

THE NEW FEMINIST

P.O. Box 597, Station "A", Toronto 116, Ontario, Canada

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2

May, 1971

LITTLE GIRL

POSITION PAPER ON
REPORT OF THE ROYAL
COMMISSION

FEMINIST VOICES FROM
THE PAST

CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING

MALE CHAUVINISM

A SENSE OF HUMOUR?

ITEMS OF INTEREST

MAGAZINE COMMITTEE:

Marina, Sherrill and
Dorothy

All rights reserved.
Written permission for
reprint must be obtained.

LITTLE GIRL

by Val Perkins

Not running or jumping or skipping along
But walking terribly tall
Striding and stretching and feeling just great
Strange - there's no reason at all
For this big and good feeling
Walking alone
In a mood pink and orange and gold
On the way home from school
At the age of nine years
The feeling's too much to be told
Leaves are shining overhead
Sun weaves a golden arch
You stride and glow
And stretch and grow
But the strangest thing by far
You never ask just why this is
Away back there you know
The world is friendly warm and good
It's Friday afternoon
Your time's your own for two days now
You know just what you'll do
You'll rake those leaves there on the lawn
Into shapes and squares and houses
With windows and doors and things like that
Timeless gay abandon
But the best of all was the smell of fall
Earth and leaves and fires
And a happy mind to make-believe
So many things at random

POSITION PAPER OF A FEMINIST ON:
THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE
STATUS OF WOMEN IN CANADA AND ON THE NATIONAL
AD HOC ACTION COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

By Dorothy

Women are coming together all over the world - from different backgrounds - from different economic and political outlooks - from different generations - from different religions - from different races. We are coming together out of a huge commonality more real and significant than any other tie we have. A new and growing awareness of the oppression of woman as woman and a firm determination to shatter the chains that have bound us for thousands of years in virtually all cultures is involving us in what is probably the greatest revolution in history.

It is important for Canadian women to remember that the problems of women in Canada are part of a world-wide problem with very deep roots.

In order to achieve our goals, we as women, must be very sure that we make a thorough analysis of this deep and complex problem. Society is so riddled with the cancer of woman's oppression that nothing short of a complete re-structuring of institutions and attitudes in all areas of life can cure it. Every institution must be re-examined including marriage, the family, the church, the free-enterprise system, government, business, labour unions and the educational system. All of these have incorporated and in most cases derive direct benefits from the perpetuation of the exploitation of the female half of the human race. A few superficial changes in laws and in policies within institutions will not liberate women. There is a danger, in fact, that temporary relief of symptoms could camouflage a real aggravation of the basic sickness. Reformist type changes to a system, in which power groups have a vested interest in our oppression, may create even more serious problems for our children. We must not unthinkingly and irresponsibly accept this type of change as any kind of valid solution.

Change for the sake of change, even if it is radical change, is equally dangerous. Each suggestion for change must be carefully examined by women. We should be prepared to make our own kind of radical changes. Socialism, for example, must not be regarded as, in itself, a remedy for all the problems. However oppressive we feel the capitalist system is for women, we must not forget that our oppression pre-dates the capitalist system and we must not forget that women continue to be oppressed in countries where there have been successful socialist revolutions.

A whole new image of woman must be created.

Many suggested freedoms, hailed as potential break-throughs in the general striving for a more humane and less alienating society have been conceived in the minds of men and male-identified women and may be very bad for women. For example, underlying the changes and proposed changes in divorce laws to make them more humane is a belief in the institution of marriage. This could postpone an analysis of the institution itself, which is probably the

most oppressive institution of all for women. It must also be kept in mind that making divorce easier, before all women have economic independence equivalent to that of men, could be tragic to many women today. Women, themselves, must define new values and create new institutions if we are to have a world in which we can live as whole, free human beings.

There is a very real danger in concentrating too much on issues such as those so thoroughly and necessarily documented in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada. The danger is that of being seduced by obvious simple solutions to today's pressing problems in our personal lives. The problem of the oppression of women by men was not solved by getting the vote; nor will it be solved by the implementation of the recommendations of the Report. However valid and urgent are our united cries for equal pay, day-care centres and abortion on request - however valid these are, we must keep our eye on the goal this time. If all the recommendations of the Report were implemented this would only be a very small beginning. Our goal must be to obtain full human status for women in every area of human activity. And this is not to accept the present 'human activity' - realm of the male. Values in the male realm, today, are firmly rooted in the evils of power, dominance and oppression. We must look for a broader and deeper definition of human life.

The consciousness of all women in Canada must be raised. We must begin to think of ourselves as human beings. This is a very radical proposal! We must involve ourselves in analysis of all the implications and ramifications of sex-roles in every aspect of our lives. We must question all the values instilled in us from birth. We must discover for ourselves the true reason for our oppression and we must learn to stand up and fight for ourselves.

We are fighting a complex web of power structures. Its depth and complexity has yet to be revealed in full to us. The backlash has only just begun. We can look forward to further exposure by the enemy of his true colours. We will then have less trouble defining the enemy - he will define himself. It is inevitable. We can look forward to this, it will be a blessing in disguise, because in this particular battle the enemy has used the mask of 'lover' and 'protector'. It is difficult to fight those who speak of love and protection. It is difficult, in spite of mounting evidence, to convince many women of the degree to which they are exploited. But this time men have pushed it too far and at a time in history when it is highly inappropriate. We are living in a era of polarization of oppressors and oppressed - we are living in an era which is being forced to look at the hypocrisy of actions in direct conflict with ideals - we are living in an era where the 'people' are demanding 'power' - we are living in an era of disillusionment - we are hearing more and more about human dignity, human rights, independence, self-fulfillment etc. Nothing is so powerful as an idea when its time has come. We have more power than we realize. Our enemy is being forced into a position where he must declare that he wishes to oppress us and that is as it should be - a most unpopular position in view of the tenor of the times and a position which will no doubt cause many uncommitted women to reconsider where their loyalty lies OR he must declare that he does not wish to oppress us. In the latter case he must ask us to define our oppression - only the oppressed can do this - and he must cease to oppress us economically, socially and sexually. But we must not under-estimate the enemy

- he has great power and a considerable vested interest. The enemy must be completely unmasked and exposed for the exploiter that he is. Exploitive power structures which oppress us must be destroyed or radically changed.

We can be sure that vested interests will use every device at their disposal to trick us into acceptance of small reforms far short even of those recommended in the Report. We must be on the alert. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts. We must not define our oppression in terms of adding up the discrete pieces of our oppression as detailed in the Report but rather we must keep in mind that we are engaged in an enormous political battle for survival - the problem of the physical and psychological power of one class of people - men, over another less powerful class of people - women.

Many women still think of the manifestations of this power as 'natural'. We must learn not to unquestioningly accept anything as 'natural'. The scientific method must be applied to designing a new and better way of life - this must involve us in thinking about new and better ways of thinking about ourselves and the way we live with other people in an ever-changing environment.

We must ask new and correct questions if we are to arrive at new and correct answers. José Ortega y Gasset has stated that tradition is a peculiar form of sleepwalking which makes people think, feel and desire in forms that from time out of mind have prevailed in the human environment and about whose validity one feels no misgivings whatever. If we believe that radical change is needed we must not cling to tradition. We must not be afraid to give up what we have because we find it comfortable or at least known. Some values we have considered beyond question, even precious, must now be looked at critically with new eyes.

The original request for a Royal Commission was initiated by women of courage and vision relative to the climate of that day. In the short time which has passed since then there have been enormous changes in our physical and social environment. The women who made the original request came from established women's groups - the only women's groups which existed at that time. All of these groups were formed for purposes far removed from the area of developing the consciousness of women as a political group. In addition, most of these groups are firmly rooted in the status quo and in tradition and many of them still perpetuate and even encourage the traditional role for women. Few young women today are joining these groups. The climate has changed.

Young, vital, concerned, intelligent and educated people today are questioning old values, drawing attention to our society's dehumanization of people, to the devastating injustices which riddle our so-called democracy, to the hypocrisy of our values etc. Women's Liberation and Feminist groups have sprung up everywhere - sometimes in the most unlikely places. These groups are dealing specifically with women and sex-roles arbitrarily assigned and rigidly enforced (rather than peripherally, as were the older groups). A large network of these groups, many as yet invisible to most people, has developed in Canada and in almost every country in the world. These new groups have done more to raise the consciousness of people to the oppression of women and the ways in which it manifests itself in our society than would have been dreamed of a few years ago. They speak from a new, intense,

sensitive awareness of the pain and suffering of women. Much penetrating, incisive and worthwhile analytical work has been done by these groups. If their words and actions do not fit in with the accepted words and actions of 'ladies' it is with good reason. 'Ladies', by definition, do not become involved with radical ideas let alone radical actions. 'Being a lady' is soon identified as part of our oppression as our consciousness is raised.

Young women in the Women's Liberation Movement have much to contribute and they are the ones who will be most affected. It is important that as many as possible of these women be heard, whether or not they are from established national organizations. The National Ad Hoc Action Committee On The Status Of Women has recognized to a degree the Women's Liberation Movement which is commendable. It is the nature of the movement that its groups are not organized in traditional ways; the small group has been found to be most effective in raising consciousness and developing trust among women. It is from members of such groups that the growing literature of the movement has come. Politically and academically these women have been recognized and there is no doubt that this recognition will increase. Traditional women's groups must recognize that leadership will emerge from the young radical women; they must be prepared to listen to and learn from the young radical women; they must realize that women in the movement are speaking for large and increasing numbers of aware women interested only in women and prepared to devote their lives to the cause. And surely that's what it's all about!

It is in this context that we in the movement view the Report and the Ad Hoc Committee.

It is in this context that we question even the four principles adopted by the Commission:

1. Women should be free to choose whether or not to take employment outside their homes
2. The care of children is a responsibility to be shared by the mother, the father and society
3. Society has a responsibility for women because of pregnancy and childbirth, and special treatment related to maternity will always be necessary
4. In certain areas women will for an interim period require special treatment to overcome the adverse effects of discriminatory practices

A more basic principle than number 1 would be the principle that all classes of human beings should share equally and therefore be represented equally in all areas of human endeavour.

A more basic principle than number 2 would be that the care of children is the responsibility simply of society. Motherhood and fatherhood as presently understood should be seriously questioned. Along with this should go the principle that every child must have equal opportunity in our society regardless of whether the child is male or female and regardless of the economic or social status of its parents. This is far from the case today.

Principles 3 and 4 refer to "special treatment". Special treatment has

always worked to the disadvantage of women. Its inclusion in two of the four principles is therefore cause for serious concern. A more basic principle than 4 would be that there must be an end to all categorization on the basis of sex in legislation, institutions and attitudes. Reproduction of life should be the point of take-off rather than a special reference to pregnancy as though it were a problem belonging to women. If "special treatment" is considered necessary it would indicate greater awareness of the real problem if this were seen as reparations for past wrongs. The fact that it is conceivable that life will be reproduced in the laboratory in the not-too-distant future and the impact of this on our lives should be in our minds today. Research on the social implications of this should be underway.

The orientation of the Report, despite a few passing references to "radical change", assumes a continuation of the categorization of human beings into two classes - men and women, and a continuation of the institution of marriage and family as the basic unit of society. Whereas, it is important that we get rid of the categorization of people by sex and of the institutions of marriage and the family as presently conceived.

The patriarchal system is perpetuated by the family, the educational system and the churches. R. D. Laing, a well-known British psychiatrist, has called these three institutions the "slaughter-houses of our children". Perhaps we could extend this and say they are the slaughter-houses of human beings.

What is really most damaging to us is probably the classification, "woman". We are so thoroughly socialized in the area of language that it is difficult to conceptualize the non-existence of this word. Language is a tool of the status quo - so many attitudes are incorporated in the language we are taught before we have developed any critical abilities. If the noun "woman" did not exist; if being female was described as a condition of the human being i.e. if it was an adjective rather than a noun, it would indicate a completely different attitude. We would then truly be human beings first. It would simply modify and clarify the noun in a way which was of no greater significance than adjectives such as "tall" or "short", "fat" or "thin" etc. This is truly our long-range goal and we must be sure that short-range goals do not preclude the attainment of the long-range goals. Perhaps, therefore we should be wary of the dangers inherent even in grouping together and identifying ourselves as women - it may accentuate the sex categorization of people. For immediate political reasons, there is no other way than to develop a woman's identity but we must keep alert and aware this time if we hope for meaningful results over the long term.

In summary, we, women, must clearly differentiate between political expedient, however urgent, and our real goals. Our revolution is the most important revolution in the history of human beings. It must go deep. Essentially the future, if there is to be one, for human beings, is in our hands. Men will not do it. We can. Contrary to our conditioning we are important, we are intelligent, we are powerful. We must de-condition, un-learn and tune out the re-inforcing brainwashing which surrounds us. We can and must be brave and strong. The only hope for the creation of a new and better world where people can live and love in dignity and freedom is in developing alert, aware, determined, educated and purposeful women who are sure enough of their identity as human being that they have no fear of, but rather hope for an end to sex categorization.

FEMINIST VOICES FROM THE PAST

Katherine Phillips 1631 - 1664

TO ONE PERSUADING A LADY TO MARRIAGE

Forbear, bold youth; all heaven here
 And what you do aver
 To others courtship may appear,
 'Tis sacrilege to her.
 She is a public deity,
 And were't not very odd
 She should dispose herself to be
 A petty household god?

First make the sun in private shine,
 And bid the world adieu,
 That so he may his beams confine
 In compliment to you.
 But if of that you do despair,
 Think how you did amiss,
 To strive to fix her beams which are
 More bright and large than his.

Poulain de la Barre seventeenth century:

"All that has been written about women by men should
 be suspect, for men are at once judge and party to
 the lawsuit."

E. St. V. Millay 1917

..... I never again shall tell you what I think,
 I shall be sweet and crafty, soft and sly.
 You will not catch me reading anymore
 I shall be a wife to pattern by.
 And some day when you knock and push the door,
 Some day not too bright and not too stormy
 I shall be gone
 And you may whistle for me

CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING

The term consciousness-raising is often used these days, sometimes with little understanding of what it really means.

Consciousness-raising is conducted in small groups of women numbering from about six to ten members. A topic is chosen and each woman in the group speaks from her own personal experience on this topic. No woman may be criticized or challenged re: her perception of what has happened in her life. The group may, however, ask questions of clarification, after a woman has finished speaking. It is important that no member interrupt another when personal testimony is taking place. Under no circumstances is any information shared with the group during discussion to go outside the group. Personal testimony is confidential. This is essential if women are to learn to trust each other and to escape the old idea that it is disloyal to speak about family matters and inter-personal relationships outside the family. Not only shouldn't anything be spoken about outside the group; it also should not be written down.

After each woman speaks about her personal experience, the group may then draw generalizations. Certain themes will begin to become apparent. It is the group's job to recognize these themes and state them as generalizations. While each of our experiences have been individual, our oppression has taken similar forms. Generalization helps to uncover these consistencies in the experience of women. In a very short time, the women in a consciousness-raising group begin to have a very clear idea of the mechanics of oppression and woman hatred. It is a great help to write down the generalizations (not personal testimony) that emerge from each meeting so that the group may refer to them in the event they want to write group papers, do actions, or come to conclusions etc. in relation to their consciousness-raising.

You may have a few friends or neighbors with whom you would like to get together and talk. The process of consciousness-raising is very simple. Basically, women speak to each other out of their own direct experience. However, carrying out the process is not so simple. It is hard for women to talk to each other and to trust one another. It takes a consciousness-raising group at least four to six weeks to work together well. Once women do begin to open up to each other, another problem arises -- women develop different ideas about solutions to the same problem. Some take reformist views and others take revolutionary views. These political differences can become crucial when the group has been together three or four months. At this time, it is wise for the group to make a decision either to split along political lines or to stay together. It usually takes six months to a year for members in the group to build real trust, and love for each other. This may seem like a long time but when we consider how many years each woman has been taught to despise other women, one year is a remarkably short period of time to achieve so much.

Consciousness-raising can accomplish the following:

1. Clean out your head
2. Uncork and re-direct your anger
3. Learn to understand other women
4. Discover that your personal problem is not only yours

Suggested topics and order for consciousness-raising:

MONTH 1

Week 1

How was the life of a woman presented to you as a child?
What expectations were you supposed to fulfill?
What do you think of womanhood presently?

Week 2

What were your early childhood experiences with sex?
With yourself, relatives, children your own age, older people?

How did these affect your view of sex and your view of yourself as a woman?

How have they affected your attitudes later in life?

Week 3

What have your adult sexual experiences been like?
Discuss your relationships with men as they have evolved
What about seduction, Rape? Sexual affairs of varying durations?

Have you ever lied about orgasm?

Week 4

How do you feel about having children, pregnancy?

How do you relate to contraception and abortion and what has been your experiences with these?

MONTH 2

Week 1

How do you feel about marriage?

Are you or were you married to a man?

Did it fulfill your expectations of what marriage was supposed to be?

Did or do you feel yourself operating within the traditional male-female roles in this relationship?

Week 2

Discuss your parents and their relationship to each other and to you.

Can you trace a sense of self to your parents?

Week 3

Discuss your relationship with other women.

Have you ever felt competition for men?

Week 4

How was your education affected by your sex?

MONTH 3

Week 1

What kind of work do you do to make a living?

How do you feel about it?

How does sexism operate on the job?

Would you get fired if you refused to play out your role as a male-identified woman?

Week 2

How do you feel about raising children?

If you are a mother, has this caused you to feel you are living for others, to lose your sense of self?

Can you see any way for women to have children without these consequences?

Week 3

How do you feel about getting old (and your mother getting old)?

Menopause?

Using make up and hair coloring to disguise aging?

What do you fear most?

Week 4

Can you conceive of your own death?

What have been your past experiences with death?

Why does male politics rest so heavily on death (i.e. war, extermination of jews, Indians, Blacks)?

Men kill men; women rarely kill other women, Why?

MONTH 4

Week 1

How has violence intruded into your life?

How do you feel about violence?

(a) violence and sex (b) violence as self expression and purgation of oppression (c) violence as a political reality

This should also include such topics as self-defence, violence as a way of keeping women in their place, and threatened violence

Week 2

How do you feel about love?

What have been your experiences with love?

Do you feel you can love other women?

Can you love yourself?

How much of your life is organized around love?

Week 3

What was your early family background?

Did you develop a concept class through your early life experiences?

How are class differences affecting you today?

Consider how class affects women

Week 4

Do you have a concept of race?

If so, how did you acquire it?

How is racism affecting you today?

Consider how racism affects women

Other subjects that could be discussed: Problems of growing up as a girl, woman as sex object, discrimination you have experienced, sexism in the world around you and finally how do you think these things can be changed.

The above procedures for consciousness-raising were originally developed by Sappho Collective and other New York women's groups. Women A Journal of Liberation Winter 1971 issue published an article "Rapping In Small Groups". Many of the above consciousness-raising procedures were included in this article. Many New Feminists have used simliar procedures in our consciousness-raising cells and found them extremely useful in developing our woman's consciousness.

I think I knew who I was when I was 2

MALE CHAUVINIST

by Dorothy

- M is for the marriage vows he's broken
- A is for his arrogance and greed
- L is for his love that's just a token
- E is for his ego that I feed

- C is for his cock and for his crudeness
- H is for the hatred he displays
- A is his abominable lewdness
- U is for his underhanded ways
- V is for the victim he accuses
- I is for his insults to my pride
- N is for the nipple he abuses
- I is the intelligence I hide
- S is for the swagger that he uses
- T is for my tears, those many tears I've cried.

Put them all together, they spell ugly
 Sins for which he someday will be tried.

Nicholas Chauvin was a much wounded officer in Napoleon's army who idolized his emperor with what was considered blind enthusiasm. The term "chauvinism" signifies unreasoned and exaggerated patriotism, or a bellicose attachment to a lost cause. A "male chauvinist" is a sexist who displays irrational devotion to the male sex and contempt for the female sex.

A MALE CHAUVINIST PIG IS A PIG WHO IS A MALE CHAUVINIST!

THE MALE CHAUVINIST PIG AWARD --- goes to John Rich, the George Wallace of the movement in Toronto. When a male chauvinist "psychiatrist" (God help us lunatics!) produces his best "arguments", it makes one think the revolution may be won more easily than we thought.

"Shall I tell you what I consider to be wrong? What I consider to be wrong is that most of the people in the Western Hemisphere are stark, staring mad and the few people who recognize this are regarded as lunatics by all these stark, staring mad people." Ashley Montagu

".... Western conscience one admires its ingenuity. It must constitute one of the biggest knots in which man has ever tied himself. One of its many peculiar features is that the more tied in the knot, the less aware are we that we are tied in it."

"Most people live in a post-hypnotic trance induced in infancy."

R.D.Laing

WATCH FOR THIS BOOK:

The Death of the Family by DAVID COOPER a noted British psychoanalyst associated with R.D.Laing. In this book Cooper calls for the replacement of the traditional family with other forms of human relationships.

Publisher: Pantheon

ANOTHER NEW BOOK with an interesting title:

"Blaming the Victim"

This book discusses the ideology which permits middle-class whites in the United States to blame poor people for being poor.

Comment: Who will write the book exposing the male for defining the limitations of women and then blaming his victim?

The MALE CHAUVINISTS we speak to, whether straight or gay, often accuse us of having no sense of humour. Humour is a vicious weapon which oppressor classes have usually used against oppressed classes. This has been particularly evident in the oppression of women by men. How often have we been laughing on the outside and crying on the inside? And now that our consciousness is raised somewhat we neither laugh nor cry and then we watch the victim get blamed (in this case for having no sense of humour). The hatred men have for women is exposed in their so-called humour. What percentage of 'humour' exploits and degrades women? Why have racist 'jokes' practically disappeared? Did blacks laugh at minstrel shows? Men's humour tells us nothing about women but it tells us a lot about men. Humour may be one of our most important weapons in the revolution. We can use it; we are beginning to use it. In its simplest form it can be consciousness-raising for women and for men. As we develop it we will see it has an important use, not just as a defence but as an offensive and deadly weapon in open warfare. Who started this war?

A SENSE OF HUMOUR?

Your Morning Smile in the Globe and Mail has been noted for its high percentage of anti-woman jokes(?) of the He/She variety where "She" inevitably comes up with the "dumb female" remark. Somebody goofed recently. Or maybe a woman "research assistant" slipped it by her boss:

Woman in cannibal tribe: "I simply don't know what to make of my husband these days."

Second woman in tribe: "I'll send over my new recipe book."

And some Women's Liberation humour:

He: "What do you say to a little fuck?"

She: "Hello, little fuck."

From demonstration signs:

"We know when we're being screwed."

"Eve was framed."

A suffrage ditty:

"Mother takes in washing
So does sister Anne
Everybody works in our house
Save our old man."

Most limericks are anti-woman. How about this one?

"I'm coming," he shouted with glee;
"Do you think you can make it with me?"
"I've had at least four,
And I'd like to have more;
There's no way you could satisfy me."

MEN AREN'T HEALTHY FOR WOMEN AND OTHER BEINGS

FLY SWATTERS FOR SALE

From song by Bev Grant:

When I'm walking down the street
And every man I meet
Says baby ain't you sweet
I could scream
But although those guys are sick
And think only of their prick
It ain't sweet I feel
I just feel good and mean

They whistle for me like a dog
And make noises like a hog
Heaven knows they sure got
Problems I agree
But their problems I can't solve
Cuz my sanity's involved
And I'm tired of bastards
Fuckin' over me

He: "You're bitter."
She: "Have you ever wondered why?"

♀ LUV ♂

NOISES FROM ON TOP AND FROM DOWN UNDER

Show me ya luv me,
sweetheart

What are you doing?

OOOh Babeee, there!
Gush Gush Gush
I luv ya babyyy

Oh! you're hurting me

Love?

(what a mess)

I'm sorry, sweetheart

But I didn't come

ZZZZZ

Will you - - - -

Prick!

SHMUV

He: "You feminists aren't 'ladies'!". She: "Right on!, man."

THE TROUBLE WITH YOU MEN IS YOU JUST DON'T HAVE A SENSE OF HUMOUR!

And anyway -

When we're sad, could it be because we have a lot to be sad about?

ITEMS OF INTEREST

Ladies Home Journal, yes, Ladies Home Journal recently ran an article entitled "Wives Who Run Away" with the following sub-title: "nearly 30,000 women leave home every year, deserting their families to assume new identities and build new lives"! The author of this article found that one of the main reasons wives run away is because of "the untenable position in which our society has placed her". The women felt stranded in an alien world, they were alone in the house most of the time, bored, frustrated, useless. Since the early 1950's (the age the feminine mystique) the percentage of missing wives has tripled!

"Beauty Contests, yes! Women's Liberation, no!" While a beauty contest can be held at Nathan Philips Square free of charge (for as the city fathers say: it isn't political!!!?), The Toronto Abortion Campaign Committee had to pay a fee to hold its Abortion Festival May 8. Those anti-abortion people who showed up obviously don't care about life at all or they would try to improve the lives of those already living rather than defend the yet unborn.

Jeanette Lavell, an Indian woman in Toronto, challenged the patriarchal system, April 19 when she petitioned the court to change the Indian Act which states that if an Indian man marries a non-Indian woman, he can confer Indian status upon her and their offspring while an Indian woman who marries a non-Indian man can not only not confer Indian status upon him or their offspring but also loses her own Indian status. Judge B.W. Grossberg was insulting to both women and Indians in his statements telling her that throughout history women lose their status when they marry and she should be happy that she was so privileged to be able to marry a white man! When shown the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada, which recommends the very thing Jeanette is fighting for, the judge dismissed it as having been written BY WOMEN.

Six Indo-chinese women (2 from North Vietnam, 2 from South Vietnam and 2 from Laos) visited Canada the last weeks in April and met with Voice of Women and Women's Liberation, both in Vancouver and in Toronto in a series of conferences which were widely attended by Canadian and U.S. women. The main theme of this conference was ending the war in South-east Asia and unity among women.

The University of Toronto will be offering three courses on Women's Studies in the fall and York University is offering one. Many U.S. universities and colleges have been offering similar courses - an ever-increasing number. One of the courses at the U. of T. is an interdisciplinary course and will focus on Feminism in America; a history course will deal with pre-Industrial Revolution women in Europe; the third course is being offered in the sociology department.

The National Ad Hoc Action Committee on the Status of Women was able to set three generally agreed upon priorities to push for in respect to the Report of the Royal Commission: (1) Day-care , (2) abortion and (3) the addition of the word "sex" to Human Rights Codes. The women's organizations which this committee represents have been asked to send in a further list of priorities which their organizations wish to advance.

Although it comes as a surprise to many people, the word "sex" is still not in Ontario's Human Rights Code in spite of two bills before the house including it , three demonstrations demanding it and two briefs presented to government officials by Women's Coalition. The most shocking aspect of this is the fact that the model for the Ontario Code was the United Nations Declaration of Human rights in which the word "sex" appears, but it was excluded by Leslie Frost from Ontario's Code.

York University is holding a two day workshop devoted to exploring Male/Female stereotyping with emphasis on the resultant alienation and lack of meaningful relationships between the sexes. The workshop will be conducted by a MAN. (Imagine a workshop on Black/White stereotyping with emphasis on the resultant alienation and lack of meaningful relationships between the races/^{given by a white}) The analogy is less than perfect as is usual with analogies; the point is we are talking about an Oppressor Oppressed situation. To talk of the poor male imprisoned in his sex-role is more than a little analogous to talking about the oppression of the young male WASP. The waters become muddied; there is no enemy; all we need to do is hold hands and take of our clothes. BUT NOTHING IS REALLY CHANGED. Only the oppressed understand oppression. Only the oppressed can break the chains. The LIBERALS are at work again trying to de-fuse the radical, trying to absorb the alternative.

This workshop is June 12 and 13 at York Campus; there is a fee of \$65.; and everyone who can afford it will no doubt be group therapied "out of their minds", will go home having found \$65. worth of "true identity" and God's in the heaven all's right with the world!

The Man giving the course is Dan Sullivan; he has worked with R.D. Laing in England. Well, VERY INTERESTING.