lorde's letter points feminists, away from radical feminist theory, toward postmodern theoretical frameworks.

I begin Part II, with a close reading of Lorde's "Open Letter," using insight from Lorde's other writings to elaborate and explain her central arguments. First, I outline the common ground between Lorde and Daly. Second, I interpret the critical arguments of Lorde's letter. On the basis of my reading, I conclude that Lorde's letter is, among other things, an attempt to effect a shift in Daly's thinking which would strengthen her work and help realize the vision they share. Third, I explore the context of Daly's decision not to respond in kind to Lorde's letter from several different perspectives. On the basis of this exploration I offer contextual explanation for Daly's decision.

The Common Ground in the Radical Feminisms of Lorde and Daly

In "Poetry Is Not a Luxury," Lorde calls for a radical feminist mode of living based on the "knowledge" we derive from what she refers to variously as "that dark true depth," the "place of possibility within each of us," and "that back place, where we keep those unnamed, untamed longings." In the "Open Letter," she says, "as you know,"

> when I speak of knowledge [...] I am speaking of that dark and true depth which understanding serves, waits upon, and makes accessible through language to ourselves and others. It is this depth within each of us that nurtures vision. (1984, 68)

This "knowledge," on Lorde's view, is insight gained from a "know-ing" process rooted in identification with the experiences of women who have survived and thrived under the agency-suppressing weight of oppressive regimes.[2] It is the insight which gives shape to Lorde's visionary claims: *we were never meant to survive*, *your silence will not protect you*, *the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house*, *anger is a useful response to racism*, *differences among us can be a creative force for change*, and *poetry is not a luxury.* These are not new ideas, claims Lorde, but "old and forgotten ones, new combinations, extrapolations and recognitions from within ourselves." (38) Lorde shares with Daly the belief that making a "truly different" world, a radical feminist world, requires excavating *and* re-inventing radical ideas. Daly's concept of "the moving center of the Self," or a woman's "Background," is close to Lorde's "back place of unnamed, untamed longings," in that it names the "source" of radical feminist insight. (Daly 1978, 6) Women who act from the Background, on Daly's view, experience an opening of our "inner eyes" and "inner ears" enabling us to see through and beyond the "foreground" lies of the fathers, to our own "stolen integrity/energy/be-ing." (20)

This feminist know-ing process, which leads women to "radical and daring ideas," requires a focus on those feelings -- anger, love, joy -- experienced by those of us who have survived and thrived, feelings which are regularly ignored, trivialized, or condemned. (Lorde 1984, 37) The process, says Lorde, requires

---

[2] The hyphenated term "know-ing" highlights the kinship between Lorde's and Daly's epistemologies. Daly uses the hyphen to flag the difference between patriarchal "nouns of knowledge" and radical feminist "verbs of know-ing." See Daly (1978, 11).

that each of us learn "disciplined attention to the true meaning of *it feels right to me.*" (Ibid.) For example, in the "Uses of Anger," Lorde argues, anger which is focused with precision is a tool which helps clarify differences among us and teaches us, in the process, to distinguish allies, with whom we have grave differences, from genuine enemies. (127) In "Uses of the Erotic," Lorde argues, *erotic* feelings can be a path to radical insight. (56) By "erotic feelings" Lorde does not mean the disengaged sensations promoted by pornography, but that "internal sense of satisfaction" one achieves when she brings sensuality together with love and joy. (54) From giving our focused attention to erotic feelings, she argues, we are led to the radical idea that it is possible to animate *all* of our action and thinking with this internal sense of satisfaction. As she puts it, "the erotic is not a question only of what we do; it is a question of how acutely and fully we can feel in the doing." (Ibid.)

Lorde has been charged with contributing to the dualistic construction of the rational white male and the emotional dark female. (101) On my reading, Lorde refuses this dualism, privileging neither construction. It is clear in "Poetry is Not a Luxury," she does not shun reason, but only the deployment of a rationality disengaged from the feelings associated with the struggles to meet human needs. In an interview with Adrienne Rich, Lorde speaks of reason devoid of feeling as a "road." On this analogy, she explains,

> if you're traveling a road that begins nowhere and ends nowhere, the ownership of the road is meaningless. If you have no land out of which the roads comes, no place that road goes to geographically, no goal, then the existence of that road is totally meaningless. Leaving rationality to the white man is like leaving

> him a piece of that road that begins nowhere and ends nowhere. (100)

Understanding, on Lorde's view, constitutes a dimension of know-ing which involves recognizing the patterns among our emotional perceptions and organizing them in conceptual and linguistic expressions so we can travel, pursuing radical feminist change. Reason "serves" radical insight by ordering the chaos of emotions. Lorde speaks of feeling and thinking not dichotomously, but "as a choice of ways and combinations." (101) Hence, on my reading, Lorde's "knowledge" is a *synthesis* of rational thinking and experiential feeling. A similar attempt to resist the dichotomizing of thought and feeling is present in Daly's work. Chapter ten of *Gyn/Ecology* is devoted to a discussion of the need for radical women to "Spin" the "lost thread of connectedness" between thinking, imaging and feeling. (Daly 1984, 390)

If a dualism exists between reason and emotion, Lorde claims, the white man has constructed it by taking "a world position, a position throughout time" against what is not strictly rational within themselves and others. (1984, 101) Patriarchal modes of living "defined by profit, by linear power, by institutional dehumanization," Lorde writes, are the result of the history of acting on the belief that "the head will save us. The brain alone will set us free." (38) Exclusive reliance on rationality has taught us, argues Lorde, an instrumentalist mode of living, which she calls the "european mode." (39, 37) In this mode we are taught to distrust and reject our emotions and sensuous experience, and simultaneously, to hate and fear any difference associated with it which we find

in ourselves and in others. Instead, we are taught to believe in and live by the dictates of a disembodied reason, and simultaneously, to *identify* with those who we associate with this rational standpoint, i.e. western white men. We learn to hear only their voices within us. Both Lorde and Daly argue that new feminist modes of living must begin with know-ing which is informed by listening to those feeling-identified voices within each of us.

Lorde and Daly also share views on patriarchy. Lorde is unambiguous in the letter about her agreement with Daly's claim that patriarchy is global. She affirms, with Daly, the fact that the oppression of women knows no ethnic nor racial boundaries. (Daly 1978, 111; Lorde 1984, 70) In addition, Lorde speaks of the patriarchal oppression in terms very similar to Daly's. Both agree patriarchy manifests itself in social practices which exploit or harm women, and ideologies which distort and silence women's ways of know-ing and living. For example, Lorde writes about patriarchal suppressions of the erotic,

> we have been warned against [the erotic] all our lives by the male world, which values this depth of feeling enough to keep women around in order to exercise it in the service of men, but which fears this same depth too much to examine the possibilities of it within themselves. So women are maintained at a distant/inferior position to be psychically milked, much the same way ants maintain colonies of aphids to provide a life-giving substance to their masters. (1984, 53-54)

In a similar vein, Daly writes that men fetishize women's procreative organs, rather than acknowledging "female creative energy it *all* of its dimensions," in order to mask their "parasitic relationship to women." (1978, 60) At this level of generality, Lorde and Daly only differ on what fuels the oppressive patriarchal

psyche. While Lorde attributes it to xenophobia, Daly believes it is a self-awareness of inner barrenness or lack, which men develop as a result of being dependent on the foreground structures of society to define their identities and life goals. (359-360) Furthermore, both insist that women who run on this patriarchal fuel are responsible for their contribution to the oppression of other women. Lorde consistently criticizes women who indulge their internalized fear of difference, often in the hope that their silence will protect them. The challenge facing us is not simply the external conditions of our lives, she insists, but "that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us, and which knows only the oppressors' tactics, the oppressors' relationships." (123) Similarly, Daly's theory of patriarchal oppression includes a thoroughgoing critique of the ways women have internalized patriarchal voices and who, heeding those voices, participate in oppressive practices as "Token Torturers."

Lorde and Daly also share the view that even if patriarchy is everywhere, it does not exhaust social reality. To insist on the possibility of identity formation "beyond" patriarchal construction is *not* to deny that we are products of dominant institutions and ideologies. It is only to deny an insidious form of phallocentricism. Women who have survived, and even thrived, in the midst of oppressive regimes defy the role and goal expectations built into various patriarchal constructions of Woman. Those who have resisted and "escaped" these constructions are *different.* Lorde and Daly share a theory of radical sexual difference which challenges the *appearance* that patriarchy's foreground constructions exhaust the realm of possibility. But Daly and Lorde speak of, and

to, women who are off the categorical grid of social identities. The existence of women who are radically "Other," on this view, is proof that there is, has always been, more to the social construction of identity than the totalizing discursive mechanisms deployed by white Western capitalist patriarchs. The efforts, of both Lorde and Daly, to *name* feminist-identified symbolic and conceptual resources and processes signifies a shared commitment to re-membering, dis-covering, and re-creating autonomous feminist agency and liberating social identities.

Lorde and Daly map a path of liberation for women from individual empowerment to collective feminist action which is in an important sense "beyond" patriarchy. Both argue, social change begins with individual transformations which involve women's efforts to center themselves and enhance their agency. Lorde believes women are able to find their center -- recognize their deep feelings and use them to shape their thinking -- through identification with their foremothers whose concrete daily experiences under patriarchy made them, of necessity, "world"-builders. Radically "Other" women, in different historical periods and different cultural contexts, have constituted and created "worlds" in the sense of matrices of social constructs which constitute fields of meanings and values, materialized in identities, practices and relational structures.[3] Lorde and Daly argue, grandmothers and mothers, as well as sisters, friends and lovers have woven spaces/time contexts out of their daily lives within which their feelings and actions -- which were scorned, denied, and

---

[3] Here I am drawing on María Lugones' concept of a "world." See Lugones 1987.

trivialized in their father's houses -- made sense and found affirmation. Wherever women have bonded in strength and love there have been "worlds" in the making. Women who have moved in these "worlds" are able to center themselves by attending to and acting on those feelings, which Lorde argues, are the condition of women's liberation.

Daly and Lorde agree, sisterhood -- the condition for feminist "world"-building -- is possible only when self-centering women who find each other and connect. Lorde writes on this point,

> as a Black lesbian feminist, I have a particular feeling, knowledge, and understanding for those sisters with whom I have danced hard, played, or even fought. This deep participation has often been the forerunner for joint concerted actions not possible before. (59)

Women empowered through trusting their own internal processes, Lorde points out, are dangerous. Women so empowered, engaged in work, in play, in love, and in critical dialogue with other women in touch with their own "unnamed, untamed longings," constitute a serious threat to patriarchal life as usual. This is one of the things experience has taught women who have not only survived, but thrived: women bonding expands the universe of possibility. In Daly's words, "the Fire of Sisterhood results from the Sparking of Female Selves who are finding each other." (1978, 370) Patriarchs know, Daly claims, that they have everything "to fear from the combination of even two or three Sparking Female Selves, for Sparking Spinsters confirm each other's sense of reality, burning through [patriarchal] lies." (379-380)

Both find productive world-building tools in language and myth. If women are to find each other, we must give our radical ideas shape in language.[4] Both advocate metaphorical practices of naming. Lorde argues, in our present historical moment, poetry is the best language for expressing and conveying women's radical insights because it is a form of expression which combines the problem-solving rationality of the "european mode" with the experiential emotionality of women's "ancient, noneuropean" modes. (37) In her view, to understand poetry as fantasy and utopian vision is to obscure its revolutionary potential. Poetry is, in Lorde's words, "a revelatory distillation of experience," which "lays the foundation for a future of change, a bridge across our fears of what has never been before." (37-38) Poetry *expresses* the possibility of Other worlds, without which we might never have the courage, Lorde says "to attempt the heretical actions that our dreams imply, and so many of our old ideas disparage." (38-39) In *Gyn/Ecology*, Daly suggests along the same lines, that gynocentric forms of writing "crystallize" feminist process. "Like crystal balls" or "Glowing Globes" she claims, women's writings allow "us to foretell the future and to dis-cover the past, for they further the process itself by transforming the previously unknown into that which we explicitly know." (23) Hence, Daly agrees with Lorde, in the process of calling forth radical world-making action, poetry is not a luxury.

---

[4] This was the subject of papers presented by Daly, Lorde and others on a panel, at the 1977 Annual Modern Language Association Convention, entitled "The Transformation of Silence into Language and Action." *Sinister Wisdom* 6 (Summer 1979).

Feminist myth-making is an important world-building tool because it challenges the patriarchal ideology which denies the existence of powerful self-centered women, feminist-bonding, and simultaneously, provides a source of insight about histories of woman-identified modes of living. As she read the First Passage of *Gyn/Ecology*, Lorde reports in the letter, she "nodded in agreement" with Daly's theory of myth and mystification. In this passage, Daly argues that patriarchal myths -- which share the basic pattern of the all-male Christian symbolic -- function to mystify and deceive women about radical feminist possibilities represented by female symbolic figures, specifically, the "goddess." Myths, according to the *patriarchal* myth-makers, express "intuitive insights," about meaningful human activity which "open up depths of reality and of the self otherwise closed to us." (46) In fact, Daly argues, the "insights" expressed by patriarchal myths actually close off depths of reality and of the Self otherwise opened to women, by "deceiving us into believing that these are the only doorways to our depths and that the fathers hold the keys." (Ibid.) The Christian symbolic order, characterized by "processions from and return to god the father," requires, the "murder" or "dismemberment" of the goddess. Lorde was nodding in agreement with Daly's claim that the face of the goddess has been obscured through the complete denial of female mythic presence implicit in the idea that the only sacred human activity is patriarchal-bonding. The real doorways to our depths, our Background, insists Daly, is the knowledge expressed in gynocentric myths which were distorted, reversed and buried in the making patriarchal myths. According to Daly, and Lorde concurs, "Re-membering the Goddess,"

involves recognizing the "archetypal messages about our own Prehistory and about Female-identified power." (47)

The metaphor of the "goddess" is central to the re-construction of female identity in the work of Lorde and Daly. In the "Open Letter," Lorde writes that Daly's work on the nature and function of the goddess agrees with what she has discovered in her searches through African myth/legend/religion for the "true nature of old female power." (67) In Daly's work, the "goddess" stands for "the deep source of creative integrity in women," which enables autonomous female agency. (111) In Lorde's poetry and fiction, "the Black Goddess," or sometimes, "the poet," or "the Black mother," is a mythic figure who trusts her own insight and animates all of her activities with "that internal sense of satisfaction." The "Black Goddess," names and symbolizes ancient female-identified power. Lorde and Daly agree that individual transformation in identity can begin by identifying one's own possibilities with those which the "goddess" represents, that is, by "Re-membering the Goddess" within ourselves.

In order to illustrate what this "re-membering" process entails more concretely it will be useful to consider a passage from Lorde's "biomythography," *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name*. The passage opens with the question, "to whom do I owe the woman I have become?" (Lorde 1982, 4) Lorde's answer is DeLois, a woman who

> lived up the block on 142nd Street and never had her hair done, and all the neighborhood women sucked their teeth as she walked by. Her crispy hair twinkled in the summer sun as her big proud stomach moved her down the block while I watched, not caring whether or not she was a poem. Even though I tied my shoes and tried to peep under her blouse as she passed by, I never spoke to

> DeLois, because my mother didn't. But I loved her, because she moved like she felt she was somebody special, like she was somebody I'd like to know someday. She moved like how I thought god's mother must have moved, and my mother, once upon a time, and someday maybe me.
>
> Hot noon threw a ring of sunlight like a halo on the top of DeLois's stomach, like a spotlight, making me sorry that I was so flat and could only feel the sun on my head and shoulders. I'd have to lie down on my back before the sun could shine down like that on my belly.
>
> I loved DeLois because she was big and Black and special and seemed to laugh all over. I was scared of DeLois for those very same reasons. One day I watched DeLois step off the curb of 142nd Street against the light, slow and deliberate. A high yaller dude in a white Cadillac passed by and leaned out and yelled at her, "Hurry up, you flat-footed, nappy headed, funny-looking bitch!" The car almost knocking her down. DeLois kept right on about her leisurely business and never so much as looked around. (Ibid.)

It was the black goddess apparent in DeLois's size, movements, and unswerving centeredness to which Lorde believed she owed her becoming. This example resonates with Daly's claim that the "moving presence of each Self calls forth the living presence of other journeying/enspiriting Selves." (366) The black goddess re-membered in those women, like DeLois, who make a place for themselves in spite of a world bent on their nonexistence, reveals to others possibilities, feminist modes of living, which might otherwise not be apparent. DeLois inspired Lorde to move like she was somebody special, and to laugh, in the face of her fears and the ever-present threat that she would be run down. It is Lorde's conviction that not only she, but *all* women, must attempt to re-member the black goddess within. It is the nature and function of the Black Goddess to call on us, and to *authorize* us, to fight the fears and silences which stand between us and our freedom. On Lorde's view, women all live with the threat we will be run

down, presenting each of us with two choices. Obey the rules of the road and stay out of the way, or, like DeLois, mark your course and move forward accordingly. It takes the kind of "guts" one learns from identification with that which is powerful, female and Black in order to make the latter choice.

Daly also affirms feminist myth making as a liberation strategy. "Feminists are agents for the Goddess Nemesis," claims Daly, "the Divine Daughter claiming her rights." (40, 347) As such feminists recognize that acts of "Goddess murder" separate women and that acts of "re-membering the Goddess" connect women. Lorde and Daly agree that connection among women is the condition for feminist autonomy. Their efforts to articulate female-centered symbolic orders are intended to assist with the creation of contexts, or worlds, which make sense of the lives of women who refuse to live up to patriarchal constructions of Woman.

The common ground in the projects of Daly and Lorde suggest it is a mistake to reduce their views to the opposite poles of modernism and postmodernism, a mistake which obscures the similarities in their radical feminist projects. Daly and Lorde simultaneously resist reifications of gender and insist that something important is lost when feminist conceptions of sexual difference, i.e. radical female Otherness, is denied. Neither views theoretical narrative as antithetical to sisterhood. Furthermore, both find the ground for sisterhood in epistemological practices, rather than essentialist claims about women's nature. In fact, if either posited a fixed and unchanging female essence, their respective critiques of women who have chosen loyalty to the fathers would make very little

sense. While neither would embrace an essentialist theory of sexual difference, both reject a form of humanism by insisting that sexual difference matters. The concrete conditions of women's lives, including making and circulating in women's worlds, have presented a multitude of unique social and political possibilities and choices. Lorde and Daly agree patriarchal constructions have distorted sexual difference. By making dominant worlds within which "Woman" is the waste bin for those parts of themselves which are not strictly rational, patriarchal agents have waged war on differences associated with emotion and sensuality. Given this fact, some feminists have moved to affirm the nonrational in the name of women's liberation. However, this is clearly not the feminist strategy embraced by Lorde and Daly. Both reject the artificial opposition of the masculine and the feminine, the rational and the emotional, by refusing to come down on either side of these dualisms. Their strategy, and I believe it is characteristic of what is radical in their shared vision, is a third path. They have chosen the path of DeLois. Radical sexual difference is important, not because oppression has made it so, but because those *living* under oppression have it made it so, and not through any simplistic re-affirmation of the feminine.

Lorde's First Two Criticisms

> The oppression of women knows no ethnic nor racial boundaries, true, but that does not mean it is identical within those differences. Nor do the reservoirs of our ancient power know these boundaries. To deal with one without even alluding to the other is to distort our commonality as well as our difference. For then beyond sisterhood is still racism.
>
> Audre Lorde, "Open Letter to Mary Daly"

As I read the letter, Lorde makes three related criticisms of *Gyn/Ecology*. I discuss the first two in this chapter, and the third, which involves Daly's *use* of Lorde's work, in Part III. Lorde's first criticism is that Daly "distorts our differences" in her analysis of patriarchal oppression. Lorde is criticizing Daly for using the "master's tools," specifically for relying on the assumption that we must "either ignore our differences, or view them as causes for separation and suspicion." (112) On Lorde's view, it is not the "very real differences between us" which threaten solidarity, but the *misnaming* and *misusing* of these differences "in the service of separation and confusion." (115) Second, Lorde criticizes Daly for "distorting our commonality," or "the real connections that exist between all of us." Lorde is concerned with the "connection" we share in virtue of identifying with female symbolic figures who break with patriarchal mythology, e.g. the "Goddess" or the "Witch." When Lorde charges that Daly is "dealing only out of a patriarchal western european frame of reference" she is contesting Daly's racially- and ethnically-neutral representation of a female symbolic "Background" which is, particularly, white and Western. As I read the letter, Lorde is attempting to move Daly in the direction of a conception of feminist-identification which turns on the recognition of racial and ethnic difference. Contra the postmodern feminist footnotes cited above, Lorde's challenge to Daly is not simply *theoretical*. It is directed against a particular racial and ethnic discourse she finds in *Gyn/Ecology*. Borrowing Ruth Frankenberg's concepts, I argue that Lorde is trying to shift Daly from a "color- and power-evasive" to a "race cognizant" frame of reference. On my reading, Lorde's letter is *not* a call

for Daly to abandon the pursuit of radical sexual difference. It is *not* a call for the end of radical feminism. Quite the opposite. Lorde is worried about the lack of "material on non-white female power and symbol in white women's words from a radical feminist perspective." The letter is a call for the growth and development of radical feminism.

It will be useful to begin with a sketch Lorde's views on socially constructed differences. The assumption of difference among individuals, as well as within and among groups, is Lorde's fundamental starting point. She rejects the humanism which suggests differences are simply mythic constructs designed to establish dominant social identities and reinforce political hierarchies. Any approach which understands all significant differences as the products of dominant discourses would be reductive on her view. The history of Western thinking has conditioned us, she claims, "to see human differences in simplistic opposition to each other: dominant/subordinate, good/bad, up/down, superior/inferior." (114) But these oppositions, in Lorde's view, obscure and distort the spectrums of human diversity which have emerged historically around the world. Distorted constructions of difference captured in oppositional categories have functioned, in some modern histories of oppression, to collapse this diversity into criteria which justify the persecution of those who deviate from what she calls the "mythical norm." (116) Hence, she would not deny that *some* differences *are* mythical fabrications constructed through hierarchically opposed categories in order to *create and sustain* the norm. However, her point is that difference is more than a linchpin of oppression, even if oppression has involved

"misusing" and "misnaming" difference. (115) For example, some forms of racism are characterized by the use of stereotypes to claim black-identified cultural practices are inferior to white-identified cultural practices. On Lorde's view, the racism lies not in pointing to the difference between the practices, but in *distorting* that difference by making it a measure of value. If Lorde was wrong, that is, if oppression and difference were essentially and constitutively related, then we would not consider the refusal to recognize some differences another form of oppression.

Lorde urges women to "extract these distortions from our living at the same time as we recognize, reclaim, and define those differences upon which they are imposed." (Ibid.) What is the nature of these differences which Lorde insists are distorted by ageism, racism, classism, sexism and heterosexism? As I suggested in my reading of Lorde's theory of radical sexual difference, they are not essentialist differences in the sense of given or static ontological endowments. However, they are "essential" because they reflect our existence and circulation in variously constituted fields of meaning, value, and social organization, what I have been calling "worlds." The differences which Lorde claims women must recognize, reclaim and define are "world" differences. On Lorde's vision, the promise of radical feminist change lies in the affirmation and creative employment of racial and ethnic world differences among women. (111-112)

The *first* criticism in Lorde's letter in need of analysis is that Daly implies "all women suffer the same oppression," which obscures "the many and varied

tools of patriarchy." The problem arises, Lorde says, when "these tools are used by women without awareness against each other." Although Lorde is not explicit about how Daly implies all women suffer the same oppression, it is safe to assume she is concerned with the "Sado Ritual Syndrome," the seven-point analytic device Daly fashions to reveal connections among the ritual practices of Indian Sati, Chinese footbinding, African genital mutilation, European witchburning, and American gynecology. Consider what Lorde means by "all women suffer the same oppression." The phrase is ambiguous between (i) all women share a universal *experience* of oppression, and (ii) all the *practices* which constitute women's oppression are the same. A reason for thinking that Lorde is not criticizing Daly for implying (i) all women *experience* the same oppression, is Lorde's expressed concern that the problem with Daly's implication is that it obscures various "tools of patriarchy." If Lorde criticism were directed against Daly's generalizations about the experience of oppression then one would expect to hear Lorde represent the problem in terms of obscuring varieties of psychological or ontological damage, rather than varieties of patriarchal "tools." In fact, Lorde agrees with Daly's claims about the psychological consequences for women victimized through ritual reenactments of "Goddess Murder."

Lorde is critical of the "Sado Ritual Syndrome" because it implies (ii) that the *practices* which constitute women's oppression are basically the same. Lorde is concerned that different practices, "various forms and degrees of patriarchal oppression, some of which we share and some of which we do not,"

are obscured by Daly's Sado-Ritual Syndrome. (70) What are the different practices which Lorde is worried Daly has obscured? What are the "tools" employed under the various "forms" of patriarchy, which women might inadvertently use against each other?

"Tools" might refer to the ritual practices themselves. However, recall that the problem with obscuring the "tools" is the risk of women using them, without awareness, against each other. Since it is unlikely Lorde is worried feminists might inadvertently engage in practices like footbinding or genital mutilation, the "tools" at issue are most probably not these practices. The "tools" obscured by the Sado Ritual Syndrome, on Lorde's view, are discursive assumptions which have shaped various racist and ethnocentric patriarchal formations. By looking only at the gynocidal ritual atrocities from the perspective of the Sado Ritual Syndrome, *Gyn/Ecology* reveals a one dimensional picture of patriarchy.

Hence, Lorde's concern is *not* that Daly's analysis misinterprets the ritual atrocities analyzed in *Gyn/Ecology* as patriarchal violence. On the contrary, she agrees with Daly that African genital mutilation is patriarchal violence. Denying this, on Lorde's view, would be a case of ethnic difference being *distorted* in the service of patriarchal efforts to divert attention from the gynocidal intent of these practices. She makes this point explicit in an essay on redefining differences, by claiming against the views of Jomo Kenyatta, that female circumcision is a "cultural affair," that it is a "crime" against black women. (120) Lorde's criticizes Daly more for what cannot be seen through the lens of the Sado Ritual Syndrome as Daly has it focused, than for what Daly has brought clearly into

focus. Lorde is concerned that there is more to patriarchy than what Daly reveals in the Sado Ritual Syndrome analysis. For example, in the U.S., patriarchal power is manifest in the racialization of subjugated groups, the de-racialization of dominant groups, and an ideology of "color-blind" institutions. Since the Sado Ritual Syndrome is not sensitive to manifestations such as these, Lorde claims Daly implies women all suffer the same oppression.

Given this reading of Lorde's concern, what is the tool at work which white women might use, without awareness, against women of color? Here's an example. The systematic *denial* of health care to women of color in the U.S. -- which is different than getting health care of a lower *quality* -- is masked with an *assumption* that all women's health care needs are generally the same and can be assessed through the experiences of white women. If white feminists were to mobilize a campaign to improve women's health care, based on the assumption that *the* issue was *quality* of service, rather than *access* to health care, it would ignore the problem faced by many black women and could eventuate in less health care resources being allocated to black women. White feminists, without awareness, would have used the master's "color-blind" assumption against black women.

Another dimension of patriarchy which might be obscured by the Sado Ritual Syndrome analysis, on Lorde's view, is cultural forms which have emerged from modern histories of violence *among* societies. For example, the history of European colonialism in India has had a devastating effect on traditional Indian cultures. Similarly, the American importation and enslavement of Africans meant

not only millions of deaths, but also cultural domination in the form of genocide. One of the discursive assumptions informing these atrocities is the belief that Western European patriarchal culture represents the global paradigm of human culture. Any society which fails to meet this standard of culture is not considered culture. Therefore, destroying it, especially if it is to replace it with "real" culture, is not only justifiable, but laudable. Practices of ignoring, distorting and eliminating cultural differences are integral to the forms patriarchy has historically taken in the West.

How might women use these tools of cultural imperialism against other women without awareness? If white American feminists, like Daly, challenge the patriarchal assumption that men set the standard for what counts as human on the basis of sexual difference, without also challenging the assumption that white Western culture sets the standard for what counts as culture, we inadvertently use the tools of the dominant culture against our sisters who do not share a white Western heritage. In my analysis of the second major criticism of Lorde's "Open Letter" I will argue that Lorde found this kind of assumption in Daly's representation of the female symbolic of *Gyn/Ecology*.

On this reading, it becomes evident why Lorde often racializes her references to patriarchy, e.g. she refers to "white patriarchy." However, these references not a denial that patriarchal oppression is a planetary phenomenon, but an affirmation that patriarchal oppression is a heterogeneous phenomenon. If my reading is right, Lorde is not suggesting that what is problematic about the Sado Ritual Syndrome analysis is the focus on patriarchal violence, nor that it

constitutes a global narrative. Her critical claim is that the Sado Ritual Syndrome analysis obscures the ways patriarchal oppression manifests itself intra- and inter- culturally. This claim is driven by Lorde's basic concern, that is, how to forge and strengthen connections among women. Lorde believes feminist analyses without focused attention on distortions and misnamings of racial and ethnic difference threatens connections between women by heightening the possibility that women in dominant cultural positions will inadvertently use their father's tools against other women.

The *second* major criticism I find in Lorde's letter is that Daly includes only "white, western european, judeo-christan goddess images" in *Gyn/Ecology*. To highlight the exclusion Lorde asks, "Where was Afrekete, Yemanje, Oyo, and Mawulisa? Where were the warrior goddesses for the Vodun, the Dohomeian Amazons and the warrior-women of Dan?" (67) There are two problems, according to Lorde, with Daly's exclusion of black female symbolic figures. First, by excluding black female symbolic figures, Lorde claims, Daly "dismissed [Lorde's African] heritage and that of all other noneuropean women," which involves using the patriarchs tools against them. Second, according to Lorde, the exclusion "denies the real connections that exist between all of us." (68)

Consider the first problem. Lorde charges that by excluding nonwhite goddesses Daly has dismissed Lorde's heritage and the heritages of all other noneuropean women. Lorde asks Daly in the letter to "be aware of the effect that this dismissal has upon the community of black women." (Ibid.) She charges that Daly's dismissal of black female heritage "does not differ from the

specialized devaluations that make Black women prey, for instance to the murders now happening in [Daly's] own city."[5] (69) This is a strong charge which requires a careful reading. Notice, she is *not* saying the exclusion of black mythic figures is *like* murdering black women. She is saying that the systematic devaluation of black women implicit in their exclusion and erasure is a condition which fosters violence against black women. In this way, Daly's exclusion and erasure is like patriarchal exclusions and erasures.

Patriarchal devaluations of what is black and female have taught black women to fear and deny, or even, not to be able to recognize their own forms of power. In order to recognize and realize their inner strength and resources, on Lorde's view, black women need the insight that only their own mythic background and heritage can provide. In "Eye to Eye," Lorde suggests that to search for the power within herself she must be willing to move through her internalized fear and dismantle "America's measurement" of her through re-membering her heritage. (146-147) In her research Lorde finds that

> Black women have a history of the use and sharing of power, from the Amazon legions of Dahomey through the Ashanti warrior queen Yaa Asantewaa and the freedom fighter Harriet Tubman, to the economically powerful market-women guilds of present West Africa. We have a tradition of closeness and mutual care and support, from the all-woman courts of the Queen Mothers of Benin to the present day Sisterhood of the Good Death, a community of old women in Brazil who, as escaped slaves, provided escape and refuge for other enslaved women, and who now care for each other. (151)

---

[5] In a footnote, Lorde explains the reference, "In the spring of 1979, twelve Black women were murdered in the Boston area."

Lorde's criticism of *Gyn/Ecology* suggests that dis-covering *this* heritage is every bit as essential to the realization of black women's integrity/energy/be-ing as remembering the Spinsters and Witches in white Western women's heritage is to their/our becoming. Since African women's heritage, on Lorde's view, is symbolized by the black goddess who is absent from the pages of *Gyn/Ecology*, the mythic "Background" and Journey Daly maps there does not open the door to black women's depths.

A further consequence of the exclusion is the barrier it erects to black sisterhood. In "Eye to Eye" Lorde argues that black women who cannot love themselves cannot love their black sisters. (155) In fact, she writes in this essay about the painful "crucifixions" black women reenact upon each other, "the avoidance, the cruelty, the judgments" which separate black women, and she explicitly links these separations with the situation of being denied black goddesses and black female symbolic figures. (164-5) Re-membering the black goddess, on Lorde's view, addresses the "need for Black women to confront and wade through the racist constructs underlying [their] deprivation of each other." (164) By excluding black goddesses in *Gyn/Ecology* Daly contributes nothing to black women's struggles to overcome the forces that separate them from each other.

The consequences of the *exclusion* must be understood in connection with the *inclusion* of analyses in *Gyn/Ecology* which represent noneuropean women as "victims and preyers-upon each other." (67) The problem, in Lorde's view, is *not* that Daly analyzes the practices of Indian Sati, Chinese footbinding,

and African genital mutilation as crimes against women. The problem stems from presenting these analyses as if they told the whole story about the lives of Indian, Chinese and African women. In contrast, Daly presents her analyses of the Western practices of witchburning and gynecology in connection with female symbolic figures reclaimed from white Western European traditions. By including Artemis, Metis, and Nemesis, as well as, Hags, Crones, Spinsters and Witches, Daly presents a complex, if still incomplete, story about the lives of European and American white women. Lorde's criticisms specifically concern Daly's dismissal of the goddesses and warriors from her African tradition in connection with Daly's analysis of African women as victims and "Token Torturers," which includes, for example, a vivid description of six African women holding down and violently mutilating a young girl with the broken neck of a bottle. (163) In presenting this image *and* failing to include black goddesses which reflect the "power and strength and nurturance found in the female bonding of African women," Daly has "distorted and trivialized" Lorde's archetypal experience in a manner not unlike the racist patriarchal devaluation which make black women prey to murder. The lack of a black female mythic presence in *Gyn/Ecology*, on Lorde's view, reveals Daly's underlying assumption that "the herstory and myth of white women is the legitimate and sole herstory and myth of all women to call upon for power and background, and that nonwhite women and our herstories are noteworthy only as decorations, or examples of female victimization." (Lorde 1984, 69) By assuming the heritage and myth of European women functions as the symbolic source of power for all women, Daly

leaves women of color with only two possibilities for finding themselves in *Gyn/Ecology*: *assimilated* in a white Western symbolic frame of reference or *broken* by the totalizing experience of patriarchal violence. When Lorde comments in the letter, "I am used to having my archetypal experience distorted and trivialized, but it is terribly painful to feel it being done by a woman whose knowledge so much touches my own," she is pointing out that Daly has hurt her with one of the master's tools in *Gyn/Ecology*. (68)

Now consider the second problem Lorde identities with excluding black goddesses, that is, that Daly has denied the "real connections" among all women. Recall that Daly and Lorde agree that female symbolic figures, and the legends which surround them, are sources of archetypal information about female power we need for re-membering our autonomous agency and building worlds to make our lives possible. They agree that re-membering the "goddess within" enables us to forge "real connections" with other women. However, Lorde's criticism regarding Daly's distortion of the "real connections" among women clearly goes beyond the idea that we all need our goddesses, to the claim that we all need the black goddess. On my reading, Lorde's point is that only through identification with the black goddess can white women recognize and resist the internalized hate and fear we are taught to associate with blackness. Insisting that white women identify with the Black Goddess is Lorde's strategy for helping white women to unlearn the lessons through which they/we have learned only to identify with white men. Only through identification with the Black Goddess will white women be able to realize a self-conscious and critical

perspective on their/our own race and ethnicity, and to see the urgent need to stand with their sisters of color against racism and imperialism. By excluding nonwhite, nonwestern goddesses from *Gyn/Ecology*, Lorde is concerned that Daly has foreclosed the possibility of a sisterhood which is cognizant of, and grounded upon, racial and ethnic difference. In the absence of black female symbolic figures, white women may not be able to face those differences upon which, Lorde insists, our connections rest.

Before moving on it will be instructive to turn again to *Zami* this time for insight into Lorde's claim that in distorting her heritage, Daly distorted the real connection among all women. After acknowledging her symbolic debt to DeLois, Lorde acknowledges another debt to,

> the pale girl who ran up to my car in a Staten Island midnight with only a nightgown and bare feet, screaming and crying, "Lady please help me oh please take me to the hospital, lady..." Her voice was a mixture of overripe peaches and doorchimes; she was the age of my daughter, running along the woody curves of Van Duzer Street. I stopped the car quickly, and leaned over to open the door. It was high summer. "Yes, yes, I'll try to help you, I said. "Get in." And when she saw my face in the streetlamp her own collapsed into terror.
> "Oh no!" she wailed. "Not you!" then whirled around and started to run again.
> What could she have seen in my Black face that was worth holding on to such horror? Wasting me in the gulf between who I was and her vision of me. Left with no hope. I drove on.
> In the rear-view mirror I saw the substance of her nightmare catch up with her at the corner - leather jacket and boots, male and white.
> I drove on, knowing that she would probably die stupid. (1982, 5)

This passage vividly illustrates what consequences she believes will follow for white women who cannot find or face "the Black Goddess" within. Without the

establishment of our connections on the basis of our common source of strength, white women's prospects for survival are greatly reduced.

On Lorde's view, women's survival and freedom depend on our interdependence, our connections. The prospect of this interdependence is threatening, especially for black women, explains Lorde, unless each white woman who shares the dream of female autonomy is able to "reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives there. See whose face it wears." (1984, 113) If those of us who are white cannot confront these fears and learn to identify our power with what is female *and* black, then Lorde insists, our "mutual (nondominant) differences" cannot be recognized and utilized as tools for change. Without these tools, "only the most narrow perimeters of change are possible and allowable." (Ibid.) Radical feminism must find its foundation, according to Lorde, in the recognition of racial and cultural difference.

Lorde's argument fits together like this. Daly distorts the differences among women, which are the result of being exposed to the different patriarchal practices, by not giving focus to the racial and cultural assumptions informing her analyses. In addition, by assimilating the power and Background of all women to that of white Western European women she distorts the commonalties among women, i.e. the ability to act and connect with other women under patriarchal oppression through identification with radically Other female symbolic symbols. Both distortions rest on assumptions Daly makes from a white Western European standpoint. Hard as it may be to believe for those who have studied

Daly's work, Lorde is charging that *Gyn/Ecology*, in certain respects, expresses identification with her white, Western European fathers. Daly whole-heartedly agrees the work of dis-covering, re-claiming, and naming cannot be accomplished within the father's frameworks. But the difference between the term Daly uses most, "fathers," and the one Lorde uses most, "masters," is telling. In Lorde's view, Daly attempts to reject the tools employed in the father's mythologies and practices, but in the process she (inadvertently) uses the Master's ethnocentric, racist tools. In the effort to avoid the Master's tools, Lorde believes it is essential to sort by race and culture, the various assumptions in the conceptual tool boxes of patriarchy.

On my reading, Lorde's challenge to Daly's frame of reference is an attempt to shift Daly's thinking about racial and cultural differences among women. I want to conclude by re-framing Lorde's challenge using some conceptual resources developed by Ruth Frankenberg. The central concept in Frankenberg's book, *White Women, Race Matters* (1993), is "race discourse." By "discourse" Frankenberg means, "historically constituted bodies of ideas providing conceptual frameworks for individuals, made material in the design and creation of institutions and shaping daily practices, interpersonal interactions, and social relations." (265) A "race discourse" is such a body of ideas about the nature and meaning of race, racial differences, and racism. A "race discourse," in other words, is like a "tool box," i.e. a set of framework principles or assumptions about race, racial difference, and racism which guide or govern

practices. A "race discourse" is a constitutive part of a "world" as I have been using the term.

Frankenberg argues three "race discourses" have emerged in different moments of U.S. history, each of which frames race differently.[6] The first discourse on race Frankenberg calls "essentialist" because it emphasizes "real" or "biological" differences between the races. On the basis of these essential differences, this discourse provides arguments for white racial superiority, e.g. the "scientific" biology- and evolution-based theories which were used to justify antimiscegenation laws which were on the books in the U.S. until 1967. (72-73) In Lorde's lexicon, the essentialist discourse *distorts* racial differences. The second discourse, which emerged in the 1920s, is popularly referred to as "color-blindness," but which Frankenberg re-names "color- and power-evasiveness." This discourse, premised on the notion that we are all the same under the skin, provides fuel for the assimilationist policies of the government, and fashions a tool for blaming the victim of assimilation for any failure to realize the ideal of American democracy. In Lorde's lexicon, the color- and power-evasive discourse *denies* racial difference.

The third discourse, which Frankenberg names, "race cognizance," emerged in the late 1960s with Black Power, La Raza, and the American Indian movements. Like the essentialist discourse, this discourse emphasizes racial

---

[6] Frankenberg develops her idea of a "race discourse" from Michael Omi and Howard Winant's analysis. (Omi and Winant,1986) She explains about her analysis that it "diverges from theirs in a range of ways, including the names I have given to specific periods or tendencies, my emphasis on the continued salience of 'essentialist racism,' and my focus on daily life rather than on intellectual movements, political processes, and social movements." (Frankenberg 1993, 268).

difference. But unlike the essentialist discourse the terms for understanding racial difference are determined by the experiences of people of color. Frankenberg explains that "where difference within the terms of essentialist racism alleges the inferiority of people of color, in the third moment difference signals autonomy of culture, values, aesthetic standards, and so on."[7] (14) And unlike the essentialist discourse, the race cognizance discourse affirms difference in historical, political, social terms rather than biological terms. (157)

Borrowing these concepts, my point is this. Lorde was trying to effect a shift in the race discourse Daly was operating out of, from "color- and power-evasion" to "race cognizance." This reading makes sense of Lorde's challenge in historical terms. At the time Daly wrote *Gyn/Ecology* the race-cognizant discourses were just emerging in the U.S. Frankenberg traced the emergence of race-cognizant views among white feminists she interviewed to their awareness of the very immediate critique of feminist racism coming from U.S. women of color, who were critiquing white feminist racism. (167) Lorde's "Open Letter to Mary Daly" was part of the critique which enabled white feminists to move beyond a "color-evasive" frame of reference. In this historical context is becomes clearer that Lorde was trying to push Daly toward a race cognizant radical feminism. On my reading, Lorde believed that realizing the vision of global sisterhood depended on Daly's willingness to make such a shift in *Gyn/Ecology.*

---

[7] Here makes a connection between race-cognizance and feminism, pointing out second wave feminism has some of its roots in the antiracist and cultural nationalist movements which gave shape to "race cognizance."

The Context of Daly's Decision Not to Respond in Kind

I began Part II, by pointing out that Daly did not respond "in kind" to Lorde's letter. However, in the "New Intergalactic Introduction" (1990) to *Gyn/Ecology* Daly acknowledges Lorde's letter and describes a brief meeting she had with Lorde in which they discussed the book and the letter.[8] (xxx) Regarding Lorde's explicit request for a response to the "Open Letter," Daly explains, "it continues to be my judgment that public response in kind would not be a fruitful direction. In my view, *Gyn/Ecology* is itself an 'Open Book.'" (xxx-xxxi) In this section I read the social and historical context in search of reasons for Daly's decision not to respond in kind.[9] Daly's new introduction provides perspective on the moment fifteen years earlier when she began work on *Gyn/Ecology*. Regarding 1975, she says,

> my world split open, in the most Positively Revolting ways imaginable. That year marked my entry into a New Realm of Qualitative Leaping through galaxies of mind space. [...] It was a Startling, Stunning Time, consisting of Moment after Moment of Spinning Integrity. I believe that this book could not have been written earlier, because before that Time there was no context which would have allowed for the possibility of its becoming. But that year was marked by a convergence of many events which hurled me into utterly New dimensions of thinking, living, loving, writing, and be-ing. (xi)

I focus on those dimensions of the context which I find reflected in Daly's perspective, including the perspectives of black nationalism, the new left, the

---

[8] According to Lorde, she wrote the letter on May 6, 1979 and published it four months later. Daly and Lorde met at the Simone de Beauvoir Conference in New York on September 29, 1979.

[9] In this chapter I search for reasons within the social and historical moment. In the next part, I search for a textual explanation. However, these analyses may not be able to provide a complete answer to the question at hand. A complete answer may require insight into the complex web of interpersonal relationships and political engagements of Daly's life, insight I cannot provide.

nascent second wave women's movement, and the voices of radical black feminists. First, I point out the influence of these various perspectives on Daly's thinking by briefly discussing several of the theses which constituted what she calls the "Qualitative Leap" she made in writing *Gyn/Ecology*. Second, I examine directly the shift from Civil Rights to Black Power within the discourse of black liberation during the late sixties and early seventies; the response by white men of the New Left in the face of challenges from radical feminists; and the voices of radical black feminists in the early seventies. Finally, I say what I think Daly heard in Lorde's letter within the context I have reconstructed as one way of explaining why Daly did not respond in kind.

What Daly's "Qualitative Leap" Reveals About the Context

In the first section of the new introduction, entitled "The Watershed Year," Daly reflects on the exhilaration of reading a radical feminist paper which she had prepared for the Second International Symposium on Belief sponsored by Cardinal König of Vienna entitled, "The Qualitative Leap Beyond Patriarchal Religion." (Daly, 1975) The "Qualitative Leap" refers to what Daly saw as an unavoidable choice facing women concerned with philosophical/theological questions.

> One either tries to avoid "acceptable" deviance ("normal" female idiocy) by becoming accepted as a male-identified professional, or else one tries to make the qualitative leap toward self-acceptable deviance as ludic cerebrator, questioner of everything, madwoman, and witch. (ibid.)

Although the choice between assimilation and ostracism is not an easy one, Daly makes it clear where she stands. Like Matilda Josleyn Gage and Virginia Woolf

in their times, Daly made the choice in the mid-seventies to think from the perspective of the Witch, the female Outsider, the "Ludic Cerebrator."[10] The larger theoretical framework within which this choice takes shape is presented in the symposium paper which includes twenty-three theses. Among the theses which constitute the "Qualitative Leap" are the following.

> 1. There exists a planetary sexual caste system, essentially the same in Saudi Arabia and in New York, different only in degree. (20)
>
> 5. All of the major world religions function to legitimate patriarchy. This is true also of the popular cults such as the Krishna movement and the Jesus Freaks. (ibid.)
> 8. A significant and growing cognitive minority of women, radical feminists, are breaking out from under the sacred shelter of patriarchal religious myths. (20)
>
> 13. The ethos of Judeo-Christian culture is dominated by The Most Unholy Trinity: Rape, Genocide, and War. It is rapism which spawns racism. It is gynocide which spawns genocide, for sexism (rapism) is fundamental socialization to objectify "the other." (21)
>
> 22. Entrance into radical feminist consciousness involves recognition that all male-dominated "revolutions," which do not reject the universally oppressive reality which is patriarchy, are only reforms. (22)

In Part III, I explore the development of these theses in *Gyn/Ecology*. The question I want to raise now about each point is, what does it say about the context Daly as saw it? The reason I think these theses will provide an indication of Daly's perspective at the time is that this paper was probably the last writing she did before she began writing *Gyn/Ecology*. The paper contains, in addition to the theses, segments which are obviously earlier versions of the

---

[10] According to the *Wickedary* (1987), "Ludic Cerebration," defined by Daly in 1975, is "thinking out of the experience of being: the free play of intuition in New Space, giving rise to thinking that is vigorous, informed, multidimensional, independent, creative, tough." (143)

first introduction to *Gyn/Ecology*, as well as the Preludes to the First and Second Passages of *Gyn/Ecology*. A brief consideration of these five theses will provide a window to the world as it appeared to Daly in 1975.

The first thesis suggests Daly was responding to a world, or a discourse, within which the existence of a "planetary sexual caste system" was explicitly denied. In fact, Daly was in the midst of several discourses denying this claim. In the wake of emerging post-modern critiques, it was quickly becoming fashionable among Western scholars in the human sciences and mythology to reject universalistic narratives in favor of positions which rested on acknowledging the incommensurability of cultural practices. Daly was in close proximity to the voice of the Western scholar in her position as associate professor of theology at Boston College. It was also common among the leaders of the emergent political movements like Black Power, La Raza and the American Indian Movement in the United States, as well as other anti-imperialist nationalist movements around the world, to deny that the women in these movements had anything in common with the women outside of them. One explanation for why leaders of these racial and national liberation movements took this position, offered by Partha Chatterjee (1989), is that the women of the group seemed to provide a ground for the establishment of a unique cultural identity, the signifier of a fundamentally different world, a ground which it was necessary for launching claims for cultural autonomy or nationhood. In the context of the project of establishing a particular cultural identity, the idea that

the women of the group seeking the identity were the same as women all over the world probably seemed to constitute a threat to the heart of the project.

The fifth thesis makes the claim that the "planetary sexual caste system," or patriarchy, is legitimated by "all of the major world religions." This thesis suggests that Daly was looking out at a world of women whose religious beliefs were obscuring their ability to see the possibilities of living self-determined lives. A footnote in *Gyn/Ecology* provides a vivid illustration of what she had in mind.

> An article in an Indian paper, the *Sunday Standard*, May 11, 1975, described the wretched existence of the 7,000 widows of the town of Brindaban, "the living specters whose life has been eroded by another's death." These poverty-stricken women with shaved heads and with a single white cloth draped over their bare bodies are forced every morning to chant praise ("*Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Hara Krishna*" ... ad nauseam) for four hours in order to get a small bowl of rice. In mid-afternoon they must chant four more hours in order to receive the price of a glass of tea. A not unusual case is that of a sixty-nine-year-old widow who was married at the age of nine and widowed at eleven, and has been waiting ever since for the "day of deliverance." (114)

When Daly said "all the world religions" she meant Bubbhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and Christianity, as well as "secular derivatives" including Fruedianism, Jungianism, Marxism, and Maoism. What she saw in the world were various "sects subsumed under [patriarchy's] vast umbrella/canopy." (39) This was the perspective she brought to the increasing numbers of women in the seventies moving into the work force, especially the male-dominated academic fields who were making the choice to become male-identified. In other words, she was aware of the vast numbers of women from India to the U.S. in the late twentieth

century living by belief systems which were obscuring their ability to see the possibilities of living self-determined lives.

Thesis eight identifies Daly's affinity with the emergent radical feminist movement of the late sixties and early seventies. From Daly's perspective, it was Radical Feminists who were cracking the code of planetary patriarchy by unmasking the deceptive legitimating forces of patriarchy, and exorcising male-identified patterns of thought from their consciousness. The radical feminist whose work Daly was probably most familiar with at the time was Robin Morgan. Morgan's poetry is included in five of the ten sets of epigraphs which introduce Daly's chapters in *Gyn/Ecology*. And, if specific references to Morgan's political writings are absent in *Gyn/Ecology*, the spirit and direction of those writings is not. Morgan edited the first major anthology of the women's liberation movement, the 600 page tour de force, *Sisterhood is Powerful* (1970).

This was a time when women educators across the disciplines were facing discrimination, denials of tenure, and firings, especially those radical feminists like Daly who were making the qualitative leap toward self-acceptable deviance as ludic cerebrators, questioners of everything, madwomen, and witches. Daly describes the denial of her application for promotion to the rank of full professor at Boston College which culminated in a nation wide protest by feminists against harassment and discrimination in Higher Education. According to Daly, Robin Morgan opened the Forum on Women in Higher Education held in protest of Boston College's denial of promotion on the grounds that she had

"made no significant contribution to the field," with the words, "Sisters, we meet on bloody Jesuit ground." (xiv)

Thesis thirteen makes a claim about the relations among different systems of oppression what was prevalent in the seventies in the U.S. which employs metaphor of a tree root. Recall from the opening paragraph in Part I what Morgan said she meant by "radical" feminist. It meant to her "that sexism is the root oppression, the one which, until and unless we uproot it, will continue to put forth the branches of racism, class hatred, ageism, competition, ecological disaster, and economic exploitation." (Morgan, 1977, 9) What does this thinking about the relations among the major systems of oppression say about the context Daly as saw it? The use of the tree root metaphor was not particular to radical feminists. It was pervasive throughout the spectrum of political movements of the seventies. In response to New Leftists and Black Nationalists who were insisting that capitalism or racism, or some combination was the root of oppression and the cause of sexism, Radical Feminists were insisting that patriarchy was at the root of problems of racism and economic exploitation.

Thesis twenty-two points to the discourse whirling around the question of who is "radical" and who is "reformist" in the universal struggle against oppression. The context was constructed in a way that made "radical" politics those belonging to the movement which identified the oppression at root of all oppressions. Hence, in 1975, the various autonomous movements were locked into battles over whose movement was the truly radical one. With Daly's

awareness of these contextual dimensions in mind, I now begin a more focused survey of some of the perspectives which constituted this context.

From Civil Rights to Black Nationalism

Black nationalism evolved in the 20th century through the visionary work of W.E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, and Harold Cruise among others. Black nationalist politics in the 1960s, informed by this legacy, were shaped in part, by the lessons of the civil rights movement.[11] In order to describe the moment in which Daly began writing *Gyn/Ecology* from the perspective of the black nationalism which took shape in the United States in the late sixties and early seventies I trace significant developments in the work of Stokely Carmichael.

After the arrest of Rosa Parks in 1955, black activism in the U.S. took its shape in the civil rights movement. In the late fifties and early sixties civil rights groups, notably SNCC, CORE, and SCLC, worked against segregationist policies using a variety of tactics, such as, economic boycotts, voter registration campaigns, sit-ins and mass demonstrations.[12] Martin Luther King symbolized the vision of political equality and full participation in U.S. society pursued through actions such as these designed to change unjust laws and social attitudes. In his "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (1963) King argued that Americans have a *moral* responsibility to break unjust laws.

---

[11] Black Nationalism was/is not a monolithic ideology. It has taken many different shapes around the world during the last several hundred years. Even in the United States there are a number of different Black Nationalist traditions. They varied on a number of issues, not least of which was the role of women in a nationalist movement. A good reference on the different traditions is Raymond L. Hall's *Black Separatism in the United States*, (New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1978).

[12] Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Congress of Racial Equality, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

> An unjust law is a code that a numerical or power majority group compels a minority group to obey but does not make binding on itself. This is *difference* made legal. By the same token, a just law is a code that a majority compels a minority to follow and that it is willing to follow itself. This is *sameness* made legal. (King, 1963)

The force behind this integrationist vision was the claim that U.S. society had not lived up to the promise of its democratic ideals. This contradiction was evident in the history of U.S. laws and programs conceived and justified on the basis of "real" or "biological" racial *difference*. Against this history of essentialist racism, the idea that people are all the *same* under the skin, made sense. The civil rights demand for a "color blind" society was an effort to force whites to act in accordance with "equality and justice for all."[13]

By the mid-1960s black activism began to take a new shape in the Black Power movement, which was among other things, a stepping stone to nationalism. The ideological evolution of Stokely Carmichael illustrates this transformation. Carmichael, one of the founders of SNCC, was an early advocate of the integrationist approach. However, he claims, civil rights activism taught him that the problems associated with being black in the U.S. could not be solved by integration and political equality. In *The Black Power Revolt* (1968) Carmichael argues that integration fails to confront "the problem of color,"

> As a goal, it has been based on complete acceptance of the fact that in order to have a decent house or education, blacks must move into a white neighborhood or send their children to a white school. This reinforces, among both black and white, the idea that "white" is automatically better and "black" is by definition inferior. This is why integration is subterfuge for the maintenance of white supremacy. (67)

---

[13] In his dissenting opinion in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1892) Supreme Court Justice Marshall Harlan argued, "Our Constitution is color-blind." For a discussion of the "The Color-Blind Principle" see *Blacks and Social Justice*, Bernard R. Boxill, (Rowman & Allanheld, 1984).

The problem was not simply that whites had excluded blacks from social, political, and economic spheres. Rather, it was that U.S. society was organized by and reflected the legacy of white power. "The reality is that this nation, from top to bottom, is racist," claimed Carmichael. (70) The interests which govern the economic, social and political spheres are white interests. The values, beliefs, traditions, and institutions which constitute U.S. society are white. On this view of the problem, struggles for equality which do not attack the white power structure maintain white supremacy by presupposing and implicitly affirming white assumptions and standards for participation. Because white power is "built in," realizing the vision of social integration meant, for Blacks, assimilation in a white world. King's position, making "sameness" legal, on Carmichael's view would only serve exacerbate the problem since the standard for sameness was white.

Effective resistance to white power, Carmichael insisted, would require "Black Power," by which he meant in 1968, the combination of political self-determination, economic self-sufficiency, and cultural autonomy. At first, Carmichael worked to realize these ideals in the U.S. context. He helped organize The Black Panther Party to speak for the needs of urban blacks in the U.S. "from a position of strength." (62) He argued, from this position of political power that "the masses could *make or participate in making* the decisions which govern their destinies, and thus create basic change in their day-to-day lives." (ibid.) Poverty would be addressed by black politicians acting in the interests of

the black community. Carmichael argued, for example, "if a black man is elected tax assessor, he can collect and channel funds for the building of better roads and schools serving black people -- thus advancing the move from political power into the economic arena." (64)

Cultural autonomy, he argued, was necessary to combat the psychological damage done to blacks in a society built on the distortion and denial of black experience. He illustrates this damage reflecting on his boyhood trips to the Saturday movies.

> White Tarzan used to beat up the black natives. I would sit there yelling, 'Kill the beasts, kill the savages, kill 'em!' I was saying, Kill *me*. (68)

This internalized self-hatred, Carmichael argued, was the historical legacy of slavery in the U.S. To be born black in the U.S. today was, he insisted, to begin life in doubt of one's worth as a human being. (1967, 29) Carmichael and Hamilton wrote *Black Power* in order to "ask the right questions, to encourage a new consciousness and to suggest new forms which express it." (vii) The consciousness they sought to awaken among the black people was a race consciousness of black values, beliefs, traditions, and possibilities. The emphasis here is on racial *difference*, understood in social and historical, rather than essentialist, terms. In order to develop this liberating consciousness,

> Black people must redefine themselves, and only *they* can do that. Throughout this country, vast segments of the black communities are beginning to recognize the need to assert their own definitions, to reclaim their history, and their culture; to create their own sense of community and togetherness. (37)

They argued that redefinition could be accomplished through "the use of words." For example, black folks should reject the term "Negro" because it defines blacks, in white terms, as "lazy, apathetic, dumb, good timers, shiftless, etc." (37) On the other hand, they suggest, "African-American," "Afro-American" are terms which blacks can use to self-define as "energetic, determined, intelligent, beautiful and peace-loving." (ibid.) Redefinition, they pointed out, requires a "common bond," a sense of community such as that which is evoked when "people refer to each other as brother -- soul-brother, soul-sister." (38) In addition, they suggested that challenging white-identified self-understandings necessarily involved learning black history, "a history not taught in the standard textbooks of this country." White supremacy has maintained itself on the lie that blacks "had no culture, no manifest heritage, before they landed on the slave auction blocks in this country." (ibid.) Race consciousness among blacks, they insisted, required a collective identity built on a common language, a sense of community, and their shared history. In their words, "the time is long overdue for the black community to redefine itself, set forth new values and goals, and organize around them." (32)

In 1971, reflecting on the lessons of political work within the U.S. context, Carmichael explains that he and other black activists soon learned, "our solution cannot be found within America, even though those of us who live in the United States may remain there physically." (1971, 177) As Carmichael's thinking developed he developed an Afrocentric perspective by linking the plight of blacks in the U.S. with Africans on the African continent. This link was explicitly

historical. It is a mistake, he argued, to view slavery as the beginning of black history in the U.S. and colonialism as the beginning of black history on the continent. He claimed, on behalf of blacks around the world, "Our starting point in history must precede the period of colonialism and slavery; must precede the Arabic and Europeans invasions." (222) He points out that all Africans were connected in virtue of their land and civilizations prior to slavery and colonization. The slaves were Africans who were taken from their land and the colonized were Africans who had their land taken from them. (223) As a result of their losses,

> Africans today, irrespective of geographical location, have a common enemy and face common problems. We are the victims of imperialism, racism, and we are a landless people. (222)

In *Black Power*, Carmichael and Hamiliton began to think in terms of Frantz Fanon's analysis in *Wretched of the Earth*. "Black Power means that black people see themselves as part of a new force, sometimes called the 'Third World,'" they asserted, because institutional racism is just another form of colonialism. (1967, xi, 5) They tried to make this case on political, economic and social grounds.

They argued, blacks in the U.S. are subject to white rule, directly or indirectly, in manners similar to colonial subjects. Despite the insistence of some that the U.S. political system is pluralistic, Carmichael and Hamilton pointed out, "white groups tend to view their interests in a particularly united, solidified way when confronted with blacks making demands which are seen as threatening to vested interests." (7) Whites rule blacks directly when, for example, the federal government claims that there is a limit to what it can do to stop white abuse of

black civil rights workers. (9) Whites rule indirectly when, for example, the participation of black politicians turns on their loyalty to the White Establishment. (12) Finally, they argue, the manipulation of political boundaries and the devising of restrictive electoral systems indicate there is a form of political colonialism operating in the United States. (15)

The colonial status of blacks is also evident in the organization of economic life in the United States. Carmichael and Hamilton insist, following Fanon in Hegelian terms, the colonies have existed for the sole purpose of enriching the colonizer, a process which has always resulted in the economic dependence of the colonized. (16-17) A similar process is at work in the United States, they argue, for example, when "exploiters come into the ghetto from outside, bleed it dry, and leave it economically dependent on the larger society. (ibid.) Socially, the colonial relationship is perpetuated in the U.S. through representations of blacks designed to justify the denial of basic human entitlements, housing, medical services and education. (23) Degradation and dehumanization are the consequences of social colonialism. Carmichael and Hamilton assert, for example, that "White America's School of Slavery and Segregation, like the School of Colonialism, has taught the subject to hate himself and to deny his own humanity." (31)

At this point Carmichael and Hamilton propose that the solution lies first, in the development of a liberated black consciousness, and second, in what they call "political modernization," by which they mean challenging the traditional

values and institutions of American society, working for new political and economic organizational structures, and broadening the base of political participation. (39) This analysis, Carmichael argues, which had been achieved through "years of hard work, organizing, and learning" ultimately led him and others by 1970 to face the reality that "there is no way we can operate as an independent island surrounded by a hostile white community's police and military forces."[14] (1971, 177) He began to urge blacks in the United States to recognize "the fact that we are an African people, that we must be about building a nation. (180)

In 1971 he claimed, "Pan-Africanism" the highest political expression of Black Power and began to formulate an ideology which mapped black liberation along nationalist lines. Quoting Malcom X, Carmichael declared, "even though we might remain in America physically while fighting for the benefits that the Constitution guarantees us, we must return to Africa philosophically and culturally, and develop a working unity in the framework of Pan-Africanism." (179) On the basis of this Pan-Africanist analysis he comes to the conclusion that American blacks must abandon their identities as "black Americans" or "Afro-Americans" and to embrace their "African" identities. (200-1)

Stokely Carmichael's Pan-Africanism shares with other black nationalisms the demand for organizations uniformly composed of the victims of racial oppression. (Omi, Michael and Howard Winant, 1986, 38) The civil rights

---

[14] In the early seventies Carmichael was expelled from SNCC and quit the Black Panther Party. He changed his name to Kwami Toure, and moved to Conakry, Guinea where he became a citizen of Guinea and lived with his wife, South African musician Miriam MaKeba (sp?).

movement had been *the* rainbow coalition of the twentieth century made up of social and political groups, labor unions, churches, and the Left. To a large degree SNCC's early successes were due to the efforts of SNCC activists to recruit white students into the movement. A case in point was the Mississippi Voter Registration Project of 1963 led by Bob Moses.[15] However, as black activism evolved coalitionism gave way to separatism. Part of this evolution involved coming to consciousness about the need to redress psychological racism. Carmichael argued that blacks must organize blacks because, "only black people can convey the revolutionary idea that black people are able to do things for themselves." (1968, 68) On this analysis, white allies organizing in the black community, doing things for blacks, actually undermine black liberation.

In "The Myths of Coalition" Carmichael and Hamilton still admit the need for coalitions, but raise questions about the politics of coalition work from the perspective of Black Power. "Coalitions with whom? On what terms? And for what objectives?" they asked. (1967, 59) Because what is good for White America is not necessarily what is good for Black America; because those who enter coalitions are not similarly situated with regard to political and economic security; and, because coalitions cannot be sustained on a "moral, friendly, sentimental basis," they argue, blacks should not enter coalitions unconditionally. (60) First, they point out, most liberal reformers who advocate coalitions are militant about civil rights, but reject "militant Negro organizations because they

---

[15] The story of this project is the subject of the 1994 award-winning documentary, *Freedom On My Mind.*

find them 'too race-conscious.'" (Quoting James Q. Wilson, 66) So coalition work which is in black interests must have as its goal, not reform of the system, but a rejection of "Anglo-conformity" and a radical reorganization of society. Second, Carmichael and Hamilton reveal that historically blacks who have worked in coalition with whites have been treated as "a political football, to be tossed and kicked around at the convenience of others whose position was more secure." (70) Hence, they insist that viable coalitions require that all parties can operate from their own "power base." Finally, they argue, coalitions formed solely on "good will" cannot weather conflicts of interest. The limits of "good will" become clear when the issue is "more job competition, 'lower property values,' or their 'daughter marrying a Negro.'" (77) Therefore, they suggest, all coalitions should be based on a mutually beneficial goal, which in turn, is based on the self-interest of each part to the coalition. Finally, after years of failed efforts to unite with whites in coalitions, Carmichael abandoned his faith in coalitions altogether and embraced separatism. Recounting the history of interracial coalitions which have worked to the disadvantage of blacks, he concludes, the first priority of a revolutionary movement must be to build its power base so that it is strong enough to achieve its own ends. Hence, he insisted, "we depend upon no one but ourselves." (1971, 196)

On the question of women's role in the Black Power movement, Carmichael had very little to say. Perhaps this was due to his infamous claim that "the only position for women in SNCC is prone." (Evans, 1979, 87) According to Sara Evans, Carmichael made this comment, at the end of a day

relaxing with activists attending a SNCC staff retreat in Waveland, Mississippi, 1964, as a rebuttal to the suggestion by women in SNCC that sexist leadership might be hampering the organization's effectiveness. The responses by angry women may have led Carmichael to the conscious decision to refrain from commenting on the role of women in the movement. There are two notable exceptions. *Black Power* (1967), which contains no discussion of sexism or feminism, is dedicated to,

> our mothers, Mrs. Mabel Carmichael (affectionately known as May Charles) and Mrs. Viola White, and to all the black mothers who have struggled through the centuries so that this generation could fight for black power.

I think it is useful to read this dedication in light of the Moynihan (196?) report which attributed the plight of blacks in the United States to the "tangle of pathology" engendered by the black matriarchate. Interestingly, bell hooks points out, "the very same Moynihan report that promoted the idea that black men had been 'unmanned' by black women urged black men to enter military service." (hooks, 1981, 104) From the point of view of this insight, the *Black Power* dedication simultaneously debunks the myth of the black matriarchate by naming black mothers the progenitors of a revolutionary generation, and the myth of the emasculated black man by implying that the authors are revolutionary fighters. Hence, on my reading, the dedication says something important about Carmichael's view on the role of women in the Black Liberation movement. Namely, that one of the revered functions of women is to have and raise children who will grow up to fight for the race.

The other exception to Carmichael's silence on the role of women in the movement is his practice of referring to the African continent as a mother. For example, he encourages blacks in the United States to embrace an African identity because, "The African's power base is his homeland -- Mother Africa." (1971, 224-5) Since this symbolic practice of reference was common among nationalists struggling against different imperialist forces in throughout the twentieth century, it is useful to consider it light of the role it played within those movements. For help in understanding this role consider Mrinalini Sinha's (1994) explanation of how an essentialist representation of Indian womanhood aided in the establishment of a national identity in the struggle for independence from England.

> The central contradiction confronting Indian nationalism was to modernize indigenous society to keep pace with the West while at the same time to avow a unique and distinctive cultural identity for the nation, on the basis of which the political claim to nationhood could be made. The nationalists addressed this contradiction by elaborating the spiritual and material domains of culture as distinctive and autonomous spheres. Indian nationalism, Chatterjee suggests, located "its own subjectivity in the spiritual domain of culture, where it considered itself superior to the West and hence undominated and sovereign." Furthermore, Chatterjee suggests that this system of dichotomies was related to the socially prescribed roles of men and women. Women, as the preservers or guardians of tradition or "culture," became the embodiments of that inner spirituality which lay at the core of national identity. Having located the essence of national identity in the spiritual sphere, with women as the embodiments of this spirituality, nationalists were now free to "modernize" or make any concessions to the West in the material world. (6-7)

I want to suggest that something like this is at work in Carmichael's Pan-Africanism. By locating the essence of the nationalist identity in the traditionally

feminine domain of reproduction, which he distinguished from the productive domain where "modernization" was necessary, Carmichael advanced a patriarchal form of nationalism. The projection of a symbolic African Mother whose functions are circumscribed within the reproductive realm of the home suggests that Carmichael had in mind a revolutionary "script" for black women designed to obscure their ability to see the possibilities of living self-determined lives. Notice that in this sense, Carmicheal's African Mother constitutes what Lorde would call a *distortion* of one of the real differences between black and white women. As we shall see, black feminists were quick to point out that forging an identity on the basis of the construction of a feminized Other, especially one so popular among Western patriarchs, had oppressive consequences for the women who were supposed to share in the black nationalist identity.[16]

New Left Meets Radical Feminism

The Civil Rights movement gave birth not only Black Power, but also to the "New Left." On some accounts the "Old Left" -- made up of Communists, labor and religious activists, and pacifists -- had burned-out resisting the McCarthyism of the 1950s.[17] The children of the Old Left, along with other middle class youth of that generation, who joined the sit-ins, voter registration

---

[16] In Part III, I point out how Daly's attempt to forge a gynocentric identity on the basis of the construction of racialized/feminine Others, e.g. the Indian widow, also so popular among western Patriarchs, had oppressive consequences for women who were supposed to share in a global feminist identity.

[17] This is the perspective of Maurice Isserman's *If I Had a Hammer...: The Death of the Old Left and Birth of the New Left*, (Basic Books, 1987).

drives, and freedom rides in the early 1960s, revitalized and reinvented the Left in the form of the anti-war movement, student movement, and counter-cultural movement of the late 1960s. The growth and development of the "New Left" was hastened by the shift in black activism away from coalitions toward separatist organizations. At first, this shift left many young white radicals without a cause.[18]

In an effort to respond to the idea that each oppressed group should organize itself, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) produced a powerful indictment of American social and political values, and set out to put their theory into practice through their Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP), student protests, and later in resistance to the Vietnam war.[19] The early theoretical positions of SDS, heavily influenced by the moral and political force of the Civil Rights movement, stressed the values of equality, brotherhood, and participatory democracy.[20] In addition, SDS theorists proclaimed the inseparability of ends and means. As sixties scholar, Todd Gitlin, put it, "SDS had a passion to make life whole: to bring political commitment into private life." (Gitlin, 1987, 365)

In *Personal Politics* (1980) Sara Evans underscores the important contributions which the New Left made toward the emergence of the Women's Liberation movement. First, in conjunction with the Civil Rights movement, it

---

[18] My account of this history is indebted to Sara Evans's *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement & The New Left*, (New York: Vintage, 1980).
[19] SDS was the youth organization of the League for Industrial Democracy. See *Personal Politics*, chapter 5.
[20] The SDS manifesto, the "Port Huron Statement," was written by Tom Hayden, (New York: Students for a Democratic Society, 1962).

provided a training ground for women activists who were taken seriously, some for the first time in their lives. Second, it promoted a substantive critique of oppression and a vision of a different future. Through Civil Rights and New Left activism, Evans argues, many women "found the inner strength and self-respect to explore the meaning of equality and an ideology that beckoned them to do so." (23) Third, it provided the opportunity for women to build informal friendship networks locally and across the country. And, finally, it presented a concrete *threat* to the self-respect of women in the movement in the form of the hypocrisy of the men in the movement too extensive to ignore. (218-22)

In contradiction with the leftist commitment to the process of participatory democracy, men on the left maintained gender role expectations consistent with those promoted in the larger mainstream culture. Leftist men saw themselves as the intellectual muscle behind the movement and relegated women to the less prestigious tasks, commonly referred to as the "shitwork." According to Robin Morgan, women provided the New Left with its "labor force of secretaries and cooks and speechwriters and Panther- Breakfast-program fixers (at 4:00 A.M.) and mimeograph-machine churners." (Morgan, 209) The competitive and aggressive intellectual mode that dominated the New Left, according to Evans, excluded women from full participation and leadership roles and, at the same time, made it almost impossible for women to protest their exclusion. Women were pressured by male "heavies" to accept the predominately masculine norms. As Marlene Dixon put it,

> women had learned from 1964 to 1968 that to fight for or even sympathize with Women's Liberation was to pay a terrible price:

> what little credit a woman might have earned in one of the Left organizations was wiped out in a storm of contempt and abuse. (Quoted in Burris, 325)

As the New Left grew (tenfold between 1965 and 1967), and the Vietnam war escalated, concern with equality, participation and process gave way to "a kind of macho stridency and militarist fantasy." (Evans, 200) Women were further marginalized once the definitive revolutionary act became risking a jail sentence for burning one's draft card. A popular anti-war slogan valorizing this marginalization announced, "Girls Say Yes to Guys Who Say No!" (179)

Like many outside the movement, women in the movement suffered sexual harassment and exploitation, often lauded under the banner of "sexual revolution." Marge Piercy's writings suggest that in the early days, among *some* movement men there was *some* interest, more and less sincere, in exploring egalitarian heterosexual relationships. (Piercy, 1969, 422) However, for the most part, she claimed, movement men, "fall into two categories: those who make it clear that what they are doing is fucking, and those who provide a flurry of apparently personal interest, which fades mighty quick." (431) Todd Gitlin's recollections confirm Piercy's account,

> [i]n the rush toward phantasmagorical revolution, women became not simply a medium of exchange, consolidating the male bond, but rewards for male prowess and balm for male insecurity. The fantasy of equality on the barricades shattered against the reality of the coffeepot and the mimeograph machine. (Gitlin, 1987, 372-3)

Among the "revolutionary" leaders, Piercy charges, "fucking a staff into existence" was only the extreme form of what passed for common practice in many places. (Piercy, 430) What kept radical women from challenging their own

exploitation in a movement which claimed to be for "human liberation," was a concern for the "larger justice," which women accepted, Piercy argued, because women are taught from childhood to "immolate" themselves to the male and the family. (436-7) Women of the New Left had, like other women, internalized the patriarchal script of the sacrificial mother.

For several years women in the New Left worked on the premise that their male comrades could be made to see the contradiction between their political beliefs and practices, and upon discovering it, would reform themselves. In an effort to push this process along SDS women brought a resolution to the floor at the 1967 SDS convention calling for recognition that the liberation of women, like that of any "colonized" group, must be part of the larger fight for human freedom; demanding women's full participation in the movement; and pledging to support their brothers in their efforts to resolve their contradictions. (Evans, 190-1) After the resolution was read, the meeting hall erupted with men yelling, arguing, cursing, and objecting all over the floor. In the end, part of the resolution passed, Evans reports, and

> [i]t all duly appeared in *New Left Notes* alongside a cartoon of a girl -- with earrings, polkadot minidress, and matching visible panties -- holding a sign: "We Want Our Rights and We Want Them Now." (192)

Hence, she concludes, "SDS had blown its last chance." (ibid.) The road to an autonomous women's movement was paved.

Women's farewell to the New Left was symbolized, on Morgan's view, by the women's 1970 seizure of *Rat*, one of the major "underground" newspapers of

the left and counter-culture.[21] In the first women's issue Morgan published "Good-bye to All That" (1970), which featured a detailed list of misogynist crimes committed by all of the important male leftist leaders and a demystification of their rhetoric. (Morgan, 1978,122-30) In this open letter she says good-bye to the male *Rat* staff who had published articles on "pussy power" and "clit militancy;" good-bye to Charles Manson, Abbie Hoffman, and John Sinclair; good-bye to "the illusion of strength when you run hand in hand with your oppressors;" and to "the dream that being in the leadership collective will get you anything but gonorrhea." (124) "Good-bye" was widely reprinted and discussed, much to the dismay of those named. In response to this letter, Morgan reports, she received death threats from her "revolutionary" brothers. After *Rat* was seized, Morgan claims, the New Left was never the same again. What she and others were finally coming to terms with, she writes, was, "the Awful Truth: that it was the *politics* of the Left, not solely the men who mouthed them, which were male supremacist." (118)

The New Left in 1967, writes Evans, was "increasingly fragmented." (Evan, 195) Gitlin is more candid in his comments about 1967 through 1971. He claims, the "tough-talking men of steel, committed to their revolutionary mirage, were losing their grip on reality." (Gitlin, 373) In reality, he claims, their inflated rhetoric was no match for the National Guard, the Draft Board, the CIA, and the other coercive forces of the State. It was an agonizing time for leftist men who

---

[21] Evans dates women's departure to a meeting of women in Chicago in the aftermath of the 1967 National Conference for New Politics (NCNP). The women at this meeting wrote a manifesto declaring that women should organize their own movement. (196-199)

still had not grasped the fact that "the male-run movement was moving nothing but itself." (ibid.) Leftist women, on the other hand, who had already grasped this fact, were on their way to their own revolution through the creation of an autonomous women's movement. Since women had been "the cement of the male-run movement," Gitlin argues, "their 'desertion' into their own circles completed the dissolution of the old boys' clan." (Gitlin, 374) Resentment on the part of the men was manifest in scapegoating and guilt-tripping feminists for the "directionless and dying" left. (Morgan, 1977, 209) It was also manifest in hostility like that exemplified at the 1969 rally organized by the antiwar National Mobilization Committee to protest the inauguration of Richard Nixon. Marilyn Salzman Webb, a veteran of the New Left and newly involved member of New York Radical Feminists took the stand in front of thousands of demonstrators. She began to speak in clear and certain terms about the oppression of women. Gitlin describes what followed,

> pandemonium broke out in the crowd below her. She plunged on, denouncing a system that views people as "objects and property" -- and a cheer went up. She heard shouts: "Take her off the stage and fuck her!" "Take her down a dark alley!" "Take it off!" (Gitlin, 363)

After she finished, Shulamith Firestone took the microphone, and demanded "Let's start talking about where you *live*, baby," in a frontal attack on the hypocrisy of "revolutionary" men, who claimed to stand for making life whole by bringing political commitment into private life. (Ibid., Also, Evans, 224.) Organizers, concerned that a riot was in the making, hurried the women off stage. This event was only one in a series of attacks by leftists men on

feminists; others included breaking up meetings, bomb threats and vicious name-calling.[22]

Borrowing a phrase from the left, Barbara Burris suggested, "A Specter is Haunting the Left -- The Specter of Feminism." (Koedt, et. al., 1973, 327) In the face of the specter of feminism many leftist men retreated to the patriarchal haven of dismissive ridicule and misogynist hostility. However, as the New Left's focus shifted in the early seventies from anti-war activities to anti-imperialist activities, their response to feminism became more strategic. Open hostility gave way to attempts to "re-capture" women's energy and spirit in a "renewed" movement. A case in point is a carefully worded 1975 New American Movement (NAM) statement of objectives.[23] (Judis, 1975) The statement includes the claim that socialist analysis "subsumes" other movements, including women's liberation, which arose among newly proletarianized workers. It proclaims, at the same time, that NAM's work is "not incompatible with the existence of autonomous women's and third-world organizations," advancing the vision of a respectful coalition of autonomous movements. NAM's explicit goal, to "develop the potential for socialist consciousness" that exists in other movements in order to unite the socialist movement appears to be in tension with the goal of autonomy as it was articulated by leaders in the liberation movements of blacks and women. In the "Fourth World Manifesto" Burris offers as a scathing reply to

---

[22] Examples of these sorts of attacks are documented throughout the feminist literature on this period. An incomplete list of accusations directed against feminists by leftist men, which I composed in the process of researching this period includes calling feminists: a lower form of life, divisive, bourgeois, selfish, dumb chicks, reformist, reactionary, frivolous, and castrating bitches.
[23] The New American Movement (NAM) was founded in 1971 and claimed to be the socialist descendant of SDS.

efforts like NAM's charging that they exploited feminism as an "organizing tool." (In Koedt, 324) She characterizes such efforts as, "trying to get a finger in the Women's Liberation pie." (ibid.)

The most effective leftist response -- to women's departure from the New Left -- was the slanderous accusation that radical feminists where just "white, middle-class, women." The label might not have stuck if it had not been echoed by black male revolutionaries concerned that "their" women might follow suit, and by the mainstream media which was working full time to distort feminism in a multitude of fiendish ways. (Combahee River Collective, 1981) "White" and "middle-class" were adjectives meant to describe the *noun*, the thing, "woman." According to Burris, the order of terms was intended to imply that women's positions in society are determined only by race and class. According to the dominant political analyses among leftists at this time, sex was *not* a significant social determinant of one's position. In fact, the nature of leftist men's sexual perceptions of women suggests to me that their political roots were planted firmly in the patriarchal discourse of essentialist sexual difference. Unlike their fathers in the Old Left, who had wrestled with the "Woman Question," many men of the New Left had not even heard of it. Because McCarthyism had so thoroughly devastated the Old Left, Evans argues, ideological continuity between the old and the new waves of leftist politics was lacking. (Evans, 118-120) From the narrow perspective of the New Left, the situation of women hardly constituted oppression. In support of this position, men of the New Left would point to black women who prioritized the struggle against racism, and Vietnamese women who

prioritized the struggle against capitalist imperialism. In fact, most New Left men claimed any discussion of women's "oppression" was peripheral or a deliberate effort to sabotage "the" revolution. It was these politics founded on the idea that capitalism, perhaps in relation with racism, is the fundamental form of oppression, which denies the very existence of patriarchy which Robin Morgan found "inherently male supremacist."

In 1970, Robin Morgan began searching for, and helping to create, the connective tissue among women, the "organic" solidarity Beauvoir had thought impossible, the ground of sisterhood. She began, "O language, thou precise Richter scale of attitudinal earthquakes!" to say "we," rather than "they" when referring to women. (1977, 5) She began to organize women who had previously been, "angels of mercy for so many other causes." (102) She and other New York Radical Women organized the first major action of the second wave Women's Movement, a protest against the 1968 Miss America Pageant in Atlantic City. (62) Morgan recounts that this event was chosen because it was "a perfect combination of American values - racism, militarism, capitalism - all packaged in one 'ideal' symbol, a woman." (64)

Soon after the Pageant Action, Morgan helped create WITCH, a group founded on the idea of identifying with witches because "any woman who was intelligent, articulate, nonconformist, aggressive, or sexually liberated was usually burned at the stake." (69) The WITCHes were dedicated to direct action which mixed zany humor with militant politics. Their audacious tactics

incorporated history and theater with confrontation and disorderly conduct. For example,

> On the true Underground's Holiest Day of the Year, All Hallow's Eve (known to mortals and Woolworth's as Halloween), at the stroke of High Noon, a Coven of WITCH (Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell) emerged from the Underground Gates of the IRT at Wall Street to pit their ancient magic against the evil powers of the Financial District -- the center of the Imperialist Phallic Society, the enemy of all witches, gypsies, guerrillas, and grooves. (75)

Dressed as Shamans, Faerie Queens, Matriarchal Old Sorceresses, and Guerrilla Witches the coven danced right through the Federal Reserve Treasury Bank and the New York Stock Exchange, led by a High Priestess bearing a papier-mâché head of a pig on a golden platter, casting spells on corporate stockholders and singing (to the tune of "Tisket-a-Tasket") "Wall Street, Wall Street, Crookedest Street of All Street / Foreign Exchange / Student Exchange / Wife Exchange / Stock Exchange / Trick or Treat / Up Against the Wall!" (ibid.) In the process of resisting the Stock Exchange guards, who were about to phone for help, Morgan reports, "the line went mysteriously dead." (76) Following this report she comments, "Dig it: these are guerrilla witches." (ibid.) The idea spread and soon there were covens forming across the country hexing everything from the Bridal Fair at Madison Square Garden to the United Fruit Company (for oppressing South American peasants and North American secretaries) to the unsuspecting Mrs. Pat Nixon. (72-3)

The remarkable thing about Robin Morgan's political work was that she had such a clear sense of where the movement should be going at a time when

there was very little feminist theory for guidance. Some of WITCH's strategies, e.g. the "guerrilla" and theatrical tactics, were influenced by politicos and proto-anarchists on the left. (72) However, the left cannot be credited with the mythic and historic dimensions of the groups' actions, not to mention the flair. Morgan and others were taking the connection between 20th century feminists and 15th century witches to the streets. In 1970, eight years prior to the publication of *Gyn/Ecology*, she wrote,

> We are the myths. We are the Amazons, the Furies, the witches. We have never not been here, this exact sliver of time, this precise place. There is something utterly familiar about us. We have been ourselves before. (142)

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly credits Morgan for inspiring and encouraging women to identify as witches. Daly writes, "many women have understood this identity of the Witch within, the Self who is the target of the fathers' attacks and the center of original movement." (Daly, 1978, 221) Radical Feminists of the second wave virtually founded the Women's Liberation movement on re-membering and re-inventing female symbolic figures who broke with the male-identified scripts of the fathers, revolutionary ones included.

There was at least one script the early second wave radical feminist did not break with. I am referring to the "radical" script which claimed that systems of oppression are related as the roots of the tree are related to the branches. This "root" thinking, can be traced back in the Western tradition at least to Karl Marx's distinction between the base and the superstructure. According to Marx, the "engine" of historical change is in the "base," that is, in the economic

relations which constitute the most fundamental dimension of the social structure in a given historical moment. On this view, all the other dimensions of social life, including law, morality, and religion as well as the politics of race and sex, in any given epoch are rooted in the mode of production characteristic of that epoch. Hence, the Marxist answer to the question regarding the oppression of women was that it manifests itself as a superstructural formation determined by the prevalent mode of production. So, for example, under capitalism, women are oppressed at the most basic level by their economic class, if there women experience sexism it is due to their class position. This is the assumption behind the socialist analysis which sees feminism as a movement which arose among newly proletarianized workers, and which seeks to "develop the potential for socialist consciousness" that exists in the women's liberation movement in order to unite the socialist movement.

This same pattern of "root" thinking is apparent among radical feminists, like Robin Morgan, in the early seventies. Recall my opening line in Part I,

> Today in the United States, Radical Feminist theory is commonly associated with the theses that patriarchy, a socially constructed sex-class or castelike system perpetuated through ideologies of male supremacy, is the root and model form of oppression; and that women's liberation will be achieved through a revolutionary feminist struggle to overthrow the system which begins with the reclamation and revaluation of women's experience. (1)

Careful consideration of Morgans' view and the seemingly disparate views of the men in the New Left and the Black Liberation movement reveals a connection in their ways of thinking about the relations among systems of oppression. Both the radical feminists and revolutionary men were arguing that there was one

system at the base or root of the others which acted as a causal determinant in the workings of the other systems of oppression which were said to spring from it. The men of the New Left insisted feminism was a bourgeois movement. Black Nationalist men insisted that feminism was a racist movement. Radical feminists insisted, in reaction, "sexism is the root oppression, the one which, until and unless we uproot it, will continue to put forth the branches of racism, class hatred, ageism, competition, ecological disaster, and economic exploitation." (Morgan, 1977, 9)

It was from this radical feminist perspective that Burris challenged the accuracy of the label "white, middle-class, women" by pointing out that, in fact, it is sex, rather than race or class, which determines women's primary "caste" position in society. For example, she argued, if race was a primary determinant of one's social position, then *all* whites would share the same privileges and exercise the same powers. In fact, since white men exclude white women from the white power structure, she reasoned, "whiteness does not overcome the caste position of being a woman in this society." (330) Any "incidental advantages" which a white woman accrues in virtue of being white or middle-class "come to her mainly in her affiliation with a dominant white male," and are "meaningless in terms of women's true caste position as a sex." (ibid.) On this radical feminist analysis, the label is only an effective weapon against feminists who have failed to identify their "true caste position as women." (331)

In support of their claim that sex was the primary social determinant radical feminists made cross-cultural arguments. Burris argued, for example,

that women around the world shared the repression of their female cultures within their national, ethnic or racial cultures. Drawing support from "third world" women, Algerian women in particular, who resisted their subordinate status within their national liberation movements, she criticized nationalist revolutionary analysis which viewed women's oppression as a byproduct of colonialism. For example, she quotes Algerian women in order to "show that a nationalist, anti-imperialist revolution does not free women because the dominant male culture is identified as the national culture, and male supremacy is never attacked." (351) The objective of her cross-cultural analyses is to make the case that sex is *the* primary social determinant.

It was in these analyses that Radical Feminism found the basis for solidarity among women. This way of thinking about the relations of systems of oppression led Burris to argue, since "the Female Liberation Movement must cut across all (male-imposed) class, race, and national lines, any false identification with privileges that are really male (such as whiteness or class, etc.) will be fatal to our Movement." (332) It was in this tradition that Daly argued, "false inclusion" is a tactic employed by men to keep women of different ethnic, national, class, and religious affiliation from discovering that women are the Enemy men seek to kill. (Daly, 1978, 365) These Radical Feminist theorists shared the logic which moved them from the belief that sex was a primary social determinant, through cross-cultural arguments for that belief, to the conclusion that women's solidarity must be grounded in a woman-identified politic which condemned any identifications on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion or class.

These early Radical Feminists did not see, from the perspective of the logic premised on the metaphor of a "root" form of oppression, the connection between their views and those of their "brothers." They made their arguments for the "radical" claim in reaction to leftist men who were attempting to undermine and co-opt the emerging autonomous women's movement. In response to the leftist claim that only class and/or race, but not sex, were the primary determinants of social position, Radical Feminists made the defensive counter-claim that sex was a more fundamental determinant of social position than were race or class. In response to the leftist claim that sexism was peripheral or superstructural, Radical Feminists argued race and class were byproducts of patriarchy. In response to leftists who held up African-American and Third World women in support of their position, Radical Feminists held up other African-American and Third World women in support of their position. And in response to leftist's who fought for solidarity only against imperialist or racist domination, radical feminists worked for only against patriarchal domination. This is the same game.

There is evidence that some Radical Feminists were leery of the game and tried to avoid it. For example, Morgan attempts to distinguish her argument that sexism is more fundamental than other forms of oppression from the comparisons of human suffering which were characteristic of what she calls, "more-oppressed-than-thou" politics popular among leftists. In addition, the choice of the 1968 Miss America Pageant because it was "a perfect combination of American values - racism, militarism, capitalism - all packaged in one 'ideal'

symbol, a woman," is evidence that radical feminist activists grasped the importance of understanding, at a certain level, that oppression and privilege are lived in ways that are not captured by the metaphor of the root. Still, this limited level of understanding and critique of leftist politics raises the question, why did Radical Feminists play? It is important to keep in mind that many of the early Radical Feminists had matured politically in the New Left. Barbara Burris had worked in the Civil Rights Movement, the peace movement, and SDS. Robin Morgan had written for *Rat* and been active in the anti-war and anti-imperialist arms of the New Left. Shulamith Firestone was involved with NCNP. Anne Koedt, one of the editors of the anthology *Radical Feminism*, had been an SDS activist. With the notable exception of Mary Daly most of the early radical feminists had learned what it meant to be "radical," how to frame and defend their positions, and how to attack those positions which conflicted with their own, from their involvement with the male-dominated New Left, a few from involvements with anti-imperialist nationalist liberation struggles. Their participation in the "radical" discourse obscured the possibility of a gynocentric perspective which self-consciously and critically sought out patterns revealed by the intersections among patriarchy, racism, economic exploitation, colonialism, and imperialism.

Black Feminism

If it is not already obvious, most of the radical feminists who, I have been claiming, launched the autonomous U.S. Women's Liberation movement from

the critique of the New Left, were white women. There was some truth in the claim that radical feminists were a bunch of white women. The fact that there were not a lot of black women among those calling themselves "Radical Feminists" was *not* because white women were more woman-identified than black women, *nor* was it because feminism was a white woman's thing. In large part, it was the historical legacy of relations between black and white women from slavery to segregation to the liberation movements in the sixties. From the perspective of Cynthia Washington, director of the Mississippi Freedom Project in 1964, black and white women "started from different ends of the spectrum." (Washington, 238-40) She explains that most black women had been forced by circumstance to be independent and, therefore, in their movement work they welcomed support. Many white women, on the other hand, sought independence in their movement work because they had been historically forced into dependence on men. As a result black and white women made different choices in the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, Washington recalls, not all black women made the same choices about how they would relate to the movement.

> [S]ome black women were "producing children for the black nation," while others began to see themselves as oppressed by black men. [...] To me, it was not a matter of whether male/female oppression existed but one of priorities. I thought it more important to deal with the folks and the system which oppressed both black women and black men. (239)

Faced with two autonomous movements, male-dominated Black Liberation and white-dominated Women's Liberation, both of which were making cases for

liberation on the basis of "root" thinking, many black women at the time, like Washingtion, were forced to prioritize different dimensions of their life experience. Even though there was no Black Feminist movement in the early seventies, there were black feminists speaking out about sexism, racism, and capitalist exploitation against of black women. Washington reports black women spoke out against *sexist* male leadership. In particular, she recalls her own response to Stokely Carmichael's notorious comment that the only position for women in SNCC was prone. According to Washington, she and another black project director, Muriel Tillinghast, who were there at the time, "were not pleased." (Washington, 239) They knew that their positions in the movement was proof that what he said wasn't true. Furthermore, despite the sexism of black men, there was also the long tradition of black women and men struggling *side by side* for the liberation of the race which held the promise that the contemporary Black Liberation movement would grow in this tradition.[24] Hence, most black women, like Washington, forced to choose, chose to work within the Black Liberation movement rather than the Women's Liberation movement.

In *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought* (1995), editor Beverly Guy-Sheftall brings together a collection work which spans the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Chapter Three, entitled "Civil Rights and Women's Liberation: Racial/Sexual Politics in the Angry Decades," includes political theory by Francis Beale, Mary Ann Weathers, Linda La Rue, Angela Davis and Michele Wallace, among others. A concern that all these women give

---

[24] bell hooks has written eloquently about this history in a number of her books.

voice to, and around which the differences in their views can be seen, is the myth of the black matriarch. White men, most notably, Patrick Moynihan, argued that the black matriarch was the root cause of the oppression of the black race. But it was not only white men that made this case. Michele Wallace describes how she heard it as an attack on her in 1968,

> I was told of the awful ways in which black women, me included, had tried to destroy the black man's masculinity; how we had castrated him; worked when he didn't work; made money when he made none; spent our nights and days in church praying to a jive white boy named Jesus while he collapsed into alcoholism, drug addiction, and various forms of despair; how we'd always been too loud and domineering, too outspoken. (In Guy-Sheftall, 221)

In my representation below of the voices of black feminists I was trying to hear the ways in which their thinking about the myth of the black matriarch was influenced by, and refused, the "root" thinking prevalent in the liberation movements of the day.

According to Guy-Sheftall, Francis Beale's essay "Double Jeopardy," first published in Robin Morgan's *Sisterhood is Powerful* (1970), became the most anthologized essay in the early years of women's liberation publications. In her introduction to the essay Guy-Sheftall points out that Beale's essay,

> addressed the double burden of race and gender that black women confronted; dealt with issues of reproductive freedom for black women in a sanguine manner; articulated early on the necessity for the white women's liberation movement to be anti-imperialist and antiracist, a refrain that was repeated by many feminist women of color throughout the 1970s and 1980s; and provided a revolutionary vision of a 'new world' free of all oppressions, including capitalism. (145)

Beale opens the essay with a statement which indicates the hold that "root" thinking had on her thought about the relation between the systems of capitalism and white supremacy. She claims, "The system of capitalism (and its afterbirth -- racism) under which we all live has attempted by many devious ways and means to destroy the humanity of all people, and particularly the humanity of black people." (146) Thinking of capitalism as the source of the destruction and racism as its "afterbirth" indicates not only "root" thinking but also Beale's effort to incorporate both class and race analyses in her thinking.

On the model of bourgeois white womanhood she claims,

> A woman who stays home caring for children and the house often leads an extremely sterile existence. She must lead her entire life as a satellite to her mate. He goes out into society and brings back a little piece of the world for her. His interests and his understanding of the world become her own and she cannot develop herself as an individual having been reduced to only a biological function. This kind of woman leads a parasitic existence that can aptly be described as legalized prostitution. (147)

Against this white-identified ideal of womanhood, Beale stands with black women who have been "browbeaten with this white image." (ibid.) Her critique emerges from the reality of the "degrading and dehumanizing jobs" that were relegated to black women which made their realization of the white ideal impossible. There is no common ground on her view in the experiences of black and white women.

On the more prominent leadership role of black men in the black liberation struggle, Beale criticizes black men who she hears espousing the myth of the black matriarch, arguing that "they have been castrated by society but that black women somehow escaped this persecution and even contributed to this

emasculation." (148) She follows this criticism with the claim, "the black woman in America can justly be described as a "slave of a slave." While she admits that black men have been emasculated, lynched, and brutalized, she adamantly denies that black women have played any part but "scapegoats" in these atrocities. Black men, she says, who "are exerting their 'manhood' by telling black women to step back into a domestic, submissive role are assuming a counterrevolutionary position."(ibid.) However, she insists, at the same time, that

> black women are not resentful of the rise to power of black men. We welcome it. We see in it the eventual liberation of all black people from this corrupt system of capitalism. Nevertheless, this does not mean that you have to negate one for the other. This kind of thinking is a product of miseducation; that it's either X or Y. It is fallacious reasoning that in order for the black man to be strong, the black woman has to be weak. (ibid.)

Here, in the same breath, she depends on and criticizes the logic of "root" thinking. She depends on it to unite black men and women against racism rooted in capitalism, and criticizes it to unite black men and women against sexism. On the basis of this position, Beale criticizes black women "who project in an intellectual manner how great and rewarding this [weak] role will be and who feel that the most important thing that they can contribute to the black nation is children." (149) On her view, by embracing "a bourgeois white model," they are undermining their own revolutionary interests as black women.

It is important to note that while Beale prioritizes her commitment to black nationalism, her critiques of both black and white womanhood are clearly informed by a radical feminist perspective. However, on the subject of the

relationship of black women's struggles to the white women's liberation movement she claims,

> While there are certain comparisons that one can make, simply because we both live under the same exploitative system, there are certain differences, some of which are quite basic. [...] Any white group that does not have an anti-imperialist and antiracist ideology has absolutely nothing in common with the black woman's struggle. In fact, some groups come to the incorrect conclusion that their oppression is due simply to male chauvinism. They therefore have an extremely antimale tone to their dissertations. Black people are engaged in a life-and-death struggle and the main emphasis of black women must be to combat capitalist, racist exploitation of black people. While it is true that male chauvinism has become institutionalized in American society, one must always look for the main enemy -- the fundamental cause of the female condition. (153)

In the end, she grounds her commitment to prioritizing the black struggle against capitalist, racist exploitation, in the same logic which she condemns as "fallacious" which requires either X or Y. In this case, she reasons, either "male chauvinism" or racist capitalism is the "most fundamental cause of the female condition."

Mary Ann Weathers's essay, "An Argument for Black Women's Liberation as a Revolutionary Force," was included in the chapter on "Radical Feminism" in the anthology *Voices from the Women's Liberation* (1970) edited by Leslie Tanner. (157) The premise of Tanner's book, identified by Guy-Sheftall as a "major tenet of 'second-wave' white feminism in the 1970s," was that "all women are 'sisters,' despite class differences, because of their common experiences of oppression." (ibid.) Weathers opened her essay by offering the statement, "Nobody can fight your battles for you; you have to do it yourself," as the basis

for the case for black women's liberation. (158) She criticized black women who are "expounding all their energies in 'liberating' black men," who talk about "giving black men their manhood -- or allowing them to get it," or who "chew the fat about standing behind our men." (ibid.) On behalf of black women's liberation she proclaims,

> We do not have to look at ourselves as someone's personal sex objects, maids, baby sitters, domestics, and the like in exchange for a man's attention. Men hold this power, along with that of the breadwinner, over our heads for these services, and that's all it is servitude. In return we torture him, and fill him with insecurities about his manhood, and literally force him to "cat" and "mess around" bringing all sorts of conflicts. This is not the way really human people live. This is whitey's thing. And we play the game with as much proficiency as he does. (160)

Hence, she shares with Beale a radical feminist critique of black manhood and womanhood as they are constructed within the black liberation movement, *and* she shares the "root" thinking which views sexism as "whitey's thing." At first, it appears that like Beale, Weathers makes a primary commitment to the struggle against racist capitalist exploitation. However, she goes on to insist, what Beales denies, namely that,

> *All* women suffer oppression, even white women, particularly poor white women, and especially Indian, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Oriental, and black American women whose oppression is tripled by any of the above mentioned. But we do have female's oppression in common. This means that we can begin to talk to other women with this common factor and start building links with them and thereby build and transform the revolutionary force we are beginning to amass. (Her emphasis, ibid.)

She resists the forces urging her to side with either black or women. In an effort to resist the logic of "root" thinking she proposes Black Liberation and Women's

Liberation link up with "with the entire revolutionary movement consisting of women, men and children," in a fashion similar to that of NAM. (158)

In "The Black Movement and Women's Liberation," (1970) first published in the *Black Scholar*, Linda La Rue explains the ambivalence of many black women to the Women's Liberation movement and suggests that the movement "has developed a sudden attachment to the black liberation movement as a ploy to share attention that it has taken blacks 400 years to generate." (166) On her view, any alliance between the two movements, such as that proposed by Weathers, would be unwise. Despite the "surge of 'common oppression' rhetoric and propaganda," La Rue argues, "any attempt to analogize black oppression with the plight of the American white woman has the validity of comparing the neck of a hanging man with the hands of an amateur mountain climber with rope burns." (164) The idea that black women and white women share a common oppression is mistaken, on La Rue's views because "there is a difference," between blacks who are "oppressed" that is, "unreasonably burdened, unjustly, severely, rigorously, cruelly, and harshly fettered by white authority," and white women who are "only suppressed," that is, "checked, restrained, excluded from conscious and overt activity." (166) In arguing for a common cause between black and white women, she insists white feminists threaten to minimize or eclipse the "real oppression" of all blacks. (164)

She goes on to argue that a commitment to the Black Movement must include a thorough-going critique of sexism. As a committed member of the movement she writes,

> If we are realistically candid with ourselves, we will accept the fact that despite our beloved rhetoric of Pan-Africanism, our vision of Third-World liberation, and perhaps our dreams of a world state of multi-racial humanism, most black and a good many who generally exempt themselves from categories still want the proverbial "piece of cake." American values are difficult to disregard, for, unlike what militant "brothers" would have us believe, Americanism does not end with the adoption of Afro hairstyles on pregnant women covered in long African robes. (165)

She applies her internal critique to Carmichael's comment about the place of black women in the movement, insisting that it imports "white-ascribed characteristics of women." (171) In La Rue's view, the "black movement needs its women in a position of struggle, not prone." (ibid.)

Among the most compelling black feminist voices of this period was that of Angela Davis. On the back cover of her (1974) autobiography, she is described as "America's most wanted woman."

> She was once the FBI's Most Wanted Criminal -- charged by the State of California with kidnapping, conspiracy and murder in the Marin County Courthouse shoot-out. Later, she was acquitted. She is a Communist. Feminist. Intellectual. Symbol of the shattering sixties. Leader in the Black revolution. Now, a Black, brainy and beautiful woman tells the compelling story of her life, loves, sorrows, relationships with George Jackson and the Soledad brothers, the outrages that shaped a public drama and her struggle for freedom in America. (Davis, 1975)

In the course of her story it becomes evident that Davis was straddling the New Left and Black Power movements. Situated in a political context which compelled her to profess her loyalties to only one movement, she resisted by trying to work at the intersections. For example, in 1968 she worked as a member of the Communist Party together with the Black Panther Party to create a political education program. However, since this false necessity to find the root

of all oppression constituted one of the main tenets of all the liberation movements in the sixties in the U.S., she was often forced to choose. For example, she recalls how the political education program was effected when a "crisis struck at the Black Panther Party" which lead to a purge of some Communists. Describing how the crisis effected the intersection she was working at, she wrote,

> they did not even confront me with the ultimatum given Deacon -- namely, to choose one of the two parties -- Black Panther or Communist. (This had been discussed before we entered the Panther Party, and it had been agreed on both sides that the two parties were not in competition with each other and that thus there existed no problem of conflict of loyalties.) (1975, 192-3)

Reflecting back on these times in 1992, she recalls how compelling the invitation, extended in the "offensive nationalist rhetoric of Malcom X," was to join an empowering black community. (Davis, 1992) With contacts from Stokely Carmichael, she "embark[ed] upon an exploration of some of the nationalisms of the era." On her discoveries she recalls,

> I found out, during my initial contacts, that Ron Karenga's group was too misogynist (although I would not have used that word then). Another organization I found too middle class and elitist. Yet another fell apart because we, women, refused to be pushed to the back of the bus. And even though we may have considered the feminism of that period white, middle class, and utterly irrelevant, we also found compulsory male leadership utterly unacceptable. (ibid.)

As a result, Davis asserts, she and her sisters, her closest comrades, fought tenaciously for their "right to fight."

In her essay "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves" (1970), described by Guy-Sheftall as a "landmark," Davis stands up for

black women and with black men against the misogynist/racist construction of the black matriarch. Although Davis's reflections are focused on the period of slavery, the ways in which that history is present in 1971 are evident throughout.

In order to get a sense of the depth of identification among radical black women and men in the movement during this period, consider the relation between Davis and George Jackson, which she foregrounds in a dedication of the essay.

> I would like to dedicate these reflections to one of the most admirable black leaders to emerge from the ranks of our liberation movement -- to George Jackson, whom I loved and respected in every way. As I came to know and love him, I saw him developing an acute sensitivity to the real problems facing black women and thus refining his ability to distinguish these from their mythical transpositions. George was uniquely aware of the need to extricate himself and other black men from the remnants of divisive and destructive myths purporting to represent the black woman. If his life had not been so precipitously and savagely extinguished, he would have surely accomplished a task he had already outlined some time ago.

In the essay Davis is concerned the "fictious clichés," particularly that of the black matriarch, which "have given credence to grossly distorted categories through which the black woman continues to be perceived." Like other black feminists at the time, Davis felt the urgent need to refute the myth that the black matriarch was at the "root" of the oppression of black people. This myth was advanced in the racist Moynihan report as well as in the sexist black nationalist rhetoric of the late sixties and early seventies. A rigorous effort to deconstruct the black matriarch, Davis suggests, must begin at "its presumed historical inception," that is, slavery. (In Guy-Sheftall, 200) She argues that the myth,

which promoted the idea that black women "actively assented to slavery" as collaborators, could not be true because "the slave system did not -- and could not -- engender and recognize a matriarchal family structure." (201) In fact, she points out, "the American brand of slavery strove toward a rigidified disorganization in family life, just as it had to prescribe all potential social structures within which black people might forge a collective and conscious existence." (ibid.) Hence, the "designation of the black woman as a matriarch is a cruel misnomer." (202) However, she goes on to say that this truth does not imply the black slave woman played no significant role. On the contrary, Davis submits that "by virtue of the brutal force of circumstances, the black woman was assigned the mission of promoting the consciousness and practice of resistance." (ibid.) While her mission was dictated by "the male supremacist ideology of white society in America; it was also woven into the patriarchal traditions of Africa." (205) Nevertheless, she finds overwhelming evidence of the black woman, at every juncture, "transcending, refusing, fighting back, asserting herself over and against terrifying obstacles." (214) Davis underlines the fact that her strength was not directed against her brother, "she fought alongside her man, accepting or providing guidance according to her talents and the nature of their tasks." (214) Davis's provides this (revisionist) history lesson in order to aid the understanding of black men and women about how the myth of the black matriarch works as an ideological weapon to keep black women from taking, in her words, "our place wherever our people are forging on towards freedom.

Lest there be any confusion about the relation between Davis's debunking of the black matriarch, and Lorde's effort to reclaim the Black Mother, I offer a few brief notes. I think the projects of both Davis and Lorde are responses to the urgent need to stand against this ideological warfare being waged, most directly, against black women during in the sixties and seventies. The myth of the black matriarch which is the target of Davis's critique constitutes what Lorde would call a "distortion" of the difference represented, in Lorde's view, by the archetype of the Black Mother. While Davis fought the distorted archetype from the ground of concrete historical circumstance, Lorde fought the distortion from the ground of possibility represented by black female symbolic figures reclaimed from patriarchal myth. One difference in their projects reflects the political alliance each was working to foster at the moment. Davis's project, which focuses on how the distorted myth threatens the common struggle of black people, was primarily intended to strengthen the ties between black men and women. Lorde's project, as articulated in her open letter to Daly, focuses on how the myth is obscured and distorted by ethnocentric racism, was primarily intended to strengthen the ties between black and white women.

In contrast with Lorde's "Open Letter" and Davis's "Reflections," Michele Wallace's "Anger in Isolation: A Black Feminist's Search for Sisterhood" (1975) focuses the absence of strong ties between black women. Wallace was a founding member of the National Black Feminist Organization (1974) and author of a "controversial feminist polemic she wrote in her twenties," entitled *Black Macho and the Myth of the Superwoman* (1978). (Guy-Sheftall, 219) She must

have been working this book during the same years Daly was working on *Gyn/Ecology*.[25] *Black Macho* was, "a critique of the male-dominated civil rights and misogynist Black Power movements, and a scathing exposé of sexual politics within the African American community." (ibid.)

In "Anger in Isolation" Wallace recounts how it took her "three years to fully understand that Stokely was serious when he'd said [her] position in the movement was 'prone,' three years to understand that the countless speeches that all began 'the black man ...' did not include [her]." (221) She recalls how she was told, when she first began calling herself a feminist, "That's whitey's thing." (225)

> In *Ebony*, *Jet*, and *Encore*, and even in *The New York Times*, various black writers cautioned black women to be wary of smiling white feminists. The women's movement enlists the support of black women only to lend credibility to an essentially middle-class, irrelevant movement, they asserted. (ibid.)

Wallace comments on this warning, "Time has shown that there was more truth to these claims than their shrillness indicated." (ibid.) She goes on to criticize white feminists, including radical feminists, for their "hands off" approach when it comes to black sexism. She writes,

> I've got no pressing quarrel with the notion that white men have been the worst offenders, but that isn't very helpful for a black woman from day to day. White women don't check out a white man's bank account or stockholdings before they accuse him of being sexist -- they confront white men with and without jobs, with and without membership in a male consciousness-raising group. (ibid.)

---

[25] See Wallace's self-critique of *Black Macho* in her new introduction, "How I Saw It Then, How I See It Now," (1990).

In this criticism she is suggesting that there is a failure of interracial sisterhood implicit in white feminist critiques which sidestep black men's sexism in order to avoid being racist.

Wallace's critiques of black men's sexism and white women women's racism contribute to an explanation of why she must "search for sisterhood" among black feminists. She searched in vain for black sisterhood in the National Black Feminist Organization, which folded when it was barely off the ground, because she says "many of the prime movers in the organization seemed to be representing other interest groups and whatever commitment they might have had to black women's issues appeared to take a back seat to that." (226) Her efforts to start a black women's consciousness-raising group were thwarted, she says, because "we had no strength to give to one another." (ibid.) She observes, "Despite a sizable number of black feminists who have contributed much to the leadership of the women's movement, there is still no black women's movement, and there appears to be for some time to come." (ibid.) Her important point is that black women's deep engagements in the Black Liberation, the New Left, and Women's Liberation functioned effectively to keep black women isolated from one another. Describing the plight of black feminists in the early seventies, she concludes,

> We exist as women who are black who are feminists, each stranded for the moment, working independently because there is not yet an environment in this society remotely congenial to our struggle -- because, being on the bottom, we would have to do what no one else has done: we would have to fight the world. (227)

Why Didn't Daly Respond in Kind to Lorde's Letter?[26]

In order to develop a historically sensitive understanding of how Daly might have received Lorde's letter it is important to keep in mind that hearing is a process which depends on a context. In this regard it is useful to consult Daly's thinking about "Depth Hearing." (Daly, 1987,72; 1978, 412) "Depth Hearing" is the name Daly gives to the logic described by Nelle Morton, whereby in the beginning is not "the Word," but hearing. Morton explains:

> I knew I had been experiencing something I had never experienced before. A complete reversal of the going logic in which someone speaks precisely so that more accurate hearing may take place. This woman was saying, and I had experienced, a depth hearing that takes place before the speaking -- a hearing that is far more than acute listening. A hearing engaged in by the whole body that evokes speech -- a new speech -- a new creation. The woman had been heard to her own speech. (Daly, 1978,412)

The idea of "hearing a woman to her own speech" suggests, against traditional logic, which presupposes that there is nothing to hear until something is said, that the reverse is true, i.e. there is nothing women can say until there is hearing.[27] Hearing, or understanding, takes place *before* speaking, in the sense that what is spoken is incoherent without a context within which it can be heard. Here is an example. In the "Preface" of *This Bridge Called My Back* (1981), Cherríe Moraga relates how she experienced being heard into speech for the first time.

---

[26] I ask why Daly did not respond "in kind," that is, with another open letter, in order to highlight the possibility that one might find an implicit response to Lorde in Daly's later work.

[27] Marilyn Frye suggested to me that this idea is another way of thinking about the French feminist idea that there is no female writing in the context of the male symbolic, that there must be a "female symbolic" before there can be female speech. At any rate, Frye points out, Daly and Morton are rejecting the view that the speaker can make meaning all by himself, which is implied in the idea that first there is the word. Correspondence, June 7, 1995.

> Months ago in a journal entry I wrote: "I am afraid to get near to how deeply I want to love the other Latin women in my life." In a real visceral way I hadn't felt the absence (only assumed the fiber of alienation I so often felt with anglo women as normative). Then for the first time, speaking on a panel about racism here in San Francisco, I could physically touch what I had been missing. There in the front row, nodding encouragement and identification, sat five Latina sisters. Count them! Five avowed Latina Feminists: Gloria, Jo, Aurora, Chabela y Mirtha. For once in my life every part of me was allowed to be visible and spoken for in one room at one time. (xvii)

In order to be seen and heard as a whole presence, she is saying, she need to be able to experience this bodily/spiritual form of Latina-identification among her sisters.

In this section of the paper, I will consider what Daly might have heard and what she could not hear in an effort to understand her decision not to respond in kind to Lorde's letter.

What reasons can be found in the political context of the late sixties and early seventies for Daly's decision not to respond in kind? First, consider the common ground between Daly and Lorde. The extent and limits of the common ground in the feminisms of Lorde and Daly, as I have outlined it above, could not have been apparent to Daly during the time she was writing *Gyn/Ecology*. All of Lorde's political writings were published after *Gyn/Ecology* with the exception of "Poetry is Not a Luxury" (1977). By 1977, Lorde had published several books of poetry from a radical black perspective, however, she was writing the *first* volume of her poetry in which she spoke from a black radical feminist perspective, *The Black Unicorn* (1978), at the *same time* Daly was writing

Gyn/Ecology.[28] They were both working, simultaneously, on writing projects which involved speaking from radical feminist perspectives using symbolic/mythological insight and deconstructive strategies as a basis for generating woman-identified thought, one from a black radical feminist perspective, one from a white radical feminist perspective.

In 1977 Daly and Lorde both read papers on a Modern Language Association "Lesbian and Literature" panel entitled "The Transformation of Silence into Language and Action."[29] The other panelists included Julia Stanley, Judith McDaniel and Adrienne Rich. Daly read a paper (1978b) which contained sections of *Gyn/Ecology* on the "State of Patriarchy as a State of War" and the "warrior element in Sisterhood." In the paper she argued, since "the Female Self is The Enemy under fire from the guns of patriarchy," a woman's survival depends on her resistance to assimilation. She must not be "tied back by old ligatures, old allegiances," Daly proclaimed.

> She pledges allegiance to no flag, no cross. She sees through the lies of alleged allies. She re-veres no one, for she is free-ing her Self from fears. (8)

Sisterhood, unlike brotherhood, Daly argued "has as its core the affirmation of freedom." (9) After Daly's paper, Lorde read an untitled paper (1978b) which was reprinted in *Sister Outsider* with the title, "The Transformation of Silence into

---

[28] Poetry by Lorde prior to 1977 included, *The First Cities* (1968) New York: Poets Press, *Cables to Rage* (1970) London: Paul Breman, Heritage Series, *From a Land Where Other People Live* (1973) Detroit: Broadside Press, and *New York Head Shop and Museum* (1974) Detroit: Broadside Press. "An Interview: Audre Lorde and Adrienne Rich," (1979) provides useful background on Lorde's life, especially in the late sixties and early seventies. (Lorde, 1984)

[29] All of the papers presented on this panel were published together in *Sinister Wisdom*, 6 (Summer, 1978). The panel was attended by 700 women in December, 1977, Chicago, IL.

Language and Action." (1984) Lorde opened her paper with a poem from *The Black Unicorn* entitled "A Song for Many Movements." After reading the poem, Lorde reflected,

> In listening to Mary I was struck by how many of the same words seem to come up. They did in her paper, and I know they do in mine, words such as *war*, *separation*, *fear* and the ways in which those words are intimately connected with our battlings against silence, and the distortions silence commits upon us. (1978b, 12)

Lorde explicitly connects themes in her work with themes she heard in Daly's. Lorde goes on in her paper to announce that she had a tumor in her breast. Although the tumor was benign, she explained how facing her mortality enabled her to overcome other fears and silences which stood between women who were working at "bridging our differences." Echoing themes in Daly's paper, Lorde said,

> The women who sustained me through that period were black and white, old and young, lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual, and we all shared a war against the tyrannies of silence. They all gave me a strength and concern without which I could not have survived intact. Within those weeks of acute fear came knowledge -- within the war we are all waging with the forces of death, subtle and otherwise, conscious or not -- I am not only a casualty, I am also a warrior. (ibid.)

Daly probably heard in these words agreement with her argument that patriarchy is a *war* waged against *all* women, a war which *separates* women. She probably also heard Lorde agree that overcoming the *fear* of death is possible only through sisterhood which enables women to dis-cover the warrior within. In the context of this particular moment when many black women were prioritizing the struggle against the racist war threatening the existence of *all* blacks, she

probably assumed Lorde shared her radical feminist analysis which located the root of their shared oppression in patriarchy.

Perhaps it was Lorde's effort to connect her work with Daly's which led Daly to include an excerpt from one of Lorde's poems as the opening epigraph in the chapter on African genital mutilation. It is clear from the "Open Letter" that Lorde felt there was enough common ground in their feminisms for Daly to be including a quotation from her work. Daly was not mistaken to hear in Lorde's words affirmation of the common ground between. The problem which led Lorde to write the "Open Letter" was that Daly heard *only* the common ground between them. Although most of Lorde's poetry prior to *The Black Unicorn* was written from a black-identified, or race-cognizant perspective, including the collection, *New York Head Shop and Museum*, in which Daly found the excerpt which she used in *Gyn/Ecology*, Daly heard only Lorde's woman-identified voice. When Lorde said "I am not only a casualty, I am also a warrior," Daly heard a woman like herself, i.e. one who seemed not be "tied back by old ligatures, old allegiances," one who pledged allegiance to no racial identity. Daly's assumption that Lorde's was a woman-identified, rather than a black-identified voice, is what leads Lorde to ask Daly in the letter of "Did you ever really read my words, or did you merely finger through them for quotations which you thought might valuably support an already conceived idea concerning some old and distorted connection between us?"[30] (1984, 68) The "old and distorted

---

[30] In view of my examination of the common ground in the positions of Lorde and Daly, it is revealing to ask this question about postmodern feminists' reading and use of Lorde's words as evidence that the "Open Letter" is a postmodern critique of radical feminism. Serious

connection" is color-evasive idea that we are all the same "under the skin." What Daly did not hear was Lorde's claim that sisterhood depends on fighting this idea as well as other distortions which cause us to view our differences as "causes for separation and suspicion rather than as forces for change." (Lorde, 1984, 110)

If Daly did read Lorde's words what might she have heard? Within the radical feminist context taking shape at this particular moment, if she heard Lorde's black-identified voice, she probably heard it as a sign of an earlier stage of Lorde's journey towards radical feminism, a stage in which Lorde was more male-identified. Like many white radical feminists who left behind their identification with their white brothers in the new left upon coming to radical feminist consciousness, Daly probably assumed that in coming to radical feminist consciousness Lorde would abandon her earlier black-identified perspective. If Daly was thinking along these lines she probably heard in the "Open Letter" something that sounded like residual male-identification. Or she may have heard a contradiction. According to the logic of root thinking, one could not be both black-identified and woman-identified at the same time. A response in kind which suggested that Lorde was either male-identified or caught in a contradiction probably did not seem like a response which might constructively advance the dialogue between black and white women.

---

consideration of this question, in my view, reveals that white Western postmodern feminists have not come to terms with the ways in which they are walking the path of Daly's mistakes.

On the one hand, Lorde was urging women to bridge their differences. On the other hand, Lorde says the letter is intended to clarify differences between them as black and white women which she argued Daly obscured by implying that all women suffer the same oppression as women. Furthermore, Lorde claims that it is not enough that women identify with the Goddess within, black and white women must learn to identify with the Black Goddess. Now consider these assertions of racial difference in the context of the moment. What did Daly hear in Lorde's assertions of difference?

Lorde's claim that the oppression of black women was different than that of white women probably sounded like agreement with the claims about differences being made by black nationalists and black feminists. Lorde's claim that Daly obscured differences by implying all women suffer the same oppression, may have sounded like the claim among radical blacks that white feminists obscured differences by incorrectly identifying the root of black women's oppression. Recall that Carmichael argued that U.S. society was organized by and reflected the legacy of white power, that the values, beliefs, traditions, and institutions which constitute U.S. society are white. This is the view behind the black argument that feminism is "whitey's thing." While Daly may not have read Carmichael, she probably read Francis Beale since she and Beale were both included in the anthology *Sisterhood is Powerful* (1970). In addition, remember Beale insisted that there were "quite basic" differences in the experiences of black and white women, and that "while it is true that male chauvinism has become institutionalized in American society, one must always

look for the main enemy -- the fundamental cause of the female condition," which was racist capitalism. Beale and others who were arguing that the experiences of black and white women were different were arguing it on the grounds that black women's oppression was rooted in racism and/or capitalism, while white women's oppression (if white women were "oppressed," rather than "only suppressed" as suggested by La Rue) was rooted in "Americanism." Considering the theses of Daly's Qualitative Leap we can deduce Daly's radical feminist reading of positions like these. Any insistence on the differences in the oppression of women only served the interests of men who were benefiting from the planetary sexual caste system. Women under the influence of these men failed to see how their allegiance obscured the possibilities of living self-determined lives. In the absence of a context within which Daly could hear Lorde's refusal of the black nationalist position on the differences between black and white women, she probably assumed that Lorde's difference claims indicated that she held some version of this position. She most definitely would not have been alone in this assumption.

Lorde makes the claim that Daly was dealing out of a patriarchal western European frame of reference, and in so doing , was serving the destructive forces of racism and separation between women. Could Daly hear it? In my view, this claim may have seemed somewhat incoherent to Daly in the context of the radical feminist view that identification with *any* group of men, in particular white men, was a sign of male-identification. Since radical feminism was about rejecting all forms of male-identification, she and other radical feminists believed

themselves to be self-consciously refusing their racial, cultural and class privileges and points of reference. Since Lorde's claims appeared to have dismissed this commitment, her view may have appeared to Daly, as a misunderstanding of her work. On this reading of Lorde, Daly may have felt that a response would result in more division among women. If Daly thought the misunderstanding was the result of a distortion of the connection between them, she probably could not hear in Lorde's letter a constructive critique of radical feminism, her decision not to respond might have been an effort to avoid the kind of quarrel among women that would only serve men's interests.

Lorde's claims that the oppression of black women was different than that of white women also probably sounded like agreement with the claims of new leftists. Recall that the men of the new left were arguing that feminists were just "white, middle-class, women" whose experiences were fundamentally different from those of black and Vietnamese women who were oppressed by racism and capitalism. Here again, without a context for distinguishing Lorde's claims about the differences in the forms of women's oppression from the claims about differences in women's situations made white leftist men, Daly probably heard in Lorde's claims more traces of male-identification. Also remember that it was common among leftist men to quote black women and Vietnamese women who named only racism and/or imperialism as the source(s) of their oppression as evidence against the radical feminist claim that patriarchy was global. When Lorde claims in the letter that Daly had misused her words in *Gyn/Ecology*, utilizing them only to testify against her "as a woman of color," Daly probably

heard not only echoes of the women of color who stood with the leftists against the radical feminists, but also a rebuke for using her black voice in the name of radical feminism. Since white radical feminists at this time did not recognize that they shared with leftist and nationalist men a pattern of root thinking about the relations among oppressions, Daly probably did not recognize in Lorde's criticism an attempt to use *both* her black voice *and* her woman's voice in the name of radical feminism. Such an attempt probably would have seemed misguided or confused. After accusing Daly of misusing her words, however, she makes her intention evident by insisting, "my words which you used were no more, nor less, illustrative of this chapter than "Poetry Is Not a Luxury" or any number of my other poems might have been of many other parts of *Gyn/Ecology*." (1984, 68)

Evidence that Daly could not hear the concern behind Lorde's suggestion that Daly might have chosen to included material on non-White/European female power and symbol from a radical feminist perspective is found in Daly's reply that *Gyn/Ecology* is not a compendium of goddesses. (Daly, 1990, xxx) Recall that Daly and Lorde share view that women are connected in virtue of a source of inner strength which makes authentic choice and radical action possible. Lorde's concern was that by excluding material about her African Background, black women would not have *access* to the source of their gynergy. Had Daly been able to hear this concern she might have considered the possibility of a fruitful response. The context which kept Daly from hearing Lorde on this point is complex. First, the idea was in the air, in the aftermath of the expulsion of

whites from the Black Liberation movement, that whites should not go around trying to be experts about the subjective experiences of people of color. The imperative to organize on the basis of your own oppression seems to have led white radical feminists to research their own herstory, but without a complete understanding of the racial and cultural dimensions of their herstories. In addition, it may have seemed to radical feminists at the time, in view of the barren field of feminist research on nonwhite/European women's histories, that all the historical research on oppressed minorities, like much of that propounded by Pan-Africanists, was sexist. Lorde herself acknowledges the paucity of research on nonwhite/European women's histories at the time.

What would Daly have heard in Lorde's claim that all feminists need, not only the Witch and the Spinster, but the Black Goddess or Black Mother? Since Daly was operating on the assumption that the feminist symbolic figures in *Gyn/Ecology* were racially- and ethnically-neutral insofar as they symbolized a refusal to pledge allegiance to any and all male-identified nations or movements, then Lorde's call for racially and ethnically specific symbolic figures would sound like another instance of male-identification. In the early seventies black nationalists and Pan-Africanists appeared to be the only ones calling for racially and ethnically specific symbolic figures. Carmichael was not alone in calling for blacks in the U.S. to embrace "Mother Africa" as their homeland as part of taking on a black nationalist identity. Daly would have been critical of Carmichael's strategy at the very least because his use of the female symbolic figure of "Mother Africa" was derived not from the concrete lives of African women, but

from his own patriarchal nationalist interests. Would Daly have been able to distinguish Lorde's call for all women to embrace the Black Goddess from the kind of call Carmichael and others were making for all blacks to embrace Mother Africa? She probably would have assumed that Lorde's call was *not* informed by an interest in legitimizing patriarchal gender role expectations. On the other hand, she would have had no feminist context for understanding the interest informing Lorde's call, especially in light of her assumption that she and Lorde shared the radical feminist project of bridging the differences among women, which appeared to her to depend on a racially- and ethnically-neutral feminist symbolic. Lorde's work in *The Black Unicorn* (1978a) was one of the first published works, if not the first, by a black feminist based on the radical feminist strategy of recovering the "true nature of female power" assumed to be buried beneath and obscured by patriarchal mythology, in this case African mythology. Ironically, Lorde's project may have been influenced by her reading of Daly's previous work. In the "Open Letter" she thanks Daly for having *Gyn/Ecology* sent to her, then informs her,

> As in *Beyond God the Father*, many of your analyses are strengthening and helpful to me. Therefore, it is because of what you have given to me in the past work that I write this letter to you now, hoping to share with you the benefits of my insights as you have shared the benefits of yours with me. (1984, 66)

What Daly was unable to hear in Lorde's letter was Lorde's message that radical feminism *must* be self-consciously and critically race- and ethnicity-cognizant. Because she could not hear this, could not comprehend how this was possible,

perceived it as the demise of radical feminism, at this time, it appeared to Daly that a response in kind would not be a fruitful direction.

In the context of the early seventies Daly could hear black men like Carmichael speaking for himself and black women, insisting that racism was the root of oppression faced by blacks, and therefore, blacks must prioritize the struggle for black liberation. She could hear white leftist men standing up for the "universal" causes, speaking for themselves and everyone else against white feminists who they claimed were only reformist advocates for their own particular cause. If she heard the voices of black women she heard them standing with their brothers, prioritizing the struggle for black liberation instead of the struggle for women's liberation. Lorde probably first sounded to Daly, and other white radical feminists at the time, like a brave black woman who shared the knowledge that in order to end racism, it was necessary to get to the root of the problem, and therefore necessary to stand with her sisters in the struggle for women's liberation.

But Daly plainly could not hear Lorde in a deep way when she first received the letter because at the time there was no context which would have allowed for the possibility for Depth Hearing. Wallace's comments in "Anger in Isolation" speak to this absence. "Stranded," she wrote in the early seventies, "Perhaps a multicultural women's movement is somewhere in the future." (In Guy-Sheftall, 226) My understanding of Lorde's letter is possible because the multicultural women's movement which Wallace hoped for was created in the late seventies by women calling themselves "Radical Women of Color." Toni

Cade Bambara introduces these women whose writings are published together in *This Bridge Called My Back* (1981),

> Blackfoot amiga Nisei hermana Down Home Up Souf Sistuh sister El Barrio suburbia Korean The Bronx Lakota Menominee Cuban Chinese Puertoriqueña reservation Chicana campañera and letters testimonials poems interviews essays journal entries sharing Sisters of the yam Sisters of the rice Sisters of the corn Sisters of the plantain putting in telecalls to each other. And we're all on the line. (vi)

Radical Women of Color were women who shared the experience of living lives as "bridges" between worlds. Cade Bambara appeals to Lorde's "Open Letter" to describe how this experience brought them together and enabled them to identify with each other. In the "Forward" to the book she says,

> though the initial motive of several siter/riters here may have been to protest, complain or explain to white feminist would-be allies that there are other ties and visions that bind, prior allegiances and priorities that supersede their invitations to coalesce on their terms ("Assimilation within a solely western european herstory is not acceptable" -- Lorde), the process of examining that would-be alliance awakens us to new tasks ("We have a lot more to concentrate on besides the pathology of white wimmin" -- davenport)
>
> and a new connection: US
> a new set of recognitions: US
> a new site of accountability: US
> a new source of power: US (ibid.)

Through "fashioning of potent networks of all the daughters of the ancient mother cultures " Cade Bambara suggested, women of color must come to know each other as sisters. Sitting down and breaking bread together, she argued is the beginning for women who take up the task Quintanales described as "seeing radical differences where they don't exist and not seeing them when they are critical." (vii) This was a vision of sisterhood that refused the root thinking which

identified fundamental differences in experiences as sources of "causes for separation and suspicion rather than as forces for change."

In the preface of *This Bridge Called My Back* Cherríe Moraga provides insight into the context the book helped to create in the U.S.

> The Left needs it, with its shaky and shabby record of commitment to women, period. Oh yes, it can claim its attention to "color" issues, embodied in the male. Sexism is acceptable to the white left publishing house, particularly if spouted through the mouth of a Black man. The feminist movement needs the book, too. But for different reasons. (xiii)

Among the reasons she gives for why the feminist movement needed the book is the failure to make the connections between the racism, classism and sexism in their lives and the lives of their "would-be" sisters of color. But the needs of these movements was not the primary focus of Moraga's insight. In this preface she is attempting to articulate a new and different conception of sisterhood which is coming into existence and being named. Listen as she describes her first visit to Boston to meet with Barbara Smith.

> By the end of the evening of our first visit together, Barbara comes into the front room when she has made a bed for me. She kisses me. Then grabbing my shoulders she says, very solid-like, "we're sisters." I nod, put myself into bed, and roll around with this word, *sisters*, for two hours before sleep takes on. I earned this with Barbara. It is not a given between us -- Chicana and Black -- to come to see each other as sisters. This is not a given. I keep wanting to repeat over and over and over again, the pain and shock of difference, the joy of commonness, the exhilaration of meeting through incredible odds against it. (xiv)

It is through the words Lorde spoke to Daly that Moraga is able to articulate the "pain and shock of difference" which came with a the realization of a multicultural sisterhood. Moraga wrote,

> When Audre Lorde, speaking of racism, states: "I urge each one of us to reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives there." I am driven to do so because of the passion for women that lives in my body. I know now that the major obstacle for me, personally, in completing this book has occurred when I stopped writing it for myself, when I looked away from my own source of knowledge. Audre is right. It is also the source of terror -- how deeply separation between women hurts me. How discovering difference, profound differences between myself and women I love has sometimes rendered me helpless and immobilized. (xvi)

What Lorde was trying to say required a context within which it made total sense to reject the thinking premised on the idea that fighting one system of oppression, the root of the other systems, could radically change the world.

One of the most important papers in *This Bridge Called My Back*, entitled "A Black Feminist Statement" written by black feminists calling themselves the Combahee River Collective, describes how they became disillusioned with movements which insisted on one order of allegiance, and how this created the need "to develop a politics that was antiracist, unlike those of white women, and antisexist, unlike those of black and white men." (210) This paper provides previously unavailable framework for understanding Lorde's criticisms in the Open Letter. The insight of the Collective that makes sense of Lorde's letter is that "the major systems of oppression are interlocking," that is, not related as the branches are to the roots of a tree. (209) They make the claim against the idea that either race and class or sex is the root of their oppression, that "there is such a thing as racial-sexual oppression which is neither solely racial nor solely sexual, e.g. the history of rape of Black women by white men as a weapon of political repression." (213) Although I do not believe Daly could hear it at the

time, this is what Lorde meant when she claimed that Daly had distorted the differences between black and white women.

From our historical moment, it is difficult to keep in mind that a context within which Daly might have heard the depth of Lorde's letter did not exist. From the early 1960s up until after the publication of *Gyn/Ecology* in 1978, black and white feminists had been on two different historical trajectories. While there was some awareness among the early radical feminists that theirs needed to be an anti-racist, multicultural movement, it was abstract and unrealized. This was largely due, in my view, to the prevalence of root thinking among white radical feminists. In order to illustrate how incomprehensible it was to white feminists that a black feminist such as Lorde could claim at once black- and woman-identification, consider the following reflection. In an essay on the history of what she calls a "class-race-gender" analysis, Kathleen Daly reflects on the context surrounding, and her response to, the first time she heard Audre Lorde speak.

> I began as a graduate student in sociology in 1978. At the time, debate centered on the possibility of linking Marxist theories of class with feminist theories of gender. Could these theories be reconciled or were they in ontological conflict? Clearly, in asking those questions, race was not on the agenda. Also, around that time Audre Lorde came to the Amherst area to give a speech. I remember then a confusion I felt -- and one she wished to teach the audience -- about her multiple commitments. She discussed her participation in black community groups, in women's groups, and in gay and lesbian groups, but she wanted to stress, she was a whole person, one person across these settings. I asked her, nervously raising my hand in a large auditorium setting, how *can* you be and act all these things at once? My memory of her response to my question was that it didn't make any sense to her. (Kathleen Daly, 1993,59)

There was certainly awareness among early black feminists that feminism needed to include a critique of white European women's racism and ethnocentrism, however, there was no black feminist movement to amplify the critique and demand that white women be accountable to it. The world of "Radical Womyn of Color," out of which came the systematic critiques of white feminism, did not emerge until the early 1980s. Despite their respective awarenesses, black and white feminists in the early 1970s were as segregated as their sisters before them at the turn of the century, for different, but related reasons. There was no history which Daly might have turned to for insight about how to respond to Lorde in a constructive manner. To my knowledge, there is nothing in print about *any* cross-movement interactions or communications among white Radical Feminists and Feminists of Color from 1967 to 1979 on the idea of anti-racist, multicultural feminist solidarity. Lorde was one of the first to put the idea into words. Lorde was the first to fathom the possibility that women might come together on the basis of their differences. To think that Daly, whose work emerged *before* the contemporary writings by Radical Women of Color, should have heard Lorde's New Words, and responded in a feminist anti-racist, multicultural manner is to make a serious ahistorical error. It is to assume Daly could respond out of a context which did not exist.

In the process of considering what Daly might have heard in Lorde's letter I suggested that she may have heard Lorde's words in a distorted way. She may have thought Lorde was speaking from male-identified voice. She may have heard a contradiction which seemed consistent with a stage of coming to radical

feminist consciousness. She may have heard betrayal if she believed that Lorde's criticisms framed her and other white radical feminists as male-identified in a war that seemed clearly to be between us and them. This, I have been suggesting, is the strength of the conceptual grip root thinking can have on one's most passionately held beliefs. It is reasonable to assume that Daly chose not to respond in kind because, at the time, as she read Lorde's criticisms they pierced the heart of radical feminism with an arrow dipped in the poison of divide-and-conquer. Perhaps the only honest response Daly could imagine at the time was to respond to Lorde's "Open Letter to Mary Daly" with an "Open Reply to Audre Lorde." If she could think of nothing to say in reply to Lorde's accusation that she had used the white Western European "tools of patriarchy" against Lorde and other women of color, except to make a counter-accusation stating Lorde had used patriarchal nationalist tools against her and other white radical feminists in her "Open Letter to Mary Daly," then it is not hard to understand why Daly did not respond in kind.

I have also suggested that Lorde was saying something important, and new, about the conditions for sisterhood. She was saying that sisterhood requires giving up the root thinking which split the black feminist in two and learning how to identify with difference, but Daly could hear nothing in her criticisms but a serious threat to sisterhood. On my reading of the context, Daly heard her saying radical feminism is fundamentally flawed. Daly did not hear the promise in Lorde's letter, on my view, because the bodies had not yet come together to hear her to speech. The context created out of and symbolized by

the project entitled, "This Bridge Called My Back" did not yet exist, and this is the context which is ahistorically assumed when people ask, "why didn't Daly respond to Lorde's letter?" Lorde's letter was one of the sparks, a really Big Spark, that ignited what Daly calls, remembering the moment when she got the letter, an "Explosion of Diversity." (1990, xxx) What Daly had not realized, but acknowledges in the new introduction, is that "Explosions of Diversity do not happen without conflict." The interaction between Daly and Lorde took the shape of an unresolvable conflict because it was a part of changing the world, a new world was coming into being, the world of "Radical Women of Color." What has remained unresolved, and still open to question, then, is the nature of the *relation* between Radical Feminists and Radical Women of Color? Does our sisterhood ride on the issue of whether or not our oppressions are related as the branches of tree are to the roots? Since it probably appeared to Daly, at least at the time, as if it did, it is not hard to understand why she chose not to respond in kind.

It may seem that my speculations about Daly's decision not to respond in kind to Lorde's letter only answer the historical question about why Daly did not respond in 1979. However, with regard to the question of why Daly has continued, into the 1990s, to believe that a response in kind would not be fruitful, I think it is helpful to keep in mind that a context which might support reciprocal Hearing and constructive dialogue is to date, still in a process of becoming.

Part III

THE RACIAL AND ETHNIC POLITICS OF *GYN/ECOLOGY*

In the "New Intergalactic Introduction" to *Gyn/Ecology* Daly extends an invitation to those who have read the criticisms of *Gyn/Ecology*, and "who have a sincere interest in understanding and discussing this book" to read it and "*think* about it." (1990, xxxi) In this chapter I accept Daly's invitation and take seriously her claim that *Gyn/Ecology* is an "Open Book." She claims that *Gyn/Ecology* was not written to be worshipped as a sacred text. She was aware that she had not written the "Last Word" when she "set it free" in the hope that it "would be Heard and that it would harmonize with the works of other women, whose melodies, of course, were coming from different Realms of the Background." (xxx) In the spirit of this vision of "New Creation" I begin to *think* critically about the racial and ethnic politics of *Gyn/Ecology*. In my study of the racial and ethnic politics of *Gyn/Ecology* I bring Lorde's criticisms to the text. Using Lorde's criticisms as a guide, first, I argue that Daly uses white Western patriarchal tools, without awareness, against her sisters; second, I show how the Journey of radical feminism as charted by Daly in *Gyn/Ecology* fails to provide a liberating path for women of color, leading me to the conclusion that radical feminist book was written from a white Western perspective for white Western women.

In considering the racial and ethnic politics of *Gyn/Ecology* let us begin by considering who the book is said to be written by and for. Using the commonly employed string of adjectives to identify Daly, one might say she is a "white Irish-American feminist raised working-class and Catholic." However useful such a description might be for conveying vital information about the perspective of her book, Daly would definitely not choose these designations to identify herself, and they are not the adjectives which describe her on the jacket the 1990 edition of *Gyn/Ecology*. According to the jacket she is,

> a Positively Revolting Hag who holds doctorates in theology and philosophy from the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. An associate professor of theology at Boston College, this Spinster spins and weaves cosmic tapestries in her own time/space.

And, on the jacket of *Outercourse: The Be-Dazzling Voyage, Containing Recollections From My Logbook of a Radical Feminist Philosopher (Be-ing an Account of My Time/Space Travels and Ideas -- Then, Again, Now and How)* (1992), she is identified as,

> the author of *The Church and the Second Sex*, *Beyond God the Father*, *Gyn/Ecology*, *Pure Lust*, and *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language* (Conjured in Cahoots with Jane Caputi). This Pirate/Voyager commutes Irregularly from the Other side of the moon to lecture around the United States and Europe and to teach Feminist Ethics at Boston College.

There are clues in these book jacket blurbs to Daly's racial and ethnic identity. Perhaps the most important clue is that there is no sign in these descriptions of any racial identification. Consider what feminists have discovered about patriarchal gender identity: only women have a gender, men are simply humans.

The same sort of thing is true of racist/ethnocentric racial/ethnic identity: only people of color have a race/ethnicity, whites are simply humans.[1] Hence, the absence of racial identification in the description of Daly suggests she is white and Western. If skin color, hair and facial features are any indication, the photograph of Daly on the jacket of *Outercourse*, confirms this assumption.

Another clue can be found in the terms "Hag," "Spinster," and "Pirate/Voyager" which Daly often chooses to describe herself. Although these terms of identification may appear to be neutral with regard to ethnicity, careful consideration suggest Western European ancestry. In *Gyn/Ecology* (1978) Daly defines "*Hag*," "from an Old English word meaning harpy, witch." (14) A "Spinster," she says, is "a woman whose occupation is to spin," and one "who defines her Self, by choice, neither in relation to children nor to men." (3) In the "New Intergalactic Introduction" Daly claims she is a "Pirate" because in *Gyn/Ecology* she "Righteously Plundered treasures of knowledge that have been stolen and hidden from women, and [she] struggled to Smuggle these back in such a way that they can be seen as distinct from their mindbinding trappings." (1990, xxiv) If the "treasures" she is after are any guide to her ethnicity, she is explicit that *Gyn/Ecology* focuses primarily on "myths and symbols which were direct sources of christian myth." (xxx) In other words, Daly is "Plundering" through the patriarchal symbol systems of her own Western tradition. Curiously, in her comments about Lorde's letter in the "New Intergalactic Introduction" Daly explains, after writing *Gyn/Ecology* she anticipated a "profusion of New Creation,

---

[1] For a lucid analysis of whiteness as an unmarked category see Frankenberg, 1995.

which [she] believed could emerge from women of all races, cultures, classes -- from women all over this planet, speaking/Be-Speaking out of our various and vital heritages." (ibid.) What is curious is that Daly anticipates women of all races, cultures, and classes speaking out of their various and vital heritages, but in *Gyn/Ecology* she does speak/Be-speak explicitly out of her heritage. She seems only to have discovered her "ancestral home" in the context of the "explosion of Diversity" which she claims moved personally. Here for the first time she names her Irish heritage a "Treasure Island" which she recognizes "deeply as the wellspring of my Background, my ancestral home." (ibid.) This hindsight suggests that when she was writing *Gyn/Ecology*, she was not fully aware of her own racial and ethnic heritage. In this respect, Daly would not have been different from most white Americans in the seventies, and many today. As I suggested above, it is common among members of a dominant group to see their dominant group traits as neutral. When one belongs to both dominant groups (e.g. white and Western), and oppressed groups (e.g. women and lesbian), the tendency appears to be to see one's marked oppressed group identity (e.g. gender) as neutral with regard to one's dominant group identity (e.g. race/ethnicity). Hence, Daly sees herSelf as a woman without a racial/ethnic identity.

Notice, in contrast, how Audre Lorde is presented on the jackets of her books. On the jacket of *Sister Outsider* there is a photographic portrait beneath the title on the front cover, which -- again on the basis of skin color, hair and facial features -- suggests African ancestry. The following blurbs on the back

cover of *The Black Unicorn* (1978) provide explicit information about Lorde's racial and ethnic identity. Adrienne Rich's blurb includes this description.

> Refusing to be circumscribed by any simple identity, Audre Lorde writes as a Black woman, a mother, a daughter, a Lesbian, a feminist, a visionary; poems of elemental wildness and healing, nightmare and lucidity. Her rhythms and accents have the timelessness of a poetry which extends beyond white Western politics, beyond the anger and wisdom of Black America, beyond the North American earth, to Abomey and the Dahomeyan Amazons.

Like Daly, Lorde regularly used the terms "Lesbian," "Feminist," "Warrior," "Amazon" and, occasionally, "Witch" to name herself. Unlike Daly, the "Spinster," whose self-definition never included, on principle, a relation to children, Lorde often defined herself symbolically and concretely as a "Mother." What is more to the point here is the fact that Lorde always identified as "Black," while Daly never identifies as "White."[2] As I argued in Part II, Lorde always identified as "Black" because, on her view, the promise of radical feminist change could only be found through the reclamation, recognition and creative employment of racial and ethnic world differences among women. Daly on the other hand, I suggested, viewed the affirmation of racial or any cultural differences except gender, as misguided male-identification. On the basis of this view, marking her own racial and ethnic identification would have given the impression that she identified on some level with those white Western men who took pride in the supremacy of their heritage. On Lorde's view, not marking it is claiming an identity which as Rich puts it, is too simple.

---

[2] Of course, racial and ethnic identifications are social constructs which belong to particular contexts. Hence, they shift for given individuals as they move geographically.

Daly's decision not to mark her racial and/or ethnic heritage was not a mere oversight. She is explicit that *Gyn/Ecology* is for those parts of one's self which are quite simply woman-identified. In the Preface she states who the book is for in two separate passages. In the first passage she offers *Gyn/Ecology* as an invitation to "women who choose to be present to each other."(xlvi) She names this "complex participation in be-ing" the Journey of "Female-identified yes-saying." (xlvii) Acknowledging that there is no way "to divide the Female World into two camps: those who say 'yes' to women and those who do not,"

> The Journey of this book, therefore, is (to borrow an expression from the journal *Sinister Wisdom*) "for the Lesbian Imagination in All Women." It is for the Hag/Crone/Spinster in every *living* woman. It is for each individual Journeyer to decide/expand the scope of this imagination within her. It is she, and she alone, who can determine how far, and in what way, she will/can travel. She, and she alone, can dis-cover the mystery of her own history, and find how it is interwoven with the lives of other women. (ibid.)

While Daly says the book is for parts of women's Selves which she names "Lesbian" or "Hag," with the acknowledgment that she cannot specify the life experiences which might fall under these names for any given woman, she names the possibilities with terms which belong to a particular heritage. The idea that each woman must dis-cover this Female-identified part of her self through identification with these symbolic figures in the context of her own life history, presupposes she has grown up in a place where these terms of identification could make some sense. That the book is for the Self "in every *living* woman" is also significant. In Daly's conceptual framework, the "foreground" and the "Background" distinguish different modes of living, the

former she names "necrophilic," the latter she names "biophilic." Our "foreground" selves are not really living, not biophilic, in the sense that we are just going through the motions in our lives according to the patriarchal scripts. As we shall soon see, among these patriarchal scripts are the scripts of racial and ethnic identification. For now what is important to note here is that Daly implies in this passage that the book is for that part of a woman's Self which she may dis-cover in the context of her *individual* history, not her *collective* racial or ethnic history. This point, considered together with the racially- and ethnically-neutral introduction of the Hags and Lesbians, obscures the sense in which the recovery of these symbolic figures is the *collective* project of radical women with a white Western heritage.

She extends a similar invitation in another passage of the Preface. In this passage, preceded by a discussion of how *Gyn/Ecology* is bound to be (mis)read by traditional academics, Daly suggests Journeyers must take Virginia Woolf's "vow of derision," which is a commitment to "refuse all methods of advertising merit, and hold that ridicule, obscurity and censure are preferable, for psychological reasons, to fame and praise." (xlviii-xlix) The book is an invitation to "the deriders," that is, she says,

> to the Wild Witch in all women who long to spin. This book is a declaration that it is time to stop putting answers before the Questions. It is a declaration/Manifesto that in our chronology (Crone-ology) it is time to get moving again. It is a call of the wild to the wild, calling Hags/Spinsters to spin/be beyond the parochial bondings/bindings of any comfortable "community." (xlix)

There are two important points here which speak to the question of who the book is for. First, the book is for those of us who share a chronology, which she names a "Crone-ology" to designate that it is the one which originates with the Witch. Which Witch, one might ask? While Daly acknowledges in footnotes that American and African women were hunted as witches, *Gyn/Ecology* deals only with European witches. (179, 180) The book is for those who trace their roots through a European Crone-ology. Second, the book is *not* for those who belong to "any comfortable 'community.'" The "community" about which she is directly concerned here is the United States "women's community," which on her view, grew out of and coopted much of the energy of "the women's movement." However, she derides all communities for the same reason she believes that biophilic living begins with that part of the Self which refuses racial and ethnic scripts. It is a "symptom of settling for too little, of settling *down*, of being too comfortable." (xlix) *Gyn/Ecology*, then, is for the Movement of women who identify as Female yes-sayers, but claim no racial nor ethnic identities. That is white Western women.

In this part, I read *Gyn/Ecology* in *complicity* with racist and ethnocentric ideology and discourse. My case presents the textual grounds for Lorde's claim that *Gyn/Ecology* was written from a white Western patriarchal perspective. In the part IV, I read *Gyn/Ecology* for resources of *resistance* to white Western patriarchy, and go on to develop this possibility under the heading "Radical White Western Feminism." One of the strategies I will use throughout this part,

in order to get at the racial and ethnic politics of the text it will be to ask where the Journeyer, who the book is for, stands in relation to others in the text.

Daly Uses White Western Patriarchal Tools, Without Awareness, Against Sisters

Recall that Lorde argued in the "Open Letter," that by distorting the "various forms and degrees of patriarchal oppression" and obscuring "the many and varied tools of patriarchy" Daly ignored "how those tools are used by women without awareness against each other." In fact, she suggests Daly has used the tools of white Western patriarchs against her Indian, Chinese and African sisters in *Gyn/Ecology*. I suggested, in my reading of Lorde's letter, the tool Lorde was referring to was a "color- and power-evasive" assumption operative in Daly's Sado-Ritual Syndrome, the seven-point analysis of the basic patterns of similarity in the apparently disparate practices of sati, footbinding, genital mutilation, witch-burning, and gynecology. In this section I try to show how the Sado-Ritual Syndrome represents patriarchy in a way that leads Daly to use, without awareness, this white Western patriarchal tool against her sisters. My analysis will focus on the case of Indian women. If it can be shown that Daly does use the weapons of patriarchy against her sisters in *Gyn/Ecology*, then book cannot, in any liberating sense, be *for* them.

Consider what Daly says about the Sado-Ritual Syndrome when she first introduces it in the "Prelude to the Second Passage."

> In the following pages I will analyze a number of barbarous rituals, ancient and modern, in order to unmask the very real, existential meaning of Goddess murder in the concrete lives of women. I will focus upon five specific righteous rites which

> massacre women: Indian *suttee*, Chinese footbinding, African female genital mutilation, European witchburning, American gynecology. In examining these, I will seek out basic patterns which they have in common, and which comprise the Sado-Ritual Syndrome. (111)

Daly is claiming that Indian *suttee*, Chinese footbinding, African female genital mutilation, European witchburning, American gynecology have in common elements which reveal that patriarchy is the war on the Self in every living woman. This claim is developed in support of her larger thesis that patriarchy is a planetary system. If it is true that there is a patriarchal war against women in African, India, China, Europe, and America, there are grounds for believing that patriarchy is a planetary phenomena.

Keep in mind the need to establish a theoretical case which established the nature and scope of patriarchy in the 1970s. The act of making such a case was itself a revolutionary act. Reflecting on this moment in 1990, Marilyn Frye wrote, "[f]or feminist thinkers of the present era the first and most fundamental act of our own emancipation was granting ourselves authority as perceivers, and we accomplished that act by discovering agreement in the experiences and perceptions of women." (Frye, 1992, 61) Feminists of the sixties and seventies had been stopped short of making these discoveries, according to Adrienne Rich, by those who insisted that as women "we were utterly different, that the difference between us must be everything, must be determinative, that from that difference we each must turn away; that we must also flee from our alikeness." (Rich, 1979, 310) As I pointed out in Part II, women were prohibited from connecting on the basis of their alikeness on penalty of accusations of racism

and imperialism, by a diverse group, including white leftists, Black nationalists, Orientalists, Indian nationalists, and Western scholars across the disciplines. Daly shared with Rich and other radical feminists at the time the view that heeding this prohibition meant "passively consent[ing] to remain an instrument of men." (ibid.) Daly, with these patriarchal voices in her ear, insisted in response,

> [t]hose who claim to see racism and /or imperialism in my indictment of these atrocities can do so only by blinding themselves to the fact that the oppression of women knows no ethnic, national, or religious bounds. There are variations on the theme of oppression, but the phenomenon is planetary. (111)

Hence, as Daly conceived it in the moment she was writing, the Sado-Ritual Syndrome was an effort to counter the prevailing discourses functioning effectively to keep women separated from each other, and therefore, without a ground for making sense of the discrepancies between "the official story of 'Man and His World'" and our own experiences. (Frye, 1992, 59) The effectiveness of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome as a weapon of resistance for women in this moment depended on making the case that women shared the experience of being the targets of a patriarchal war.

In the context of the larger Journey of radical feminism, Daly suggests the creation of authoritative perceivers is what the Second Passage is all about. As the Voyager moves through the Second Passage, identifying the basic patterns which all five atrocities have in common, she discovers in them "the lethal *intent* of patriarchy." (112, Daly's emphasis) As the Voyager becomes increasingly knowledgeable about the "universal intent to destroy the divine spark in women," Daly suggests, she is able to distinguish her "Self-centering way" from "the male-

made maze." (315) She develops this ability in virtue of "her strengthened powers of hearing and seeing," which Daly describes as,

> a kind of multidimensional / multiform power of sensing / understanding her environment. This is a Self-identified *synaesthesia*: it is a woman-identified *gynaesthesia*. It is a complex way of perceiving the interelatedness of seemingly disparate phenomena. It is also a pattern-detecting power which may be named positive paranoia. (316)

She emerges from this Passage, with "a growing integrity of vision and purpose." (112) Daly claims,

> [a]s a consequence of her courage to see, she finds the focus of her anger, so that it fuels and no longer blocks her passion and her creativity. Thus this exorcising Passage gives her the right of passage into the Otherworld, the world of her own Enspiriting, Sparking, Spinning Ecstasy. (ibid.)

This gynocentric method, handed down by Matilda Joselyn Gage and Virginia Woolf, through radical feminist time/space, takes the shape in *Gyn/Ecology* as the creation of the a-mazing female mind capable of seeing through patriarchal foreground to the Background, the source of power and ground for agency. The analysis in the Second Passage, is then, explicitly *for* the Journeyer's growth in consciousness.

The first chapter of the Second Passage is a chapter entitled "Indian *Suttee*: The Ultimate Consummation of Marriage." In an effort to identify the distortion in Daly's picture of patriarchy which leads her to use, without awareness, a patriarchal tool against her Indian sisters, I begin with her representation of Indian women. The chapter opens with an epigraph from

Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *In This Our World* which introduces the reader to the image of the Indian woman Daly constructs in the chapter.

> Slow advancing, halting, creeping,
> Comes the Woman to the hour!
> She walketh veiled and sleeping,
> For she knoweth not her power. (113)

The "Woman" is the Hindu widow. She is slowly advancing, halting and creeping, to the hour when she will be burned alive on the funeral pyre of her husband.[3] Advancing according to a religious script that casts her as good and pure only in the ultimate act of self-sacrifice, there is little evidence in Daly's narrative of her resistance. "If the general situation of widowhood in India was not a sufficient inducement for the woman of higher caste to throw herself gratefully and ceremoniously into the fire," Daly asserts, "she was often pushed and poked in with long stakes after having been bathed, ritually attired, and drugged out of her mind." (116) In addition to the image of the widow as victim of this "barbarous ritual of female slaughter," Daly presents an image of her as a victim of a religion which "trained [her] to worship her appointed husband as a god" (128) and "taught that the husbands death was the fault of the widow." (118) Under the influence of these religious teachings she is "veiled and sleeping," that is, without the consciousness which is the condition for genuine choice. On Daly's view, the only possible voluntary and deliberate participation on the part of widows "consisted in 'choosing' to jump from the frying pan into the

---

[3] Daly offers statistic in a footnote in support of her claim that "[a]lthough *suttee* was legally banned in 1829, and despite the existence of other legal reforms, it should not be imagined that the lot of most Indian women had changed dramatically since then, or since the publication of Katherine Mayo's *Mother India* in 1927." (114)

pyre." (125) The Indian woman has been so thoroughly victimized by the Sado-Rituals of Indian society she does not know her own power, that is, she does not realize that it is within her, as it is in all women, to break with the sacrificial script and act on her own initiative.

The primary source behind Daly's account is Katherine Mayo's *Mother India* (1927). Daly describes Mayo as the "startling exception among scholars who have written about women in India," (127) and as a "sister Seeker / Spinster" whose work is in danger of "being maligned, belittled, erased, deliberately forgotten." (130) Daly draws from *Mother India* descriptions of the religious context of widowhood (119, 127); evidence, collected by Mayo during a tour of a *Purdah* hospital, of young girls who had been murdered or crippled for life as a result of the their husband's severe sexual violence (121); and the following excerpt which, according to Daly, conveys Mayo's "description of the 'unspeakable' *dhais*, [that is,] 'midwives' from the 'untouchable' caste to whose filthy, brutal, grotesque, and frequently murderous ministrations the woman in childbirth is subjected." On Mayo's account,

> Such labor may last three, four, five, or even six days. During all this period the woman is given no nourishment whatever -- such is the code -- and the *dhai* resorts to all her traditions. She kneads the patient with her fists; stands her against the wall and butts her with her head; props her upright on the bare ground, seizes her hands and shoves against her thighs with gruesome bare feet, until, so the doctors state, the patient's flesh is often torn to ribbons by the *dhai*'s long, ragged toe-nails. Or, she lays the woman flat and walks up and down her body, like one treading grapes. Also, she makes balls of strange substances, such as hollyhock roots, or dirty string, or rags full of quince-seeds; or earth, or earth mixed with cloves, butter and marigold flowers; or nuts, or spices -- any irritant -- and thrusts them into the uterus, to hasten the event. (Quoted in Daly, 439n)

Mayo's exposé, celebrated by Daly with superlatives, is presented as an "eye witness account" which "aroused a storm of protest in the East and in the West," indicating "Mayo had struck a nerve." (127) Daly responds to those who protested *Mother India* that Mayo's provides a "realistic" assessment of the situation Indian women face in contrast with the protesters "defensive rhetoric." (127)

It is important to understand the analytic context within which Daly represents Indian women as victims and preyers upon each other. Her construction is the result of an A-mazing effort to connect what may first appear (to the Journeyer) as disparate phenomena: the rite of sati and "our" rituals, in this case, Western scholarship about sati. (115, Daly's emphasis) Regarding this effort, Daly explains,

> My purpose here is to detect in these perpetuations of murder patterns whose effect is mental murder. This pattern-detecting -- the development of a kind of positive paranoia -- is essential for every feminist Searcher, so that she can resist the sort of mind-poisoning to which she must expose herself in the very process of seeking out necessary information. (125)

As one of the "the few women in 'advanced' countries who have some idea of the facts of sexism and some knowledge of 'women's history,'" Daly says, it is the responsibility of the feminist Searcher to un-cover "the continued massacre that is masked by the rituals of re-search which repeatedly re-cover the interconnected crimes of planetary patriarchy."[4] (123) Beginning with *Webster's*

---

[4] According to the *Wickedary*, a "Searcher" is "one who traverses and surveys dangerous terrain, seeking the Knowledge buried and continually recovered by the re-searchers of the State of Reversal." (161-2)

definition of sati as "the act or *custom* of a Hindu woman *willingly* cremating herself," (116, Daly's emphasis) Daly works to expose Western scholars' representations of sati as a practice which Hindu women have willingly and deliberately "sought out, enforced, and accepted." (117) She uncovers a pattern of grammatical usage such as strategic employment of the active and passive voice, as well as the use of neutral terms like "custom" and offensive rhetoric in the guise of "objective scholarship," which make Indian women "appear as the agents of their own destruction." (117) Their language, she argues, exhibits "their complicity in the same social order which was / is the radical source of such rites of female sacrifice." (115) For example, she reproaches Benjamin Walker, author of *The Hindu World: An Encyclopedic Survey of Hinduism* (1968), for using the active voice in his descriptions of widows. Walker indicates his identification with those who pushed, poked and drugged the widows by referring to the widows as agents who "adopted the practice" and "immolated themselves." (117)

Daly draws several examples from the writings of mythologist Joseph Campbell. In the first he is discussing sati as a "custom" of human sacrifice in conjunction with the practice of burying wives, harems and attendants alive in the tombs of ancient Egypt. Regarding evidence that the victims died hideous deaths from suffocation, Campbell claims,

> [i]n spite of these signs of suffering and even panic in the actual moment of the pain of suffocation, we should certainly not think of the mental state and experience of these individuals after any model of our own more or less imaginable reactions to such a fate. For these sacrifices were not properly, in fact, individuals at all; that is to say, they were not particular beings, distinguished from a

> class or group by virtue of any sense or realization of a personal, individual destiny or responsibility. (116-7)

The women who died in the tombs should not be thought of as victims, on Campbell's logic, because they did not have individual identities like "ours." In another example, Campbell offers a description of the sacrificed woman from the perspective of the distinction between the "real" self who lives by sacred scripts and the "unreal" self who acts on her own individual initiative.[5]

> *Sati*, the feminine participle of *sat*, then, is the female who really *is* something in as much as she is truly and properly a player of the female part: she is not only good and true in the ethical sense but true and real ontologically. In her faithful death, she is at one with her own true being. (118)

On this logic, Daly points out, "to be killed is 'good and true,' and to cease to exist is to be." (119) Here Campbell is suggesting the widows should not be thought of as victims because in the sacred act of sacrifice they realize their "true and real" existence.

These are examples, Daly argues, of "scholarly mystification" which dull "all sense of the unrightness of such rites as suttee, regarding them with detached interest and making them appear isolated and unrelated to 'our' culture." (123-4) Campbell is what she names a "devotee of the rites of detached scholarship." (119) What connects him as a representative of Western scholarship with Indian patriarchs who prod the widow to the pyre is a failure of

---

[5] Recall from Part II, I explained Daly's view about how patriarchal myths deceive women. According to the patriarchal myth-makers, Daly points out, myths express "intuitive insights" about meaningful human activity which "open up depths of reality and the self otherwise closed to us." In fact, Daly argues, the "insights" expressed by patriarchal myths actually close off depths of reality and of the Self otherwise opened to women, by "deceiving us into believing that these are the only doorways to our depths and the fathers hold the keys."

identification with her as a victim. Daly finds this failure again in Campbell's description of the live burial of a young widow in 1813 as "an *illuminating*, though *somewhat* appalling, glimpse into the deep silent pool of the Oriental, archaic soul... [emphases mine]." (ibid.) In response to this description Daly points out that Campbell misses "the fact that the 'archaic soul' was a woman destroyed by Patriarchal Religion." (ibid.) Daly argues, these mystifications, so prevalent in Western research, indicate "that the authors identify on some level with the agents of the atrocities, while being incapable of identifying with the victims -- a subjective condition which is masked by the pose of 'objective scholarship.'" (125) This pose not only colludes in legitimating these gynocidal atrocities, Daly points out, it "keeps minds / imaginations in a state of readiness to accept similar or comparable practices which carry out the same program." (123-4)

In this chapter, then, Daly distinguishes between those who identify with the victims, including herself, Katherine Mayo, and all radical feminist journeyers, and those who do not identify with the victims, including Western scholars and Indian patriarchs, and those hostile towards radical feminism. She offers her representation of the Indian woman as victim, revealed by the Sado-Ritual Syndrome analysis, with the intention of standing with her against those who commit and condone the patriarchal crime of sati. In contrast, the representation of the Indian woman as an agent acting on her most cherished beliefs, offered by the patriarchs, East and West, Daly argues, indicates a detached stand, one from which the ritual is not viewed as a crime. The underlying assumption Daly is operating on here is that crimes have victims; no victim, no crime. The Sado-

Ritual Syndrome is an analytic device designed to make the line between perpetrators and victims, between right and wrong, clear and distinct.

Daly claims to reveal a connection between Western scholars and Indian patriarchs in their shared adherence to the basic assumption which underlies their planetary gynocidal social order: that the widows consciously and deliberately immolate themselves as an expression of their love, devotion, and fidelity. In fact, Daly's analysis includes direct references to the views of only two Indian men.[6] While neither addresses this basic assumption directly, both offer images of Indian husbands who could be deserving of nothing less than undying expressions of love, devotion and fidelity. For the most part Daly assumes a construction of the traditional Indian patriarch as defender of "barbaric" social customs sanctioned by orthodox readings of Hindu scriptures. There is no sign in her analysis of the Indian men who worked for social reforms in India throughout the nineteenth century. The following examples are mentioned by Kumari Jayawardena in *The White Woman's Other Burden* (1995).

> The Parsi reformer Behramji Merwanji Malabari, submitted a memorandum entitled, "Notes on Infant Marriage and Enforced Widowhood" and called upon the government to raise the age of consent. And in his journal, *The Indian Spectator*, Malabari frequently discussed the treatment of women and children in India.

---

[6] The first is a justification for child marriages, offered by a Brahman during the Legislative Assembly Debates of 1925. She reports that he exclaimed, "To the Brahman girl-wife the husband is a greater, truer, dearer benefactor than all the social reformers bundled together." (121) The second is offered as an example of the "sort of defensiveness which [Katherine] Mayo's exposé evoked." (127) Daly presents the following commentary on and quotations from Dalip Singh Saund's *My Mother India* (1930). "Defending the hindu married woman's condition, he pictures her as 'dropping longingly into his [her husband's] embrace with almost divine confidence...' He speaks for his sister (who of course is not allowed to speak for herself): 'And when the ideal of her childhood was realized, no wonder she found in his company that height of emotional exaltation which springs from the proper union of the sexes and is the noblest gift of God to man. The American girl thinks my sister married a stranger; but she had married an ideal, a creation of *her* imagination, and a part of her own being [emphasis mine].'" (127-8)

> In 1890, on a visit to Britain, he wrote an "Appeal on Behalf of the Daughters of India" that led to further debates in Britain on Indian family life (Farquhar 1915: 87) Similarly, one of India's leading social reformers, M.G. Ranade (1842-1901), a high court judge in Bombay, also took up the issue. He had succeeded in bringing together social reformers from all parts of India into a National Social Conference that met annually from 1887 to 1895 as part of the Indian National Congress sessions. (Jayawardena, 92)

The efforts of Malabari and Ranade indicate that there were Indian men who worked to end the crimes perpetrated against Indian women. Nor does Daly mention the efforts of Gandhi, who said,

> the *Smritis* contain texts which can command no respect from men who cherish the liberty of woman as their own and who regard her as the mother of the race ... The question arises as to what to do with the *Smritis* that contain texts ... that are repugnant to the moral sense. I have already suggested ... that all that is printed in the name of scripture need not be taken as the word of God or the inspired word. (Quoted in Chatterjee, 1989, 627)

Why is there no acknowledgment in the pages of *Gyn/Ecology* of the social reform efforts led by Indian men? Perhaps she decided it was not necessary to acknowledge these examples because they presented only token efforts which would not undermine her thesis regarding planetary patterns. Even if there were some Indian men who struggled on behalf of Indian women, Daly may have reasoned, they did not upset the line she was drawing in the chapter between on the one side, feminist Searchers such as herself and Mayo, and on the other side, Western scholars and Indian patriarchs because their efforts were not rooted at any level in an identification with the experiences of Indian women. Rather, their efforts were motivated by the assumption that to be politically credible in the struggle against British control, social reform was necessary.

Support for this explanation is found in Daly's condemnation of the book written by Dalip Singh Saund in protest to Mayo's *Mother India*. Daly points out that in the book he speaks for his sister, "who of course is not allowed to speak for herself." (128) Chatterjee confirms the practice among Indian men of speaking for "their" women was the rule among Indian nationalists. He reports about the nationalist discourse that it has been,

> a discourse about women; women do not speak here. It is a discourse which assigns to women a place, a sign, an objectified value; women here are not subjects with a will and a consciousness. (Chatterjee, 632)

Within the nationalist discourse the Indian woman is not considered a victim because she holds this place, has this value, in the struggle to secure national identity in resistance to British imperialism. There is an unmistakable resemblance between the essentialism which informs Campbell's view of the widow as a symbol of the "Oriental, archaic soul" and that which informs the Indian nationalist's view of her as the symbol of Indian identity. Hence, Daly might have reasoned that the reform efforts signified less identification with the victims of ritual atrocities than a view among some Indian nationalists that the movement for self-rule would be well served by social reform on their behalf, leading her to the conclusion that anti-imperialist patriarchy is still patriarchy.

On Lorde's view, however, representing patriarchy without distinguishing between, in this case, imperialist and nationalist formations constituted through racial and ethnic discourses presents a distortion with serious consequences for global sisterhood. Having identified the kind of distortion Lorde was concerned

with in Daly's text, the question becomes, what tool has been obscured by the distortions? In order to get at the nature of the tool, consider the similarities Daly has obscured between her representations of Indian women and those of the Western scholars she criticizes. In particular, it will be instructive to examine the common ground in the views of Daly and Campbell. Consider first the connection between Campbell's image of the Indian widow good and true expression of "archaic, Oriental soul" and Daly's image of Indian woman as victim of barbarous violence. On both representations the widow is advancing on the funeral pyre as an actor following a script. On Campbell's view, the Indian woman is not a victim insofar as she is participating in "archaic Oriental" customs which "open up depths of reality and of the self otherwise closed to [her]."[7] Immersed in the sacred activities of her culture she is "not properly an individual at all." However, he insists, she "really *is* something in as much as she is truly and properly a player of the female part." On Daly's view, the Indian woman is a victim of those whose intent is to deceive her into believing that the script which she follows is the only "doorway to her depths." She plays the female part in patriarchal religious scripts because she has been forced through deception into believing that "veiled and sleeping" is the only key to truth and goodness. What is common in both Campbell's and Daly's representation is the Indian woman as the Other. She is not like the white Western Subjects: not like Campbell with his sense of "personal, individual destiny or responsibility," not like

---

[7] These are the words of Karl Jaspers, quoted by Daly in her critique of the male myth-makers' discourse in "Deadly Deception: Mystification Through Myth," (46).

Daly and the other "women in 'advanced' countries who have some idea of the facts of sexism and some knowledge of 'women's history,'" who must take responsibility for un-covering the massacre. Only those who might break with the scripts acting on their own initiative are Subjects. The Indian woman is the Other of the Western scholar who erases her suffering by refusing to see her experience on "any model of our own" experience. She is the Other of the radical feminist who makes it her responsibility, as one of the few who is *not* veiled and sleeping, to detect the patterns among the disparate atrocities in order to stand up for her and others like her who do not have the knowledge of their own power.

The tool at work here is the construction of the nonwhite, nonWestern woman as Other. The construction of indigenous women of colonial empires took various shapes, according to Thomas Prasch,

> They appeared as sexual opportunity or temptation (depending on the terms of the account) for white men, a motif through all imperial territories that takes perhaps its most pronounced form in the Western imagination's vision of the Orient's veiled women, harems, and baths; as the pretext for imperial intervention to save women from "barbarian" practices ranging from *sati* in India to pologamy in Africa and the Middle East; as the unresisting subjects of tradition-bound patriarchal cultures; and as metaphorical embodiments for a passive and penetrable, thus femininized, realm. (1995, 175)

In Daly's analysis, the Indian woman is Other as pretext for radical feminist critique which implicates the "barbarous rituals" perpetrated against women in different social contexts in a planetary system. Obviously this is not the same as Othering with the intent of sexual conquest or essentialist identity construction. However, from the perspective of the Indian woman whose experiences are at

issue here, there is no difference in the perspective which would make a difference. Neither the Orientalist, the patriarchal Indian nationalist, nor the Western feminist acknowledges the Indian woman's full subjectivity. This is the situation which leads Gayatri Spivak, in her speculations on widow-sacrifice, to ask, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1985) Regarding the connection in the thinking of Daly and Western patriarchs on the rite of *sati*, Spivak is explicit,

> The abolition of this rite by the British in 1829 has been generally understood as a case of "white men saving brown women from brown men." White women did not produce an alternative understanding, as one can see from perusing the nineteenth century British Missionary Registers down to Mary Daly. (121)

In depicting the Indian woman as a victim of a tradition bound patriarchal culture, Daly employed the tool of Othering, without awareness, to silence Indian women.[8] Both Daly and the scholars she criticizes assume their authority as competent interpreters of sati. Daly assumes the correctness of her radical feminist standpoint in much the same way as the Western scholars assume the correctness of their "objective" standpoints. Neither understands their social location as a problematic place from which to begin their respective analyses. Neither attempts to hear the voices of the Indian women in order to understand the practice. Both effectively silence the Indian women by speaking *for* them. The fact that not even one Indian woman's voice can be heard in Daly's analysis of *sati* suggests that Daly has used one of the patriarchs tools against her sisters. She has represented the Indian woman as utterly *different* from herself and other white Western feminist Searchers. To represent Indian women as

---

[8] For a review of the voices of Indian women on *sati* and other issues see Sinha, 1994.

thoroughly victimized and only American women as capable of consciousness and resistance is, on Lorde's view, is to distort their differences.

In the next chapter of the Second Passage, "Chinese Footbinding: On Footnoting the Three-Inch 'Lotus Hooks,'" Daly lays out a second a-mazing analysis, similar in key respects to her analysis of *sati.* Here again, Daly constructs the view of the traditional patriarch, this time Chinese, on the basis of a few brief references cited in the Western patriarchal texts. She dismisses the idea that Maoist revolutionaries are to be credited with bringing an end to footbinding, since their motive did not derive from identification with the victims, but from their interest in getting women into the work force. (142) The only voices of Chinese women that can be heard are the Chinese mothers who use to say, "if one loved a daughter, one could not love her feet." Daly offers this saying in support of her thesis that women are used as Token Torturers to obscure the male-centeredness of the ritual. (139-40) Even more than the chapter on *sati*, this chapter is a focused critique of Western patriarchal scholarship. Over half of the chapter is devoted to the seventh element of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome, the legitimation of the ritual by the rituals of "objective" scholarship. As alluded to in the title of the chapter, the main point of the chapter is to a-maze the connection between the Chinese ritual footbinding and Western scholarship about footbinding, in order to aid the Journeyer in her ability to perceive the workings of patriarchy, and to be able to distinguish her path from that the scholarly men of her tradition. In the process, Daly again makes her case on the basis of a construction of an Other, only this time, it is the

Chinese woman rather than the Indian woman who is the victim discovered by the feminist Searcher. Viewing herself on the side of the victim, again without awareness, Daly distorts the racial/ethnic difference between women in a dualistic construction of the white Western feminist who knows and the nonwhite, nonWestern woman who does not.

A similar analytic pattern is evident in the third chapter of the Second Passage, "African Genital Mutilation: The Unspeakable Atocities," however, Daly shifts the focus of analysis in this chapter in a significant way by explicitly taking up the silence of the victims. In fact, their silence is the subject of the chapter. Where the chapters on *sati* and footbinding focused on the forces of legitimation at work in the texts of Western patriarchal scholars, this chapter focuses on the forces of silence, erasure, and denial at work in many disparate quarters about the crime of genital mutilation. While Daly quotes two African women in the chapter -- a woman from Guinea who testified as a witness at the International Tribunal on Crimes Against Women (163), and a "young Egyptian woman physician" who gave reasons why she would circumscribe her own daughter (165) -- neither challenges Daly's construction of the African woman as acting according to a patriarchal script that casts her as good and real only insofar as she participates in the ritual atrocity of genital mutilation. Both women are silent on the gynocidal intent of this crime. Daly offers the following explanation for the absence of African women's voices of resistance.

> Those who have endured the unspeakable atrocities of genital mutilation have in most cases been effectively silenced. Indeed this profound silencing of the mind's imaginative and critical powers is one basic function of the sado-ritual, which teaches women never

> to forget to murder their own divinity. Those who physically survive these atrocities "live" their entire lifetimes, from early childhood or from puberty, preoccupied by pain. (155)

On Daly's view, her depiction of nonwhite, noneuropean woman "only as victims and preyers-upon each other" does not ignore the voices of resistance among African women, rather, it illustrates how effective patriarchy has been in silencing them.

This chapter opens with the following epigraph drawn from Lorde's poem, "A Sewerplant Grows in Harlem."

> Have you ever risen in the night
> bursting with knowledge and the world
> dissolves toward any listening ear
> into which you can pour
> whatever it was you knew
> before waking
> Only to find all ears asleep
> or drugged perhaps by a dream of words
> because as you scream into them over and over
> nothing stirs
> and the mind you have reached is not a working mind
> please hang up and die again? The mind
> you have reached is not a working mind
> Please hang up
> And die again. (153)

In order to explore Daly's discussion of the silence among African woman in the chapter, it will be fruitful to examine her analysis through a reading of Lorde's poem. Why did Daly choose *this* poem for *this* chapter? I suggest she chose it because it seemed to capture so perfectly every radical feminist thing she wanted to say in the chapter. I think, in choosing it, she understood herself to be

engaging in an "act of Biophilic Bonding with" Lorde.[9] From Daly's gynocentric perspective, the "night" women are rising from is the society of gynocidal patriarchy, constituted by the concrete foreground practices of sati, footbinding, genital mutilation, witch-burning, and gynecology, which are re-enactments of patriarchal myth. The women rising from this night "bursting with knowledge" are the "significant and growing cognitive minority of women, radical feminists, [who] are breaking out from under the sacred shelter of patriarchal myths," named in Daly's eighth Qualitative Leap thesis. (1975, 20) This would include the feminist Searchers whose analyses provide the primary feminist sources for each of the chapters of the Second Passage, i.e. Katherine Mayo, Andrea Dworkin, Fran Hoskin, Matilda Josleyn Gage, and herself. It would also include those whose voices are heard in the text through the epigraphs, including Audre Lorde's voice. The "knowledge" these radical feminists are bursting with is the knowledge which the Journeyer, who has been traveling through the Second Passage of the book, is coming to consciousness about, namely, the "deep and universal intent on this patriarchal planet to destroy the divine spark in women." (Daly, 1978, 315) There is no "listening ear" for this knowledge because all ears are "asleep." On Daly's perspective, Lorde is describing the experience of radical feminists in the early seventies in the United States who were beginning to name and theorize patriarchy without a context within which it could be heard. Lorde's poem probably seemed to speak directly to Daly's experience as she

---

[9] In the new introduction, after expressing regret for "any pain that unintended omissions may have caused others, particularly women of color, as well as myself," these are the words that Daly used to describe what writing *Gyn/Ecology* meant to her. (1990, xxxi)

was discovering the Sado-Ritual Syndrome at work in the ritual of female genital mutilation.

In this chapter Daly is bursting with the knowledge of patriarchal violence in the midst of a "conspiracy of silence" around the crime of genital mutilation. (157) According to Fran Hoskin, the editor of the *Women's International Network News*, located in Lexington, Massachusetts,

> International agencies, the U.N. and U.N. agencies, especially WHO and UNICEF (both devoted to health), development agencies (such as U.S. Agency for International Development), non-governmental organizations working in Africa, missionaries and church groups concerned with health care, also women's organizations including World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, Y.W.C.A., and the Associated Country Women of the World, and others working in Africa, all know what is going on. Or they have people in Africa who know. This is quite aside from the Health Departments and hospitals in African countries and the M.D.s, especially gynecologists, who get the most desperate cases.... The doctors know all. But they don't speak. (In Daly, 1978, 157-8)

A-mazing these disparate silences, Daly points to "their essential sameness." (158) Their collective silence on the crime committed against African girls and women reveals their fundamental ability to identify with the victims. "Educated" persons and African leaders, Daly suggests, "babble about the importance of 'tribal coherence' and 'tradition' while closing their eyes to the physical reality." (ibid.) This is the situation faced the feminist who has risen in the night, bursting with knowledge, to find everyone is asleep, "or drugged perhaps by a dream of words." The "dream of words" drugging the potential listeners, on this reading, is the patriarchal script which fails to condemn the ritual on the grounds of "avoiding cultural judgment." Daly hears the message of those who deny

responsibility and blame for the crime by naming the mutilation a "custom" which must be respected as part of a "different tradition," as instructions from a patriarchal operator, "Please hang up/ And die again." What Daly found in Lorde's poem was a woman, like herself, who was waking up to the knowledge of the horrible crimes against women only to find all ears asleep or drugged .

Consider Daly's position in the midst of this situation, in which the African woman is silenced by pain, and in which academics, catholics, liberal reformers, population planners, and "politicos of all persuasions" collude in a conspiracy of silence. Regarding her position in this chapter, she explains,

> I have chosen to name these practices for what they are: barbaric rituals/atrocities. Critics from Western countries are constantly being intimidated by accusations of "racism," to the point of misnaming, non-naming, and not seeing these sado-rituals. The accusations of "racism" may come from ignorance, but they serve only the interests of males, not of women. This kind of accusation and intimidation constitutes an astounding and damaging reversal, for it is clearly in the interests of Black women that feminists of all races should speak out. Moreover, it is in the interest of women of all races to see African genital mutilation in the context of planetary patriarchy, of which it is but one manifestation. (154)

On Daly's view, accusations of racism are intended to keep white Western women, like herself, from speaking out. The possibility is not apparent to her that one might speak out about patriarchal violence against African women in a racist or ethnocentric manner. Although she is aware that others will be critical of her exposé, she is not aware of how racism and ethnocentrism are embedded in her radical feminist perspective. She cannot see how speaking *for* the African woman Others them by affirming racist and ethnocentric discourses which represent them only as victims. Part of what keeps Daly from seeing the racism

and ethnocentrism of her perspective is the responsibility she feels as Searcher who knows to speak out. She views this responsibility as transcending race and racism.

Daly presents her perspective on "sex differences and race" in the process of critiquing Felix Bryk's *Dark Rapture: The Sex Life of the African Negro* (1939). According to Bryk, genital mutilation is "practiced for erotic reasons." (In Daly, 1978, 170) On his view, efforts to end the practice will be thwarted by nature.

> Woman is forever woman, and man everywhere man; independently of race or color of skin -- white, black, yellow, or copper-red; whether ugly or beautiful; despite youth or age; beyond good and evil. (ibid., 172)

His explanation rests on an essentialist view of sexual difference which, as Daly points out, is designed to legitimize the rigidly role-defined order of planetary patriarchy. Bryk also holds an essentialist view of racial difference, evident in his claim that "They [Blacks] like to lie -- particularly to the whites -- just as children do, because, like children, they cannot comprehend the moral necessity for truthfulness." (ibid.) Notice that there is a contradiction in his views: He says everywhere men and women are different, and at the same time, all blacks are the same, i.e. they are all morally depraved. However, black women can not be, at the same time, women who are like white women in their not being men, and women who are essentially different than white women in their being liars. The way essentialism works, they are either like or not like all other women. Daly sees the racism in Bryk's effort to Other blacks and the misogyny in his Othering

of women, but not the contradiction. The important thing she wants women to hear in his position is his patriarchal voice. In her words,

> It would be helpful if women of all races could hear this message of patriarchy with the deep understanding/hearing of the labyrinthine inner ear, for it describes succinctly the sexual caste system, pointing to its fundamentally same view of all women. (172)

Since patriarchy is "color-blind," Daly reasons, it is in all women's interests to speak out against it. Not to speak out would be racist, on Daly's view, because it would collude in Bryk's racism by seeing blacks, in this case black women, as different from white women. However, she warns,

> There is a danger presented by such unabashedly racist books that the underlying, universal misogyny will go unnoticed. Haggard criticism should enable women who have been intimidated by labels of "racism" to become sisters to these women of Africa -- naming the crimes against them and speaking on their behalf -- seeing through the reversal that is meant to entrap us all. It is truly *racist* to keep silent in the face of these atrocities, merely 'studying' them, speaking and writing deceptively about them, applying different (male-centered) standards to them, failing to see and name the connections among them. Beyond racism is sisterhood, *naming* the crimes against women without paying mindless respect to the "social fabric" of the various androcratic societies, including the one in which we find our Selves imprisoned. (172)

The root thinking evident in Daly claim is that seeing the racism threatens to obscure the "underlying" misogyny. The danger here is in taking one of the branches for the root. Sisterhood is "beyond racism" because it transcends the essentialist racism based on the idea that all blacks are different than whites.

On Daly's view, the radical feminist sisterhood of *Gyn/Ecology* is anti-racist and anti-ethnocentric because it refuses essentialist notions of racial difference. It is anti-racist and anti-ethnocentric because of its concern not just

with discrimination against white American women, but with the war against *all* women "white, black, yellow, or copper-red" on this planet. From a race-cognizant perspective, like Lorde's, Daly's "color-blind" re-action to Bryk's essentialist racism, distorts the importance of racial difference which signals as autonomy of culture, values, aesthetic standards, and so on. Hence, Daly has used the tools of color-evasive racism and ethnocentrism against her sisters of color without awareness. This is not ignorance in the sense of "ignoring" racism and ethnocentrism. On the contrary, her lack of awareness is undergirded by her deep perception and conviction that radical feminism is "beyond racism."

Having examined the first three chapters of the Second Passage in which Daly analyzes the oppression of nonwhite, nonWestern women, we are in a position to understand how does Daly's Sado-Ritual Syndrome analysis has hurt Indian, Chinese, and African women as well as Indian-American, Chinese-American and African-American women. As Lorde says in the letter, representing women of color as victims, voiceless victims, helps maintain an atmosphere of violence against them. If objective posturing by Western scholars connects them with those who commit crimes against nonWestern women by keeping "minds / imaginations in a state of readiness to accept similar or comparable practices which carry out the same program," then any similar connection between radical feminist and Western patriarchs probably has the same effect. In the process of my investigation I argued that both Daly and Western patriarchs view nonWestern women as Other. By representing nonwhite, nonWestern women only as victims, Western minds / imaginations,

including feminist minds / imaginations, remain in a state of readiness to accept the violence against them. I submit this critique as grounds for my conclusion that the book was not written for nonwhite and/or nonWestern women. *Ironically*, Daly's radical feminist theory uses white Western patriarchal tools against nonwhite, nonWestern women as part of a conscious effort to condemn the crimes perpetrated against them. Daly's explicit claims that the Journey of the Second Passage is an exercise in "woman-identified gynaestheia" -- necessary for the creation of the a-mazing female mind capable of seeing through the patriarchal foreground to the Background reality of women's Selves -- together with the conscious and critical understanding of the white and Western perspective of the feminist who is bursting with radical feminist knowledge of planetary patriarchy, suggest *Gyn/Ecology* was written for white Western women.

How the Journey of Radical Feminism Charted in *Gyn/Ecology* Fails to Provide a Liberating Path for Women of Color

Recall from my reading of Lorde's letter, I argued, that the *inclusion* of analyses in *Gyn/Ecology* which represent nonwhite, nonWestern women as victims and preyers-upon each other, must be understood in connection with the *exclusion* of powerful and resistant female symbolic figures from Indian, Chinese and African traditions. (See Part II, 21-24) I suggested, following Lorde, that in presenting the image of the African woman as Token Torturer, a victim coerced into complicity with patriarchal scripts, *and* failing to include black goddesses which symbolize the strength and knowledge and female-bonding of African

women, Daly distorted Lorde's archetypal experience. Daly's exclusion, according to my reading of Lorde's letter, revealed Daly's underlying color- and power-evasive assumption that the herstory and myth of white women can represent the symbolic Background for all women. With Lorde's criticism as a guide, let us now turn to the last two chapters of the Second Passage.

What about the last two chapters of the Second Passage in which Daly finds the Sado-Ritual Syndrome at work in early modern Europe and contemporary [North] America? Doesn't she represent European and American women as victims in the war against the Self in every living woman, just as she represented Indian, Chinese and African women as victims? If she represented *all* women as victims, that might suggest that I am on the wrong track in attempting to link the problems Lorde found in *Gyn/Ecology* to Daly's white Western perspective.[10] However, I will argue in this section I am not on the wrong track. Unlike the first three chapters of the Second Passage (on *sati*, footbinding and genital mutilation) which present nonwhite, nonWesten women only as victims, the last two chapters (on witch burning and gynecology) do not represent European and American women as only victims.[11]

Consider the fourth chapter of the Second Passage, entitled "European Witchburnings: Purifying the Body of Christ." In this chapter, the witch who is represented as a "victim" of patriarchal violence, is also represented as a symbol

---

[10] If this was the case, it might indicate that there is a theoretical problem (as suggested by the postmodern feminist footnotes mentioned in Part II), rather than a problem with the race discourse Daly is operating out of, as I have been suggesting.

[11] Taken together the chapters on European and American rituals (114 pages) offer the reader almost twice as much analysis as the chapters on Indian, Chinese, and African rituals (64 pages).

of female knowledge and power. She symbolizes a "threat" to the patriarchal order. This image of victim/threat is introduced in the epigraph by Willie Tyson.

> A woman's place is set like a tightly woven net
> She's chained like a dog to her position.
> But if by chance or fate she should happen to escape
> She's a menace to the keepers of tradition.
> So if you have the gift to heal but forget which way to kneel
> Get ready for a manmade Inquisition.
>
> *In the Witching Hour you come to your power*
> *You feel it deep inside you, its rising, rising*
> *And you think it's a dream until you hear yourself scream*
> *Power to the witch and the woman in me.* (179)

The European witch in this chapter is represented -- unlike the Indian widow, footbound Chinese woman, and mutilated African woman who follow the patriarchal scripts to Self-destruction -- as a menace who threatens to patriarchy by acting on her own initiative! Here, for the first time in the Second Passage, Daly addresses the question, "just *who* were the women who were so horrifying to the learned experts who created, controlled, and legitimated the witchcraze?" (193) Recall she did not ask, just *who* were the women who were so horrifying to Indian patriarchs and Western scholars who created, controlled, and legitimated *sati*? Nor did she ask, just *who* were the daughters, what potential did they have, which horrified Chinese patriarchs and Western scholars to the point of creating, controlling, and legitimating the ritual of footbinding? Nor did she ask, just *who* were the girls and young women who represented such a threat to those who created, controlled, and legitimated female genital mutilation? The reason she did not address these questions is provided by Daly in the following passage.

> The situation of those accused of witchcraft was somewhat different from that of the footbound Chinese girls and of the genitally maimed girls and young women of Africa, for these were mutilated in preparation for their destiny -- marriage. It was also somewhat different form the situation of the widows of India, who were killed solely for the crime of outliving their husbands. For the targets of attack in the witchcraze were not women defined by assimilation into the patriarchal family. Rather, the witchcraze focused predominantly upon women who had rejected marriage (Spinsters) and women who had survived it (widows). The witch-hunters sought to purify their society (The Mystical Body) of these "indigestible" elements -- women whose physical, intellectual, economic, moral, and spiritual independence and activity profoundly threatened the male monopoly in every sphere. (184)

She does not ask the questions about "just who these women were" who were victimized in India, China, and Africa, because her Searches led her to the conclusion that they were "veiled and sleeping," completely Silenced, or Token Torturers. These were women who were "defined by assimilation into the patriarchal family." They were "digestible" rather than "indigestible" elements of society. She did not ask the question of *who* these women were, in a Background sense, because her analysis led her to believe that they presented no threat to the patriarchal order.

So, just who was the witch? The witch was the target of patriarchal violence, not in order to make her a good wife or mother, but because she refused these patriarchal roles. Like the other victims of patriarchal violence the witches were women accused of and punished for impurity. Daly offers the following case to provide perspective on the confessions of those accused.

> A typical example was that of a young woman of twenty, whose name was Agnes, who was tortured in Tettenwang, Germany, in 1600. On August 11 she was hoisted repeatedly in the strappado (defined in Merriam Webster as a torture consisting of "hoisting the subject by a rope sometimes fastened to his [sic] wrists behind his

> back and letting him fall to the length of the rope"). According to Lea, she bore this heroically, confessing nothing and pardoning those who had falsely accused her, even those she had been hoisted eleven times, ten of them with a fifty-pound weight. Ten weeks later she was hoisted again and was told that her mother had accused her, and then "her courage gave way." (181)

On Daly's analysis, Agnes was accused of being a witch because she symbolized a particular sort of impurity. This was not the bodily impurity which legitimated genital mutilation, but rather an impurity her mode of living presented within the larger social body ("The Mystical Body"). The witches were accused of sexual impurity to mask the "intent" of the witch hunters, which Daly claims, "was to purify society of the existence and of the potential existence" of "women outside patriarchal control -- Spinsters and widows -- whose crime is independence (indigestibility)." (183, 185) Unlike the victims who followed the scripts to become good and true women, the witches were "strong women" who refused to follow the scripts, and were tortured for presenting this threat. (183)

On Daly's analysis, the witches were victimized because they were Hags (healers, counselors, wise women, teachers) who "earned the respect of the people" through expressions of their "real female-identified goodness, that is, [through their] independence, strength, wisdom, and learning." (193) Like the daughters of educated men, their independence was the condition for their contributions. The were women who had earned the respect of the people through their work which combined "spiritual and medical" knowledge. Because of their knowledge, Daly argues, the Witches became the targets of a "secret bond between seemingly distinct and even opposed categories of men"

obsessed with "purifying society of deviant/defiant women." (185) According to Daly's a-mazing analysis, this "gynocidal fraternity" included members of the legal profession, priests from the "bitterly opposed" traditions of catholicism and protestantism, "aspirants to political power," those who controlled the newly invented printing press, and the rising professional class of knowledgeable "experts."[12] (185-193) The witchcraze, on Daly's view, was a war waged by "an aspiring 'intellectual' elite of professional men" against "a spiritual/moral/know-ing elite cross-section of the female population of Europe." (194) The witchcraze differs from other atrocities in the Second Passage in that this "primal battle of principalities and powers was at heart concerned with the process of know-ing, which the professionals wanted to possess and control as their "body of knowledge." (194) This was not a slaughter of innocent victims, but a "battle" over knowledge.[13] The European witch was a Warrior Witch.

Daly acknowledges this difference constitutes a break with the basic similarities dis-covered among the other patriarchal crimes analyzed in the Second Passage. "However," she suggests, "it is essential also to be aware of some significant differences" in manifestations of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome. (180) The difference between the war on women who are "veiled and sleeping" and the "battle" against the wise women is significant, Daly asserts, for "Hags and Crones [who] are struggling to survive today" on the "boundaries of

---

[12] An interesting research project might be made of comparing Daly's gynocentric historicism with Foucault's "new" historicism.

[13] For a review of the recent literature on gender and the historiography of the European witch-hunts see Elspeth Whitney's "International Trends: The Witch 'She'/ The Historian 'He'" (1995) in the *Journal of Women's History*, vol. 7, No.3 (fall).

androcratic Western-dominated society." (ibid.) In order to understand the significance of this difference recall the two-fold project of the Second Passage: to establish on the basis of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome that patriarchy is a planetary war on the Self in every living woman, *and* in the process, to create and develop the a-mazing female mind capable of perceiving the relation between, on the one hand, foreground myths and rituals, and on the other, Background practices and potentialities. In the previous Second Passage chapters the feminist Searchers do *battle* with the Western scholars over how women who are the targets of the patriarchal world war should be perceived. The feminist Searcher herSelf, is not a victim, but one "bursting with knowledge." She is one who acts responsibly on her knowledge on behalf of the silenced victims of patriarchy. It is "essential" to acknowledge the difference between the (Indian, Chinese, and African) victims and the (European) victim/threat if the Journeyer/Searcher is going to be able to recognize the Witch within her as the doorway to her depths. The difference is significant because of the *relation* between the Journeyer who a-mazes the Sado-Ritual Syndrome in the chapters on patriarchal atrocities in India, China and Africa, and the Witch who is dis-covered in this chapter. The radical feminist Journeyer is a Witch! In Daly's words,

> The women hunted as witches were (are) in a time/space that is not concentric with androcracy. Hags are Self-centering, constituting the Society of Outsiders, defining gynocentric boundaries. (186)

It is important for the Journeyer to find herSelf, through a-mazing the European witchburnings, because in that identification the Journeyer discovers that she is more than a victim, she is one who defines her a mode of living from the knowledge within herSelf, a knowledge and mode of living which present a liberating path beyond patriarchal boundaries. Here for the first time in the Second Passage, Daly presents a connection between the Journeyer or feminist Searcher who is a-mazing the planetary massacre and women who are victims of it. The Journeyer/Searcher is *unrelated* to the Indian woman, the Chinese woman and the African woman, but she is the symbolic descendent of the Witch. From this Hag-identified perspective the Journeyer realizes by the end of the chapter,

> There is much to be done. Working with increased confidence and precision, Hags must continue in the spiritual tradition of such visionaries as Matilda Joselyn Gage, continuing to uncover our past and paths to our future. This will be possible to the degree that we continue with courage in the Journey of our own time/space. Seeing through the fraudulent re-presentations of the witchcraze will help us recognize the tactics of today's Male Midwives, the professional Wizards who have unsuccessfully "succeeded" the Wise Women -- the Unhealers of Modern Medicine. (222)

By including in the Sado-Ritual Syndrome analysis of the witch, representations of women who are both victims of patriarchy and threats to it, Daly offers the history and Background of European women to the feminist Searcher who must face in the last chapter the Sado-Ritual which threatens to make a victim, who presents no threat, of her.

In the final chapter of the Second Passage, "American Gynecology: Gynocide By the Holy Ghosts of Medicine and Therapy," Daly clearly intends to present the American woman who suffers the crimes of gynecology as another victim of planetary patriarchy. She asserts from the start,

> I have shown in the earlier chapters of this passage how women in various cultures -- which are merely multi-manifestations of the overall culture of androcracy -- have often been lulled / lobotomized by the myths and habits of their particular social context. Drugged by the prevailing local dogmas and disabled physically, they have not always seen the intent behind the vicious circle of maiming and murder of mothers and daughters. In twentieth-century America, women are lulled by the myths and rituals of gynecology and therapy, believing that "doctor knows best." We have entered the Ice Age of Gynocidal Gynecology. (224)

Like the Indian woman who is drugged to induce her to follow patriarchal scripts to self-destruction, like the footbound woman of China who is disabled physically and mentally, like the African woman who is silenced in pain by genital mutilation, American women are kept by gynecologists "in the state of perpetual patients whose bodies and minds are constantly invaded by foreign objects -- knives, needles, speculums, carcinogenic hormone injections and pills, sickening self-images, festering fixations, debilitating dogmas."[14] (230) Daly's analysis includes an exposé of a range of Sado-Rituals including estrogen replacement therapy (especially DES), the "recent hysterectomy epidemic," the "breast surgery craze," forced sterilization as well as forced motherhood (via abortion laws), and "psychiatric re-placement of [a woman's] Self-identified natural history by man-made misinterpretations." (236)

---

[14] In this chapter, Daly explains in a footnote, she uses "the term *gynecology* broadly to refer to all those professions -- including psychiatry and the other psychotherapeutic fields -- which specialize in the 'diseases and hygiene' of women's bodies and minds." (224)

Despite of Daly's intention to present the American woman as victim of gynecology, the Journeyer/Searcher does not identity with her as such because she is also represented as part of a tradition of strong, knowledgeable, resistant women linked genealogically, or as Daly says "Crone-ologically," with the European women burned as witches. Unlike the other chapters of the Second Passage, which all begin with the first element of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome (obsession with purity), this chapter begins with a section entitled, "A Brief Crone-ology." The argument of this section is that, in the West, patriarchy has taken shape in different formations in response to particular threats which have presented themselves in three historical moments: early modern, nineteenth century, and late twentieth century. During the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Daly argued in the previous chapter, "the European witchcraze signaled the arrival of a new age of gynocidal processions." (229) In response to the threat presented by Spinsters and widows outside patriarchal control whose process of know-ing gained them the respect of the people -- "their competence shows up the incompetence of the legitimated professionals" -- patriarchy took shape in the witchcraze. (193) According to Daly, "Man-midwives of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteen, and nineteenth centuries were under fire from woman midwives, such as Elizabeth Nihell, who described their instruments as 'weapons of death.'" (224) Hence, it is no coincidence, on Daly's Crone-ology that "the massacre of the wise women/healers during the witchcraze was followed by the rise of man-midwives who eventually became dignified by the name "gynecologist." (224)

During the nineteenth century, Daly argues patriarchy took shape in gynecology, which was a response to the threat presented by feminists. In Daly's words, "it is essential for Crone-ologists to see that the specialized treatment for women known as gynecology arose in the nineteenth century as a direct response to the first wave of feminism." (227) She makes her case by reading together two seemingly disparate histories -- the history of the emergence of gynecology and the history of the first wave women's movement -- in order to make apparent that they are connected by being responses to assertions of female strength and knowledge. Among the disparate events she a-mazes are the following.

> In 1848, the year of the first Women's Right's Convention, Dr. Charles Meigs was advising his pupils that their study of female organs would enable them to understand and control the very heart, mind, and soul of woman. (ibid.)
>
> In 1852 Dr. Augustus Kingsley Gardner let out a battle cry against "disorderly women," including women's rightists, Bloomer-wearers, and midwives. (227)

Thus, the patriarchal response to feminists of the first wave was like the response to the Witches, in that both were intended to maintain the sexual caste system by eliminating threats and potential threats to it. Finally, in this chapter Daly goes on to establish the gynocidal link between American Gynecology and second wave of feminism. Previewing her analysis, she says,

> our Crone-logical analysis will show that the current escalation of murderous gynecological surgery (and of chemotherapy and psychotherapy) is no chronological coincidence. There is every reason to see the mutilation and destruction of women by doctors specializing in unnecessary radical mastectomies and hysterectomies, carcinogenic hormone therapy, psychosurgery,

> spirit-killing psychiatry and other forms of psychotherapy as directly related to the rise of radical feminism in the twentieth century. (228)

By perceiving the connections between the witchcraze and gynocidal gynecology in the last two centuries Daly a-mazes these seemingly disparate phenomena to reveal how "the mutilations and mutations masterminded by the modern man-midwives represent an advanced stage in the patriarchal program of gynocide." (226) Hence, in the chapters on witchburing and gynecology Daly has provided a context for understanding these crimes which she does not provide in the chapters on *sati*, footbinding and genital mutilation. In fact, the chapters on witchburing and gynecology fit together in a way that the other chapters do not. Together they present a historical narrative which enables the Journeyer to see the Background of women acting on their own initiatives (witches, first and second wave feminists) behind the foreground practices which are re-enactments of patriarchal scripts of Goddess Murder. The Journeyer sees the crimes as responses to female knowledge and power, rather than crimes perpetrated against victims who are "veiled and sleeping." Seeing them as such, Daly points out, it is

> necessary for Spinsters/Lesbians to provide the most lucid analysis possible in this State of Siege. Precisely as defiant deviants, as Daughters of the healers burned as witches because they were "indigestible," we can take on the label Impure as a badge of honor, for we defy the pure image of perfect femininity. As Anti-Marys whose prehistoric sources are the ante-Marian Goddesses, we are in a position to see Mary, Eve, Athena, the Total Woman as fetishes formed from fragmented female divinity. [...] Spinsters who are choosing be-ing are ecstatically moving outside the space of the patriarchal holding pattern. From the vantage point of Journeyers into the natural Background of our Selves, we can expose and judge all pseudochoices and pseudosolutions foisted upon women by the foreground fetishists. In order to do so

> effectively, we must analyze the legitimating logic as well as the techniques employed by the purifiers / castrators of women. (240)

Unlike the victims of the other chapters who are not able to provide a lucid analysis, who are not in a position to expose and judge pseudochoices, the American woman is because she has a Witch within her.

Under each of the elements of the Sado-Ritual Syndrome analysis in this chapter, the representations of American women as victims are contextualized with insight made possible by the Crone-ological approach. For example, in her analysis of the gynecologist's obsession with purity, Daly refers to Adrienne Rich's discovery of the "reversal" in the traditional historical story of gynecology which suggests that "filthy" midwives were replaced by antiseptic ob/gyns. Quoting Rich, Daly points out,

> "The midwife, who attended only women in labor, carried fewer disease bacteria with her than the physican. [...] In the seventeenth century began a two centuries' plague of puerperal fever which was directly related to the increase in obstetric practice by men." The hands of physican or surgeon often came directly from cases of disease to cases of childbirth. (236)

This example provides even a more striking example of how the portrayal of victims is different in this chapter than in the first three chapters of the Second Passage if considered in contrast with Daly's analysis of Mayo's "description of the 'unspeakable' *dhais*, 'midwives' from the 'untouchable' caste to whose filthy, brutal, grotesque, and frequently murderous ministrations the woman in childbirth is subjected." (439n) In the American account, by an a-mazing reversal, Daly reveals that the midwife was not the filthy one after all. However, in the Indian account, Daly's a-mazing analysis reveals that the midwife is filthy,

but warns the reader not to misinterpret the fact "the *dhais* are females, imagining that this employment of the filthiest and most ignorant women to attend women in childbirth is not patriarchal in its context and intent." The difference between the two accounts is that the latter is offered without a Crone-ological type contexualization to locate the *dhais* in a female-identified time/space of her own. She is understood only as an agent of male-identification.

While there are no references to racial identity in the chapter on the witchburnings, Daly makes an effort in this chapter to include among the American women victimized by gynecological practices, examples of black women. For example, she notes J. Marion Sims, the "father of gynecology,"

> began his life's work "humbly," performing dangerous sexual surgery on black female slaves housed in a small building in his yard, but rapidly moved up the professional ladder, becoming the "moving spirit" behind the founding of the Woman's Hospital in New York, which provided him with bodies for his brutal experimental operations. (225)

She also notes that Sims used indigent women in these experimental operations and provides the following footnote for support.

> Mary Smith, an Irish indigent, suffered thirty of his operations between 1856 and 1859. The black slave Anarcha had suffered the same number in his backyard stable a decade before. (ibid.)

The obvious point here, in addition to the fact that Sims was a gynocidal butcher, is that American gynecology is a Sado-Ritual which is practiced with only minor variations across race and class. Situating the experience of Mary Smith, an Irish-American indigent, side by side with the experience of Anarcha, an African-

American slave, is meant to suggest that American descendants of European and African women alike share a history of victimization at the hands of men like Sims. However, an important difference between the experiences of the Irish-American and African-American women is obscured by this connection. On the basis of the Second Passage, only the Irish-American women's experience is represented in the context of a Crone-ology. Since, black American women do not share the history of white women of European descent, they appear, in this chapter, more like the Indian, Chinese and African victims in the first three chapters than like the Witches of the previous chapter. Since they were slaves, rather than witches, they appear, like the women in the first three chapters of the Second Passage, as only victims rather than as victim/threats.

Before moving on, consider one more example from the chapter. In her analysis of the seventh component of the gynecological sado-ritual, concerning the legitimation of the ritual by the meta-ritual of "objective" scholarship, Daly discusses an article on "Giant Uterine Tumors," which describes the "management and surgical removal of a 65 lb. uterine tumor." Daly reports that the article,

> begins with the sentence: "Surgery for massive abdominal tumors is interesting and challenging." This professional piece placidly lists a series of hideous "procedures," to which the woman (described as a sixty-year-old, black, gravida 1, para 1) was subjected. We are informed that the patient was "afraid of the hospital and surgery." The woman, whose healthy fear had kept her away from the hospital, had lived with the tumor for fifteen years, but had suffered from low-back pain and had trouble "ambulating." After treatment, she had not only the same problems but others, infinitely more serious. She was subsequently hospitalized at a nursing home, where she died approximately seven months after her original admission to the hospital. It is safe

> to conclude that the surgery was not "interesting and challenging" for her. (290)

While it cannot be denied that Daly identifies with the victim of this ritual atrocity against the "devotees of the rites of de-tached scholarship" who mask their failure of identification by the pose of "objectivity," Daly has represented the black American woman as utterly different from herself in a dualistic construction of the white feminist who knows and the black victim who does not. On Daly's view, the woman with the tumor had a "healthy fear" that kept her away from the hospital, but it was not a fear informed by the knowledge of the Witch. She did not know enough about the gynocidal intent of gynecologists to save her own life. Daly also presents similar examples of white women as victims. The difference, again, is that the white Journeyer who is discovering the crimes perpetrated against women like herself knows that she is not *only* a victim because she has the knowledge of survival handed down to her by her European foresisters.

To illustrate how the Journey through the Second Passage of *Gyn/Ecology* presents different paths, consider the paths presented for a white Western woman, like myself, and a black Western woman, like Lorde. Upon coming to the first chapter of the Second Passage I discover the Indian woman "veiled and sleeping" and I realize that even though I am unrelated to her, as one of the few women capable of seeing the horror of their situation, I have a responsibility to un-cover the forces of legitimation which masks the massacre against her. I am the feminist Searcher. I stand up for her in a battle against the

Western patriarchal scholars who identify with the perpetrators of the crimes against her. In the next chapter I discover the Chinese women as victim who is made into a Token Torturer. And though she seems different than me, I understand that making her into a Token Torturer is a patriarchal strategy to separate women.

I go on to a-maze the connection between the Chinese ritual of footbinding and Western scholarship about footbinding. I do this analytic work in order to aid me in my ability to perceive the workings of patriarchy, and to be able to distinguish my path from that the scholarly men of my tradition. I stand up for the victims of footbinding arguing that they are used as Token Torturers by men who seek to mask the male-centeredness of their ritual. Next, I discover the African woman who is silenced by the pain of genital mutilation. Bursting with the knowledge of her victimization I find "all ears asleep" in a "conspiracy of silence" against her. By this chapter of the Second Passage, I am becoming increasingly knowledgeable about the "universal intent to destroy the divine spark in women" and I am experiencing "a growing integrity of vision and purpose." I am clear that despite the attempts to silence me with accusations of racism, it is my responsibility as a feminist Searcher to stand up for my victimized sisters by "naming the crimes against them and speaking on their behalf." I feel relieved to hear the voice of Audre Lorde, who seems to know exactly what I know, i.e. the message of patriarchy to *all* women is "Please hang up and die again."

Next I come to the chapter on the European witchburings. I meet the European woman, my foresister, and I realize that she is not only a victim, but

also a symbol of female knowledge and power who represents a threat to the patriarchal order. Finally, a woman victimized under the planetary system of patriarchy who, like me, knows that following the patriarchal scripts *makes* you a victim. She is the target of men obsessed with purifying society of women like her, who refuse patriarchal scripts, who act on their own initiatives. Yes, Agnes was a victim, but she had the "courage" to "heroically" endure the strapedo, confessing to nothing for ten weeks, because she *knew* she had committed no crime. She had earned the respect of the people through her independence, the condition of her "real female-identified goodness." My foresister, who had engaged in a battle with the patriarchal forces at the dawn of the modern period, provides for me a model of struggling to survive on the boundaries of androcratic Western-dominated society. I can identify with her battle because her history is present in my battle today against the Western patriarchal scholars who incessantly legitimate patriarchal violence against me and my sisters around the world. She and I are in a time/space that is not concentric with androcracy. We are Outsiders. As I approach the final chapter of the Second Passage I am aware there is much to be done.

Finally, I arrive in the last chapter of the Second Passage which a-mazes the Sado-Ritual Syndrome as it manifests itself, at home, in my part of the planet. It is the hardest part of the Journey for me because I must face the ways my situation is similar to the situation of those I have been told are so utterly different from me. Upon my arrival I am reminded that American gynecologists intend to make a victim of me, and I see that in America, women like me are

"lulled by the myths and rituals of gynecology and therapy, believing that 'doctor knows best.'" In the face of this foreground reality, I realize I must be like Katherine Mayo, Andrea Dworkin, Fran Hoskin, and Matilda Joselyn Gage before them, and the Witches before her. I come to this realization as I read the "Brief Chronology" provided at the outset of the chapter. I am part of a tradition of strong, knowledgeable, independent women linked Crone-ologically with the European women who were healers, counselors, wise women, and teachers. I am not a victim, I am a descendent of this tradition. I am one of the few, "a significant and growing cognitive minority of women;" I am "breaking out from under the sacred shelter of patriarchal religious myths." I am *enraged* to discover that "the mutilation and destruction by doctors specializing in unnecessary radical mastectomies and hysterectomies, carcinogenic hormone therapy, psychosurgery, spirit-killing psychiatry and other forms of psychotherapy" is an attack on me! With the Witch as my guide, I become the judge of pseudochoices! I judged the filth of the *dhais* as a measure of how child birth is devalued under patriarchy. I judged the filth to the European midwife a reversal. In this chapter, I see and condemn the reversals which provide the foundation for the Sado-Ritual Syndrome as it is manifest in American gynecology. It is the Witch within me who finds J. Marion Sims guilty of crimes against Mary Smith and Anarcha. I am able to see that researchers who find the management and surgical removal of uterine tumors "interesting and challenging," regardless of the gynocidal consequences. In this chapter I come to my power through a-mazing the crimes committed against me.

Now consider the path presented for a black Western woman, like Lorde, as she experiences the Journey through the Second Passage of *Gyn/Ecology*. Upon coming to the first chapter of the Second Passage she discovers the Indian woman "veiled and sleeping." If, on the basis of her experience with Black Nationalism in the United States, she recognizes a similarity in their situations, she may wonder if there is any relation. On the basis of the representation of the Indian woman as a total victim, she might decide there is no relation. In response to the horror of the Indian woman's situation, she is presented with two paths: that of the Western patriarchal scholar who stands back from the situation masking his inability to identify with the victim with "objectivity;" or that of the responsible feminist Searcher who stands up for the victim by un-covering and condemning the forces of legitimation which masks the massacre against her. She might agree with the feminist Searcher that *sati* is a crime against women and that Western scholars legitimate the crime. At the same time, if she senses something amiss in the feminist Searcher's assumption of responsibility for the victimized Indian woman, she may hesitate to identify herself as a Searcher. Since the Journey presents only two paths, not siding with the feminist Searchers is equivalent to siding with the perpetrators of gynocide.

Moving on to the next chapter Lorde discovers the Chinese woman as victim who is made into a Token Torturer. Perhaps she identifies, as the Searcher does, the patriachal strategy of using women as scapegoats to turn women against each other. She also follows the Searcher in a-mazing the

connection between the Chinese ritual of footbinding and Western scholarship about footbinding. But here again she feels the inclination to distinguish her path from that the white Western feminist Searcher who only seems to hear the voices of white Western men. Perhaps she beings to wonder, even if she agrees with the radical feminist critique of the "objective" and legitimating standpoint of the Western scholar, why his voice gets privileged in a project which is about women a-mazing the systematic nature of patriarchal oppression. She may ask, is the Searcher's path through white, Western patriarchal scholarship the *only* path to consciousness of the planetary dimensions of patriarchy?

Next, Lorde comes to the chapter on African genital mutilation. Immediately she realizes she is not a feminist Searcher, fore there is no indication that the feminist Searcher bears any relation to the African woman, and Lorde is well aware that the African woman is her foresister. While she, like the Searcher, is bursting with the knowledge of the African woman's victimization, and outraged at the "conspiracy of silence" against her foresister, she also *knows* that it is a lie that the African woman is only a victim, silenced by the pain of genital mutilation, incapable of speaking for herself. She knows Black women have a history of using and sharing power and a tradition of closeness and mutual care and support because she has dis-covered in her Searches through African myth and religion Afrekete, Yemanje, Oyo, Mawulisa, the warrior goddesses of the Vodun, the Dahomeian Amazons, and the warrior-women of Dan. She realizes, at this point, the Searcher in *Gyn/Ecology* has

constructed an Other of her African foresister in order to support her thesis that patriarchy is a planetary phenomena. While she shares with the Searcher a vision of global sisterhood, she knows it can never be realized by taking responsibility for those who have been victimized. Now Lorde is able to name what is amiss in the Searchers assumption of responsibility. She remembers one of the important lessons of Black Power in the sixties, "only black people can convey the revolutionary idea that black people are able to do things for themselves." White women must listen to Black women speaking for themselves about the crimes committed against them. In attempting to speak for the African woman the Searcher has made a victim of her. Now Lorde is angry, not only at the perpetrators of the genital mutilation, and the "objective" Western scholars who legitimate it, but also at the feminist Searcher for contributing to the violence against her African sisters by silencing their voices in the name of radical feminism. By this point in the Journey, Lorde is seeing racism in the feminist Searcher's position. The racism is not in her condemnation genital mutilation, but in the unsisterly way she goes about it. From the perspective of the Journey, Lorde's seeing racism in Daly's position is equivalent to trying to silence her radical feminism. Since the Journey presents *only* the path of the white Western scholar and the white Western feminist, she probably comes to the conclusion by this point that this Journey is not for her. Furthermore, she is not pleased to find her poem being misused in a chapter bursting with distortions. It leads her to wonder whether the Searcher had read her work or that of other Black women for what it might give her. She realizes by the end of this chapter, she is in a

time/space that is not concentric with white Western radical feminism. In order to stand with her Indian, Chinese and African sisters, she must identify, not as a Searcher, but as a Sister Outsider to the Journey of radical feminism as Daly has charted it. As she approaches the chapters on European and American women under patriarchy she is aware there is much to be done.

In the chapter of the European witchburnings she meets the white Western woman's foresister who is represented, unlike her foresister in Africa, not only as a victim, but also as a symbol of female knowledge and power. She notes rhat the European women burned as witches knew that following patriarchal scripts would *make* them victims. Perhaps she wonders if the women burned as witches in Africa, mentioned in a footnote, knew this too. (180) Perhaps she wonders about the *relation* between the European witchcraze, imperialism and the slave trade.[15] Perhaps she is irritated at the arrogance of a Sister Searcher who represents only *her* foresisters as models of know-ing, courage, independence and "real female-identified goodness." Perhaps she wonders where Matilda Joselyn Gage stood on abolition and reconstruction. Clearly she has questions about the limits of her desire to identify with a Witch who sees herself and the world from a "color- evasive" perspective.

Finally, she arrives home to America in the last chapter of the Second Passage. If she is relieved to find the Searcher uses examples of both black and white American women who have been victimized by gynecologists, she is

---

[15] I wonder about it. This will be one focus of my research project at the NEH Seminar on Feminist Epistemologies I will attend in July.

probably disappointed to find that they are not contextualized by a "Brief Crone-ology" which reads gynecology as a direct response to African-American feminism.[16] The *inclusion* of black women as victims, in conjunction with the *exclusion* a historical narrative which enables the Journeyer to see the Background of black women acting on their own initiatives behind the gynocidal/racist foreground practices, constitutes a Journey of "assimilation within a solely western european herstory." (Lorde, 1983, 69) This Journey confronts Lorde with an either/or choice: identify with Anarcha and the nameless "sixty-year-old, black gravida 1, para 1" as a victim, or identify with Mary Daly, Katherine Mayo, Andrea Dworkin, Fran Hoskin, and Matilda Joselyn Gage before them, and the European Witches before her as an assimilated black feminist. Perhaps there is an alternative. Knowing what Lorde knew, I assume that she would have been looking for a liberating path through *Gyn/Ecology*. Here's just one example of where she might have found it. Consider the seemingly disparate experiences of DeLois, one of the symbolic figures in Lorde's work who models a Black feminist mode of existence, (See Part II, 12) and the victim, which Daly reports, is described in an volume of *Obstetrics and Gynecology* as a "sixty-year-old, black, gravida 1, para 1." Lorde might have recognized DeLois in this black woman with the tumor "whose healthy fear had kept her away from hospitals." (289) Like DeLois, who marked her own course

---

[16] Daly provides a few notes in the chapter which might go into such a Crone-ology. For example, "Women, particularly nonwhite and other low-income women, are the unwilling victims not only of sterilization but of forced motherhood -- a fact demonstrated repeatedly, as in the 1977 U.S. Supreme Court decisions allowing Congress and state legislatures to ban funds for elective abortions." (245)

in the world, and moved like she was somebody special in the face of her fears and the ever-present threat that she would be run down, this woman *knew* she was never meant to survive, which is why she was not lulled into the hospital fifteen years earlier believing, "doctor knows best." There is no reason to doubt that Lorde, and other Radical Women of Color, who were Searching for and discovering the patriarchal/racist/imperialist foreground distortions and silences which obscured their own Background traditions, would find it any more difficult or less necessary to dis-cover the distortions and silences obscured in a white Western radical feminist text. Lorde comes to her power through *Gyn/Ecology* by a-mazing it in her "Open Letter to Mary Daly."

When I began to lay out the two paths presented through the Second Passage for a Journeyer like myself and for one like Lorde, I said it was to illustrate that *Gyn/Ecology* was written from a white Western perspective for white Western women. In an important sense the fact that it does not offer a liberating path for someone like Lorde is *not* problematic. If there is a problem with white Western women taking responsibility for everyone else's liberation, as I have suggested there is, then it is appropriate for white Western feminists like Daly to be thinking, in particular, about the becoming of white Western women like herself and me. However, this exercise has revealed that the path it presents even for white Western women is problematic. In order to understand why, reconsider Lorde's request in the letter that Daly be aware of how the "assumption that the herstory and myth of white women is the legitimate and sole herstory and myth of all women to call upon for power and background,"

encourages the demise of radical feminist theory by serving the "destructive forces of racism and separation between women." (Lorde, 1983, 69) By presenting a path for white Western women which only enables us to see our nonwhite, nonWestern sisters as victims and preyers-upon each other, Daly has undermined her goal of making the Second Passage an exercise in the creation of our Selves as authoritative perceivers. Recall that Frye suggested that the process of granting ourselves authority as perceivers was accomplished "by discovering agreement in the experiences and perceptions of women." However, throughout the Second Passage, the Searcher is engaged in a-mazing the texts of white Western scholars, which convinces her that Indian, Chinese and African women cannot speak for themselves, so a-mazing their texts appears to be the only way to establish the thesis that patriarchy is global. But if she cannot hear the voices of Indian, Chinese and African women she cannot discover whether or not their experiences and perceptions agree with hers. The authority she grants herself through a-mazing the texts of white Western scholars is like their authority in that it is established from a distance, rather than in the process of a dialogue. In order to create herself as an authoritative perceiver, she must assume that *all* women of all cultures have herstories and gynocentric myths to call upon for power and background which have been stolen, distorted and buried beneath the patriarchal foreground in their worlds. She must Search for the women in India, China, and Africa, who, like the European women burned as witches knew, and like the white Western Searcher, know, and she must listen for what they can teach her, not only about how their

cultures are like hers, but also how they are different so she does not use the tools of her culture, without awareness, against them. The vision of global sisterhood, shared by Lorde and Daly, depends on making the Journey of radical feminism for white Western women critically and creatively race- and ethnicity-cognizant about the different Realms of the Background.

Part IV

RADICAL WHITE WESTERN FEMINISM: TOWARD A RECONSTRUCTION OF *GYN/ECOLOGY*

I hope that in its richness, as well as in its incompleteness, Gyn/Ecology *will continue to be a Labrys enabling women to learn from our mistakes and our successes, and cast our Lives as far as we can go, Now, in the Be-Dazzling Nineties.*

Mary Daly, "New Intergalactic Introduction"

among my people
it is rude
to listen to another
without making noises
of acknowledgment.
a famous anthropologist
now deceased
said the invention
of the boat
started racism.
it is rude to listen to this
silently.
many men and many women
say a good woman
accepts their vision
of whom she should be
in the world.
it is dangerous
to listen to this
without sucking one's teeth.
i am a black woman.
i am a lesbian.
now make a noise
of acknowledgment.

Terri L. Jewell, "Show You Hear"

I argued in Part III, Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* is a radical feminist book written from a white Western perspective for white Western women. As such it charts *one* white Western radical feminist Journey, one which is problematic in that it inhibits the goal of sisterhood. Now, in light of what I have discovered studying *Gyn/Ecology* and Audre Lorde's "Open Letter to Mary Daly," I explore a reconstruction of the text by charting a new radical feminist Journey for white Western women which I call "radical white Western feminism." This project is based on the assumption that there is important, even critical, work to be done by white Western feminists from a radical perspective such as Daly's, which is primarily for white Western women who seek a perspective and mode of living that is gynocentric as well as critically and creatively race- and ethnicity-cognizant.[1] I offer these explorations toward a reconstruction of *Gyn/Ecology* as a response to Audre Lorde's open letter, which is intended to "show I hear," and as a response to Mary Daly's invitation to *think* about *Gyn/Ecology* in light of Lorde's criticisms, which is intended to move the dialogue among radical feminists -- of all races, cultures and classes -- in a fruitful direction.[2]

First, a word about the meaning and necessity today for the reconstructive work I begin here. For the purposes of this paper, I employ the term "theory reconstruction" in contrast with "theory replacement" to distinguish two ways

---

[1] Two important influences on the development of my thinking along these lines, in addition to Lorde and Daly, are María Lugones and Ruth Frankenberg. While I believe this form of radical feminism must also be critically and creatively class-conscious and sexuality-conscious, I am not yet prepared to articulate how these awarenesses might inform and transform the politics of the position I investigate here. However, the work I am doing here is a step in the direction of this more multi-dimensional radical feminism.

[2] Part IV is also an acknowledgment of the a-mazing work of Terri Jewell, self-described "succulent heretic and voluptuous outlaw," who took her own life in November 1996.

theory evolves.[3] "Theory replacement" refers to a process whereby previous theories, which are fundamentally flawed, are abandoned in favor of new rival theories. In contrast, "theory reconstruction" involves efforts to dis-cover and re-invent theories in need of revision by working through their deficiencies. By taking a theory apart and putting it back together again in a new form it may attain more fully the goal it has set for itself.[4] In feminist intellectual circles today there are stories circulating about the evolution of feminist theory. A common version of the story suggests that for the past twenty years feminist theory has been growing up. In its infancy radical feminist theory relied on "modernist" assumptions and reductive accounts of women's experience. Through a series of challenges and lessons, it is said, feminist theory has matured to its grown-up "postmodern" state. On this story, the challenges and lessons of the eighties, including Audre Lorde's "Open Letter to Mary Daly," point to fundamental flaws in earlier radical feminist theories indicating the necessity of abandoning them in favor of new postmodern feminist theories. Recall from Part Two, I argued out that Lorde's letter was read by some feminists as a lesson which pointed to the pitfalls of using gender as an analytic category, and the problems with constructing quasi-metanarratives and appealing to essentialist conceptions of woman. On this reading, the lesson of Lorde's letter requires and authorizes the abandonment of radical feminist theory. Relatively autonomous feminist theories

---

[3] I used the work of Tom Rockmore (1989) to clarify the distinction for myself and to articulate it here.

[4] According to Habermas, "This is the normal way of dealing with a theory that needs revision in many respects but whose potential for stimulation had still not been exhausted." (Habermas, 1979, 95)

like Daly's, conceived on the basis of concepts and insights, re-membered and invented, by women, past and present, have been replaced by "new" postmodern feminist theories consciously derived from theoretical frameworks borrowed or imported from white Western men (e.g. Foucault, Lacan, Derrida, Habermas) thinking in patriarchal time/space.

On my view, abandoning radical feminist theory and replacing it with postmodern feminist theory is not necessary on the grounds that Lorde's letter, as I argued in Part Two, was an attempt to effect a shift in Daly's thinking which would strengthen her radical feminist theory and help realize the vision of global sisterhood which they shared. It is misguided to find in Lorde's insistence that racial and ethnic differences be recognized a call for the abandonment of radical feminist theory. The letter is, foremost, a lesson about the need for a shift in radical feminism from a color-evasive to a race-cognizant discourse. While there may be useful theoretical work for feminists who want to deconstruct and appropriate the theoretical tools of the postmodern fathers, I believe it is a mistake to suggest that replacing radical feminist theory with this sort of work is authorized by Lorde's letter.[5] Not only is the replacement of unnecessary and unauthorized, there is still important work to be done that cannot be accomplished by replacing radical feminist theories with postmodern feminist

---

[5] In fact, it is the same kind of mistake Lorde accuses Daly of making. Recall Lorde criticizes Daly for failing to read her work seriously, for merely fingering through it in search of quotations which would valuably support her already conceived thesis. On the basis of my reading of Lorde's work, especially the common ground I outline in her work and Daly's, I am suggesting the postmodern feminists who footnote Lorde's letter to authorize their theoretical projects have failed to read Lorde's work seriously, have found in her letter only a critique which supports their already conceived postmodern theses.

theories. These are two substantively different kinds of theoretical projects. Postmodern feminists abandon the goal of doing theory by re-membering and inventing our own conceptual and analytic tools, insisting engagement with the theories of Marx, Freud and their descendants is inevitable. Following Lorde's radical insight that the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house, I offer my reconstruction as a contribution to the evolution of radical feminist theory which does not grow up to be postmodern feminist theory, but radical white western feminist theory.

Up to this point I have been taking the radical feminist theory of *Gyn/Ecology* apart. Let's examine the pieces. On Daly's theory, the Journey of radical feminism is movement from the patriarchal foreground to the feminist Background. The concepts of the "foreground" and "Background" distinguish between two modes of existence, patriarchal and feminist. For women, living in the foreground realm of "objectification and alienation" means participating in rituals and practices according to patriarchal mythic scripts. The self-sacrificial Indian women advancing on the funeral pyre and the American woman following doctors orders are acting out the roles prescribed by gynocidal masculinist myth. The Chinese woman binding her daughters feet and the African woman excising her daughter in preparation for marriage are playing the parts of Token Torturers in the foreground production of patriarchy. In contrast, Background living means acting on one's own initiative. The Self-centering European woman who refuses to be defined by assimilation into the patriarchal family and the feminist Searcher

who does battle with the "objective" Western scholar are examples of Background living.

In Part One I suggested that "a-mazing," the method by which the Journeyer travels from the foreground to the Background, distinguished Daly's radical feminist theory. "A-mazing" involves both identifying the foreground scripts and seeing through them to the Background reality which they obscure and distort. The Journeyer travels through the First and Second Passage by identifying similarities in the apparently disparate phenomena of mythic scripts and their corresponding rituals around the world. In the process she comes to the knowledge that patriarchy is the war on the Self in every living woman and strengthens her pattern-detecting powers enabling her to distinguish her Self-centering way from the man-made maze. Following in the "Tradition of Great Hags and Crones," particularly Matilda Joselyn Gage (who dared to Think for Herself by re-membering a Hag-identified perspective) and Virginia Woolf (who invented the Outsider's Society rather than choosing between the twin evils of dependence on men in the private house or following in the processions of educated men) Daly found a radical feminist theoretical practice in a-mazing which held the promise of moving women beyond patriarchy toward a radical feminist Background mode of thinking and living.

In my view, the fundamental issue which stands between Lorde and Daly is about sisterhood and difference. Daly and Lorde share a vision, as I argued in Part Two, "escape" from patriarchy via a radical feminist mode of living informed by a know-ing process rooted in identification with women who have survived

and thrived under oppression. For Daly, in *Gyn/Ecology*, this know-ing process is a-mazing, through which we discover our similarities masked by apparent differences. In the letter, Lorde acknowledges "As outsiders, we need each other for support and connection and all the other necessities of living on the borders." But, she insists, "in order to come together we must recognize each other." (70) Lorde claims the metapatriarchal project of radical feminism is not possible unless women stop viewing our differences "as causes for separation and suspicion rather than as forces for change." (1983,112) Lorde's criticisms suggest Daly has not established the needed foundation for sisterhood using only the tool of a-mazing, because a-mazing does not require the kind of engagement with women from different patriarchal worlds which enables recognition of "real" differences. The question presented by Lorde's claim, is *how* to begin the work of identifying, reclaiming and utilizing the "real" differences, i.e. "world" differences, which lie beneath the foreground distortions of these differences, i.e. racism and ethnocentrism. Lorde herself acknowledges, we have no patterns for relating across our "real" differences as equals. (115) I will argue in this part, first, that that there is a useful resource in a-mazing for doing the work Lorde calls for, even if there are limits to how far it can take us on the Journey of Radical White Western Feminism. Second, I will explore María Lugones's practice of "world-traveling" as a resource in my reconstruction of *Gyn/Ecology*.

Since I have suggested the fundamental issue which stands between Lorde and Daly is to be found in their views on sisterhood and difference, I will

begin with a brief examination of each of their views. In the Third Passage, Daly describes the "becoming of Gyn/Ecology" which involves "breaking out of patriarchal processions" and "discovering the sources of the Self's original movement." (315-16) Hence, "Gyn/Ecology" is Daly's name for the patterns of Female-identified movement in the Background." Chapter nine, "Sparking: the Fire of Female Friendship," describes the patterns of relating among Self-centered women in the Background, that is, the patterns of Sisterhood. In the Prelude to the Third Passage, she explains that "Sparking" is "creating a room of one's own, a moving time / spaceship of one's own, in which the Self can expand, in which the Self can join with other Self-centering Selves." (319) In the first section of "Sparking" entitled "The Radical Enemy of the Patriarchal World War," Daly begins to describe the patterns of sisterhood by distinguishing it from brotherhood. The model for brotherhood, she argues, is comradeship. Men bond in war by projecting an Enemy who they are all against. Daly finds a clue about this bonding in the term "comrade," which "is derived from a Middle French word meaning a group of soldiers sleeping in one room, or roommate." (ibid.) According to Daly,

> [t]he concept of room here is spatial, suggesting links resulting from physical proximity, not necessarily from choice. The space is physical, not psychic, and it is definitely not A Room of One's Own. To the degree that it has been chosen, the choice has been made by another. The comrades do not choose each other for any inherent qualities of mind/spirit. (ibid.)

In contrast, the model for sisterhood is friendship, which "does not essentially depend upon an enemy for its existence/becoming." (320) Friendship between

women, on Daly view, depends on refusing the identities imposed on us by patriarchal scripts because, as she argued in the Second Passage, these scripts keep women separate from our Selves and each other. In throwing off the "male-imposed veils / covers / identities" and "re-claiming their female heritage," Daly argues, Hags discover they are alike. (366) This alikeness is complex. Recall from Part Two, I explained that while Lorde and Daly shared views about how patriarchal oppression effects women, they differed on what fuels the patriarchal psyche. Lorde attributes it to xenophobia, while Daly believes it is a self-awareness of inner barrenness or lack, which men develop as a result of being dependent on the foreground structures of society to define their identities and activities. This is a development of Woolf's view that by following in their own processions men are reduced to "cripples in a cave." Men define their identities and bonds through participating in the death march which is patriarchy, that is by following the scripts of war. (370) Women who refuse foreground scripts are alike, on Daly's view, in that women define their Selves and bond in friendship on the basis of "acknowledging their radical aloneness." (366) This is the heritage Daly reclaims in her identification with the Witch and the Outsider.

According to Daly, "Crones journeying together find after a while that one of the most difficult parts of the journey is dis-covering the meaning of *together.*" (367) There is a temptation, Daly suggests, when journeyers are first "breaking away from the feminine condition" to imitate male comradeship through bonding in the "fire of communal ecstasy." (370) This brings us back to a point I made at the beginning of Part Three. (5-7) Recall that Daly suggests that *Gyn/Ecology* is

"for the Hag/Crone/Spinster in every *living* woman," not for those who belong to "any comfortable community," whether it be a religious community, the women's community or the African-American community. Since Journeying into the Background means learning to act on our own initiatives, without dependence on communal scripts of any sort, Daly claims, "women loving women do not seek to lose our identity, but to express it, discover it, create it." (373) Identity construction, on Daly's view, is an individual project. Hence, the togetherness of sisterhood is the "combined combustion" of individual Hags who Spark each other, or bond, on the basis of their "highly individualized" Self-centering and Self-Affirming movement "outside the State of Possession, the fathers' foreground." (379, 370). In contrast with the "necrophilic self- loss" which is the object of male merging, Daly suggests, "the Fire of Sisterhood results from the Sparking of Female Selves." As she puts it, the "moving presence of each Self calls forth the living presence of other journeying/enspiriting Selves." (366).

In the last section of "Sparking," entitled "Separation: A Room of One's Own" Daly offers her views on sisterhood and difference. It is this section which Lorde must have been referring to when she said in the letter, "I feel you do celebrate differences between white women as a creative force toward change, rather than a reason for misunderstanding and separation." (70) In terms which resonate with Lorde's writings Daly insists Hags must acknowledge that each Self is unique in that each has her own history and her own temperament and abilities. She makes a distinction between merely tolerating and genuinely respecting these differences. She condemns the liberal attitude of "tolerating"

differences, which appears to support originality -- "different strokes for different folks" -- but which, in fact, is often used to silence "strong-minded Hags -- who are labeled 'intolerant,' 'extreme,' and 'narrow.'" (381) Genuine respect for differences is essential, on Daly's view, because that it was it means to affirm the Self in another women acting freely on her own initiative. On the basis of genuine respect of differences, Daly suggests, Hags are capable of "Sparking in free and independent friendship rather than melting into mass mergers." (382) The relationships among Hags are "free and independent" in the sense of not being constrained by stereotypic foreground scripts. "Since there are no models, no roles, no institutionalized relationships to fall back upon," Daly explains, "we move together and apart in ever-varying patterns of relating. (382)

> Women who have the courage to travel can see the absence of standardized roles as an asset, for such roles inhibit our struggle for truthfulness and fidelity. [...] As de Beauvoir correctly points out, men and women are always playing a part before one another. In contrast to this, Lesbians need not pretend. As she observes: "They [these liaisons] are not sanctioned by an institution or by the mores, nor are they regulated by conventions; hence they are marked by especial sincerity." (383)
>
> Paradoxically, then, it is the likeness of women that makes room for our otherness, our wildness, our strangeness. The creation of separate female-identified psychic, mythic, semantic, physical spaces is necessary for likeness and wild otherness to grow. Each individual Amazon must have such room of her own, and she must be free to communicate the light and warmth generated in the privacy of her own room to the hearts/hearths of other Hags, and to receive their luminous energy. (ibid.)

Because the Journeyer needs the space to explore and develop the potential of her own initiatives, a room of one's own, or a separate space, is the condition for a sisterhood which embraces genuine differences.

It is important to keep in mind, that while Daly is clearly thinking of these pattern of relating which depend on acknowledging individual differences as characteristic of sisterhood in general, her description emerges from a particular tradition. In the Crone-ology recovered by Matilda Joselyn Gage, the women burned as witches were individuals whose knowledge of healing had earned them the respect of the people, but whose only apparent relation to one another was their common refusal to be assimilated to patriarchal identities. Furthermore, there is no discussion of the relations among the members of Virginia Woolf's "Outsider's Society" beyond their common desire to escape the private house without getting caught on the Wheel of Patriarchal Processions. Neither the Witches, nor the Outsiders, constitute a community with established patterns of relating. The paradigm for radical feminist thinking and living on Daly's view is being able to do one's own thing, alone, without dependence on men, interference from children, or reliance on prescribed social roles and relations for a sense of self. Sisterhood, then, affirming each other's individual projects which are alike in their common goals, but not sharing in a common project.

Now listen again to Lorde's words, "As outsiders, we need each other for support and connection and all the other necessities of living on the borders." Recall the picture of black women's mythic background and heritage evoked by Lorde.

> Black women have a history of the use and sharing of power, from the Amazon legions of Dahomey through the Ashanti warrior queen Yaa Asantewaa and the freedom fighter Harriet Tubman, to the economically powerful market-women guilds of present West

> Africa. We have a tradition of closeness and mutual care and support, from the all-woman courts of the Queen Mothers of Benin to the present day Sisterhood of the Good Death, a community of old women in Brazil who, as escaped slaves, provided escape and refuge for other enslaved women, and who now care for each other. (151)

On Lorde's view, interdependence among women is the centerpiece of sisterhood. She is explicit about this in "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," proclaiming,

> Interdependency between women is the way to a freedom which allows the I to *be*, not in order to be used, but in order to be creative. This is a difference between the passive *be* and the active *being*. [...] (111)

The know-ing process which must inform a radical feminist mode of living, on Lorde's view, handed down in her tradition by women who survived and thrived under patriarchy, involves interaction. "Without community," she insists, "there is no liberation, on the most vulnerable and temporary armistice between an individual and her oppression." (112) The paradigm for radical feminist becoming on Lorde's view is breaking with notions of community which require the "shedding of our differences" and having the courage to explore together the potential in our collective "world" differences.

Daly says sisterhood requires radical aloneness. Lorde says sisterhood requires radical collectivity. Daly says the paradigm for liberation is independence. Lorde says the paradigm is interdependence. Daly says we need separation in order to be. Lorde says we need mutual care and support to be. What is going on here? I think Cynthia Washington put her finger on the distance between the views of Lorde and Daly when she pointed out, "We

Started From Different Ends of the Spectrum." (1977) Reflecting on the tradition behind her perception that white women were "crazy" to want leadership roles in the civil rights movement, she said,

> I couldn't understand what they wanted. As far as I could see, being a project director wasn't much fun. I didn't realize then that having my own project made a lot of difference in how I was perceived and treated. And I did not see what I was doing as exceptional. The community of women I worked with on projects were respected and admired for their strength and endurance. They worked hard in the cotton fields or white folks' houses, raised and supported their children, yet still found the time and energy to be involved in struggle for their people. They were typical rather than unusual.
> Certain differences result from the way in which black women grow up. We have been raised to function independently. The notion of *retiring* to housewifery someday is not even a reasonable fantasy. Therefore whether you want to or not, it is necessary to learn to do all of the things required to survive. It seemed to many of us, on the other hand, that white women were demanding a chance to be independent while we needed help and assistance which was not always forthcoming. (238-9)

For the same reason that Washington could not identity with the drive for independence among white women in the civil rights movement, Lorde differed with Daly about the possibilities of a sisterhood which begins with radical aloneness. In a poem entitled "Sister, Morning is a Time for Miracles" (1979), written as "a memorial to the conversations" she and Daly never had, Lorde wrote,

> Yet just once in the possibilities
> of this too-early morning
> I wanted you
> to talk not as a healer
> but as a lonely woman
> talking to a friend.

In contrast with the symbolic Background of Lorde's tradition characterized by relations of interdependence ("mutual care and support"), the symbolic Background of Daly's tradition is characterized by women (witches who were healers) living independently, that is, lonely and outside the relation of friendship which necessarily involves dialogue. The conversations between Lorde and Daly did not happen, because on Lorde's view, it was still "too-early" for a sisterhood at the intersections of these traditions. Within these traditions of independence and interdependence are the "world" differences, or "real" differences, among us which Lorde argues must be recognized, reclaimed and utilized as tools for the creation of radical feminist modes of living.

Hence, one important task of Radical White Western Feminists is to critically and self-consciously investigate the foundations of our own tradition for resources for and barriers to the project of sisterhood at the intersections of traditions. Toward this end I offer the following a-mazing analysis of Woolf's radical feminist project. As I explained, in Part One, Daly's Metapatriarchal Journey of radical feminism is inspired by Virgina Woolf's strategic attempt to figure out how the daughters of educated men can at once, maintain their independence and break with the processions of their fathers. On Woolf's view, because the condition of women under patriarchy was service and loyalty to men who kept them shut up in the private house, establishing and maintaining independence appeared to be the path to women's liberation. It will be instructive to return to Woolf's station on the bridge in order to see the problems with a radical feminism founded on the ideal of independence. From the bridge

between the private house and the public world, Woolf suggests, women see the same things differently than men. Even if the men and women of the "educated" class earn their own livings, "speak with the same accent; use knives and forks in the same way; expect maids to cook dinner and wash up after dinner; and talk during dinner without much difficulty about politics and people; war and peace; barbarism and civilization," she argues, women see the same things (war, nationalism, education, professional life) differently than men.

Recall that according to Woolf, men see war as "a profession, a source of happiness and excitement and [...] an outlet for manly qualities." (1977, 15-16) They see war as an expression of patriotism. Woolf made this evident by quoting the Lord Chief Justice of England, who said of Englishmen, "When we consider other nations, when we judge the merits of the policy of this country or that, it is the standard of our own country that we apply." (17) Woolf connects this imperialist perspective with the patriarchal perspective which behind the exclusion and subordination of women by identifying an "egg" which informs men's way of looking at war and women. The "egg" is the "Dictator," who "believes that he has the right whether given by God, Nature, sex or race is immaterial, to dictate to other human beings how they shall live; what they shall do." (96) The patriarchal Dictator, she argues, is motivated by -- in addition to something identified in the report of the Archbishops' Commission, as an "infantile fixation" -- a "money motive" ("To pay women more would be to pay men less") and a "psychological motive" ("To be able to set aside all worldly cares and studies and lay them upon another person"). (321-2) Men see things

from the perspective of the Dictator, then, on Woolf's view, because it appears to be in their interests to do so.

In contrast, Woolf, argues, when women look at war they see the pointlessness of hurting other people, are led to the question, "Why fight?" From women's perspective, Woolf argues, marching in their processions for the right to dictate how others shall live whether for profit, national pride, or slavish service and loyalty, only appears to be in men's interests. Women see how men are led, on the basis of their perspective, to "circle, like caterpillars head to tail, round and round the mulberry tree, the sacred tree, of property." (135) They see how success on men's way of seeing things means wearing the words "For God and Empire" around their necks "like the address on a dog-collar." (127) Women see how men's processions rob them of their sensory capacity and their humanity, reducing them to "cripples in a cave." (131-2) In order to avoid these devastating consequence, Woolf argues, women understand that while they must find a way to maintain the kind of independence men have, they cannot follow the path of their educated fathers and brothers. In order to maintain the difference of their perspective, and still earn a living in the professions, Woolf argues, women must remember and live by the "four great teachers" of their uneducated foremothers: "poverty, chastity, derision, and freedom from unreal loyalties." (145) What women can see from the perspective of the bridge is that it is not in their interests to amass wealth, seek praise and fame, or to identify with others on the basis of nation, religion, college, family, sex, or other

affiliations which spring from them. The Outsider's perspective *is* different from that of the ruling class patriarch in this knowledge and creed.

However, there are also important similarities in these disparate perspectives. In order to make these connections apparent, consider Woolf's relation to the maids she occasionally mentions in her writings. First, she qualifies her claim that women and men see the same things differently, acknowledging that she shares with educated men the expectation that maids will cook dinner and wash up after dinner. She is explicit throughout *Three Guineas* that hers is the perspective of a woman from the ruling class, although she prefers the term "educated" class. All of the women's biographies from which she culls the "four great teachers" tell the stories of the lives of women who are from the ruling class. Second, recall in "A Sketch from the Past," in the context of introducing her philosophy, she lists among the activities which must be done on a daily basis, "writing orders to Mabel." (1978, 70) While she does not explicitly acknowledge that it is the *condition* for the other activities which she describes as "far more necessary than anything else," including writing, walking by the river, and reading Chaucer, she does not require a great leap to understand the connection. Woolf herself makes a similar connection when she names the self-interested motives of Victorian men who expect women to stay home and fulfill the roles of wife and mother. Here, in Woolf's way of looking at domestic servitude is the Dictator who assumes the right to determine how other human beings shall live. In terms of the motive behind Woolf's assumption that Mabel should do her cooking and cleaning, and generally follow her orders,

there is no difference between her view and the Victorian patriarch's view of women. Both she and her father wish to "set aside all worldly cares and studies and lay them upon another person."

The perspectives of Woolf and the Victorian patriarch are also alike in a certain lack of consciousness about the internal contradictions of their own views. Woolf points out this contradiction men's perspective in a question which links the claim of the Lord Chief Justice who justifies England's right to judge other nations by its own standards on the grounds that "England is the home of democratic institutions," (17) together with the claim she finds in the newspaper which suggests women should stay home or accept lower wages. She illuminates the contradiction, you may recall, in the question, "what right have we, Sir, to trumpet our ideals of freedom and justice to other countries when we can shake out of our most respectable newspapers any day of the week eggs like these?" (98) The point here is that men of the educated classes are not aware that they hold positions which advocate, at once, both democracy and tyranny. A similar lack of awareness is evident in Woolf's perspective. In "A Sketch" she is mentions the activity of "writing orders to Mabel" as an example of "nonbeing." Like ordering dinner, fixing the vacuum cleaner and other domestic chores, like telling Mabel what to do, constitute the level of existence that "one does not remember." The moments in life which involve menial, repetitive, mindless work she says, are "not lived consciously." (70) Those whose lives are completely constituted by existence at the level of "nonbeing" may never experience one of the "sudden violent shocks" Woolf describes which enable

one to experience moments of being in which the "scaffolding of the background" is revealed. Right after Woolf locates Mabel in "cottonwool" of the foreground she describes the moment of being she experienced when she raised her fist to hit Thoby and was struck with the question, "Why hurt another person?" (71) The point here is that Woolf was not aware that she held positions which advocate, at once, domestic servitude and not hurting other people.

Notice this is almost exactly the same kind of lack of awareness that I found in my critique of Daly's analysis of *sati*, in Part Three, where I argued that in representing Indian women as victims Daly failed to identify with them in a way that was similar to the failure of identification she found behind the mask of "objectivity" in the work of the Western scholar. While the contradiction in Woolf's lack of awareness concerns class and the contradiction in Daly's concerns race/ethnicity, there is a commonality in their analyses which stems from their use of the distinction between the foreground and Background. They both use the distinction in a one-dimensional way to divide the realm of patriarchal oppression from the possibilities of represented by the ideal of independence. This is the reason Woolf does not realize she is Othering Mabel when she locates her in the foreground following orders. Patriarchal oppression, from her ruling class perspective, has meant idleness and dependence in the private house. Woolf is not making Mabel idle and dependent. Mabel, like the women described by Washington, is working outside the private house, that is, outside her own private house. However, Woolf's Othering is participating in a foreground script of class exploitation. But Woolf's feminism only recognizes the

foreground scripts of her own tradition's patriarchal oppression. Because she has an interest Mabel's exploitation -- it is the *condition* for her own Background existence understood as independence -- she is not aware of how she oppresses Mabel. When Daly constructs *Gyn/Ecology* in the tradition of Woolf she imports this one-dimensional understanding of the foreground and Background right along with the practice of a-mazing. It simply does not occur to either of them that in their employment of the distinction, which locates working class women and women of color only in the foreground, that they are acting according to foreground scripts written for white and/or ruling class Western women like themselves. By standing on the bridge between the private house and the public world without awareness of how the foreground is constituted by relations of race/ethnicity and class, as well as gender, white Western feminists fail to see that we are standing on the backs of other women. We fail to see how following the classist, racist/imperialist script of the Dictator only appears to be in our interest. If we seek the kind of independence men have we will end up like them, circling the mulberry tree, and we will lose our sensory capacity, the way to our Background. Radical White Western Feminists can and must take on the task of a-mazing the foreground which has kept us from connecting with our sisters and from learning the lessons of their foremothers, in particular, the lesson that sisterhood requires interdependence. It would be a mistake to understand my critique of the contradictions inherent in the tradition of white Western radical feminism as an indication that there is nothing constructive for us and others to learn from this tradition of survival. There is much to be said for

the Outsider's creed. Working through the lessons of the "four great teachers" (poverty, chastity, derision, and freedom from unreal loyalties) with an awareness that among them are unique contributions we have to share in the project of making a global sisterhood on the basis of recognizing, reclaiming and utilizing the "world" differences, is an important task of Radical White Western Feminism.

Where has the a-mazing investigation of the white Western tradition of radical feminism has gotten us? What I hope I have made clear through this critical re-examination of the tradition is that the analytic tool of a-mazing holds the potential for revealing to us, not only the sado-rituals of patriarchy, but also the foreground scripts of racism, ethnocentrism, and class exploitation. However, there are limits to how far the Jounreyer can go on the basis a-mazing. The practice of a-mazing can be done effectively in the solitude of one's own room. Since it does not require the Journeyer to travel out of her own tradition, or world, it does not engage her in interactions with sisters from different worlds. Remember that the Searcher moved through the Second Passage without ever interacting with Indian, Chinese, or African women. Her primary sources in the chapters on patriarchal crimes against these women were white Western Searchers like herself. Without interacting with women outside our tradition two important kinds of insight are not possible: insights about ourselves and insights about other women. First, only through interaction (listening to, asking questions, comparing perceptions, challenging) can we come to understand the complexity of the ways we are constructed in the multidimensional foreground.

Without this understanding those of us who are simultaneously oppressed *and* privileged may, without awareness, use the master's tools against our sisters even in the process of doing what appear to be good deeds. Second, while a-mazing enables the Journeyer to see into her own Background, interaction with women from other traditions is necessary in order to see into the Realms of the Background which they inhabit. And seeing other women in the contexts of their own symbolic Backgrounds is necessary for us to see them as Sisters we can identify with, and not as victims we must save. María Lugones offers a practice which, I will argue, enables the Journeyer to gain both of these kinds of insights.

In her classic essay, "Playfulness, 'World'-Traveling, and Loving Perception," María Lugones searches for a way to bridge the differences between herself and her mother, and between herself as a woman of color and white women. (1987) She finds this bridge in the practice of "world-traveling," which she describes as, "a skillful, creative, rich, enriching, and given certain circumstances, a loving way of being and living." (3) According to Lugones, "world-traveling" is commonly practiced by "outsiders" to mainstream life in the U.S. as a necessary means of survival. In order to survive, she explains, women of color have acquired the flexibility of shifting from the mainstream construction of life, or "world," where they are constructed as outsiders, to other constructions of life, or worlds, where they are "at home." (ibid.) While "this flexibility is necessary for the outsider," she says, "it can also be willfully exercised by the outsider or by those who are at ease in the mainstream." (ibid.)

In order to provide more clarity about what the practice of "world-traveling" involves Lugones offers the following assistance. An "actual society given its dominant culture's description and construction of life, including a construction of the relationships of production, of gender, race, etc.," she says, may be thought of as a "world." (10) Or, a "world" may be "such a society given a non-dominant construction." (ibid.) So, for example, both the mainstream construction of life in the U.S. and a "traditional Hispano construction of Northern New Mexican life" are "worlds" on her view. In the "world" within which one feels most at home, or "at ease," -- that is, confident because she is fluent in the language and norms, and because she is bonded with others in virtue of a shared history -- one is constructed, and knows oneself, as a person with a particular set of character traits. In a "world" within which one is not at ease, Lugones explains, one may be constructed, and know oneself, as a different person who lacks some or all of the particular traits she had at home. "The shift from being one person to being a different person" is what Lugones calls "travel." (11) For example, Lugones suggests, one who "travels" can be sure that she is a playful person and simultaneously positive that she is not playful because she knows herself in different worlds. In order to grasp Lugones's idea of a single individual being different people, one must abandon the Western idea that each of us is a unified self, for the idea that we are plural. Those who experience an underlying "I," on this view, are people who have never been required, or inclined, to "travel" beyond the "worlds" within which they feel completely at ease.

She recommends "that we affirm this traveling across 'worlds' as partly constitutive of cross cultural and cross-racial loving" and identification which is designed to resist, what she calls following Marilyn Frye, "arrogant perception." (3-4) As Lugones understands it, being taught to perceive arrogantly is part of being taught to be a woman of a privileged class and race in the U.S. and elsewhere. Describing the way she was taught to perceive her mother she says, "... I could not identify with her, I could not see myself in her, I could not welcome her world." While she loved her mother, she did not identify with her. What Lugones comes to realize is that "there is a complex failure of love in the failure to identify with another woman, the failure to see oneself in other women who are quite different from oneself." In her analysis of this failure she argues that arrogant perception cannot be cured by perception which only recognizes and respects the independence of other selves. Perception of others as independent from oneself cannot help overcome arrogant perception because it is possible to see others as independent of oneself and still fail to identify with them. This, she claims, is what White/Anglo women do to women of color:

> they ignore us, ostracize us, render us invisible, stereotype us, leave us completely alone, interrupt is as crazy. All of this *while we are in their midst.* The more independent I am, the more independent I am left to be. Their world and their integrity do not require me at all. There is no sense of self-loss in them for my own lack of solidity. (7)

Like Lorde, Lugones believes that interdependence among women is a condition for our becoming.

> I am incomplete and unreal without other women. I am profoundly dependent on others without having to be their subordinate, their slave, their servant. (8)

> We are fully dependent on each other for the possibility of being understood and without this understanding we are not intelligible, we do not make sense, we are not solid, visible, integrated; we are lacking. So traveling to each other's "worlds" would enable us to *be* through *loving* each other. (ibid.)

The cure for the arrogant perception which keeps us from understanding our selves in relation to others, then, is a loving form of perception which "world-traveling" makes possible. Lugones explains in terms of her relation to her mother that only by traveling to her mother's "world" could she identify with her "because only then could she cease to ignore her and to be excluded and separate from her." "Only then," she says, "could I see her as a subject even if one subjected and only then could I see at all how meaning could arise fully between us." (ibid.)

World-traveling, then, is a complex form of interacting which enables the traveler to identify with those from other worlds by perceiving them in the context of the world within which they are most at ease and, in the process, come to a new, fuller understanding of herself made possible by seeing herself as she is seen by those in other worlds. In Lugones's words,

> The reason why I think that traveling to someone's "world" is a way of identifying with them is because by traveling to their "world" we can understand *what it is to be them and what it is to be ourselves in their eyes.* Only when we have traveled to each other's "worlds" are we fully subjects to each other. (17)

"Knowing other women's "worlds" is part of knowing them," she explains, "and knowing them is part of loving them." Lugones suggests that by traveling to the worlds of those who are constructed in the mainstream as victims, we can

discover that in their worlds they are "really subjects, lively beings, resistors, constructors of visions." (18) Angela Davis's "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves" (1992), which I discussed in Part Two, provides a good example. By traveling to the "community of slaves," Davis discovers, beneath the traditional mainstream racist/misogynist construction of the black woman "who assented to slavery," a woman who was "transcending, refusing, fighting back, asserting herself over and against terrifying obstacles." (214) In conclusion, Lugones shares what she discovered about her mother by traveling to her world.

> My mother was apparent to me mostly as a victim of arrogant perception. I was loyal to the arrogant perceiver's construction of her and thus disloyal to her in assuming that she was exhausted by that construction. I was unwilling to be like her and thought that identifying with her, seeing myself in her necessitated that I become like her. I was wrong both in assuming that she was exhausted by the arrogant perceiver's construction of her and in my understanding of identification, though I was not wrong in thinking that identifying was part of loving and that it involved my seeing myself in her. I came to realize through traveling to her "world" that she is not foldable and pliable, that she is not exhausted by the mainstream argentinian patriarchal construction of her. I came to realize that there are "worlds" in which she shines as a creative being. Seeing myself in her through traveling to her "world" had meant seeing how different from her I am in her "world." (18)

Although Lugones does not describe the possibility in this essay, she clearly intends for White/Anglo women who want to connect with women of color to commit themselves to a similar pattern of relating.

Now consider the reconstructive project underway in terms of Lugones's case for world-traveling. While each of the geographical locations (India, China,

Africa, Europe, America) in the Second Passage is a "world"[6] in the sense that each represents a dominant construction of life in a different part of the planet, I want to suggest that there is at least one important sense in which the Journeyer, or Searcher, is not a world-traveler: she never leaves her own world. She never leaves her own world by Searching for literature written by nonwhite, nonWestern women. She does all of her Searching in the library of the white Western scholar. In addition, none of her primary feminist sources, with the exception of Katherine Mayo (who I will discuss shortly), ever leave home in their Searches. As a result, the Searcher moves through the Second Passage without interacting with Indian, Chinese, and African women in their worlds. She is a world-traveler, she is an arrogant perceiver. While she understands herself to be making an effort to identify with the women in each "world," she only accomplishes the kind of identification Lugones has in mind when she gets to Europe and America. She discovers the European Witch and the white Western Radical Feminist beneath the mainstream patriarchal constructions, as women who are, to borrow Davis's words, "transcending, refusing, fighting back, asserting [themselves] over and against terrifying obstacles." The fact that she does not discover that Indian, Chinese and African women are "really subjects, lively beings, resistors, constructors of visions" is clear evidence that she has not traveled to their worlds.

---

[6] Of course, this is a problem since each of these geographical locations constitutes a locus of many different "worlds." I am not prepared to deal with it here.

What might the Radical White Western Feminist Searcher discover if she "world-traveled" in the Second Passage to India, China, and Africa? I offer the following illustration of what she might discover on such a Journey to India. The travel log which I construct here is based on the feminist Searches of Mrinalini Sinha in "Reading Mother India: Empire, Nation, and the Female Voice." (1994) In this essay Sinha takes her cue from Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, who "argues that the voice of the colonized female is lost between the object-constitution of imperialism, 'marked by the espousal of the woman as object of protection from her own kind,' and the subject-constitution of patriarchal nationalism, which 'apparently grants the woman free choice as subject.'" (Sinha, 6) Sinha is concerned with the discourse of Indian nationalism which found "a unique and distinctive cultural identity for the nation, on the basis of which the political claim to nationhood could be made," in the essentialist construct of Mother India (Bharat Mata). (ibid.) Following Chatterjee, Sinha explains,

> Women's emancipation and national liberation, especially under M.K. Gandhi's leadership of the nationalist movement from the 1920s onwards, became part of the same struggle; the identification of women's struggles with the national struggle was summed up in the popular slogan, "India cannot be free until its women are free and women cannot be free until India is free." (7)

Sinha investigates how Indian women "interpreted this script for their emancipation," arguing that to overlook women's agency and voice "on the grounds that it reveals little more than the co-optation of women within a hegemonic male nationalist discourse, would simply serve to naturalize the new nationalist patriarchy." (ibid.) By focusing on the responses of individual Indian

women and the organized Indian women's movement to the imperialist-nationalist controversy surrounding Katherine Mayo's *Mother India* (1927), Sinha dis-covers that Indian women speaking for themselves "could never be the unproblematic repositories of an ahistorical and essentialized Indianness." (33) In this section I travel to "world" of Indian women to hear their voices in an effort to understand *what it is to be them and what it is to be me in their eyes.*[7]

Suppose I set off in my Searches to gather information about the workings of patriarchy in India and discover Katherine Mayo's *Mother India.* I find in the book a concern "with the lives of millions of women who happened to live in that part of patriarchy called 'India.'" (Daly, 1978,129) Having discovered a Sister Searcher who has actually traveled to India and who provides a detailed description of the crimes perpetrated there against women, I seek the views of Indian women on the book. First I hear Mona Bose, an Bengali woman, influential in the movement for women's education, who is one of the four Indian women Mayo mentions in *Mother India.* Her voice can be heard in an article by a British Y.M.C.A. official in *The Indian Witness* on September 7, 1927. (16) In response to Mayo's use of her statements about the apathy in India towards women's education, Bose objected to Mayo's report of their meeting, and retracted the statements which Mayo attributed to her. Next, I hear another of the women quoted in *Mother India*, Cornelia Sorabji, social reformer and author

---

[7] One might object that Daly would not have had the benefit of Sinha's 1994 research. This is true. However, all of the historical materials from which Sinha draws would have been available to Daly in 1970s, just as they were available to Katherine Mayo in the 1920s. Daly, following Mayo, chooses to exclude them from her investigation on the assumption that she would find in them "little more than the co-optation of women within a hegemonic male nationalist discourse."

of *Between The Twilights: Being Studies of Indian Women By One of Themselves* (1908). Although Sorabji was a self-confessed "loyalist" of the British Raj and long-time friend and supporter of Mayo, she requested that Mayo write a disclaimer which absolved her of any complicity with the antinationalist position Mayo takes in the book. Mayo complied in a letter which was published in the *Statesman*, March 5, 1929. (18) If I conclude that Bose's and Sorabji's retractions were the result of nationalist pressures I would not be entirely misguided. As Sinha points out, Indian nationalists were outraged that Mayo "attacked the very basis of the nationalist construct of India: *Mother India* had located the cause of India's degeneracy in the very same spiritual or cultural realm that was the basis for the nationalist elaboration of Indianness." (13)

However, Sinha also reports that there was "an outpouring of women's support for the nationalist indignation over Mother India."[8] (20) One of the most outspoken Indian women to criticize Mayo's anti-India exposé was Sarojini Naidu, the first Indian woman president of the Indian National Congress and a role model for the women's movement. Naidu first responded to Mayo's work in a telegram which was read aloud at the famous Calcutta Town Hall meeting organized by nationalist to protest *Mother India*, and which was published in *Forward*, September 7, 1927. Naidu stated, "The mouths of liars rot and perish with their own lies, but the glory of Indian womanhood shines pure and as the

---

[8] According to Sinha, Manoranjan Jha eliminates any doubt about how deeply Mayo was implicated in and guided by the British government's imperial propaganda machine in his well-documented and detailed study, *Katherine Mayo and India* (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1971).

morning star." (21) Later, in a lecture published in the January 24, 1928 issue of the *Statesman* Naidu proclaimed,

> The women of India should answer all those who come in the guise of friendship to interpret India to the world and exploit their weakness and expose the secrets of the home, with the words 'whether we are oppressed, treated as goods and chattels and forced on the funeral pyres of our husbands, our redemption is in our hands. We shall break through the walls that imprison us and tear the veils that stifle. We shall do these by the miracle of our womanhood. We do not ask any friend, or foe in the guise of a friend, to come merely to exploit us while they pretend to interpret, succour and solace our womanhood.' (21-2)

In Naidu's voice I do not hear a woman who is "veiled and sleeping." But is she more than a mouthpiece for patriarchal nationalism? Sinha provides the following useful insight about Naidu's position.

> Here Naidu, who had always drawn upon the ideals of the Indian woman as embodied in the epic figures of Sita and Savitri, was invoking the familiar image of Indian womanhood available within nationalist discourse to counter Mayo's picture of Indian women. Unlike many of her male colleagues, however, her main concern was not to prove that Indian women were not subject to certain oppressive practices but to challenge Mayo's right to speak for "Indian womanhood." (ibid.)

Other Indian women objected to Mayo's work on the same grounds. For example, Kamala Sathianadhan, editor of the *Indian Ladies Magazine* had this to say about Mayo, "we do not question her ability or her cleverness in writing this book; but we do deny her the self-presumption that she is 'in a position to present conditions and their bearings,' and we do not for a minute admit her 'plain speech' as the 'faithful wounds of a friend'; for she is no friend of ours." (21) A similar sentiment could be heard, in a 1927 letter to the *Times*, written by the wife of the leading Indian Muslim, Mrs. Ameer Ali, who said in response to

British women who grant themselves responsibility for carrying out social reforms in India,

> Indian women are not voiceless. They received the franchise, and those among them who are able and willing to take advantage of it are aware of the needs of their own people. (31)

What is apparent in these responses to Mayo's *Mother India* is an awareness that while Mayo's concern was ostensibly with the crimes against Indian women, her effort to portray them as voiceless victims was actually intended to justify British imperialism. As Naidu points out, had Mayo been genuinely concerned with the plight of Indian women, she would have reported in the book the abuses Indian woman suffered at the hands of the British. According to Sinha, Mayo knew of the exchange between Naidu and Earl Montagu, former secretary of state in India, in which Naidu accused the British government of being "indifferent to the plight of those Indian women who had been molested by British soldiers during the Martial Law Regulations in Amritsar in 1919." (15) In spite of her knowledge, she did not investigate these crimes because they might undermine the project of portraying Indian women as victims of Indian barbarism who needed to be saved by the civilizing mission of the British. (16)

Reflected in the views of these Indian women is a nationalist critique of Mayo's efforts to silence them by speaking for them and assuming the responsibility for acting on their behalf, but there is no defense of the crimes committed against Indian women by Indian men. As Sinha points out, Indian women within the nationalist discourse critiqued Mayo's diatribe as a way to open a space for their own critiques of patriarchal crimes in India. For example,

Uma Nehru, a well known Hindi journalist, published *Mother India Aur Uska Jawab (Mother India and Its Reply)* in 1928 which contained a Hindi translation of Mayo's book and an imaginary debate with Mayo on the substantive points raised in *Mother India*. In the preface Nehru says her aim is to "use this book meant to insult us to instill pride among us." (26) Sinha reports Nehru dismisses Mayo's exaggerated portrayal of the 'untouchable dhai' or midwife by invoking her readers concrete experience of these women to refute Mayo's lurid descriptions." (ibid.) On this view, shedding the imperialist portrayals of Indian women is a necessary step toward acting on their own behalf. The position of Indian women involved in the organized women's movement (constituted by predominantly upper-caste and middle-class women's organizations) also exemplified this movement away from imperialist understandings of Indian woman as victims and moved simultaneous away from patriarchal oppression. The Women's Indian Association, a pioneer of the all-India women's movement, organized the largest protest meeting of women against *Mother India* at Triplicane in Madras. According to Sinha the meeting was chaired by Dr. Muthulakshmi Amal (Reddy), the first Indian woman to be nominated to the provincial legislature. At this meeting Indian women passed the following two resolutions, which were published in the *Hindu*, September 29, 1927,

> first, they denied that "Indian womanhood as a whole is in a state of slavery, superstition, ignorance and degradation which Miss Mayo affirms"; second, they called upon the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council to enact measures that would legally prohibit child marriage, early parentage, enforced widowhood, dedication of girls to temples, and commercialized immorality. (as reported in.)

From the perspective of Indian women, Mayo's use of Indian women's suffering against the movement for Indian self-determination meant that hers was not a feminism, if it was a feminism at all, which they could identify with. From within the "world" of Indian women I hear Naidu and other Indian woman saying "Yes, we are oppressed; yes, we are treated as goods and chattels and forced on the funeral pyres of our husbands; but we are not victims! You who seek to silence us to "save" us through subordinating us the rule of your fathers are not our friends or sisters. In your effort to stand up for us, you stand in our way. We shall break through the walls that imprison us and tear the veils that stifle! We shall do these by the miracle of our womanhood."

Now it is time for me to begin laying out the path for the Journeyer through the Second Passage. Having traveled to the "world" of Indian women, I reflect on what I have discovered about myself. Before leaving for India I understood myself as one of "the few women in 'advanced' countries who have some idea of the facts of sexism and some knowledge of 'women's history.'" (Daly, 1978, 123) I knew myself as independent, capable of a-mazing analysis and committed to the feminist work of revealing the Indian woman as a victim. I saw myself in Katherine Mayo. After arriving in India and hearing the voices of Indian women, I recognize that I am an outsider here. I realize the women who are at home here do not assume I am their friend and sister. This bugs me. I have a choice. I can assume that they have been co-opted within a hegemonic male nationalist discourse or I can assume that they know something about me that I do not know. Since Mayo chose the former, which did not work to

establish her in their eyes as a friend and sister, I chose the latter. What do they see in me? In my commitment to reveal them are victims of patriarchy they see a white Western feminist who assumes she is different, an arrogant perceiver. In the manner of my feminism they see one who takes the side of the imperialist in the debate between the imperialist-nationalist controversy. They know that I have been taught the foreground scripts of the imperialism. I realize that if I want them to see me as a friend and sister I had better not represent them victims. As an outsider from an imperialist world I must recognize that my assumption of responsibility for the women of this world is the worst kind of arrogance. By looking at myself, in their world, through their eyes, I come to understand that I am not the capable and committed feminist I knew myself as in my world, I am also an outsider with the potential to use the master's tools against other women, without awareness. Through this critical self-examination I come to the conclusion that I must assume my task in the Second Passage as I construct my indictment of patriarchy is to take responsibility for resisting complicity with the scripts of racism, ethnocentrism and imperialism. Part of this work will involve coming to understand the relations, in the foreground and Background, between myself and the women in each of the chapters in the Passage.

As part of assuming responsibility for resisting the scripts which have taught me not to identify with people other worlds, I reflect on what I have discovered about Indian women from the perspective of their world. I see that in the foreground they are constructed as victims in need of protection by

imperialists and as repositories of ahistorical and essentialized Indianness by patriarchs. But I definitely do not assume these foreground scripts tell the truth about Indian women. I recognize them and present them as lies which obscure and distort the Background traditions of Indian women. I search for answers to the questions, what *threat* did those girls represent who were married as children? Just *who* were the women who were burned on the funeral pyre? *Who* were the *dhais*? Taking my cue from Uma Nehru, I see through Mayo's representation of the *dhai.* (Discussed in Part Three, 12) I a-maze the connection between Mayo's description and the description of the practices of the women who were burned as witches in Europe. I realize there is every reason to believe that patriarchal crimes in India, like those in America, are directly related to the movements of radical women past and present who knew that following the foreground scripts makes you a victim. I present the Sado Ritual Syndrome analysis of *sati* in the context of the female symbolic figures (Kali, Sita and Savitri) Indian women call on for power and knowledge.[9] I recognize the following difference between the pattern of patriarchal myth in my world and India in the fact that Indian Goddesses have not been completely obscured in Hindu. Since nothing in my radical feminist project depends on Othering Indian women, as is clear from the fact that nothing is lost in presenting myself as both victim and subject, I seek to discover the Indian Goddess within

---

[9] An excellent source for the Radical White Western Feminist interested in this reSearch is *The Feminist Companion to Mythology*, edited by Carolyne Larrington (London: Pandora Press, 1992). For Background information on Indian female symbolic figures, see "Indian Myth" by Emily Kearns.

me as a strategy of identification across the differences which have been constructed to separate me from my Indian sister.

A-mazing and World-traveling used together hold the promise of realizing the original goals which Daly intended to accomplish in *Gyn/Ecology*: developing our powers of perception as a way out of patriarchy. As Marilyn Frye pointed out, the revolutionary project of granting ourselves authority as perceivers depends on "discovering agreement in the experiences and perceptions of women." Discovering agreement is not the same as a-mazing connections, although a-mazing may be a useful tool in the process. Discovering agreement necessarily involves interaction, especially listening. I have suggested that through "world-traveling" we can come to agreement not only about similarities in our experiences and perceptions, but also agreement about differences in our experiences and perceptions. To borrow a phrase from Virginia Woolf, we can come to understand that how "we see the same things differently" than our sisters of color, in the U.S. and beyond. In the process we recognize, reclaim, and understand how we might utilize our differences as critical and creative forces for change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcoff, Linda. 1988. "The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory." *Signs*.

Beauvoir, Simone de. (1949) 1961. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H.M. Parshley. New York: Bantum.

Burris, Barbara, in agreement with Kathy Barry, Terry Moore, Joann DeLor, Joann Parent, and Cate Stadelman. 1971. "The Fourth World Manifesto." In Koedt et al (1973).

Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintage.

Carmichael, Stokely. 1968. *The Black Power Revolt*, edited by Floyd B. Barbour. Extending Horizon Books.

------- . 1971. *Stokely Speaks: Black Power Back to Pan-Africanism*. New York: Random House.

Combahee River Collective. 1981. "A Black Feminist Statement." In Moraga and Anzaldúa.

Daly, Kathleen. 1993. "Class-Race-Gender: Sloganeering in Search of Meaning." In *Social Justice*, Vol.20, Nos.1-2.

Daly, Mary. (1978a) 1990. *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

------- . 1978b. Paper delivered at the 1977 Annual Modern Language Association Convention, December, Chicago, Illinois. Published in *Sinister Wisdom*, 6.

------- . 1975. "The Qualitative Leap Beyond Patriarchal Religion." *Quest*, vol. I, no.4, spring.

------- . 1987. *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language*. Conjured in cahoots with Jane Caputi. Boston: Beacon.

Davis, Angela. 1992. "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves." In Guy-Sheftall.

Di Stefano, Christine. 1990. "Dilemmas of Difference: Feminism, Modernity and Postmodernism." In Nicholson.

DuBois, W.E.B. (192?) 1969. *The Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Signet.

Donovan, Josephine. 1992. *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions of American Feminism*, New Expanded Edition. New York: Continuum.

Evans, Sara. *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left.* New York: Vintage.

Frye, Marilyn. 1983. *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory.* New York: Crossing Press.
------- . 1992. *Willful Virgin: Essays in Feminism.* Freedom, California: Crossing Press.

Frankenberg, Ruth. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness.* University of Minnesota Press.
------- . 1995. "Whiteness as an 'Unmarked' Cultural Category." In *The Meaning of Difference.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fraser, Nancy and Linda J. Nicholoson. 1990. "Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism." In Nicholoson.

Gage, Matilda Joselyn. (1893) 1980. *Women, Church and State: The Original Exposé of Male Collaboration Against the Female Sex.* Watertown, Massachusetts: Persephone.

Gitlin, Todd. 1987. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage.* New York: Bantom.

Guy-Sheftall, Beverly, ed. 1995. *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought.* New York: The New Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. (1979) *Communication and the Evolution of Society.* Boston: Beacon Press.

hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Jewell, Terri L. (1994) *Succulent Heretic.* Opal Tortuga Press.

Joseph, Gloria I. and Jill Lewis. 1981. *Common Differences: Conflicts in Black and White Feminist Perspectives.* Garden City: Anchor.

Judis, John. 1975. "New American Movement." *Socialist Revolution*, 26, vol.5, no. 4.

Keating, AnnLouise. 1993. "Myth Smashers, Myth Makers: (Re)Visionary Techniques in the Works of Paula Gunn Allen, Gloria Anzaldúa, and Audre Lorde." *Journal of Homosexuality*, vol. 26.

King, Martin Luther. 1963. "Letter from Birmingham Jail."

Koedt, Ann, Ellen Levine, and Anita Rapone, eds. 1973. *Radical Feminism*. New York: Quadrangle.

Lorde, Audre. 1978a. *The Black Unicorn*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
------- . (1977) 1978b. Untitled Paper. In Modern Language Association Panel, published in *Sinister Wisdom*, vol.6. Summer.
------- . 1982. *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name*. California: Crossing Press.
------- . 1983. "Open Letter to Mary Daly." In Moraga (1981).
------- . 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays & Speeches by Audre Lorde*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Lugones, María. 1987. "Playfulness, 'World'-Traveling, and Loving Perception." *Hypatia*, vol.2, no.2 (Summer).

MacKinnon, Catharine. 1987. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Cambridge, Massachusettes: Harvard University Press.

Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. (1981) 1983. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings byRadical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table Women of Color Press.

Morgan, Robin, ed. 1970. *Sisterhood in Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*. New York: Vintage.
------- . (1977). 1978. *Going Too Far:The Personal Chronicle of a Feminist*. New York: Vintage.

Nicholson, Linda J. ed. 1990. *Feminism/Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960's to the 1980's*. New York: Routledge and Keagan Paul.

Prasch, Thomas. 1995. "Orientalism's Other, Other Orientialisms: Women in the Scheme of Empire." *Journal of Women's History*, Vol.7, No.4 (Winter).

Piercy, Marge. 1969. "The Grand Coolie Damn." In Morgan, 1970.

Rich, Adrienne. (1978) 1979. "Disloyal to Civilization: Feminism, Racism and Gynephobia," *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose, 1966-1978.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Rockmore, Tom. (1989) *Habermas on Historical Materialism.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Sinha, Mrinalini. 1994. "Reading Mother India: Empire, Nation, and the Female Voice." *Journal of Women's History*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Summer).

Spivak, Gayatri. 1985. "Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow-Sacrifice." *Wedge*, 7/8 (Winter/Spring).

Wallace, Michele. (1978) 1990. *Black Macho and the Myth of the Superwoman.* London: Verso.

Woolf, Virgina. (1938) 1977. *Three Guineas.* London: Hogarth.
------- . 1976. *Moments of Being: Unpublished Autobiographical Writings.* Sussex: The University Press.
------- . *A Room of One's Own.*