

# NOTES

NEW YORK RADICAL WOMEN  
789 BROADWAY, ROOM 412  
NEW YORK CITY 10003

THE WOMEN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN THE U.S.:  
A NEW VIEW  
Shulamith Firestone

THE MYTH OF THE VAGINAL ORGASM  
Anne Koedt

WOMAN AS CHILD  
Jennifer Gardner

WHEN WOMEN RAP ABOUT SEX  
Shulamith Firestone

THE JEANNETTE RANKIN BRIGADE:  
WOMAN POWER?  
A SUMMARY OF OUR INVOLVEMENT

A LETTER TO RAMPARTS

FUNERAL ORATION FOR THE BURIAL OF  
TRADITIONAL WOMANHOOD  
Kathy Amatniek

WOMEN IN THE RADICAL MOVEMENT  
Anne Koedt

ON ABORTION  
Shulamith Firestone

# FROM THE FIRST YEAR

JUNE 1968  
\$ .50 TO WOMEN  
\$1.00 TO MEN

A thesis for a future study

These two articles are based on group discussions held over the past year. Although highly interpretive, they will give the reader some sense of what a typical discussion is like at the weekly Thursday night meetings.

WORDS FROM ACTIONS: 1968

Speech given in Washington, D.C., to the main assembly of the Jeannette Rankin Brigade on January 15, 1968.

Speech given at a citywide meeting of radical women's groups at the Free University in New York City on February 17, 1968.

Speech given at an abortion repeal rally in New York on March 24, 1968. The rally demonstrated support for the activities of Parents' Aid Society, Hempstead, L.I., and its founder William Baird, in birth-control education, abortion referral counseling, and litigation against laws prohibiting such work.

---

IMPORTANT - ADDRESSES LISTED BELOW ARE NO LONGER VALID.  
FOR CURRENT ORDER INFORMATION SEE INSIDE  
BACK COVER.

---

All articles in this publication, though growing from a year of group discussion and activity, are to be taken, not as group position papers, but as the opinions and responsibility of the individual authors. Requests for reprints, or letters concerning the opinions stated, should be addressed to these authors.

#### TEMPORARY SUMMER ADDRESSES

Requests for additional copies of NOTES should be sent to

NOTES Circulation  
c/o Marion Davidson  
317 West 11th Street  
New York City 10014  
(212) 691-3795

Other correspondence, and requests for information about the group, should be sent to

The New York Radical Women  
c/o Rosalyn Baxandall  
79 St. Marks Place  
New York City 10003  
(212) 982-8388

A bibliography of material related to the woman question will be available by September 1968 at 25¢ a copy.

These members of the group were involved in producing the NOTES:

Kathie Amatniek  
Rosalyn Baxandall  
Joan Brown  
Sandy Burakoski  
Cindy Cisler  
Corinne Coleman  
Marion Davidson  
Judith Duffett  
Shulamith Firestone  
Ann Forer

Judy Gabree  
Jennifer Gardner  
Carol Hanisch  
Anne Koedt  
Lynn Laredo  
Liz Levy  
Pearl Oil  
Alice Robinson  
Ellen Shatter  
Elizabeth Sutherland



## WOMEN RAP ABOUT SEX

"If you don't want to sleep with him, he assumes you're hung-up and then you have to stay up the whole night anyway convincing him you're not!"

"Yeah, it's almost easier to go to bed and get it over with."

"But see, this emancipation thing has simply become a new line. Don't fall for it!"

"That's easier said than done. I mean, would he ever BELIEVE it was his halitosis, even if you could tell him?"

(Laughter) "'Yeah, buddy, hate to hurt your feelings but you SMELL'?"

(Timidly) "Don't you ever sleep with a guy just because he's lonely?"

"Baby, I don't do charity work for nobody."

"We've got to learn to sleep with people because WE want them, not because THEY want us - not to prove anything to them, not to make them feel better about their masculinity, not out of weakness or inability to say no, but simply because we WANT to."

"Can't you do it just because you're horny?"

"Well, if it's so simply physical, why don't you masturbate? Or go write a poem or something? Why do you have to involve someone else to gratify your needs? We're certainly bitter enough when men exploit us just to satisfy their need . . ."

"But what if you're both horny . . ."

"That's just mutual masturbation. Now, real desire for another person is something else again. I see masturbation as physical need detached from any person."

"Let's talk about masturbation. We always seem to avoid that."

"Do you think we masturbate as much as men, or do we just feel guiltier admitting it?"

"I think we probably masturbate less and confess it less."

"I disagree. I think we masturbate just as much."

"Well, in either case, guilt is the root. The question is why do we feel guiltier? After all, male masturbation is much more freely discussed."

"Maybe we're afraid to take pleasure in our own bodies. We've never really owned them."

"But also - we're afraid of direct pleasure. I mean, this is all inter-related. If our bodies are for the man's pleasure, our pleasure in sex comes only through giving pleasure. There it is, vicariousness again."

"Women don't make love to men. They make love to themselves through the men. It's narcissism."

"Narcissism is just one more type of response to a vicarious sexual role."

"But you know, we miss out. We're kept so busy playing love object, we miss out on masculine beauty."

"You can see that in art, too. It's completely distorted. The only time masculine bodily beauty was celebrated was by the Greeks or Michelangelo, who were homosexual. That's the closest we've come to the female view of the world."

"But there is greater concentration on woman's pleasure in the 20th century, isn't there? All this talk about orgasms and everything?"

"Yeah, well then how come we still don't have them?" (Laughter)

"God, I'm so glad to hear someone admit it! I thought Everyone else had them but me..."

"You know, just asking your partner when it's over, 'Did you come?' isn't the same as being concerned all along."

"Yeah, it's that old 'did you come, did you come, did you come' until you could scream."

"Or until you lie."

"Oh, so you lie too?"

"I really think we ought to examine what's going on. He asks you when it's all over if you came. Well, what good will that do you by then? If you did come, the question is crude; if you didn't, it makes you feel guilty. What's really happening is that responsibility for the failure is being subtly shifted to you so that you'll blame yourself for being frigid instead of blaming him for a bad trip."

"You know that old saying...There's no such thing as a frigid woman, only an insensitive man."

"But can't you just smell the male chauvinism all over that? Man, the great lover, playing on woman like a violin — woman the sensitive instrument. Balzac again. They don't produce our orgasms too, you know."

"Why this obsession with frigidity and orgasms? Frankly, I get bored with the subject."

"Too much Wilhelm Reich going around." (Disgustedly) "All these books and manuals about women written by men."

"Well, I know I'd give up an orgasm in a minute for some good lovin'. Orgasms aren't all there is to it, hell no."

"You know, despite what they say, I believe it does take emotional involvement. And with the present situation..."

"At the risk of sounding naive...I've been listening to this for an hour and no one has mentioned love." (Ferocious laughter)

"Love?"



"God, if I waited to fall in love, I'd be climbing the walls!"

"Yeah, forget love. If you even just like him..."

"Forget like. I'd be happy if I could only respect the guy a little bit."

"Respect — forget it. If you can even talk to him at all, you're lucky."

"Even just small talk. About the morning orange juice."

"If you can even stand to wake up next to him..."

"...can stand having his head on your pillow!" (A shocked silence)

"Do you realize what we're saying? Not only have we been sleeping with guys we don't love, but with guys we positively can't stand."

"What are we doing it for?"

"Well (with a sigh), looks like we're back where we started. Doing it for every reason but the right one."

"This is frightening. I mean, we shouldn't have to give up concern for good relationships to prove we're free."

"Because men really aren't free either. They just like to think they are."

"Yeah, we don't want to become whores like men." (Laughter)

"It's true — sensitive men admit they're unhappy sleeping around. They feel cheap and empty too."

"That Don Juan-Playboy Mystique is just as false as its reverse, the Terrible Tramp."

"But let's not confuse the degree. Sure, they're unhappy too in the role of empty conqueror. But after all, they must get something out of it or things wouldn't be that way."

"A man's sense of personal worth comes through his cocksmanship, in the Playboy mystique. It's the old business of raising your self-image by lowering someone else."

"Well, all we ever got was pure sexual exploitation, pure and simple."

"We should try to get to the roots of this, though. Sheer resentment isn't the answer. Let's look at it. No birth control, right? Women stuck with child-rearing. Who takes the consequences of sex? Women. Therefore who is less eager for sex? Women. Problem: how to get her into bed by any means necessary — without having to worry about a big bunch of kids to support. Well, of course he resorted to lies, seduction, dishonesty. Get it in and get out before you're trapped. O.K. Women wised up. Result: fewer were seducible and the sexual supply went down. The race was on. And in classic, male competitive manner — he who could get it in the most women with the fewest consequences was the winner. It's really very logical."

"Yeah, with the pill now, we have to be careful not to imitate the situation that grew out of all that. We have to liberate ourselves beyond even that sexual pseudo-freedom men supposedly have."

"What a job..."

"They're so damaged, poor bastards. But how can we do it alone? A free woman needs a free man."

(Glumly) "I used to think sex was exciting because if there was going to be a real personality confrontation anywhere, it'd be in bed. But I found out they were as blank in bed as out."

"Sometimes, you know (with a sigh), you'd almost rather play ping-pong."

-----  
Shulamith Firestone

## THE MYTH OF THE VAGINAL ORGASM

Whenever female orgasm is discussed, a false distinction is made between the vaginal and the clitoral orgasm. Frigidity has generally been defined by men as the failure of women to have vaginal orgasms. Actually, the vagina is not a highly sensitive area and is not physiologically constructed to achieve orgasm. The clitoris is the sensitive area and is the female equivalent of the penis. I think this explains a great many things. First, the so-called frigidity rate among women is phenomenal. Usually we are told that it is our hang-up if we don't have an orgasm and most women accept this analysis. But men are hung up too, and they have orgasms, so I think we must look for causes elsewhere.

What actually happens is this: there is only one area for sexual climax (although there are many areas for general sexual arousal) — the clitoris. *All orgasms are extensions of sensations from this area.* Since the clitoris is usually not directly stimulated in the conventional sexual positions, we are left "frigid." The only other kind of stimulation is purely psychological, the kind of orgasm achieved through fetishes or thinking or dreaming about someone. But this kind of orgasm is *not* caused by friction with the vagina and therefore cannot be considered a vaginal orgasm. Rather, it is a psychologically caused orgasm which manifests itself physically in the clitoris. Of the orgasms that are caused by physical contact with the clitoris, there may be many degrees of intensity, some more localized and some which are more diffuse and sensitive. The physical organ which causes them, however, is the clitoris.

All this leads to some interesting questions about conventional sex and our role in it. Men have orgasms essentially by friction with the vagina, not with the clitoris — which is external and not able to cause friction the way penetration does. Women have thus been defined sexually in terms of what pleases men; our own biology has not been properly analyzed. Instead, we have been fed a myth of the liberated woman and her vaginal orgasm, an orgasm which in fact does not exist.

What we must do is redefine our sexuality. We must discard the "normal" concepts of sex and create new guidelines which take into account mutual sexual enjoyment. While the idea of mutual enjoyment is acknowledged in marriage manuals, it is not followed to its logical conclusion. We must begin to demand that if a certain sexual position or technique now defined as "standard" is not mutually conducive to orgasm, then it should no longer be defined as standard. New techniques must be used or devised which transform our current sexual exploitation.

Anne Koedt



## THE JEANETTE RANKIN BRIGADE: WOMAN POWER?

A lot of energy and a good few months of our early formation period were spent preparing an appropriate action for the Brigade peace march in Washington, D.C., the largest gathering of women for a political purpose since the heyday of Jeanette Rankin (the first woman elected to Congress from Montana in 1919). The Brigade was a coalition of women's groups united for a specific purpose: to confront Congress on its opening day, Jan. 15, 1968, with a strong show of female opposition to the Vietnam War.

However, from the beginning we felt that this kind of action, though well-meant, was ultimately futile. It is naive to believe that women who are not politically seen, heard, or represented in this country could change the course of a war by simply appealing to the better natures of congressmen. Further, we disagreed with a woman's demonstration as a tactic for ending the war, for the Brigade's reason for organizing AS WOMEN. That is, the Brigade was playing upon the traditional female role in the classic manner. They came as wives, mothers and mourners; that is, tearful and passive reactors to the actions of men rather than organizing as women to change that definition of femininity to something other than a synonym for weakness, political impotence, and tears.

So that we came as a group not to appeal to congress, but to appeal to women not to appeal to congress. Rather we believed that such a massive gathering should be used to devise ways to build up *real* political strength.

To drive this home, we felt that a dramatic action would be least offensive and most effective. In addition to a speech written and delivered to the main body of the convention on Jan. 15, and reprinted below, we staged an actual funeral procession with a larger-than-life dummy on a transported bier, complete with feminine getup, blank face, blonde curls, and candle. Hanging from the bier were such disposable items as S & H Green Stamps, curlers, garters, and hairspray. Streamers floated off it and we also carried large banners, such as "DON'T CRY: RESIST!" Kathy Barrett of the Pageant Players, a New York street theatre group, worked with others on simple but effective costumes for the funeral entourage. We had a special drum corps with kazoo, and a sheet of clever songs written by Beverly Grant and others. Peggy Dobbins wrote a long funeral dirge lamenting woman's traditional role which encourages men to develop aggression and militarism to prove their masculinity. There were several related pamphlets, including one written by Kathie Amatniek which elaborated on the following progression:

TRADITIONAL WOMANHOOD IS DEAD.

TRADITIONAL WOMEN WERE BEAUTIFUL...BUT REALLY POWERLESS.

"UPPITY" WOMEN WERE EVEN MORE BEAUTIFUL... BUT STILL POWERLESS

SISTERHOOD IS POWERFUL!

HUMANHOOD THE ULTIMATE!

Finally, by way of a black-bordered invitation, we "joyfully" invited many of the 5,000 women there to attend a burial that evening at Arlington "by torchlight" of Traditional Womanhood, "who passed with a sigh to her Great Reward this year of the Lord, 1968, after 3,000 years of bolstering the egos of Warmakers and aiding the cause of war...."

The message inside read:

*Don't Bring Flowers... Do be prepared to sacrifice your traditional female roles. You have refused to hanky-wave boys off to war with admonitions to save the American Mom and Apple Pie. You have resisted your roles of supportive girl friends and tearful widows, receivers of regretful telegrams and worthless medals of honor. And now you must resist approaching Congress playing these same roles that are synonymous with powerlessness. We must not come as passive suppliants begging for favors, for power cooperates only with power. We must learn to fight the warmongers on their own terms, though they believe us capable only of rolling bandages. Until we have united into a force to be reckoned with, we will be patronized and ridiculed into total political ineffectiveness. So if you are really sincere about ending this war, join us tonight and in the future.*

Later, 500 women split off in disgust from the main body of the convention to call a counter congress. Although predictable under the circumstances, nevertheless it was unexpected. We were not really prepared to rechannel this disgust, to provide the direction that was so badly needed. There was chaos. The women were united only in their frustration, some calling for militancy of any kind at that late date, others for more organization for the future. They were all keenly disappointed, and fully aware of their impotence.

It was a great moment. But we lost it. And we learned the value of spontaneity, of quick and appropriate political action, the value of learning to size up a situation and act on it at once, the importance of unrehearsed speaking ability. For I think one good guiding speech at the crisis point which illustrated the *real* causes underlying the massive discontent and impotence felt in that room then, would have been worth ten dummies and three months of careful and elaborate planning.

The measure of that impotence was the very fact that the number of marchers was, for the first time in years, accurately reported: the march was no threat at all to the Establishment. By the same token general coverage of such a large march was slight or nonexistent, handled by minor reporters who had to work or wring some human interest value or slight sexual titillation from the fact that a few younger women could be spotted at this dull and hemmish hotel teaparty. But where minor reporters failed, *Ramparts* succeeded. They had to use odd agile photography, distorted quotations, and a whole lot of incorrect facts, granted, but succeed they did. (Even *LIFE* couldn't have done better, had they been interested in trying.)

Letters of protest poured in from women in radical groups around the country. But *Ramparts* just chuckled, patted the little women on the cheek, published a few (out of context) and went on its more important radical business.

Despite all this discouragement and the small returns on all our labors, the Washington experience was not entirely wasted. We learned alot. We found out where women, even the so-called "women radicals" were *really* at. We confirmed our worst suspicions that the job ahead, of developing even a minimal consciousness among women, will be staggering, but we also confirmed our belief that a real women's movement in this country will come, if only out of the sheer urgent and immediate necessity for one.

Shulamith Firestone



## ABORTION RALLY SPEECH

I would like to address this speech to those women, and there are few enough here, who had the guts to show up at this rally. There are many many more out there who could not make it. Many who are afraid to take a stand on an issue as important as their own self determination. Many who are terrified even to express support for a man who did more than merely support them, but a man who took the risks that they should have taken.

For Bill Baird now faces the absurd ten year jail sentence that really we women should have to face, if anyone must.

But I didn't come to excoriate other women. For I must confess that even I after months of work in women's liberation, had my fears about coming out openly for free abortion. Before hundreds of people? Perhaps to be quoted? God, what would my father think?

Let's face it. Woman is scared shitless. And she has good reason to be! She has been told to shut up and stop talking a million times. On a higher level, when she expressed concern for personal relationships she is told haughtily that she is too subjective, too wrapped up in her own problems. If she dares to have a self, she is termed selfish, and unfeminine. If she dares to have an opinion, she is called shrewish and opinionated. She has been told to stay at home, where she belongs, and not to meddle in important affairs, to "leave the driving to us."

Now, how can we be surprised that this woman has chosen to stay at home today? Oppressed, suppressed, depressed and repressed all her life, we can hardly now expect to find her here standing up for herself against that huge male power structure which has always put her down, the awesome authority of which she well knows.

How can we now expect that she be here, when that life-long intimidation in her is so deep-rooted that even if you put her in solitary for twenty years she wouldn't dare to *think* un-kosher thoughts or to question her position in this society. For she has internalized its values, she has accepted, and indeed in many cases she has *become*, its low estimate of her human worth.

But despite all this, the need for an abortion frequently starts a woman thinking. And let us not kid ourselves, it is not a distant Aunt who faced this problem. We ourselves do. And if by some accident, any of you women here at the rally have avoided it, you can count yourselves lucky or bless the pill. For you know as well as I that you are the exception and not the rule. Think about your female friends. I'll bet you that those of them who have had the problem outnumber those who haven't.

So we have a young woman faced with an unwanted pregnancy; if she doesn't act fast, she knows that nothing short of a miraculous miscarriage can save her from the frightening prospect of twenty years of unprepared-for childbearing, that will necessarily be, in this society, entirely on her shoulders.

In all good faith and trust she will approach her man first. Shocking what she is likely to hear, and many do, is a complete denial, something on the order of "Hell, no, it ain't mine." If she's lucky, or higher class, he may choose to assume some responsibility: that is, he will send her to an illegal doctor, perhaps help her to scrape together some money if she has none. Sometimes he will grudgingly even marry her, in which case she will never hear the end of it. And if she doesn't hear about it explicitly, she will have to be doubly grateful to him, reinforcing her already dependent position.

And if she is already married, and surprisingly, most women in this position are, her lot is not much better. She will be stuck with the full responsibility for rearing an unwanted child, but to rebel against this is to face grave personal danger, financial extortion, illegal action, blame and the resulting guilt feelings.

In all these cases the woman finds that even if the man helps her, he is helping her with HER problem, not THEIR problem, that in the end she is the one who must take the risks and pay the price for their mutual relationship with blood. And the same men exclude her from the lawmaking process which decides her fate! Think about it! How many women represent you in the law-making bodies of this country? The few that there are are not chosen as women, but as wives, wives of this or that man, or because of their reactionary politics. It is a grand convention of dogs deciding the fate of cats. And now the Blumenthal Bill comes around, providing loop-holes in the male law. So! Some dogs have decided that certain cats should be allowed to break their rules. Well, thanks. But, sir, we're getting tired of all this gratitude. We're tired of *having* to feel grateful, like house servants glad that at least they are not the field hands out there picking cotton. Who gave you lawmakers the right to make us *have* to feel gratitude? Those bodies belong to us. We don't have to appear in your courts proving our mental incompetence to you before we can avoid forced childbearing!

We refuse to be your passive vessels becoming impregnated for the greater good of society. We want a society that exists for our good as well as yours! We are not just grease between men, links between generations, not just the mothers of sons and their future wives! We are tired of being pawns in a male power game. Tired of being bought and sold and traded and used to sell your deodorants and hair sprays.

In short, we are tired of paying for the sins of men. For I often wonder if we have even gone beyond the Old Testament in which, if a man took a girl in the field he could get off the hook easily by simply paying her father for her destroyed value. No one ever asked *her* what she thought about it. She was nothing more than a piece of damaged chattel then, and even now, over two thousand years later she is still only a piece of property, a commodity for the use of man. Even that unwanted child in her, that undeveloped life, is more important than the living woman who bears him.

So: we must say to those bishops and pompous lawmakers and self-righteous men, we will no longer be shoved around. We will no longer submit to your definitions of what we should or should not be or do to become truly feminine in your eyes. For unless we have a part in creating the laws which govern our fate, then we will refuse to follow those dictates and laws.

There was a wistful note at the end of Bill's interview on WBAL. He said something to the effect that, who knows, perhaps some day women will really get angry. I thought about that. Because some of us, still very few, ~~are~~ getting angry. And we are getting angry *now*. I hope Bill will not have to wait for his Utopia quite so long as he thinks. I hope that it will be very soon when we approach him, en masse, strong, organized, conscious, and say:

We sincerely thank you, Bill Baird, for your great sacrifice. You and people like you have helped us immensely in our struggle to become aware. And now, sooner than you predicted, your wish has come true. We are angry at last. So angry that we no longer need you to fight our fight.

Shulamith Firestone



## WOMEN AND THE RADICAL MOVEMENT

Within the last year many radical women's groups have sprung up throughout the country. This was caused by the fact that movement women found themselves playing secondary roles on every level...be it in terms of leadership, or simply in terms of being listened to. They found themselves (and others) afraid to speak up because of self-doubts when in the presence of men. Their roles ended up concentrating on food-making, typing, mimeographing, general assistance work, and as a sexual supply for their male comrades after hours.

As these problems began being discussed, it became clear that what had at first been assumed to be a personal problem was in fact a social and political one. We found strong parallels between the liberation of women and black power struggle, being oppressed by similar psychological/economic dynamics. And the deeper we analyzed the problem, and realized that all women suffer from this kind of oppression, the more we realized that the problem was not just isolated to movement women.

It became necessary to go to the root of the problem, rather than to become engaged in solving secondary problems arising out of that condition. Thus, rather than storming the Pentagon as women, or protest the Democratic Convention as women, we must begin to expose the eliminate the causes of our oppression as women. Our job is not *only* to improve the conditions of the movement any more than it is to only improve the condition of professional working women. Both are reformist if thought of only as ends in themselves; and it ignores the broader concept that one cannot achieve equality for some members of one's group while the rest are not free.

In choosing to fight for women's liberation it is not enough, either, to explain it only in general terms of "the system." For the system oppresses many groups in many ways. Women must learn that the *specific methods* used to keep her oppressed are to convince her that she is at all times secondary to man, and that her life is defined in terms of him. We cannot speak of liberating ourselves until we free ourselves from this myth and accept ourselves as primary.

In our role as radical women we are confronted with the problem of assuring a female revolution within the general revolution. And we must begin to distinguish the real from the apparent freedom.

Radical men may advocate certain freedoms for women when they overlap their own interest, but these are not true freedoms unless they spring out of the concept of male and female equality and confront the issue of male supremacy.

For example, men may want women to fight in the revolution because they need every able bodied person they can get. And they may need women to join the work force under a socialist economic system because they cannot afford, like capitalism, to have an unemployed (surplus) labor force not contributing work, being supported by the state. And men may therefore advocate state nurseries so that mothers are not kept from work.

But has the fundamental concept of women changed? Do these changes mean that men have renounced the old supremacy relationship, wherein women must always be defined in terms of her man? Has the basic domination changed?

It is important to analyze the history of revolutions in terms of special interest groups. The American Revolution was a white male bourgeois revolution. The issue was being able to freely make a profit without England's interference: the Declaration of Independence was specifically written to justify independence from England. It

was a document which guaranteed rights neither to the blacks or to women. Crispus Attucks, one of the first black men to lose his life for the revolution, was fighting in a vicarious revolution - the white revolution. Betsy Ross sewing the flag was participating vicariously in a male revolution. The rights gained were not for her.

It is always true of an oppressed group that the mere fact of their existence means that to a certain extent they have accepted their inferior-colonial-secondary status. Taught self-hatred, they identify instead with the oppressor. Thus such phenomenon as blacks bleaching their skin and straightening their hair, and women responding with horror at the thought of a woman president.

The economic revolution - i.e. change from capitalism to socialism - can also be viewed in terms of male interest. Under capitalism, the majority of men were exploited and controlled by a few men who held the wealth and power over their lives. By changing the economic structure to socialism, this particular economic exploitation was eradicated.

Women in the Soviet Union fought for and supported the revolution. But whether out of genuine hope that non-domination and non-exploitation would be applied as liberally to them, or worse, out of a lack of even a minimum awareness that they themselves were important, the Soviet revolution remained a male power revolution, although many new benefits fell to women. The Soviet Union is still primarily male governed; women's integration into the labor force meant simply that she transferred her auxiliary, service relationship with men into the area of work. Soviet women are teachers, doctors, assistants, food handlers. And when they come home from work they are expected to continue the submission role to men and do the housework, cooking and assume primary responsibility for the child-rearing.

It is important for radical women to learn from these events. The dominant/submissive relationship between men and women was not challenged. Not confronted. We were asked by them instead to equate our liberation with theirs...to blame our inferior conditions on the economic structure rather than confront the obvious male interest in keeping women "in their place." We never insisted upon as *explicit* a program for freeing women as the man had demanded for freeing himself from economic exploitation. We never confronted men and demanded that unless they give up their domination over us, we would not fight for their revolution, work in their revolution. We never fought the primary cause, hoping instead that changing the secondary characteristics would win us freedom. And we ended up with a revolution that simply transferred male supremacy, paternalism and male power onto the new economy. A reformist revolution that only improved upon our privileges but did not change the basic structure causing our oppression.

A black revolutionary today would not be satisfied knowing only that the economic structure went from private to collective control; he would want to know about racism. And you would have to show him how white power and supremacy would be eliminated in that revolution before he would join you.

Until we make such similar demands, revolution will pass us by.

Anne Koedt



R\*O\*Z'S P\*A\*G\*E

## LETTER TO STAUGHTON LYNDE

Odd, that the first substantive piece on women's liberation run by the *Guardian* is written by a man, Staughton Lynd. The *Guardian* wouldn't dare do this to the Black Movement, nor would they accuse the Blacks of overstating their case.

A few corrections — the women's movement didn't arise because radicals are growing older and musing about child rearing. Women's problems unfortunately begin not after college but with prenatal conceptions, and go on beyond menopause. From childhood on, emphasis is placed on how we appear rather than who we are, and when we try to assert our humanism we're accused of being domineering bitches or worse bullydicks.

The Women's Movement began because we're tired of not being taken seriously. Even within the radical movement we are relegated to service: typing, mailing and food preparation, with sexual services on the side.

WE CONDEMN

Males who continue to say "Chick" after being told to stop.  
Stephanie Harrington and Blair Sobel who write against fashion with chicque, and a fashionable flair.  
All those male leftist publications who are idolizing guerilla women.  
Too horrible to mention: *Vogue*, etc, etc.

## QUOTABLE QUOTES +++

"Anybody who knows anything of history knows that great social changes are impossible without the feminine ferment. Social progress can be measured exactly by the social position of the fair sex (the ugly ones included)."

letter, Karl Marx to Kugelmann, December 12, 1868

"In any case ladies cannot complain of the International, for it has elected a lady, Madame Law, to be a member of the General Council."

letter, Karl Marx to Kugelmann, December 12, 1868

## AUNT TOM OF THE MONTH

Helen Gurley Brown  
Author: *Sex and the Single Girl*  
Editor: *Cosmopolitan*

## MALE CHAUVINIST OF THE MONTH

Staughton Lynd  
*National Guardian* Article  
May 15, 1968

## MOST CHAUVINIST PUBLICATION

*Ramparts*

OVERHEARD....."Well, how would YOU like to be married to the oppressor?"

WE SUPPORT

Linda Le Clair: Barnard martyr for equal cohabitation rights.

Grace D. Cox: President, Women Lawyers Association - prosecutes those who practice job discrimination because of sex.

Bill Baird: Crusader for abortion law repeal.

Doctors Rappaport and Lawrence: abortionists, recently arrested. Dr. Rappaport has already served nine years in jail for performing abortions.

Additional copies of NOTES FROM THE FIRST YEAR can be ordered at  
its original prices from

REDSTOCKINGS  
P.O. Box 413  
New Paltz, NY 12561

\$ .50 to women + 25¢ postage  
\$1.00 to men + 25¢ postage

Please enclose payment with your order.  
Make checks payable to Redstockings.