The concerns of women’s liberation activists were often disparaged in the male-dominated New Left political movements as trivial, diversionary, or merely personal, and the favored information-gathering technique of consciousness raising, involving examining personal experience and feelings, was deprecated as “therapy” rather than a political tool. Carol Hanisch (born 1942), a founding member of New York Radical Women, wrote “The Personal Is Political” in 1969 to counter these views. In a later introduction to this oft-reprinted essay, Hanisch wrote, “they belittled us no end for bringing our so-called ‘personal problems’ into the public arena—especially ‘all those body issues’ like sex, appearance, and abortion,” along with demands that men share housework and childcare. After publication in Notes from the Second Year (1970), the essay’s title became an international byword, a shorthand for a key principle of radical feminism.

For this paper I want to stick pretty close to an aspect of the Left debate commonly talked about—namely “therapy” vs. “therapy and politics.” Another name for it is “personal” vs. “political” and it has other names, I suspect, as it has developed across the country. I haven’t gotten over to visit the New Orleans group yet, but I have been participating in groups in New York and Gainesville for more than a year. Both of these groups have been called “therapy” and “personal” groups by women who consider themselves “more political.” So I must speak about so-called therapy groups from my own experience.

The very word “therapy” is obviously a misnomer if carried to its logical conclusion. Therapy assumes that someone is sick and that there is a cure, e.g., a personal solution. I am greatly offended that I or any other woman is thought to need therapy in the first place. Women are messed over, not messed up! We need to change the objective conditions, not adjust to them. Therapy is adjusting to your bad personal alternative.

We have not done much trying to solve immediate personal problems of
women in the group. We’ve mostly picked topics by two methods: In a small
group it is possible for us to take turns bringing questions to the meeting (like,
Which do/did you prefer, a girl or a boy baby or no children, and why? What
happens to your relationship if your man makes more money than you? Less
than you?). Then we go around the room answering the questions from our
personal experiences. Everybody talks that way. At the end of the meeting we
try to sum up and generalize from what’s been said and make connections.

I believe at this point, and maybe for a long time to come, that these analyt-
cal sessions are a form of political action. I do not go to these sessions because
I need or want to talk about my “personal problems.” In fact, I would rather
not. As a movement woman, I’ve been pressured to be strong, selfless, other-
oriented, sacrificing, and in general pretty much in control of my own life.
To admit to the problems in my life is to be deemed weak. So I want to be a
strong woman, in movement terms, and not admit I have any real problems
that I can’t find a personal solution to (except those directly related to the
capitalist system). It is at this point a political action to tell it like it is, to say
what I really believe about my life instead of what I’ve always been told to say.

So the reason I participate in these meetings is not to solve any personal
problem. One of the first things we discover in these groups is that personal
problems are political problems. There are no personal solutions at this time.
There is only collective action for a collective solution. I went, and I continue
to go to these meetings because I have gotten a political understanding which
all my reading, all my “political discussions,” all my “political action,” all my
four-odd years in the movement never gave me. I’ve been forced to take off
the rose-colored glasses and face the awful truth about how grim my life really
is as a woman. I am getting a gut understanding of everything as opposed to
the esoteric, intellectual understandings and noblesse oblige feelings I had in
“other people’s” struggles.

This is not to deny that these sessions have at least two aspects that are
therapeutic. I prefer to call even this aspect “political therapy” as opposed to
personal therapy. The most important is getting rid of self-blame. Can you
imagine what would happen if women, blacks, and workers (my definition of
worker is anyone who has to work for a living as opposed to those who don’t.
All women are workers) would stop blaming ourselves for our sad situations?
It seems to me the whole country needs that kind of political therapy. That is
what the black movement is doing in its own way. We shall do it in ours. We
are only starting to stop blaming ourselves.

We also feel like we are thinking for ourselves for the first time in our lives.
As the cartoon in Lilith puts it, “I’m changing. My mind is growing muscles.”
Those who believe that Marx, Lenin, Engels, Mao, and Ho have the only and
last “good word” on the subject and that women have nothing more to add will, of course, find these groups a waste of time.

The groups that I have been in have also not gotten into “alternative lifestyles” or what it means to be a “liberated” woman. We came early to the conclusion that all alternatives are bad under present conditions. Whether we live with or without a man, communally or in couples or alone, are married or unmarried, live with other women, go for free love, celibacy or lesbianism, or any combination, there are only good and bad things about each bad situation. There is no “more liberated” way; there are only bad alternatives.

This is part of one of the most important theories we are beginning to articulate. We call it “the pro-woman line.” What it says basically is that women are really neat people. The bad things that are said about us as women are either myths (women are stupid), tactics women use to struggle individually (women are bitches), or are actually things that we want to carry into the new society and want men to share too (women are sensitive, emotional). Women as oppressed people act out of necessity (act dumb in the presence of men), not out of choice. Women have developed great shuffling techniques for their own survival (look pretty and giggle to get or keep a job or man) which should be used when necessary until such time as the power of unity can take its place. Women are smart not to struggle alone (as are blacks and workers). It is no worse to be in the home than in the rat race of the job world. They are both bad. Women, like blacks, workers, must stop blaming ourselves for our “failures.”

It took us some ten months to get to the point where we could articulate these things and relate them to the lives of every woman. It’s important from the standpoint of what kind of action we are going to do. When our group first started, going by majority opinion, we would have been out in the streets demonstrating against marriage, against having babies, for free love, against women who wore makeup, against housewives, for equality without recognition of biological differences, and god knows what else. Now we see all these things as what we call “personal solutionary.” Many of the actions taken by “action” groups have been along these lines. The women who did the anti-woman stuff at the Miss America Pageant were the ones who were screaming for action without theory. The members of one group want to set up a private day care center without any real analysis of what could be done to make it better for little girls, much less any analysis of how that center hastens the revolution.

That is not to say, of course, that we shouldn’t do action. There may be some very good reasons why women in the group don’t want to do anything at the moment. One reason that I often have is that this thing is so important to me
that I want to be very sure that we’re doing it the best way we know how, and that it is a “right” action that I feel sure about. I refuse to go out and “produce” for the movement. We had a lot of conflict in our New York group about whether or not to do action. When the Miss America Protest was proposed there was no question but that we wanted to do it. I think it was because we all saw how it related to our lives. We felt it was a good action. There were things wrong with the action; but the basic idea was there.

This has been my experience in groups that are accused of being “therapy” or “personal.” Perhaps certain groups may well be attempting to do therapy. Maybe the answer is not to put down the method of analyzing from personal experiences in favor of immediate action, but to figure out what can be done to make it work. Some of us started to write a handbook about this at one time and never got past the outline. We are working on it again, and hope to have it out in a month at the latest.

It’s true we all need to learn how to better draw conclusions from the experiences and feelings we talk about and how to draw all kinds of connections. Some of us haven’t done a very good job of communicating them to others.

One more thing: I think we must listen to what so-called apolitical women have to say—not so we can do a better job of organizing them but because together we are a mass movement. I think we who work full-time in the movement tend to become very narrow. What is happening now is that when non-movement women disagree with us, we assume it’s because they are “apolitical,” not because there might be something wrong with our thinking. Women have left the movement in droves. The obvious reasons are that we are tired of being sex slaves and doing shitwork for men whose hypocrisy is so blatant in their political stance of liberation for everybody (else). But there is really a lot more to it than that. I can’t quite articulate it yet. I think “apolitical” women are not in the movement for very good reasons, and as long as we say “you have to think like us and live like us to join the charmed circle,” we will fail. What I am trying to say is that there are things in the consciousness of “apolitical” women (I find them very political) that are as valid as any political consciousness we think we have. We should figure out why many women don’t want to do action. Maybe there is something wrong with the action or something wrong with why we are doing the action or maybe the analysis of why the action is necessary is not clear enough in our minds.