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ABSTRACT:

Both the philosophy and practice of individualism as developed in Western Society since the end of feudalism to present day has largely been reserved as a luxury for men at the expense of women. Equality between men was created for a large part by the equal position that all men shared over women with men having state-enforced domination within marriage. As new freedoms arose successively from the defeudalization of society, spiritual freedom, legal freedom, political freedom, economic freedom, sexual freedom, these freedoms were intended mainly for men and only much later did women attain the same freedoms that men took for granted. Only slowly did women achieve the freedoms and moral and political equality that are necessary for living as true individuals, that is as people who live for themselves first and foremost, and not solely for the collective good or for their families. Often the philosophers who espoused equality for all mankind were themselves sexist and did not believe women were meant to be equal to men and to have their interests as individuals put before the roles men had created for them. As women fought to expand the definitions of individualism and intrinsic human rights to include women, they have been handicapped by women's association with nature and reproduction, men's superior economic power, and men's physical violence and misogyny. Women have made many gains but women and minority groups still face the obstacles created by the fact that individualism is a late luxury in human development which depends on an universally equitable high material standard of living, a standard that is rarely available to all members of any modern country, however prosperous due to inequalities within society.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Today in western society each woman's rights for self-determination, autonomy and self-realization are recognized by nearly all people and are paid at least lip service by our politicians and media. However, equality between women and men remains problematic. It is the purpose of this thesis to examine how inequality between men and women helped create individualism for men in past centuries and how today sexual inequality, though diminished, still remains a persistent obstacle for many women in their attempts to be individuals in the same full sense that most men enjoy.

Individualism is tenuous for women, as women achieve it fleetingly only as they compete, cooperate, and differentiate themselves through rules largely created by men. As the federal Justice Minister Kim Campbell stated in a recent speech in November 1992, women are accepted in the upper echelons of government and business only insofar they can pretend to be ersatz men. Our cultural stereotypes of women, the structure of our language, our economy with its segregation of women into occupations that are either unpaid or unrespected, and the privacy of the nuclear family, all handicap women's ability to differentiate themselves as equals with men. Ultimately, women remain bound to their sexual status as females, defined by their biology, and prone to stigmatization, while men easily transcend their sexuality and are automatically recognized as human beings without difficulty. Equality before the law is a necessary but insufficient condition for women to achieve equality as people as they struggle against a backlog of cultural handicaps from our more patriarchal past.

Individualism (1) is the ability of people in modern society to differentiate themselves from each other and their right and ability to independently pursue their own self-development even against the needs of their own society. It is necessary that the person is recognized as separate and autonomous, independent of any links they have with others, and self-responsible. This includes the moral equality of all human beings, that a person must never be used merely as a means to another's desires. Each person becomes a subject in his or her own right, a person of equal value to anyone else.
Emile Durkheim had reservations against individualism: he rejected it as a starting point for understanding society, and thus also differentiated individualism from both utilitarianism and atomistic egoism [Giddens, 1971] but he praised it as a worthwhile goal of group and united social action:

In short, individualism thus understood is the glorification not of the self, but of the individual in general. Its motive force is not egoism but sympathy for all that is human, a wider pity for all sufferings, for all human miseries, a more ardent desire to combat and alleviate them, a great thirst for justice. [Lukes, 1969, p. 24]

Durkheim called individualism "the cult of the individual" but showed how it was separate from separate individual action, and stated "Not only is individualism distinct from anarchy; but it is henceforth the only system of beliefs which can ensure the moral unity of the country." [Lukes, 1969, p. 25] Durkheim emphasized individualism as the process of which individuals acted not as if they were alone or if only they themselves mattered, but individualism as a social process:

A verbal similarity has made it possible to believe that individualism necessarily resulted from individual, and thus egoistic, sentiments. In reality, the religion of the individual is a social institution like all known religions. It is society which assigns us this ideal as the sole common end which is today capable of providing a focus for men's wills. To remove this ideal, without putting any other in its place, is therefore to plunge us into that very moral anarchy which it is sought to avoid. [Lukes, 1969, p. 28]

The differences between men and women's experience of the development of individualism thus was not an expression of their different natures, but of the sexes relative positions within society and the division of labor. Durkheim emphasized the importance of the division of labor within the development of individualism, for individualism depended on a spontaneous division of labour in a relative meritocracy. [Durkheim, 1949, p. 377] Thus, as we explore the development of individualism for men, we shall regularly show how women were kept subordinate to men and denied full recognition as human individuals as they were confined to traditional and nonvaluable work which rarely gave an outlet for the full expression of their potential and faculties.

The whole period of history starting with the end of the Middle Ages to the twentieth century can be seen as the evolution of individualism. Feudal and religious restraints were eroded by economic development and secularization to give people freedom from coercion from their own man-made
institutions. This lack of coercion is called negative freedom. The Renaissance, the Reformation, the Enlightenment, the end of feudalism, and the Scientific Revolution, were all vital steps in removing the bounds that tradition placed on people. New social roles were created. Status became the result of achievement rather than ascription, honor and duty faded, and people's choices became dictated by their obligations to themselves rather than to others.(2)

Concepts of individualism have evolved from an initial paradigm of seeing freedom from excessive constraint being in itself a sufficient condition to visions which see some constraints on all people as necessary to help otherwise disadvantaged people overcome a lack of opportunities, poverty, and other problems caused by inequality of condition. Our definitions of freedom have expanded from Herbert Spencer's liberalism, which sees freedom as merely the state of being without experiencing direct institutionalized coercion, to a new definition, positive freedom, which includes the empowerment of the individual to overcome obstacles. Within positive freedom people receive the material means to freely act so that they can take advantage of opportunities. [Lane, p.65, 1981] As theories of individualism became more complex, so expanded the responsibilities of the collective group to the individual to ensure a chance to enter the pursuit of happiness. This has grown to become a proactive vision of individualism that includes help for the human subject to follow the unique motivations and dreams within their soul. In the eighteenth century Enlightenment theorists thought that ending restraints on human nature would be sufficient alone to bring all the good qualities of the human spirit to the fore. [Lane (in Pennock), p.383, 1983] Human beings were seen as equal in the atomic individualism of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with human beings being so equal at heart as to be nearly interchangeable in political and economic theory. [Simmel, p.67 (in Wolff) 1950] More recently in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the definition of individualism was expanded to include positive freedoms, freedoms for self-development and self-realization. [Wiltshire, p.191, 1978] These positive freedoms included the freedom to live in a meaningful fashion without the oppressive worries of poverty and violence, and the freedom to develop the sensitive inclinations that each person harbors in their heart to develop a calling, a vocation, or a hobby, for full self-expression and self-realization. Today, this individuality has become an
end in itself. The rights of individuals in western society have achieved complete superiority over the rights of the family and the community. However, the evolution of individualism was experienced much differently for women than it was for men. When the concepts of individualism have not been sex-blind and ignored women's handicaps from living in a patriarchal society, some of the elements within the development of individualism may have actually served to disadvantage women further and to entrench their status as nonindividuals. As men have become independent subjects and praised for their masculine and human qualities, women have too often been relegated as Other, the composite of undesired 'nonhuman' qualities, or have been restricted to and perceived chiefly through their role as mothers.

The rise of the new luxuries of freedoms and opportunities for self-realization and differentiation for men have rested upon the manual labor and social restrictions upon women. In Ancient Rome the concept of citizenship for the upper classes rested upon the groaning backs of the slave underclass, and still today both the work and the rewards of maintaining society are distributed unequally. Historically, the rise of equality for men was accompanied by continued and sometimes intensified restraints over women. As the ascriptive nature of traditional class boundaries faded and all men became equal before the law in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in countries such as France, the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States in western society, women remained mired in their assigned role as Other, and became excluded from involvement in politics, business, and academia. For all men to be equal, the aristocrat, the bourgeois, and the proletariat, it was perceived openly at the time, that men naturally shared a common dominance over women. As men competed in modern society women became their level playing field. The disproportionate share of manual work done by women, proletarians, and Third World workers freed (white middle class) men up to pursue other diversions. The restrictions against women's careers reserved all opportunities for men. Women were made to be and seen as frivolous and uneducated to reserve serious and important 'human' matters for men. In addition, a strong element of fear and coercion existed. The threat of rape and sexual assault, and the relative lack of economic opportunities for women, combined to ensure that each woman would need a man to protect her from men as a group. Women became defined by their link to a man, and a woman without a male protector would be vulnerable. Claric Feinman called
this the madonna/whore duality: traditionally, men see women who are protected by men as madonnas who deserve protection from the law, but women without a male protector are seen as probably evil, especially as seductive whores, who do not deserve to be protected but to be punished. [Ollenburger, p.144, 1992]

The full recognition of women as individuals may be difficult without substantially transforming society and modern culture. Our values, our language, our philosophical tradition built on the dichotomy of male/female, all may prevent women from being recognized as individuals. Despite negative freedoms, the absence of formal restraint, despite the new positive freedoms of economic opportunity, self-reliance, and independence for women, and despite the freedom of choice in consumer goods and in birth control, women frequently are identified as women more than they are as separate unique people. Women remain disproportionately identified by their sexual roles as wife and mother, and men have the freedom of always being identified as human instead of as males, fathers and lovers. Georg Simmel once said, "For the man, there is a sense in which sexuality is something he does. For the woman, it is a mode of being." [Simmel, 107, 1984] Today, culture and individualism remain primarily male, and women are admitted temporarily and have to constantly prove themselves.

Georg Simmel, a German sociologist of the late Wilhelmine period, was aware that women's primary responsibility for childrearing robbed them of opportunities that men take for granted to distinguish themselves and that science and medicine had been often used as a rationale to restrict women's entrance into higher education, [Simmel, p. 30, 1984] but he was also crucially aware that western culture itself, morally, linguistically, and logically, facilitated the rise of individualism more for men than for women. He states:

The male sex is not merely superior in relation to the female but acquires that status of the generally human, governing the phenomena of the individual male and the individual female in the same way. In various media, this fact is grounded in the power position of men. If we express the historical relationship between the sexes quite grossly as that between master and slave, then it is one of the privileges of the master that he does not always need to think about the fact that he is master. The position of the slave, on the other hand, ensures that he will never forget his status. There is no doubt that the woman loses a conscious sense of her being as a female much more rarely than holds true for the man and his being as a male. There are innumerable occasions on which the
man appears to think in a purely objective fashion without his masculinity concurrently occupying any place in his perceptions. On the other hand, it seems as if the woman never loses the feeling— which may be more or less clear or obscure— that she is a woman. This forms the subterranean ground of her life that never entirely disappears. All the contents of her life transpire on its basis. [Simmel, p. 103, 1984]

As Simmel noticed, women are seen as either part of traditional community, or as parts and additions to male individuals:

"...none of the expressions of women, none of the phenomena and objectivations of her nature, is perceived as generally human. On the contrary, in relation to the expressions of the nature of the male, which are perceived as transsexual and purely objective, they are collectively perceived as specifically female. Man lacks the orientation to a specific external entity that is given to the woman by virtue of the unity of her existence with her existence as woman. [Simmel, p. 124, 1984]

Hence men are seen as logical, abstract, cultured, and objective, while women are forced to take the role of Other and be seen as illogical, natural and subjective.

Language and our value system seems predisposed to distinguish between individual men than it does between different women:

"In general, the average man's interest in women lies in something that is roughly the same in both the seamstress and the princess... On the whole, we can describe the individual man better than the individual woman. This is not only a consequence of the fact that, because of the social predominance of the man, the entire linguistic conceptualization of our culture corresponds to the male coloration of mental processes. It is true that the genus woman is important enough to require concepts of definition. However, the universe of language has not concerned itself with the individualized characteristics of women, and the fine nuances that are essential here are just as often unavailable for the psychological description of individual women as they are for women themselves in their attempt to make themselves fully understandable to men. [Simmel, p. 125, 1984]

At the time Simmel was writing, middle-class women had left the public workplace at the end of the nineteenth century and the ideology of motherhood as the sole calling for women was well-established. Men's work could be labeled many different ways from fireman, chairman, businessman, priest, and soldier, but the only legitimate occupation for all women was housewife. Also, we have many masculinized compliments for men such as 'he's got balls,' to distinguish unusual and commendable human behaviors which are not necessarily sexual, i.e. a rescue or a bold business deal, but we never use as a compliment 'she's got tits' as anything other than a lewd suggestive sexual remark. Women can
achieve opportunities for advancement and public recognition through adopting male values and gaining entrance to the 'male sphere' of public action, but the great amount of unpaid work women did in housework and childrearing remains anti-individualistic in that the work was seen as women's natural role rising from their instinctual nurturing nature and too unimportant for men want to do themselves.

Simmel also pointed out that the few main concepts that we usually use to differentiate between women are all generic and intrinsic to women's biology or feminine role. A woman can be a mother, a wife, an old maid, a virgin maiden, a promiscuous slut, or a lover, but in all of these categories, the woman is defined by her relationship to men and by her biology (genitals) that she shares in common with all women:

"In the typically complete woman, much that is quite generic and actually impersonal becomes something completely personal... Of course there is nothing more general than erotic relationships. And whereas there are countless occasions on which the man also experiences them and treats them in this way, they seem to constitute the specifically personal fate of the woman, not a generic event that happens to her, but rather her inherently most characteristic productivity. This also holds true for her relationship to the child, both before and after its birth - this most typical of all relationships, which extends so deeply into the subhuman... This relationship, which is so completely impersonal that it is nothing more than a transitional point in the development of the species, grows out of the center in which all the energies of her nature coalesce to form her personality. [Simmel, p. 126, 1984]

Women usually get differentiated by their role as mothers and potential lovers. If the only distinction a woman who happens to have children is whether she is a 'good' mother or a 'bad mother' (often dependent on whether she stays home with the kids or not) she cannot compete for individuality against men who regardless of whether they have kids, automatically are distinct and can differentiate themselves by their opinions and by what they wish to do, and who are not perceived mainly as fathers.

In the English language there are about twenty terms to describe the sexually active man such as stud or ladies' man (both positive), but there are two hundred such terms to describe women such as tramp, whore, slut, cunt, and floozy (all negative). [Doyle, p.221, 1991] Sexual activity with women is something a man can take part in without changing his status in a community or his self-identity, but the double standard exists for women in that her primary identity remains for men as something that is
determined by her sexual history. Virtue for men is linked to bravery, strength, and honesty, but virtue for women is chastity and 'a honest woman' is a virgin. [Gilman, (1898) 1966] It is crucial to note that not only are words to describe women's sexuality are more often negative than words to describe men's sexuality, but this sexual double-standard has carried over into every day conversation and vocabulary to describe nonsexual behavior:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Masculine</th>
<th>Negative Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;He's got balls.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The company went tits up.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Fight like a man!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Throw like a girl.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Are you man or mouse?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Single-mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Prove your manhood.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Vietnam emasculated America.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sow wild oats.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The U.N. is impotent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Virile.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The commission got castrated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stud&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Slut&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masculine terms are used for approved human behavior, while feminine terms are reserved for either deviant, female, or child-like behavior. The masculine has become human, and the human has become masculine. Any deviation from this norm has to be specified: A male doctor is a doctor, a male lawyer is a lawyer, but a woman would become a female-doctor or a woman-lawyer. Even today, the successful career woman is still often limited to a few certain roles such as 'dragon lady' or the 'mother manager' [Lips, p.172].

The status of women and how or whether men perceive women as human subjects or alternately sexual objects, is too often linked to their looks and their sexual availability. As men age, their status often rises with economic success, while women may endure substantial stigmatization as they age, and many of women's jobs such as those in the service sector, i.e. secretary and bank teller, are often dependent on their looks. Women are uniquely stigmatized in a fashion that is completely unique to their status as women, and is different from stereotyping due to class or race. The proper role for femininity as defined by men is something that a woman is not, rather than any discrete or concrete quality. A man can never be too
strong, too brave, too career-oriented, and too virile. In contrast, a woman has to avoid being in the literal sense, and to avoid being too much of any quality. A woman is told to avoid being frigid and to avoid being a slut, to avoid being fat and to avoid being flat-chested, to avoid being assertive and to avoid being clingy, to avoid being bitchy and to avoid being mousy, to avoid being ugly but to also avoid being too beautiful or else she won't be taken seriously or will risk rape. To use existentialist terminology, women's approved being is nothingness. Unfortunately, society's standards and expectations for men are impossible for women as a whole to attain, and one woman temporarily meeting the ideal may make other women appear more deviant. (4)

As we have seen from the classic Broverman study, psychologists and people in general see approved human qualities of creativity, courage, honesty, and assertiveness as approved masculine qualities. Approved feminine traits, however, are completely opposite to the traits of a mature emotionally healthy adult [Ruth, 1990, p.128]. Women are Other in our society, and are assigned all the negative non-masculine qualities. Broverman states "Should a woman change toward being a healthy adult, she becomes sick as a woman. If she is a healthy woman, she is sick as a person." [Schur, 1984, p. 209] This polarization is gradually fading and this generation of women have opportunities that their grandmothers did not have. However, individualism for women is not achieved to the full extent that men have today, and we can only guess at the possible benefits for both men and women that if women today did not have to struggle against stigmatization, job segregation, and marginalization.

The recognition of a person as a free, empowered, unique, self-oriented, responsible, creative, individual with unique personal achievements, depends upon both society's reaction and labeling and that human being's own constant efforts. The individual must be recognized as distinct and autonomous by other people as well as by his or her self. In addition, the person must be free and uncoerced in the actions of their daily lives and able to take advantages of opportunities for self-improvement to follow their own unique inclinations. Each human being needs the means to secure themselves from fear, torment, hunger and anxiety, in accordance with Abram Maslow's theory of hierarchy of needs, before they can achieve their highest forms of self-development. We now call such needs human rights and see them fit for
universal application for all human beings. Negative freedom, that is freedom from restraint or what Karl Marx might call 'bourgeois freedom,' is a necessary but insufficient condition for individualism. In addition to 'freedom from,' the individual needs the positive freedoms of 'freedom to' and 'freedom for.' A person who has talent and the inclination to develop that skill, needs to do so to become a self-actualized individual. A painter has to paint, a fish has to swim, a musician has to play. To allow material conditions, such as relative property, to prevent people from developing their unique talents, is to deny them their full potential as individuals. Liberal theory failed to recognize that true equality of opportunity depends on relative equality of condition. In the pursuit of happiness, some people start on the finish line while others start far back and handicapped with poverty or physical disadvantages.

Individualism cannot be given from one person to another but it can be taken away. Coercion, a denial of freedom, poverty, stigmatization, and racial, class, or sexist stereotypes to force other people into preconceived roles, all threaten to hurt or dehumanize relationships between people. However, individualism is an active condition, a person has to keep trying for better self-realization and to yield the fullest self-expression of their own unique emotions and nature. Today, women still face more restraints than men. Women bear the brunt of laws restricting human sexuality, such as limitations on birth control and abortion, and as well bear the greater burden from the demands of the fashion industry which tells them to lose weight and to look young and beautiful. Every woman has Cooley's 'Looking Glass Self' as she is forced to see herself as others might see her and is forced to internalize male standards of womanhood in order to succeed. | Brehm, 1989, p.86 | Also, the segregation of women into narrow roles by being treated as chiefly wife, mother, or sex object, and segregated into lower-paying manual work without control over the work, are daily invisible restrictions on many women's' full potential.(5) Traditional roles for women, though they may be satisfying for some woman, nearly always restrict women's involvement in the public sphere and limit them to carrying for family members with a much smaller social circle.

The status of women relative to men cannot be divorced from the concept of individualism. Sexual inequality may have helped initiate individualism. Equality within the sexes built on men's
subordination of women, helped men seize new opportunities as they became available and to distinguish themselves as fully human individuals separate from women. Today, it is the inequality between the sexes that maintains women's greater burden in our society, and places more limits on women's self-expression and self-realization than men. Women also remain more vulnerable than men to having their individuality, opportunities, or public recognition as morally equal human beings, yanked away. Women need economic independence by having their work publicly and directly rewarded. In periods of history in which women's work lost economic value relative to the work of men, no matter how women's position might be glossed over as domestic bliss, women faced increased vulnerability and misogyny.

If women are not equal to men, with equal freedom to freely enter social roles and to advance their careers, then women have less freedom and more vulnerability to stigmatization. Women as a category are disproportionately vulnerable to both violence, poverty, and enforced dependence. As Edwin Schur (1984) stated, it is the most vulnerable groups in any society which are prone to being stigmatized and robbed of individuality. As long as women are vulnerable, they will be dependent on the grace or mercy of male guardians. As long as they are dependent on the grace of individual men, women will be forced to endure unrealistic expectations of 'femininity', vulnerable to violence, quick to be labeled deviant, and treated by men primarily in regards to their sexuality and biology and seen as human only secondarily. The absence of formal and legal restrictions, this attainment of negative freedom, does not necessarily allow women to realize themselves as individuals. Rather the culmination of the feminist emancipatory project involves the synthesis of materialist and idealist freedoms for women attained through the relative equality of the sexes and maintained through vigorous and voluntary participation by women in all aspects of modern life.

Any discussion of an "emancipatory project" would seem to reject structural-functionalist thinking and would lead to conflict theory, yet such a direction would not necessarily be Marxist. The social thought on individualism covers a wide swath of meaning, definitions, and interpretations, and delineations have to be made and parameters set for this analysis. The reader may wish to turn to the Appendix at the end to re-acquaint themselves with the conventional meaning of the term. The normal
use of individualism assumes private property and the powers of the free market, and so hence, the Marxist definition is incompatible with this analysis. Marx states in the *German Ideology*:

> In history up to the present it is certainly an empirical fact that separate individuals have, with the broadening of their activity into world-historical activity, become more and more enslaved under a power alien to them, a power which has become more and more enormous and, in the last instance, turns out to be the world market. But it is just as empirically established that, by the overthrow of the existing state of society by the communist revolution and the abolition of private property which is identical with it, this power, which so baffles the German theoreticians, will be dissolved; and that then the liberation of each single individual will be accomplished in the measure in which history becomes transformed into world history. [Tucker, 1978, (1846) p. 163]

Marxists thus see private property and the division of labor as both oppressive and mutually incompatible with individualism. However, individualism was well developed as a social philosophy long before Marx's time, and all conventional variants value private property. Today, we have seen from the examples of countries which had professed Marxism that the abolition of private property only reduces personal freedom and autonomy, strengthening the case for the conventional definition of individualism as defined by the Encyclopedia Brittanica. Marx's conception of freedom as given in the third volume of *Capital* is rather unobtainable:

> the realm of freedom actually begins only where labour which is determined by necessity and mundane considerations ceases; thus in the very nature of things it lies beyond the sphere of actual material production.... Beyond it begins that development of human energy which is an end in itself, the true realms of freedom..." [Pearce, 1989, p. 168]

All societies will always have to have labor for mundane considerations, from the elimination of noxious wastes to policing, unpleasant tasks will always have to be accomplished. Marx derided liberalism as merely 'bourgeois freedom,' but Marx's own idea of freedom is unrealistic and unobtainable. As freedom is the foundation of individualism, as Marx's definition of freedom is problematic, so too would be the Marxian conception of individualism.

Emile Durkheim, who was neither an utopian socialist, an Anarchist, nor a Marxist, saw tremendous potential in the future development of individualism in society as long as there remained some checks and balances, and common sense restrictions to prevent some people from using their freedoms to take freedoms away from other people. Durkheim saw the way to a contented and free social peace (as
opposed to stability bought by coercion) through a mixture of freedom guided by secular moral regulation. Moral discipline would have to be maintained to control human's limitless appetites for acquisition and pleasure. [ Mestrovic. 1988, p.130 ] Unlike Marx, Durkheim was more in accord with both reality and convention when he stressed the freedoms that would be necessary for individualism and the modern emancipatory project:

This individual liberty which is so dear to us supposed not only the faculty to go about as we please; it implies the existence of a circle of things which we may dispose of as we will. Individualism would only be a word if we did not have a material sphere of action in which we exercise a sort of sovereignty. When one says that individual property is a sacred thing, one only states in symbolic form an indubitable moral axiom; for individual property is the material condition of the cult of the individual. [ LaCapra, 1972, p.234 ]

Thus private property was not the scourge of individualism, but its companion. Throughout the analysis of this paper in the later chapters the control of private property within marriage shall be firmly explored, to reveal how women historically have often lacked personal control of property within marriage and so were denied recognition as persons as well as voting rights. Durkheim did share with Marx a keen interest in the division of labor, and like Marx, opposed any rigid division of labor. However, but where Marx wished it possible to end the division of labor completely so that a person could have many jobs in one day, Durkheim saw how the division of labor, if arrived upon equitably, would serve as both the glue for modern society and to facilitate individualism as well:

Inversely, we may say that the division of labor produces solidarity only of it is spontaneous and in proportion as it is spontaneous. But by spontaneity we must understand not simply the absence of all express violence, but also of everything that can even indirectly shackle the free unfolding of the social force that each carries in himself. It supposes not only that individuals are not relegated to determinate functions by force, but also that no obstacle, of whatever nature, prevents them from occupying the place in the social framework which is compatible with their faculties. In short, labor is divided spontaneously only if society is constituted in such a way that social inequalities exactly express natural inequalities. [ Durkheim, 1949, p. 377 ]

Thus for women to be considered individuals in the same sense that men are, we can put together the following conditions: 1) Women must be free from violence directed towards them as women, that is misogyny and sexual harassment. 2) The division of labour in the work place must not follow gender lines, neither should little girls be socialized for certain occupations nor women be kept in lower paid and
less responsible positions. 3) Women must have the same opportunities as men to find work and outlets suitable for their talents. If these three conditions are met there would be greater individualistic social cohesion, and there would probably be profound changes in society as upper level positions of responsibility would no longer be masculinized, in that as Simmel once pointed out, in modern society success is masculine and failure is feminine. [Simmel, 1984] Unfortunately, despite substantial improvements, serious gender inequalities in western society still exist.

The question then, is how did we get to this present state of affairs of fading sexual polarization but strong indirect discrimination and stigmatization of women? This thesis starts with an examination of the social changes within the Middle Ages and moves to how the rigid and feudal society evolved into today's individualistic culture. Individualism is not the legal declaration of women's equality with men and so we cannot just look upon history as the independent evolution of ideas from the Middle Ages to present day. Rather individualism is the fusion of ideology and practice for a transformation of every moment of everyday life. Women struggled for full recognition as equal human beings, and without that struggle they would never have attained the legal human rights we now take for granted.

---

Notes

1) In this thesis, the word 'individuality' would quickly become overused because it has several definitions, many of which have expanded over time. However, whenever possible, I shall try to make my argument specific, and refer directly to the component of individuality that is referred to, autonomy and independence, self-responsibility, moral equality, individuation, and opportunity for self-realization through new experiences, gathering new skills and productive work. However, the word individuality is used frequently by my sources, and my use of it is often unavoidable. Whenever my meaning may be ambiguous, it will be useful to know that I intend to keep to the literal meaning as defined by the Encyclopedia Britannica Micropedia. The article from the Micropedia is printed in full in the Appendix.

2) The rise of the modern state brought new obligations, such as conscription, and later government regulation of business and the environment. Only in peacetime is the democratic state a firm ally of individualism.

3) It seems more than a coincidence that mass-suffrage for men were achieved in eras of intensifying sexism in France, the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. The dominant ideologies in all those countries at the time of male mass suffrage were openly sexist and generally banned women from the public sphere because they were 'irrational' or 'too pure'.

4) For example, if all women lost weight to appease fashion's unrealistic demands, probably the same proportion of women would be seen as too fat or too thin as before. For one woman to manage to conform
to the feminine ideal, it makes other women appear more deviant. Not all women can be the Cosmopolitan magazine superwoman who has a good career, wonderful hair, a fantastic sex life, and an anorexic body with large cleavage.

5) The stay-at-home nonworking mother is an idyllic image which many people think is the desirable method of raising children. However, a woman usually loses her identity upon marriage in regard to her credit rating, her last name, and her medical insurance plan. [Vuuren, 1973, p.160] and both the working and stay-at-home wife often subsidize their husbands' career and leisure self-development by working more hours a week than they do. [Wilson, 1991, p. 55]

6) Independence seems to be a necessary condition for individualism. This is not to say facetiously that dependents such as the physically handicapped, the elderly, and children, are not people, but to recognize that bargaining power in any relationship is a necessary to ensure being treated with respect. A woman who is financially independent has much greater protection from ending up in a continual cycle of violence or verbal abuse from her husband, than a woman who tries to rely solely on the powers of the law. In addition, work increases the sense of self-worth a person feels, and leads to greater social opportunities. As Georg Simmel stated in On Individuality and Social Forms "Individuality in being and action generally increases to the degree that the social circle encompassing the individual expands." [Simmel, 1971, p. 252]
Chapter Two: The Medieval Foundation of Modern Life

In the European Middle Ages individualism did not exist for either men or women, that is people were recognized and evaluated primarily by their links with other people than for their own unique natures. Society was organized in a manner that was seen to be God-ordained or at least ordered for the benefit of the collective whole. The material standard of living was low, and individualism was a luxury that few could afford. Few people had the opportunity for self-development by being able to secure an education, to move to where they wished to live, to work at the occupation they wished, to have freedom of conscience and religious expression, and to marry whoever they liked with little regard for material and familial considerations. Peasants by definition, [Macfarlane, 1978] were directly dependent on both their family members and their family's land tenure. Peasant society was organized collectively, with all the younger family members needing approval from the head of their family and perhaps the local landlord and aristocrat for being able to marry. The whole of society was based on ascription, with the place in the Divine Order being relegated through one's birth. On the whole, though there were periods of massive social change throughout the Middle Ages, there remained little opportunity for self-expression except through orthodox religious devotion, and each person remained subservient to the bonds of Church, caste, and family.

In a society based on ascription in which one's social position was determined by their birth, the conditions regarding a birth were the most important determinants of a person's life. Anyone born a bastard faced considerable social stigma, and conversely, one of the best compliments a person could receive was that they came "from good breeding," that is from within a proper marriage between upper caste partners. In a society in which people's survival depended on their ties and hereditary rights, a bastard risked becoming a marginalized outcast because they lacked hereditary rights. In France an unmarried noblewoman who gave birth was automatically disinherited, and in England widows who had a bastard could lose their dowry, and their children would have no land rights to live as a tenant or peasant. [Shahar, p.118, 1983] In addition, the Roman Catholic Church saw bastards as the embodiment of carnal sin and bastards would have to receive a special dispensation before they themselves could enter the
Church. [ Shahar, p.113, 1983 ] In addition to legitimacy, the race, caste, and religion of one’s parents could permanently cripple a child’s life chances. All children born to Jewish parents would also grow up to be aliens in their own land. Jews were often forcibly excluded from areas, including the entire nation of England at one point. Jewish people were not protected by Christian law. [ Painter, p.237, 1958 ] Jews were forbidden to own land, and barred from some professions like being an apothecary. A person was expected to fulfill the destiny of the caste into which they were born, which could be pleasant for some of the aristocrats, but the converse held true, that those who were born to marginalized or stigmatized persons, would also be expected to remain as outcasts.

Order and continuity were the purposes of the feudal structure, and the way this was accomplished was by limiting a person’s opportunities to those of their ancestors and their caste.

"Statues regulating the crafts in German cities show ample proof of the concept of a degrading profession affecting a person’s descendants. Where guild statues specified the registration of 'worthy birth' as a prerequisite to the acquisition of corporate rights and privileges, they excluded not only persons born out of wedlock or of unfree parentage but also the offspring of persons in certain professional categories. The long list includes executioners, jailers, executioners' assistants and lesser law enforcement officials, gravediggers, butchers, custodians of public baths, barbers, prostitutes and their protectors, musicians, acrobats or buffoons, canvas weavers, fullers, and shepherds." [ Goff, p.362 ]

As the Middle Ages progressed, the feudal restrictions on serfs and villeins in Western Europe gradually declined, but the spirit of the law continued to reflect the birth status of the people concerned and their hereditary obligations and rights. Serfdom was not formally abolished until 1789 in France, 1861 in Russia, and 1918 in Hungary. Serfdom may have disappeared in practice relatively early in England and Scandinavia, though the legal distinctions of the aristocracy remained. [ Macfarlane, 1978 ]

It is essential to understand that the feudal bonds of the Middle Ages were both restrictive and also facilitated survival. Money was too scarce to be used in most transactions up to the end of the eleventh century in Europe. [ Painter, p.95, 1958 ] This meant that nearly all transactions had to be paid in kind, not cash, until about the twelfth century. The peasant paid taxes to his lord through a proportion of necessities such as grain, meat, firewood, and his own unpaid labour to work on the aristocrat's own
estates. The feudal lord had to be self-sufficient, and generally lived on only the products of his own barony until the later Middle Ages when trade routes reopened. Transportation was difficult, roads either dusty or flooded, and merchants were attacked by robbers or, alternately, the local baron. All food had to be grown locally in each feudal fief. Until the rise of commerce in the 1100s, every person had to have a direct connection to the feudal hierarchy as either a peasant farmer or a landlord, in order to survive. All legitimate children to serfs belonged to the barony which both owned them and guaranteed them the means of subsistence. Landless knights sought to win land through marriage, battle, or jousting, and landless men from the other castes were outcasts, thieves, mercenaries, or itinerant monks. Once trade and a monetary economy opened up, greater occupational specialization was made possible and the feudal class polarization of priest/knight/peasant began to die. Feudalization only ended once people such as successful merchants and farmers, could buy land outright for themselves, and not have to win it through battle for their lords, by marriage, or by a grant from their king. In effect, money was to open the door leading out of the Middle Ages.

Most people in the Middle Ages were peasants, and their life was generally difficult and fixed into misery by the feudal structure. Some peasants were freemen, but most were serfs who were the chattel and property of their lords, or villeins, who had slightly better legal rights. The lot of a serf was better than that of a landless man without a bond to the feudal structure, however. A serf who was born into a village as an adult had the right to gather firewood, to fish, and to pasture his animals in the common land held by the lord. But ultimately a serf owned nothing and was nothing. Serfs had little incentive to work harder than they needed to for survival and to pay their tithes, because they were subject to the tax called "tallage" that allowed a baron to raise a serf's taxes as high as he wanted to confiscate anything valuable. 

Painters, p.100 ] Lords also had a monopoly over the industrial use of water for mills as well as a monopoly on bake ovens. [ Le Goff, p.125, 1990 ] The only restraint on a lord's taxes was that he would gain nothing if he taxed his serfs to death. A serf could not leave the barony or marry without permission from his lord. Women serfs did have geographic mobility that men did not have, [ Labarge, p.167, 1986 ] but they were subject to the infamous "droit du seigneur," that is a French baron had the legal right to
sleep with and rape the bride before her wedding day. Serfs were always at mercy of their brutal lords, and most barons and knights needed now legal right to rape any peasant women they wished. [Painter, p.102]

In the feudal hierarchy, a person had rights of protection only from those of their own class and below, but not from their own lords. The only option for safety for women from male brutality or alternately a long series of pregnancies, was to enter the Catholic Church and becoming a nun, cloistered from the outside world.

To restrict competition and to lobby for political power within the new towns, merchant and craft guilds were set up by traders and craftsmen. Guilds regulated the quality of the goods produced, set the prices, and limited entry into the profession by setting rules for the length of apprenticeship. At first in the High Middle Ages, entry into the guilds was relatively easy, and any free man could become a master after an apprenticeship. As the Middle Ages lengthened and the power of the guilds grew, the guilds set much stronger limits upon entry. [Painter, p.230, 1958]

Guilds had the absolute monopoly of production of that particular good or service in that town, and could ban a craftsmen outright if he or she took in too many apprentices, sold goods too cheaply, worked too hard, or innovated on production techniques. [Painter, p.231]

The guilds gradually made a stranglehold on production, and restricted entrepreneurship and experimentation. Guild secrets were called mysteries, and guild masters could neither reveal them, or improve on them. Eventually the opportunity of becoming a guild master became limited to sons and son-in-laws of guild families. [Painter, p.230]

In the Middle Ages, a person's life chances were fixed and set by the conditions of their birth, their parent's profession, and by the Roman Catholic Church. People in this era in general should not be thought of as individuals. Autonomous individuals starved. Each person needed a link to belong to the land (like a serf), or to belong to a family, church, or guild. People who had individual consciences risked being murdered by the Inquisition as a heretic or a pagan, or being placed under the Church's Interdict, which would restrict other people from dealing with them. The Roman Catholic Church was not entirely monolithic and all powerful in the Middle Ages, but it was hegemonic in that it was the source of all legitimate ethical and moral authority and discourse. The vast majority of the people could not participate
in this discourse or make any impression on the Church, however. The Roman Catholic Church carefully kept the scriptures in their original Greek and Latin and out of the vulgar common languages. Many local priests might also be relatively uneducated and uninformed of the total content of the scriptures. Books were scarce, and literacy uncommon among both peasants and nobleman. Interestingly, until the later Middle Ages, women were more often literate than their husbands, as book learning was seen as effeminate. [Bridenthal, 1987] Peasants had completely no say in the religion that was pushed on them, and in actual fact, many peasants had their connection to the Church through superstitious awe for magical rites and the miracles of the Saints. [Le Goff, p.133, 1990] Peasants prayed and sacrificed to the saints for a good harvest without having read any church doctrine or understanding the true cause and effect of agricultural production. Most people's lives were shrouded in a religious and magical aura: Disease and famine was seen as God's will, and people did not or could not understand the actual processes of nutrition, sanitation, epidemiology in their own lives. God's will was manifested in the world around them. Innocence or guilt was proved often by trial by ordeal, such as fire or water, or by fighting a duel, in which God blessed the winner. [Labarge, p.205, 1986] If a person got sick or became poor, it was God's will, and people consciously denied cause and effect as coming from both their own actions and nature, (including natural laws and germs) and worshipped a God who was solely responsible for the feudal order. This denial of the power of human agency was to linger into the 18th century's Counter-Enlightenment's arguments of Louis De Bonald. [Bottomore, p.90 1978]

Three key features of the Middle Ages must be noted for both women and individualism: 1) In the Middle Ages neither men nor women were free, and feudal society was built upon ascription, tradition, obligation, and duty rather than on intrinsic individual rights. Neither equality nor liberty was seen as desirable. 2) There was considerable sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny latent within the Middle Ages. There was sexism from the theology of Roman Catholic Church. There was misogyny from superior male physical force which was important in the violent society. The agricultural economy and system of property ownership gave the male head of the family sole control over all other family members on the landholding. There was strong patriarchal power and familial obligations which kept children, wives, and
women in particular under the control of their fathers or husbands. However, the Catholic Church implemented incest restrictions and made mutual consent necessary for marriage which prevented a true and complete patriarchal society from emerging as children could not be legally forced into marriages (or incest) against their will by their fathers. 3) The work of both men and women were indispensable and necessary for survival. Women worked hard in agricultural production, and were especially crucial in healing, midwifery, and cloth production. This economic interdependence between men and women generally managed to keep the forces of misogyny and sexism at bay. A male merchant needed a literate and level-headed wife to manage his business accounts and a male craftsmen and guild master needed a wife who could manage the apprentices and join him in the skilled work. [Bridenthal, 1987] A nobleman needed a strong-willed wife to manage his estates while he was gone out to win the king's favor or to win more estates in politics or warfare. [Labarge, p.19, 1986]

In the early Middle Ages, unmarried women appear to have been scarce relative to unmarried men. [Guttentag, 1983] Women often died early in childbirth and until the Roman Catholic Church successfully enforced monogamy, rich men could keep concubines and many wives, making the remaining women even more valuable to the greater pool of unmarried men. For most of Europe in the early Middle Ages, tribal German law was in place and the concept of dowry in place involved the groom giving gifts to the bride which ensured women a significant measure of economic independence and thus bargaining power within marriage. However, it appears that life expectancies for women in the later Middle Ages lengthened so that women on the average lived longer than men, perhaps due to urbanization and better nutrition. A massive social change in regards for gender relations occurred in the high Middle Ages as the status of women fell. Starting in the mid twelfth century the Roman form of dowry re-emerged to spread all over Europe, a form of dowry in which the bride's family paid the groom to take the woman, turning weddings into a financial transaction between men as women were transferred from the authority of one man to another. The ages for women at first marriage dropped, and the age for men at first marriage rose. [Bridenthal, 1987, p.162] & [Guttentag, 1983] This increased mating gradient led to further dowry inflation and a strongly reduced bargaining power of women within marriage as young women married
much older, stronger, and experienced men. Women lost the measure of economic independence within marriage that they once had, and a married woman was expected to mold herself completely to the will of her husband, however brutal.

The increased mating gradient and the change that men would now have to be paid to enter marriage both facilitated misogyny. Women were expected to be virginal at marriage while men were informally allowed to be sexually active. [O'Faolain, p.137, 1973] Men could fulfill their desires through prostitution, rape, seduction and coercion. Men could thus freely chose from a relatively large pool of unmarried women and could afford to be disdainful, picky, and misogynist without rebuke. Younger women lost their bargaining power within relationships, something demographer Marcia Guttentag called 'dyadic power' in her book Too Many Women? Older women also lost their status as a large pool of widows and elderly single women were created without having the same property rights and economic opportunities as men did, and thus became vulnerable to stigmatization, scorn, misogyny, and poverty. The return to the patriarchal Roman dowry system was accompanied by changes in property law restricting women's rights to control property and in Church laws restricting nun's involvement in the world outside their abbeys as nuns were forced to become cloistered. Women became seen to be expendable, which was reflected in the Roman Catholic Church's Inquisition. The Inquisition started in the thirteenth century and peaked in the sixteenth century, as an exercise of power of the new emerging and male-only church bureaucracy. About eighty-five percent of the Inquisition's victims were women. [Vuuren, 1973] Women who did not have a male guardian, those which were independent without male guardians, who were conspicuously competent midwives, or those who were mad or mentally retarded, were especially vulnerable to being stigmatized and labeled witches. The Inquisition declared that women were all more susceptible to evil than men, because women had insatiable carnal lust and because Eve was formed from a bent rib. [O'Faolain, p.209, 1973] & [Vuuren, 1973] As the Church grew in coercive strength and organizational complexity, because the church was exclusively male, this homosociality allowed misogyny to develop without any check or balance.
Christianity has never eliminated its philosophical roots in Jewish and Hebrew tradition. Judaism was never individualistic. The Christian Old Testament which was based on the earliest Hebrew writings the Torah, dictated that the Hebrews were a special race chosen by God. Judaism emphasized proper and rigid familial and sexual roles and stability over individual rights. Men and not women were to be educated and allowed to read the Talmud. Rape victims and rapists would be forced to marry to prevent a father from having his daughter ruined for marriage. The rights of the father came first in general, and the rights and obligations of the family surmounted any individual rights. An orthodox Jew had to place familial and religious obligations before individual self-development. [Guttentag, 1983] According to the Ten Commandments, God being a jealous and vengeful God, would punish the children and grandchildren of those that had incurred His wrath. However, these elements were de-emphasized as Christianity evolved separately from Judaism and Christianity did not incorporate the later holy books called the Talmud. However, strong anti-individualistic elements from Judaism would remain and be strengthened within Christianity. The Doctrine of the Original Sin, based on the Genesis story of the Garden of Eden, would remain an albatross around Christianity's neck: Belief in the Original Sin has two implications for individualism. The first is that women were more susceptible to sin than men and were meant to atone for their collective sin as women by giving birth in pain. The second implication being that all of humanity had "fallen" from its previous high state (of moral ignorance no less) and needed the strong authority of God to restrain, bind, control, and restrict evil human nature and that human's perception of morality should be replaced with what had been ordained by God and laid down in the Bible. Human beings were to distrust their own experiences and reasoning because God worked in mysterious ways and human being's sole purpose was to be an uncritical vessel of God's will which would remain incomprehensible to individual human minds.

Christianity runs afoul for women for it teaches women to practice self-denial according to rules made by and judged by men. Virtue and chastity are forever intertwined, and because women bear children, the fall from grace for women is much more visible for women than for men. A man can confess adultery and be forgiven, but once a woman sins, it seems to be remembered forever by the community.
The possibility of having an illegitimate child, and being permanently stigmatized for it, becomes extended to that if a woman lets her chastity slip once, even if an illegitimate child does not result, it is remembered forever. Men insisted on having virgins for wives because of the assumption that if a woman was not chaste before marriage, she would not be chaste during marriage and would commit adultery, and the paternity of the children would be confused. The whole legal history of Greek, Hebrew, and Roman eras, as well as medieval Europe can be re-read as men trying to control paternity and to enforce their idea of virtue for women, onto women. The double-standard for adultery was noteworthy all through these periods. Jesus, according to the New Testament, tried to end the practice of only the woman being punished for adultery, but according to the laws and social customs of these eras, the double-standard remained. Honor for a woman depended on her chastity, and honor for a man depended on his wife's and daughter's chastity.

Jesus espoused and supported the traditional familial structure of Jewish society, as he condemned divorce and sexual freedom, but he preached spiritual equality between men and women as well as ending the sexual double standard. Unfortunately, as Christianity progressed and became an institution, it took on a greater hierarchical structure and began to embody the full extent of the sexism of its times. The Apostle Paul or his disciple Timothy, laid what was to become the foundation for Christianity's sexism:

"Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or have authority over men; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty. ( 1 Timothy 2:11-15)

The doctrine of the Original Sin became the foundation of misogyny. Men were to be seen as individuals, that they could largely be defined by what they did, but woman, that is all women, had to be reminded that they were to blame for man's fall from paradise. In medieval Christian theology, stretching even through the Reformation as we shall see later, women were equated with Eve, and seen as the sinful cause for men's suffering. Women could only redeem themselves through their humble obedience to men, and in Catholicism, perpetual virginity was seen as even better. Sexual intercourse was seen as the mechanism
which transferred the curse of the Original Sin from generation to generation, and sex would forever in Roman Catholicism be seen as something dirty and sinful. St. Jerome described a woman who is chaste as somewhat blessed and redeemed, but only the female virgin as fully redeemed. Later church fathers continued this tradition. Tertulian (160-230) fought against women's role in teaching, coined the term in calling women 'the devil's gateway,' and blamed women for causing the mortality of all of mankind and the eventual death of Christ. [Carmody, p. 171] Tertullian saw all women as modern Eves worthy of enslavement:

"In pain shall you bring forth children, woman, and you shall turn to your husband and he shall rule over you. And do you not know that you are Eve? God's sentence hangs still over all your sex and His punishment weighs down upon you. You are the devil's gateway; you are she who first violated the forbidden tree and broke the law of God. It was you who coaxed your way around him whom the devil had not the force to attack. With what ease you shattered that image of God: man! Because of the death you merited, the Son of God had to die." [O'Faolain, 1973, p. 132]

St. Augustine (354-430) in his treatise used mental gymnastics to explain how men and women could have spiritual equality in Christ without altering women's intrinsic inequality. Augustine declared that man and woman together were the image of God, but man alone without woman was also the image of God, but a woman alone was incomplete.

"Augustine even states that woman in herself does not possess the image of God because she is the image of the body. She possesses the image of God only when taken together with the male, who is her head, whereas the male possesses the image of God without regard to his relation to the woman. Thus we see clearly in Augustine the theological anthropology that makes the male the image of normative humanity and woman the 'other' in the sense of the lower and incomplete." [Sharma, p. 218, 1987]

This quote embodies the thrust of my overall argument. In the peculiar development of individualism, men are seen as whole and complete in themselves, in Christian doctrine, in traditional laws and morality, and as the rational economic man of classical liberal economic theory. Women however, are seen as incomplete in themselves and are defined in relationship to men. Women are seen as negation, what man is not or should not be. Men and women may have achieved equality in Christ in Christianity, and then legal equality in the early twentieth century, but women still are not seen as immediately human. Women would remain women first, and human second.
The rise of learning in the late Middle Ages did not benefit women in the development of Church
theology. The new universities which started to be founded starting in the thirteenth century excluded
women, and men discussed women only as subject matter. The new interest in Greek ideas, brought new
misogynist ideas into Christian philosophy. The medieval theologian Thomas Aquinas adopted
Aristotelian biology, which declared that the identity (genetics) of the human species comes solely from
the male semen, and women are only produced when conception goes wrong and a defective baby is born.
[ Sharma, p. 218 ] By nature, Aquinas and his contemporaries declared, women are to be submissive to
and dependent on men. We cannot separate the development of theology from the obsession of men in
determining paternity. Men wanted to assert that their child was theirs, that is that they were the father,
and what is more, in carrying out the full development of the implications of ownership, that the child was
their sole creation, that the woman only nurtured the fetus. Again, women would be denied by this
philosophy, recognition as human, and instead would be defined as 'other.' The conception of sexuality in
the medieval Roman Catholic era was completely disadvantageous to women. Women were defined by
their sexuality at the same time their contribution to reproducing the human race was denigrated and they
were continually reminded that giving birth in pain was their punishment for Eve's transgression.
Labeling women a separate species to be herded like cattle would not have been a big step. The monks
were paranoid in their fear of women's sexuality, and saw women as a danger to be avoided, one monk in
the twelfth century calling women bags of filth covered by a deceptively beautiful skin. [ O'Faolain, p. xii,
1973 ] Women would not be allowed to forget that they were women, that they were guilty of creating sin
and that they would have to be punished and controlled.

As the Middle Ages progressed, the status of women, their opportunities for careers and most
importantly their recognition as legal persons, as able to bring cases to court and to own and distribute
property, steadily fell. This may or may not have been the inevitable consequence of the increase of
organization and technology, and subsequent increased abilities of social control of the growing
institutions of church and state which were staffed at the highest levels exclusively by men, bringing out
the latent misogyny of a society. As long as organization was problematic, and the level of technology
close to a subsistence level, it mattered little that the popes and kings were all men, because life everywhere depended on both the manual work and often leadership of women. But as women were excluded from new technologies and excluded from the growing organizations, this ended the system of checks and balances, and important men could now make decisions between themselves and view women as an abstract and negative category of Other.

There were many indications that the status of women began to seriously deteriorate starting in the late 12th century. Abbeys, which had been the educational centers for the whole community, were forbidden to educate men or to take part in secular educational affairs and community leadership. [Vuuren, p.36, 1973] The new universities of the 13th and subsequent centuries were reserved for men. [Bridenthal, p. 166] When an institution is reserved for only one group there is no representative of the exploited group present to defend their sex or race from being treated as a merely subhuman category in a lofty theory. Also, the males in the institution are accustomed to discussing serious matters only with each other, only seeing each other as human, and so will only interact with women when they need something from them not as individuals, but as women, i.e. their sexuality. This homosociality reinforced men's control over both formal social institutions and informal networks, culture and language. [Chafetz, p.77] The rise of bureaucracies in the Middle Ages eroded the powers of noble women and abbesses. The bureaucracies of the state as manned by men, reduced to extinction the administrative role played by noble women, queens, and abbesses. [Labarge, p.44] The two growing institutions were the Roman Catholic Church and the state, and women were explicitly denied the chance to be officials in either organization.

As the feudal hierarchy became more detailed, women's status fell correspondingly. The effect is causal, not a mere correlation. As the times grew less tumultuous, feudal government became formalized and subject to greater delineations of power and subordination at exactly the same time as the family structure homogenized. If a male serf was subject to his overlord, his wife was subject to him. The stability of any hierarchical system depends on people in the middle, that is people who are to be ruled and ordered to do as they are told, but who perceive at least some self-interest in the status quo, by being above another group. Ancient Indian and Japanese civilizations had the caste of untouchables, people so lowly they were
seen as subhuman. A hierarchical system needs reproduction of hierarchy at all levels. For the church and state to rule, relations within the family and marriage would have to be not egalitarian. Likewise, brutality and mean-spiritedness begets itself, 'the master kicks the slave and the slave kicks the dog.' Husbands and fathers were the representative of the whole household to the state and Church, and they in turn would reproduce the domination with their own relations with women. For the men in the Church and state to successfully dominate society, women ended up dominated.

The consensus that emerged in all the countries in the last centuries of the Middle Ages was that women were Other. Women had no property rights within marriage, and were forced by religion, law, and necessity to be obedient to their husbands and fathers. Women were passed as objects from father to husband, and even widows had their freedom of action restricted by usually not being able to inherit even the majority of their husband's property. Men could be virtuous by thought and action. The only virtue reserved for women was through inaction --through passivity to their male guardians, and to be chaste, that is to have only sexual relations within marriage, or ideally to be celibate and not to have sex at all. [O'Faolain, p.137, 1973] The cult of virginity remained supreme, for men to be spiritually pure, they would have to avoid women. It was no coincidence that women often resisted the Roman Catholic Church's ideological hegemony, by being active in the heretical and religious reform movements of the 13th century, to be quashed by force and the Inquisition. [Vuuren, p.42] Both men as well as women were denied freedom in the Middle Ages, but women's experience of feudalism was profoundly much different than what men experienced. If men were controlled and subordinated within the feudal hierarchy, they also formed a superior caste above women who would never be allowed to forget that their sexuality as women was evil.
Chapter Three: The Reformation

Moral equality is a necessary condition for any form of individualism. In order for a person to have sole control over deciding what their interests should be, and to be able to put their interests before those of society, it has to be recognized that each person is the one most capable to decide their priorities. Without this equality of conscience, a feudal-like society is the only alternative. Freedom of conscience prevents any one profession, caste, or class, from gaining hegemonic ideological control. The moral equality created by the Reformation eventually reversed the priorities of obligations from the group to the individual. People were given an obligation to develop their own private spirituality as they saw fit, distrusting the advice and orders from the church hierarchy. The bonds keeping feudalism together decayed as European society experienced atomization as individuals were obligated to trust their own interpretation of the Bible and perception of morality instead of relying on a select few to orchestrate a consensus for the benefit of the whole society. However this atomization caused by the Reformation, like the similar process caused later by the French Enlightenment, broke the bonds and obligations for men somewhat differently than what women experienced. The Protestant Reformation began the process of liberation for both men and women, but the potential improvements for women probably lay more in what the Reformation made possible in subsequent centuries, than in the actual Reformation itself.

The Reformation ended the monolithic supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church in Europe and led to religious pluralism (if not tolerance) in which religious sects and churches could reflect the ideas of independent free-thinkers such as Calvin and Luther and as well as reflect local nationalistic ambitions in England and Holland. Church censorship ended. The feudal powers of the Catholic Church were diminished except within the Papal States. Weber argued in *The Protestant Ethic*, the Reformation may have facilitated the intensification and growth of capitalism latent in the European economy. A Protestant work ethic was created, especially in the Calvinist sects. Protestants believed that everyone had a special calling in which they should unceasingly labor for the greater good of god. Calvinists may have taken this work ethic to the limit as some sects saw both hard work and material prosperity as evidence of God's blessing. [Weber, p.160, 1958] Unnecessary or conspicuous consumption was seen as sinful, and so
Protestantism may have intensified the drive for capital accumulation which helped bring about modern capitalism. In addition, Weber said that the Reformation led to a disenchantment of the world, as Puritans in particular and Protestants in general had a fierce hatred of superstition and of Roman Catholic rituals and sacrifices. [ Weber, p.168, 1958 ]

During the Reformation the Bible was translated from Latin into many languages, and religious discussion could be carried out by the common people. The central guiding light of the Reformation was the idea of spiritual equality between all people, priests were not needed to serve as intermediaries between mankind and god, and that each literate individual could interpret the Bible for themselves. This achievement of moral equality broke some of the traditional bonds between people as they became more free to hold different opinions without fear of being branded heretics.(1) Louis de Bonald, a French philosopher of the Counter Enlightenment, argued forcefully that the Reformation later led to the secularization of society by making divorce legal and placing it under political control, which weakened the family structure as well. The sin of Protestantism, de Bonald said, was that located religion in the individual's faith and not in the needs and structure of the whole society. [ Bottomore & Nisbet, p.94-95, 1978 ] Emile Durkheim, who, unlike de Bonald, was neither reactionary nor Catholic, disliked Protestantism's insistence upon the primacy of individual faith [ Bottomore & Nisbet, p.112 ] and believed that the modern ideals of moral individualism had their immediate origin in Protestantism which drew out the most individualistic elements out of Christian theology. [ Giddens, p.213, 1971 ]

The Reformation's drastic change in the sixteenth century also facilitated the subsequent Scientific Revolution in the seventeenth century. Whereas Galileo had been forced by threat of death by the Catholic Church to recant and formally withdraw his astronomical observations that Jupiter had planets and the earth moved around the sun, in Protestant parts of northern Europe astronomers such as Copernicus and Kepler had much less difficulty and were able to get their observations published without prosecution. However, the Reformation seems to have been the start of the public/private dichotomy which was to grow and limit the roles of women in later centuries. The Reformation led to the privacy and sanctity of the nuclear family, and facilitated and encouraged the belief that women were to be mothers
who being good and spiritual were to spend most of their time raising their children. Except for a minority of the Protestant reformers, such as those in the Anabaptist movement, [Sharma, 1987] most of the leaders of the Reformation were determined to limit women's roles and opportunities. The Reformation coupled with the subsequent rise of capitalism, created the belief that it was a man's world, and that women belonged in the home. [Carmody, 1985] & [O'Faolain, 1974]

The Reformation had different effects on women than men. A great benefit for women was that Protestantism broke the medieval association of women with evil. [Hamilton, 1978, p. 58] Women achieved spiritual equality with men, a major event considering that Eve in particular and women in general had been blamed for the Fall of Man. Wives were given spiritual equality with their husbands, and though they were bound to obey their husbands, women became the moral and spiritual center of the home, with responsibility for making sure the children became proper Christians. [Hamilton, 1978, p.66]

Max Weber was wrong when he wrote in the Protestant Ethic "The sexual asceticism of Puritanism differs only in degree, not in fundamental principle, from that of monasticism..." [Weber, 1958, p. 158]

To the contrary, the medieval monks had been almost rabid and hysterical with their denunciations of women as being evil temptresses, luring men to their doom. [Hamilton, 1978, p. 51] Also, where the Catholic Church had denounced women as sinful because they had insatiable carnal lust, [Andersen, 1988, p.226] the Protestants did not believe that women were as lustful or more sinful as men were. Though several sects of Protestants such as the Puritans were wary of the pleasures of sexual activity, and did not encourage sexual pleasure as a goal within marriage, the Protestant conception of sexuality was fundamentally different from monasticism. The Protestants did not believe women to be any more evil than men, chastity was no longer required for moral purity, and a married woman could have sexual relations with her husband without either of them damning themselves.

Protestants ended the virgin/whore dichotomy for women, and instead emphasized the familial responsibilities of women to be good mothers. Protestants glorified women as mothers, and in doing so distinguished the nuclear family from its more polymorphous origins, and made the nuclear family the rigid building block of their society. Divorce became next to impossible to attain, and both men and
women were to put their responsibilities to their marriage foremost. [Hamilton, p. 54] The medieval Catholic conception of divorce included annulment, in which the marriage was ruled invalid, and repudiation, which did not end the marriage but allowed the partners to live apart. Both methods had allowed a certain flexibility in ending dead marriages, a flexibility which ended during the Reformation:

The Protestants were very concerned with stable, non-adulterous, life-long marriages... The Protestants had made getting out of a marriage impossible except on grounds of adultery. While the Catholic Church had not sanctioned divorce it had evolved a considerable range of 'evasions, fictions and loopholes.' These according to O.R. McGregor, 'had served to make the medieval system tolerable in practice.' Powell has gone further: 'so tangled was the causality respecting marriage, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, that it might be said that for a sufficient consideration, a canonical flaw might be found in almost any marriage.' The Protestants abolished all these popish remnants: adultery became the only way out of a marriage. [Hamilton, 1978, p. 63]

This end to discretion in divorce (2) cemented a woman's identity with that of her role of wife to her husband and mother to her kids. Women were no longer evil and were spiritual equals of men, but they were defined by their familial responsibilities, a situation not particularly congruous with the establishment of autonomous individualism that was arising for men.

It is probably not often considered that the Reformation robbed women of a major choice and freedom in their lives; the freedom to reject the role of being a wife. In Catholic areas of Europe, women who did not wish to endure physical abuse from husbands and to bear children until they aged prematurely or died in childbirth, often joined the Church as nuns. Abbeys and nunneries gave women the opportunity to be educated, to be free of physical violence, and to not have to serve and clean up after men. During the Middle Ages rich women made generous grants to nunneries, and then retired to them in safety if they choose. The Reformation's closure of nunneries in large areas of Europe ended this choice for many women who would have taken it. With no avenue of escape left, with no choice, nearly all women out of economic necessity had to enter marriage even if they did not particularly want to. Some women could enter their sister's household and live as a part of another family, but the Reformation had closed a major freedom of women's lives. Women from idealistic pressures in the Protestant churches and from economic necessity, were to be identified not as separate individuals, but solely as mothers.
Women probably benefited more from the turbulence within the Reformation than the actual outcome once the situation had stabilized:

The sixteenth century marks the transition from medieval to modern world, and the Reformation era encompasses this period of transit with its mix of both worlds. We have already seen that in the localized, decentralized society of the feudal Middle Ages, women had greater opportunities within the family and community... The ensuing displacement of women was not necessarily a result of the Reformation. What does seem significant about the Reformation era, specifically, is that it was a period of upheaval that allowed -as do all such periods in history -women's roles to be less sharply defined or to be defined under the rubric of religious or political action... In either case, what had been an open-ended situation for women became one of increasing rigidity. The upheaval was followed by a time of retrenchment, when the progressive elements from the standpoint of women's possibilities were expunged from these movements. One example of this conservative reaction regarded divorce. During the early Reformation, progressives had wished to grant divorce for adultery, desertion, continued absence, and even extreme incompatibility. By the end of the century, the rule in England was to allow remarriage only by a special act of Parliament for each case. What the Reformation era witnessed was the changing delineation of women's roles. As this period drew to a close, women's roles became defined increasingly by sex -to the detriment of all women -rather than by class. [ Bridenthal, 1977, p. 187 ]

The Reformation left women more excluded than before from positions of theological power. The biblical ban against women speaking in public, inspired by the writings of the Apostle Paul, remained in force and in male prejudice well into the nineteenth century. [ Donovan, 1990, p.14 ] The Reformation did open up future possibilities for women, in finally granting them equal freedom of conscience with men, but it should be noted that during the Reformation period the traditional freedoms for women ended as new ones were conceived.

In Protestant countries the Reformation is usually taught as a great emancipation for freedom of thought and spiritual equality. The great intellectual thinkers of the Reformation were little less chauvinistic and misogynistic than the Catholic theologians who had preceded them. Martin Luther taught that women had a greater share of original sin than men [ Carmody, p. 175 ] though he did see women as having more potential for spiritual improvement than men. As I have stated in the previous chapter, the doctrine of original sin is an institution of social control to subordinate and humiliate all women as a group, declaring that they are all the same and that they all should be punished. Martin Luther was adamant that women should be bound to the home as mothers and wives. He states:
"The rule remains with the husband, and the wife is compelled to obey him by God's command. He rules the home and the state, wages war, defends his possessions, tills the soil, builds, plants, etc. The woman on the other hand is like a nail driven into the wall. She sits at home... Just as the snail carries its house with it, so the wife should stay at home and look after the affairs of the household, as one who has been deprived of the duty of administering those affairs that are outside and that concern the state. She does not go beyond her most personal duties." [Carmody, p. 175]

Such a position, confining women to the household, would have been absurd in the high Middle Ages when women had greater leadership opportunities, and did not even reflect the reality of Luther's era when most women were still involved in hard physical labour. Because the thinkers of the Reformation took the Bible as the only sure knowledge of God's will, they had more in common with the most strident religious fundamentalists of today and the ancient Hebrew patriarchs, than with any philosophy of equality. Luther tried to soften his position by saying that women, perhaps because they were inferior to men, had the greatest potential for improvements in virtue, if they guarded their chastity and obeyed men. [McCann, p. 297, 1983]

The Reformation cannot go down as an era which benefited both men and women. More than anything else, the Reformation was a time of the redefinition of the proper gender roles for both sexes. Sexual intercourse became no longer a sin, no longer being something that could lure men to their doom in the arms of the devil's collaborator. However, this sexual revolution had a double standard. The Reformation freed men up to enjoy sexual relations with women, a holy man or religious leader no longer had to be celibate. However, a woman could no longer be celibate, and the social forces to ensure chastity and reduce celibacy in women increased in this period. Men could now enjoy sex, and women more than ever would have to obey them in their will. John Calvin insisted on women's obedience to men, and their confinement to the newly emerging private sphere of the isolated household. Calvin went as far as to say that it was just that only female adulterers should be stoned because it was a greater sin on their part, and that women who left home for work or adventure, would deserve being raped if it happened to them. [Carmody, p. 176] The influential puritan John Milton saw women's insubordination to their husbands as worse than adultery, and only supported the legalization of divorce only as an option for the husband. [Carmody, p. 178] Again like previous theorists, Milton saw man as created for God, and woman for man.
On a personal observation, the Reformation reminds me somewhat of the sexual revolution of the 1960s, in which many young men used the new ideology to demand sex from women while depriving them leadership roles in their revolutionary organizations and still calling women 'cunts.' [ Firestone, 1970 ]

The Reformation allowed each man, in Luther's terms, to be his own priest. Man was raised towards God, and women were kept nailed to the ground, men would remain their religious leaders.

The Roman Catholic Church was also heavily influenced by the Reformation in its attitudes to the importance of the nuclear family and women's necessary subservience in it. The Reformation had changed the roles for women and the family in both Catholic as well as Protestant parts of Europe. Divorce in most Catholic countries moved out of the jurisdiction of secular law to the Church's control, and loopholes for divorce were eliminated to make divorce even more impossible to obtain. [ Vuuren, p. 50, 1973 ] However, the Reformation seemed to have stimulated interest in reading the Bible in all parts of Europe, and this facilitated an increase for education for women, though usually at a lower level than for men.

Many of the changes of the Reformation occurred out of the direct self-interest of men. King Henry VIII started the Church of England just to get a legitimate male heir. Monasteries and nunneries were closed down and the land was sold off for his personal profit. In subsequent centuries in England, divorce was generally reserved for men, and Parliament's Divorce Bills were passed to facilitate the succession of male heirs in male aristocratic families. [ O'Faolain, p. 319 ] Many European leaders and rebels adopted Protestantism as part of nationalism with the Protestant Dutch fighting off their Spanish overlords for independence. Protestants often accused Catholics of being spies, obedient to their master in Rome. The liberalization of sex within marriage directly benefited men. Women were forced to be more submissive to their husbands at the same time men's recognition of women's own sexual needs ended. Previously, there had been a Catholic tradition that a man was obligated to serve his wife's sexual needs, but with the strange link of sex and evil, when the Reformation ended women's identification with evil, it also gradually ended men's recognition of women's sexual pleasure.
The Reformation and the liberalization of religion did not happen necessarily as just the spark of Luther's idea. Luther certainly was the leader of the Reformation, and he was responsible for both its direction and its failure to catch on in most of Germany after he sided with the princes during the rebellion of the peasants, yet I suspect other less visible factors were at work. The Catholic Church had been in decay and decadence for a long period, and the invention of the printing press laid open the possibility of quickly disseminating social criticism and printing copies of the Bible in the common languages. The greater power and organization of the state and the increased wealth of the growing middle classes from mercantile capitalism laid the ground for a confrontation against the Roman Catholic Church. As people turned their attention to the market they had to take greater responsibility for their actions, relying less upon tradition to tell them what to produce and how much to sell it for. The merchants and weavers who were not guild members and who thus participated directly in the free-market had less loyalty to the Catholic Church than members of the traditional classes.  

Vuuren, p.40, 1973  

The medieval Catholic Church had fought to set prices, tithes, and to ban interest on loans, and so it was likely that the families of the growing middle-classes would find themselves less committed to the Catholic Church than in the past. Theological disputes were certainly nothing new, the Roman Catholic Church had fought the Eastern Orthodox Church, heretical sects, and popes in Rome had fought anti-popes in Avignon. However, the Reformation succeeded because the new religious ideas were bound to the growing economic power and needs of a rising class. The Catholic Church successfully dominated the feudal arena, and was always able to force recalcitrant princes and peasants into obedience, but the Church adapted too slowly to nationalism and capitalism, losing large numbers of supporters before it consolidated its position. However, the Reformation remained a theological dispute between men discussing mankind's proper relationship to God and women, and women remained largely without a voice to protest their own subordination.

Footnotes

1) Still it was difficult to be a free-thinker after the Reformation. Calvinist Geneva is sometimes romanticized as an idyllic society, but they would burn atheists. Roman Catholics certainly did not have a
monopoly on religious bigotry and intolerance. Likewise, people in Colonial America in the seventeenth and eighteenth century were intolerant of Shakers and Catholics, and women who wished to debate theology even in the privacy of their own home.

2) However, the emphasis that the Reformation placed on the spiritual foundation of marriage laid the foundation for new provisions of divorce. If marriage was a holy spiritual relationship that had to be based on mutual affection, then the death of that affection would eventually become sufficient grounds for divorce in later centuries. So, it is possible to take a position on either side of the question whether the Reformation made divorce more possible. I would say that it eventually changed the type of grounds necessary for divorce, from only functional grounds such as consanguine, leprosy, adultery, impotence, idolatry, to include emotional reasons. However, the immediate effect of the Reformation was to cement the family together, and to make divorce and separation (something that occurs frequently throughout history yet does not get much scholarly attention) less likely. The great legalization of divorce in Protestant countries largely occurred not in the sixteenth century but in the twentieth and so it would be simplistic to credit it solely to Protestantism.
Chapter Four: The Scientific Revolution

Paradoxically, the uniformity of scientific thought with its drive to establish consensus on singular scientific truth and fact, had a liberating effect for the individual. Science assumes that with logic everybody is capable of making the right conclusions from the available data. I call this belief that knowledge is reachable by anyone through proper observation and experimentation, "ontological equality." Scientific truths remain constant for everyone. Though the interpretation of facts may differ and hypothetical constructs may be challenged, scientists in any place in the world, regardless of their race or sex, can come to the same conclusion. A practical scientific consensus generally emerges, such as that the Earth is round, which then challenges beliefs in tradition and superstition. The perceived worth of magic and religion become weakened, and critical thinking intensifies. This is a profound liberating effect for the individual, and this Scientific Revolution directly facilitated the French Enlightenment and later schools of radical philosophy including modern feminism. Faith in traditional authority is weakened, and the fact that things were done one way in the past becomes no longer in itself a significant reason to continue the same behavior if new alternatives seem promising.

Superstition, including magic and religion, are incompatible with individual autonomy. Superstition brings a great coercive effect into every day living, usually in the form of a long list of things people must not do or to risk supernatural wrath beyond their comprehension. Superstition robs people of their natural inclination and ability to make decisions, and robs them of self-responsibility. Traditionally, people who believe in the supernatural would blame the supernatural for what befell them, instead of themselves or the people around them, when applicable. Thus ending superstition drops the blinkers which prevents people from seeing true cause and effect. People then become empowered as true individuals. Morality ceases to be a reified constant handed to humanity by a forbidding God, but an evolving consensus reached between human beings. Emile Durkheim and Max Weber were both quite interested in this part of modern life. Durkheim studied the rise of secular morality, and Weber coining the term 'disenchantment of the world' to describe how people were losing their feelings of supernatural wonder and mysticism. The end of magic frees people to a level of equality, no longer does one person in
a tribe or community claim the mantle of the prophet to the supernatural to order other people about. No longer do ordinary people need shamans or priests to tell them right and wrong, to reassure them, and to serve as a bridge between humanity and the supernatural. This is highly similar to how in the Reformation Luther declared each man to be his own priest: ending the supernatural allows each person to belong to themselves and to have no obligation to other people because of the perceived will of the supernatural.

The Scientific Revolution made secularization and atheism possible. No longer did knowledge have to be taken on faith. All social life and institutions no longer needed to be built to follow the assumed will of God, but could now be justified in their own terms. Emile Durkheim praised this development of rationalism:

Rationalism is only one of the aspects of individualism: it is the intellectual aspect of it. We are not dealing here with two different states of mind; each is the converse of the other. When one feels the need of liberating individual thought, it is because in a general way one feels the need of liberating the individual. Intellectual servitude is only one of the servitudes that individualism combats. All developments of individualism has the effect of opening moral consciousness to new ideas and rendering it more demanding. [ Mestrovic, 1988, 139 ]

As science begot secularization which in turn begot a loss of traditional morality, it made progressive developments of this new modern morality possible. The Scientific Revolution created both a higher standard of living, and gave hope to subsequent generations of social critics in the Enlightenment and beyond that reason, logic, and observation could create a better basis for society than tradition and custom.

Though science liberates the individual by ending the often violently coercive effect of traditional moral institutions such as religion, unfortunately the practice of science requires specialization which is beyond most people. Because only a small proportion of any society can be scientists, a scientific elite emerges, and as before when we discussed the Roman Catholic Church, any elite can become corrupted and warped through homosociality and its own material interests. If certain groups are excluded from the practice of science, there is no one to defend their interests within the scientific institutions. As all the early scientists in the 17th and 18th centuries were men, this facilitated a certain misogyny and sexism to become incorporated directly into the fundamental assumptions of basic science and perceived "objective
knowledge" of the Scientific Revolution. Women were generally perceived as sexual creatures and research objects, because that was usually how the male researchers interacted with them, and they discussed their work with only their fellow male scientists.

Science is the study of cause and effect with the principle of exacting measurements to yield testable and disprovable theories about the world around us. Science espouses the free flow of information without restriction on the subjects explored. However, there is a great difference between science and the Scientific Revolution. Strictly speaking, the Scientific Revolution was a historical period in which men rejected faith and theology's role in explaining the natural world, and instead uplifted and highly valued rationality, calculation, universality, abstraction, and scientific objectivity. Men like Newton and Galileo were geniuses who sought to mathematize and quantify the relationships of nature around them. However, nearly all scientists, until recent decades, believed that neither the interests of the scientist nor his class, sex, or racial background, could affect the data and their results. This may have distorted scientific progress because scientific research until this last generation was almost exclusively done by men, (except for a few women like Madam Curie), and these men were usually white and from middle-class backgrounds with middle-class interests. However, as science raised certain values, other values had to fall. The Scientific Revolution devalued emotion and intuition, and argued vehemently that nothing should stand in the way of scientific progress. Science became an end to itself, and paradoxically, its value of value-free research was imposed on the world.

The Scientific Revolution propped open the door to freedom of knowledge that had been unlocked by the Reformation, but the costs of the scientific paradigm have been felt in general more by women than by men. The witch-craze may have been linked with the rise of science [Donovan, 1990, p.29], women's sexuality has been a favourite topic for investigation by male scientific researchers, and the origins of the professions of both psychiatry and gynecology lie in the domination of deviant women to get them to conform to roles constructed for them by men. [Daly, 1978] & [Abbot, 1990, 106-107].

Science is not value neutral. The Scientific Revolution was built on many assumptions, such as
that truth is solid fact that can be deduced through reason and observation, that science is capable of explaining everything eventually, the universe is run rationally and mechanically like a giant clock, and not the least, there is an implicit assumption that those who practice science, traditionally men, are somehow better, more rational, wiser, and more responsible, than those who do not, especially women:

The rise of the mechanistic world view went hand in hand with dramatic changes in the nature-as-female metaphor. Where once nature had been seen as living, as the mother of creation, by 1700 the metaphor had changed to one of dominion and enslavement. It has been pointed out that this metaphor carried often aggressively sexual overtones, implications that female nature needed to be subject to rape-like force, to enable men (sic) to tear her secrets from her. Discussions of the sexual metaphor commonly make reference to the writings of Francis Bacon, sometimes called the 'father of modern science.' In his perhaps aptly-named The Masculine Birth of Time Bacon wrote of the need for the human mind to conquer nature by gaining knowledge about her: 'I am come in very truth leading to you Nature with all her children to bind her to your service and make her your slave.' Bacon appealed to all 'true sons of knowledge' to 'penetrate further,' and thus find the way into her 'inner chambers,' Female nature was, in the face of such masculine prowess, coyly submissive. [Birke, p. 115]

The Scientific Revolution degraded the knowledge of women and the wisdom from their experiences. The medical knowledge of women healers when not labeled witchcraft, was gradually replaced by licenced male doctors who often did more harm than good in assisting in and demanding total control in childbirth. [Abbott, 1990, p.115] Knowledge was seen as an exclusively masculine domain, and women were often the subject matter.

The association of women with nature cannot, however, be accepted uncritically. For, nature does not take on the personal qualities of a living woman in the scientific view; rather both nature and women take on the qualities of an Other to the rational I, the male subject. They become an It, profane, something to be controlled and manipulated to run as the physical cosmos does in the Newtonian hypothesis -that is, rationally. The impulse in the scientific view is to impose rational order on all that is alive, unpredictable, and therefore non-rational." [Donovan, p.29-30]

Ironically this ability to control unpredictable nature would have to depend on pre-existing predictable laws within nature. But it would seem reasonable to speculate that the Scientific Revolution's denigration of women's knowledge by the presumption that only acceptable paradigm was that of masculine science, also facilitated male control over the construction through social discourse the knowledge of proper roles for women and the definition of proper femininity.
Initially, only scientists in particular and men in general were seen as sharers of intrinsic and infallible logic leading definite truths through what can be called, 'ontological equality.' Women and members of visible minorities were seen as incapable of conducting proper science though they would be effected by science's results. Science certainly benefited many women as well as men, but the diverse elements within the Scientific Revolution itself were not value-neutral, and sometimes prevented men from seeing women as their equals and as individuals. The Scientific Revolution replaced metaphysical faith with an unquestioning faith in science as a reified God, with logic as something that was simultaneously unified and autonomous to human beings and inside them (men) as well. To question science became unthinkable, yet science quickly became a shield for many different personal, economic, and political interests. Science became the new ideology and the main force for the social legitimation of the new status quo, with 'scientific knowledge' used to justify the oppression of women (sexism), Negroes and Asians, (racism and eugenics) and men's domination of other animals (vivisection). This is not to say that science as the study of empirical cause and effect is wrong, but that 'scientific knowledge' can sometimes be used to mean whatever the people who can make it official knowledge want it to mean. As Weber pointed out in his lectures on the sociology of science, as science rises in esteem, there is a certain tendency to confuse scientist's technical expertise with moral and social insight.
Chapter Five: The Enlightenment and Women

The philosophy of atomic individualism which possibly originated in the 17th century with Thomas Hobbes has been usually associated with French Enlightenment thinkers and English political economists of the late 18th century, who sought, unlike Hobbes, to overthrow or diminish the old feudal order. Atomic individualism saw people as having few bonds to each other, but with the people themselves relatively interchangeable. In essence, there would be only one type of person, the rational, free-born individual who made contracts with other people only for self-profit and self-security. Other individuals were to be kept at an arm's length, so to speak, the moral influence of others distrusted, and all interaction was to be in theory, calculated in advance by this new political and economic man. This negative freedom, as calculated by the lack of obligations and restraints, was seen as the only rightful goal. In any case the world in this new political philosophy was a lonely world, with tradition and emotion disdained, and a tremendous gulf between individual on one hand and the society and state on the other. In the philosophies of both Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacque Rousseau, whose theories were otherwise quite different, the individual came first, and society came afterwards as only the creation of these individual contracts. It was Rousseau's liberalist interpretation of the social contract that would become the center of the Enlightenment philosophies debated in the new Parisienne salon society. Rousseau declared there was no greater sin than for one man to be subservient to another, and that all people had inalienable and equal rights. However inspiring and egalitarian this seemed to people at the time, this social vision was one more of fraternity between men than true equality between both men and women. The Enlightenment philosophers were interested in moving the world and displacing the nobility and other feudal classes, and most of them saw the increased subordination and confinement of women as the method to reach this new equality between men.

The Enlightenment of the 18th century drew its inspiration from the Scientific Revolution of the 17th century, and drew the power of its voice from the printing press and the rising power of the bourgeoisie, restless as the new class chaffed against the restrictions of feudalism. Newton (1687), Galileo, Descartes, and Kepler had rejected faith's role in explanation and instead tried to explain
existence and nature from empirical fact and reason. In the eighteenth century, writers like Diderot, Condorcet, Voltaire, Thomas, and Rousseau searched for laws similar to scientific principles to describe and explain human behavior, and to describe the ideal human society to free mankind from oppression. The Enlightenment was built on several assumptions: All men had the faculties to use reason, a positive freedom-loving human nature is intrinsic within all men -- Rousseau's famous "Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains," no man had an intrinsic right to oppress another, that reason and rationality would set mankind free, and that truth was unified and objective and could be discovered by men through reason and empirical observation. The Enlightenment was an emancipatory project to free mankind from superstition, irrationality, and feudalism. The Enlightenment culminated in the French Revolution's The Rights of Man of 1789 and the slogan "Equality, Liberty, and Fraternity." A brotherhood of man was hoped to be established with all men equal, without coercion, with every man free to do what he pleased without feudal or church restriction, to the betterment of all. [Simmel, 1950, p.437]

Unfortunately, when most writers of the Enlightenment used "he", "man," and "mankind," they usually meant males and were not referring to both men and women. The new concept of atomic individualism of the Enlightenment, with its view that most restrictions should be ended to give mankind what can be called pure negative freedom, rested on the assumption that man, and not woman, were purely rational.

"It rapidly became clear that the men who had resolutely claimed individualism for themselves had no intention of including large segments of humanity in the definition of individual. Women, children, slaves and frequently men of insufficient property were not taken to be individuals at all -certainly not self-accountable members of the polity. [Fox, 1991, p.122]

In effect, the inspiring Enlightenment's concept of the noble man who should be liberated to his true nature, rested on the groaning backs of women. The Enlightenment with the rights of the American and French Revolutions, (1) may have freed man, but the status of women took a distinct step backwards once all the tumult had ended.

"Initially, few even considered that the political discourse of individualism should apply to women at all. In the heat of the French Revolution, some women, most notably Mary Wollstonecraft in her pioneering A VINDICATION OF THE RIGHTS OF WOMAN,
and even some men, made the case for the rights of woman. Those precocious claims were soon repudiated, primarily by men who viewed either the liberty or the equality of women as an unacceptable threat to the stability of families—and to the psyches of men whose autonomy depended upon unquestioning female support. By the end of the French Revolution, women in France, Britain, and the United States found themselves, if anything, more firmly and universally excluded from the political realm than they had been before it. [Fox, p.123, 1991]

However, the discourse of the Enlightenment provided the vocabulary of intrinsic rights and equality that liberal feminists would use to great effect in the following centuries.

If the Enlightenment sought on one hand to free mankind to be free unrestrained individuals, then on the other it sought to keep women pregnant, lactating, (2) deprived of a scientific education, and submissive. The public and private sphere dichotomy achieved full maturation at about this time. Though most Frenchmen at this time were very poor and lived in rural areas, there was growing social concern, especially by the influential writer Jean-Jacques Rousseau, over the apparently idle wives of the rich who either were sensuous and decadent, or were moving into male circles and interested in debate and politics. [Eisenstein, p. 58, 1981] (Rousseau's disdain for the politically active woman was heavily ironic considering that Parisienne women provided him with hospitality and the Enlightenment grew as discussions made in their salons.) Rousseau, Robespierre, and Napoleon all wanted to ensure the stability of society, that is the commitment of men to the new order, by keeping women out of the public sphere, keeping them obedient to their husbands, and by tying them to a single and fixed social role as submissive mothers which would keep them from developing their individuality. [Bridenthal & Koonz, pages 249 & 253, 1977] The concept of motherhood as a career, a calling, an occupation, and a necessity for mankind, which did not exist in the Middle Ages, [Abbott, 1990, p.89] was glorified by Enlightenment men as they tried to confine women within its prison.

"No more than individualism did the ideology of domesticity, true womanhood, and separate spheres emerge fully formed at one moment in time. Beginning in the late seventeenth century and at an accelerating pace throughout the eighteenth, European and American culture, following the British lead, had been discovering the virtues of submissive womanhood and engaging in a substantive reworking of the prevailing notion of woman. During the Enlightenment, as Ruth Salvaggio has suggested, women were not so much excluded from culture as "the very idea of woman became a metaphor and figure of the essence of exclusion -of not being, of absence.' But also during this transformation, and in a surprisingly brief span of time, women who had been long viewed as especially evil, began to be depicted as especially good. The new vision above
all emphasized women's identities as dependent upon their specific relations with men within families: their roles as mothers, wives, daughters. Of the three roles, many male theorists unquestionably preferred that of mother, with its opportunities for minimizing female sexuality and for viewing women as primarily devoted to the nurture of men. In effect, the eighteenth century invented the modern concept of motherhood. There were precedents, but only in the eighteenth century did the ideal of motherhood crystallize as woman's highest mission -as her distinct career. [Fox, 1991, 124]

"...The new concept of motherhood confirmed the new centrality of the individual, although not by endowing mothers with individualism. The purpose of motherhood was, rather, to nurture the individual. Literally, good mothers nursed their own children. Figuratively, they nurtured them.... The ideology of motherhood that would rapidly develop into a full blown ideology of bourgeois domesticity appeared to offer an ideal solution to the problem of women's place in the brave new world of individualism. [Fox, 125]

There is nothing wrong with motherhood just as there is nothing wrong with fatherhood. In any free society a mother might decide to stay home and take care of her own children, but she will be robbed of her individuality and restricted in her ambition if the choice is made for her against her will. Turning women into a submissive wife and a slave to a man's children, prevents her from being an individual. The child of the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, gave sons independence of their fathers at age twenty-one [Bottomore & Nisbet, p.87, 1978] but kept women as legal minors.

How the concepts of natural rights and the equality of mankind could lead to sexism, chauvinism, and misogyny, may need some explanation. Rousseau himself, in The Social Contract, described how men and women in his hypothetical state of nature were totally equal and independent of each other. However, it was the paradigm of logic the Enlightenment thinkers used, as well as the previous loss of skill status for women workers in the rise of mercantile capitalism and the Industrial Revolution, which caused men's devaluation of women. As less work for exchange was done in the home, as men's work was removed from the home just as married women remained tied to the home and assumed sole responsibility for raising children, male writers and scientists had adopted a mechanical paradigm of the universe which neglected to explain emotions and the nonrational. Everything that could not be explained by laws and scientific observation, (or was not work done by men) became Other, less than real and not significant, and the domestic sphere and women fell into this category. [Donovan, 1990, p.3] Women's perceived emotionality, as being sexual, irrational, religious, and instinctually nurturing creatures, was distrusted.
and the philosophers based their emancipatory project on abstract logic instead which did not deal with the concerns or perspectives of women.

Though there were individual exceptions to this sexism such as Condorcet and Olympe de Gouges who both died prematurely in the course of the French Revolution because of their liberal beliefs, most of the Enlightenment thinkers were patriarchal and intrinsically sexist with their social criticism. Even John Locke (1632-1704) an English liberal who espoused a laissez-faire world and a renunciation of the Divine Right of kings because it was patriarchal and denied that it was God's will that women be dominated by man, [Eisenstein, p. 30-40, 1981] was still convinced that women ought to obey men as is demonstrated in his following statement:

"The natural differences between the sexes, however, override any presupposition of an equal right to autonomy for men and woman. Here and only here a natural difference creates a justified domination of one person by another." [Sydie, 1987, p. 2]

The most influential of the Enlightenment thinkers was Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and he was also the one most convinced that women were inferior to men, and that being defined by their sex and not their reason, he believed that they were less individualistic than men were.

"...Rousseau's individualism for men is rooted in a patriarchal and, hence, dependent existence for women; that the promise of independence and equality for man requires the subordination of woman. In trying to deny woman her 'natural' power, Rousseau renders her powerless. In trying to strengthen man, he seeks to weaken woman." [Eisenstein, p. 56, 1981]

"Rousseau: The consequences of sex are wholly unlike for man and women. The male is only a male now and again, the female is always a female, or at least all her youth; everything reminds her of her sex; the performance of her functions requires a special constitution. She needs care during pregnancy and freedom from work when her child is born; she must have a quiet, easy life while she nurses her children...[Eisenstein, p. 67, 1981]

Rousseau's idea of the good society depended on the suppression and coercion of women. He felt that women should only be educated to please their husbands, and that the moral fabric of society depended on keeping them in the newly-created private sphere (which at this point in time was still small as only a small minority of women could afford to concentrate only on childrearing) and to keep them out of participation in politics and business in the public sphere:
"Female shyness and modesty stem from nature: woman was designed, said Rousseau, 'so that she would submit to men.' Rousseau not only believed women to be naturally inferior and submissive but also put great emphasis on the notion that the sexes should be separated. ...Rousseau believed that it was inappropriate for women to share and participate in society outside the home. 'If she is married, what business has she among men?' he asked, and if she is single, 'why does she run the risk, by her indecent deportment, of shocking the man who would be inclined to make her his wife?'

Rousseau believed that women had no ability to contribute to the art and work of civilization, apart from the domestic roles. [Bridenthal, p. 225, 1977]

The male philosophers of the Enlightenment as they rebelled against superstition and feudalism, were generally unanimous that the subservience of women, the oppression of women, would be needed for their envisioned good society in which all men would be free. Few of the philosophers considered their own work on man's emancipation applicable to women, and neither did they consider women capable of having something worthwhile to say about philosophy. Likewise, when the philosophers of the conservative backlash criticized the liberal Enlightenment they did agree that the subordination of women was necessary for stable society. Louis de Bonald thought that the idea of natural rights was preposterous for society was built on the duties of the individual to society, and in particular the family and Roman Catholic Church. He wished for the father to have absolute control over all of his children and grandchildren until his death. [Nisbet, p.96, 1978]

Most of the French conservatives of the Counter-Enlightenment like Bonald and Joseph de Maistre sought to re-establish the power of the (male) pope and the male head of the family to end the disease of individualism. But as their solution was to confine women to the family and appointed, nonelected, male authority, from women's point of view, the Counter-Enlightenment and the Enlightenment must have been experienced as very similar.

There were many conservative and reactionary thinkers in the 19th century who did not necessarily believe that society needed to be built upon Roman Catholicism yet who still believed that women lacked the true rational mental faculties to be considered real human beings. Arthur Schopenhauer said that woman

"is in every respect backward, lacking in reason and reflection, a kind of middle step between the child and the man, WHO IS THE TRUE HUMAN BEING... In the last resort, women exist solely for the propagation of the race." [Miles, 1982, p.149]

Georg Hegel stated:
"The difference between men and women is like that between animals and plants; men correspond to animals, while women correspond to plants because their development is more placid and the principle that underlies it is the rather vague unity of feeling. When women hold the helm of government the State is at once in jeopardy..." [Miles, p. 150]

The 'father' of sociology, Auguste Comte, also embodied the sexism of his time and set sociology off on a sexist start, seeing women as not genuinely human and fit only to serve men:

"It is in order to better develop her moral superiority that woman must gratefully accept the rightful practical domination of man... First as a mother, and soon as a sister, then above all as a wife, and finally as a daughter, marginally as a maidservant, in these four natural roles woman is destined to preserve man from the corruption inherent in his practical and theoretical existence." [Miles, 1982, p. 151]

These comments illustrate the linking of women with motherhood that was typical of both the Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment. The philosophers of the era were nearly unanimous that women existed to propagate the race, were objects of reproduction, and that they did not have the critical and rational faculties of men. These opinions were challenged, first by Olympe de Gouge in the French Revolution, who was beheaded for her opinions, then by Mary Wollstonecraft, and then later in the nineteenth century by Sarah Grimke, Frances Wright, John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill.

The Enlightenment thinkers chorused together to demand that women stay in the home, concentrate on being good mothers, and leave real and important matters to men. Sometimes their thoughts verged on sexual apartheid:

"Thus, Desmahis, and later Rousseau and Holbach held up for emulation the values of classical Athens... They were well aware of the fact that the life experience of the lady in classical Athens was profoundly different from that of her spouse. Enlightenment thinkers who praised the Athenians sincerely believed that men and women should lead separate and unequal lives. Alongside the argument for female equality, based on natural law, there existed a second, even stronger trend in Enlightenment thought, which stressed the sexual differences and the appropriateness of an exclusively domestic role for women. [Bridenthal, 1977, p. 223,]

It does not matter so much what individual men thought women should do as what occurred in the actual practice of daily life, and the lack of praxis for women. The sexist social criticisms of the Enlightenment were influential and detrimental on the future status of women because they successfully defined the desired social role for women of the emerging classes. Bourgeoisie men wished to keep their
women as career housewives, and men who aspired to the status of the bourgeois later did the same as soon as the Industrial Revolution had progressed enough in the late nineteenth century to allow them to deny their wives paid employment. However, the liberal ideology of the Enlightenment, that truth could be achieved through reason and observation, proved to be a double-edged sword, and many feminists such as Mary Wollstonecraft, Sarah Grimke, Elizabeth Stanton, and Harriet Taylor made convincing arguments for women's education, suffrage, and participation in skilled work in the public sphere. But the sexist heritage of the Enlightenment has lingered on into the twentieth century in 'conservative' and 'traditional' values which links women's primary responsibility to the domestic sphere of childraising and caring for the home.

The liberal ideology of individual autonomy, and intrinsic individual rights, though it helped women's emancipation when women finally won recognition as persons in the twentieth century, may also have hindered the improvement of the status of women somewhat. In upholding individual rights over collective rights men kept their right to discriminate against women who depending on the time period may not be even recognized by law as individual persons themselves. Also, by safeguarding the right to privacy, the liberal ideology in (to paraphrase P. E. Trudeau) 'keeping the state out of the bedrooms of this nation' has usually prevented much from being done in combating wife rape, wife battering, and pornography. The justice system, because it is built on the liberal paradigm of autonomous individuals and assumptions that 1) individuals have the right to do everything that is not specifically prohibited, and 2) only behavior that can be proven beyond the shadow of a doubt to hurt another person, (except between husband and wife), is criminal, slows progress in dealing with women's oppression. [Fox, p. 39, 1991]

Thus, it may be misguided to retain the Enlightenment's notion that individuals are necessarily autonomous, because the life experiences and status of women is bound up in their relations with other men and women. With women having the main responsibility for childcare, women tend to (but not necessarily) experience more inter-relatedness in their relationships with other people, and see the goal of their lives as not independence but as interdependence. Autonomous or atomic individualism may rest on the oppression of women, or at least facilitate it. [Fox, p. 66] and so perhaps a more community-oriented
paradigm of individualism would be better in perceiving the differences in experiences between men and women. [Fox, 1991, p.38]

The Enlightenment must be seen as more than a rejection of superstition and feudalism, but also as an embrace of new values to deal with a changing world. These values, stressed women's domestic role and often her exclusion from public affairs. Also the new legal and moral system valued abstract laws over emotion, and universal laws over specificity of situation, or surmounted the male model of justice over the female, as theorized by psychologist Carol Gilligan [Donovan, 1990, p.168]. (Gilligan argued that men's model of justice deals with hypothetical situations and sees the suffering caused by the enforcement of law as a necessary price for a universal law, while women are more concerned about negotiations, interdependence, and compromises, and reject universal laws in order to minimize suffering.) These factors combined to make the Enlightenment a different experience for men than it was for women. Women's attainment of recognized (political) and effective (economic) individualism should be seen as historically specific and of occurring in different steps than it did for men, with the Enlightenment being an era of doubtful progress for women at best.

Notes

1) The Enlightenment climaxed with the French Revolution yet it would be simplistic to equate the two. Certainly, thinkers like Locke, Hume, and Voltaire were not violent revolutionists. In addition, many of the changes the French Revolution created were swept back by both Napoleon and following the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, so I have decided not to focus in on the Revolution but on the Enlightenment as a whole. Because of this, we cannot speak of a linear model of progress or consistent change. However, the French Revolution did lay the basis for France as a modern state and provided a model for other countries. The guilds were abolished as was primogeniture, the law that the eldest son automatically inherited the whole estate, and the powers of the Roman Catholic Church in France were much reduced, the aristocracy lost their hold on lucrative government jobs, and sons gained their independence from their fathers at age twenty-one. [Bottomore & Nisbet, p.88-89, 1978]

2) Interestingly, the Enlightenment also generally ended the practice of upper class mothers hiring a wet-nurse for their children. The Enlightenment thinkers, notably Rousseau, had very firm opinions that women should dedicate themselves to being the best possible mothers, who should nurse their own children.
Chapter Six: Capitalism and the Industrial Revolution

Industrial capitalism became the vital engine of modern individualism. Emile Durkheim saw industrialization as changing the glue that held society together from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity. In pre-industrial eras, there was less differentiation by occupation, and most people did similar work. Craft specialization did exist, but usually in most villages, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker, would keep stock animals behind their home and perceived their whole livelihood as dependent on the success of farming in the whole community. There would be a consensus of values throughout the small community. Industrialization involved the specialization of occupation and a separation between the workplace and the home. The number of professions increased dramatically to an uncountable level. With the rise or organic solidarity, society was held together because of constant economic interdependence. The people all held different occupations and different interests (especially beliefs about what they should be paid for their work!) but recognized that they would ultimately have to reach agreements with each other though their opposing interests would never be resolved. With this industrialization, people in each occupation saw they had something that set them apart from all other people in different jobs. In addition, Durkheim saw that wage labour greatly reduced the power within the family unit. The family dependent on a single unbreakable estate or farm diminished in numbers, and most families became of the type of several economically independent men and their dependents, who were related to each other. The economic independence of women, however, was problematic, as we shall see below in this chapter. However, familial authority rapidly diminished as children no longer were dependent on their parent’s estate and could instead find jobs in the expanding economy. Durkheim believed that these new ideas of individualism, of a person reducing their bonds to the community and putting their interests before society, were born in the Reformation and Enlightenment and became essentially the new religion in the era of industrialization. [Carrithers & Lukes, p.63]

The bonds of the family over the individual declined. As productive labour left the household and its members worked outside the household, the parents no longer controlled the daily work of their children. The home eventually became a center of consumption rather than production. As now people
lived and worked in two different places, employers lost both the means and inclination to meddle in the personal lives of their employees. [Seccombe, p. 234, 1992] When in the Middle Ages, children risked starvation if they left their parents' household unless they entered another household, and thus were under the rule of the head of the family, youths in the age of industrial capitalism sought work outside the home. The powers of the father over their adult children gradually dissipated as proletarianization ended the size of the economic classes of the rural farmers and the urban shopkeeper and guild masters. [Seccombe, p. 243, 1992] With household property, except for the upper classes and the dwindling petite-bourgeois, no longer productive, the features of marriage as a property transaction declined. [Seccombe, p. 235] Also, with the rise of pensions, parents were no longer dependent on their children for support in their old age. However, the benefits of industrialization, urbanization, and proletarianization were distributed unequally between the sexes. Women's unpaid domestic labour lost its recognition as real work, and the opportunities for men of getting a wage-job elsewhere, made unmarried women increasingly vulnerable for getting deserted by their lovers if they pregnant. [Seccombe, p. 244]

The transition from a subsistence level rural farming economy to an industrial urban economy was gradual and took place over many generations. As small rural farming families lost the ability to feed themselves as population increased, and as Enclosure Acts drove peasants off their land and prevented farmers from grazing animals on common areas, a rural proletariat was created. [Macfarlane, 1978] Women and men, even if their families still owned small plots of land, were obliged to seek wage labour as agricultural workers or to take in work in the 'putting out system' of cottage industries, or to send their children to be servants and apprentices to richer families. Mercantile capitalism gradually eroded the old feudal order. Large land-owners in England abandoned their duties to their peasants and drove them away, to raise sheep and cash crops on land once used for subsistence farming. The human misery caused by these Enclosure Acts reached such a level that Sir Thomas More, the Chancellor of England under King Henry VIII, deplored the greed of the new generation of landowners in his Utopia. In Eastern Europe, peasants remained tied to their land against their will, as late as 1850 in the Germanic kingdoms in Central Europe. However as trade expanded, cities grew, and competition rose, it became impossible for
any one area to be self-sufficient and ignore the social factors created by the rising forces of the free market.

Georg Simmel highlighted how the rise of the free market facilitated individualism as individuals looked to the market and not to tradition or to each other for what they were to produce, how they were to produce, whom they would produce it for, and for what price they would sell it for. [Simmel, 1984, p. 41] & [Simmel, p.439, 1950] The money economy depersonalized economic relations:

"Money is concerned only with what is common to all: it asks for the exchange value, it reduces all quality and individuality to the question: How much? All intimate emotional relations between persons are founded in their individuality, whereas in rational relations man is reckoned with like a number, like an element which is in itself indifferent." [Simmel, p. 439]

The money economy, Simmel perceived, created individual autonomy, for anyone’s money was as good as anyone else’s. Urbanization and monetarization created personal space between people even though it packed their physical bodies closer together like ball bearings in a box.

The "rationalism" of modern capitalism was also a key feature in Max Weber’s writings. As Talcott Parsons states, Weber pointed out that modern capitalism is different from the buying and selling of previous eras. "What characterizes capitalistic acquisition is rather its ‘rationality.’" [Parsons, p. 505, 1939] The market demands a code of personal ethics and self-discipline from the individuals who enter it. People can not produce what they like, how they like, and sell it for what they want. All producers must follow the market, and make commodities in the way that the market desires for greatest efficiency, and sell in price and quantity for what the market can bear. People have to calculate and follow the market, and disregard all advice from traditional sources of authority such as the Church and parents, if they want to succeed. Ultimately, Weber said, this rationality and independence created by the dependence on calculation, creates the state of pure responsibility of the individual towards himself. [Lowith, p.56]

Industrial capitalism benefited men’s attainment of individuality more than it did for women. Due to their childcaring responsibilities and the threat of male violence, women were often less mobile and less able to travel far to seek out work. The division between the public and private spheres were created at this
time, as the household gradually lost its capacity to serve as a workplace for goods to be produced for exchange and later for subsistence and consumption as well. Housework first emerged as a recognized occupation for women about 1830 in North America and Western Europe. [Wilson, 1991, p.49] Men's productive labour left the home never to return and the household ended being a workshop and became a 'haven in a heartless world.'

Many modernist writers saw the decline of the guilds as beneficial for the economy or for the individual.(1) Adam Smith was a proponent of task specialization in the division of labour for greater productivity. Georg Simmel in his essay "Individual and Society in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Views of Life" and "The Metropolis and Mental Life" [Simmel, (editor Wolff) 1950, p.64 & 448] saw the guilds as one of the many restrictions in the eighteenth century on personal freedom and self-development. However, the decline of the guilds definitely handicapped women more than it did men. There were some women-dominated craft guilds like brewing and weaving, and women usually had their skilled work and business entrepreneurship recognized in most guilds:

The Weavers, like other craft guilds, regarded a wife as a trade partner having the right to succeed to and carry on the business after her husband's death. Widows, in fact, took over all the rights, privileges, and liabilities of their deceased husbands, for example as to the proper number of looms, journeymen and apprentices. [Hamilton, p. 32]

Women survived relatively well the transition as guilds were replaced by home cottage industries as it initially increased the opportunities for paid employment for women though it began the process of deskilling their trade. However, as mass production and heavy mechanization replaced the cottage industries, the status of women, their employment opportunities, and their remuneration for their wage work, all declined simultaneously:

"In medieval Europe, women usually had been admitted to the craft guilds and, as guild members, could enter contracts and were responsible for their own debts. The guilds were now in decay, and the newer forms of commercial organizations were almost entirely male dominated. Since men in all trades objected to competition from lower-paid women, it is not surprising that they tried to confine them to the least lucrative work. Throughout this period men were invading trades traditionally exercised by women just as they had already ousted them from work such as wholesale brewing. [Bridenthal, 1977, p. 203]"
Women were allowed to work, but only in the unprofessionalized occupations involving manual labour. A double-bind was created. Lower class women were thought to be more bestial and thus fit for heavy labour, and could be paid half as much as a man for the same work, and middle class women were thought to be fragile and were denied all occupations except being a governess. [Bridenthal, p.203]

Lower class women were obligated to work to support themselves and their families, yet they largely were unable to control the value given to their work and have it seen as skilled as that of work done by men.

"Apprenticeships were made a universal and compulsory form of job training in Britain in 1563 through an act of parliament... The repeal of the act in 1814 followed a prolonged struggle between organized skilled labour and manufacturing employers seeking a free labour force...Men were better organized than women to resist attacks on apprenticeships. In their struggles to maintain their skilled status, their power, and their wages, the craft unions excluded women workers from training and from union membership. This was done not simply because of prejudice, but because women could be paid lower wages and used to undermine the union's position. Women were then used by employers as strikebreakers. The fact that untrained women were used by employers to replace male workers suggests that the skill necessary for work could still be picked up more casually than through a formal apprenticeship...The enforcement of apprenticeship regulations and the exclusion of women became tactics to preserve the skilled status of jobs under attack. The consequence was that women were pushed into areas of employment that did not demand an apprenticeship." [Gaskell, (in Hamilton) 1986, p. 368-370,]

For much of the mid 19th century, women's wages for factory work were below the actual cost of maintaining let alone reproducing, their labour power. As Frederick Engels observed in his The Condition of the Working Class in England, factory managers deliberately kept women's wages below the amount a person needed to feed and shelter themselves, assuming that a working woman would either stay with her parents or co-inhabit with a man, who would then demand sex in return for shelter. [O'Faolain, 1973] In fact, many factory managers, foremen and office managers often demanded sexual intercourse from some of their female employees, which is how the famous New York madam Poly Adler got her start into prostitution: she preferred straight prostitution to prostituting herself to work at minimum wage. [Vuuren, 1973] Lower class working women had no rights within the workforce, yet would be blamed for a host of society's ills, and though forced to work to survive, they would be accused of being improper women and bad mothers.
In the pre-industrial period women and men worked together in the household unit. The household lost its viability as a centre of production between 1820 and 1860, earlier in the more industrialized nations than in the nations that industrialized later. [Margolis, 1984, p 28] After industrialization, middle-class women were excluded from economically productive roles and were left behind at home by their husbands each morning as the men went to their factories and offices. It became a status symbol to have an unproductive wife at home. A woman who devoted her whole life to her femininity and her sex, that is who did not challenge her husband's success with her own, who spent many hours grooming herself or indulging in trivialities, made their husbands feel more masculine and important by comparison. The image of proper womanhood became an absence of worthwhile production except reproduction and motherhood. Women were to be what real people involved in the real world were not. The lower-class families experienced industrialization much differently as men, women, and young children engaged in manual work in the factories and mines. Gradually, however, between 1832 and 1844 in Britain protective legislation was introduced banning women and children from certain occupations and from working certain shifts. [Faulkner, p.153] Women thus began to lose some of their worth to employers in manual labour, even though they continued to be paid significantly less for the same work than a man. Men gradually secured for themselves the jobs that were seen as most skilled, and women were excluded from the new unions when they were formed. Starting in the mid 19th century working men demanded a family wage so that they could have the same family unit (including the same power over dependent wives) as did the bourgeois. [Abbott, p. 79, 1990] Women became to be seen as solely responsible for caring for children, and youth crime and infant mortality was blamed on negligent and ignorant mothers, especially those who worked. Middle class women intent on social reform set out to teach lower-class women who to be proper mothers, how to be feminine, and how to be hygienic. [Abbott, p. 79-80, 1990]

The Industrial Revolution did eventually provide an unprecedented level of prosperity for Europe and North America. Those who could afford it could use their new leisure time to develop nonproductive skills and hobbies that reflected their private inclinations, rather than economic necessity. Men and
women could choose from a growing number of consumer products, and workers could move from one occupation to another and move freely from one city to another. Urbanization gave people more freedom to choose their friends, employers, employees, and mates, and to find entertainment, and also the freedom to ignore other people. [Simmel, 1950, p.443] With a person free to meet and choose to interact with anyone from a large and growing number of people in urban settings, each interaction becomes less important relative to the person's own identity. The consumer market led to self-differentiation by consumption. Millions of people moved above the level of subsistence and poverty and could leisurely turn their concern to the more expressive human needs of creativity, self-expression and self-realization. Feudal powers and restrictions had been completely swept away. The employed worker, except in the Marxian definition, was independent and individualistic, that except during the course of the alienated workday, they were under few restrictions and had opportunities for leisure, education, and travel that most people did not have in previous centuries.

However, mature Industrial Capitalism has left Europe and North America in the mid twentieth century a legacy with an economy in which men do the vast majority of work that is seen as skilled. Business boardrooms, the military, and government, were left as exclusive domains of males. Women were still expected to consider raising children and caring for their husband as their primary occupation and calling in life. In the 'economic individualism' which was the prevailing ideology, of the rational man carefully interacting in the marketplace, [Lukes, p. 1990] women were unable to compete. Women were bound with the unpaid work of child-raising, and except for some of the lowest paid work in the economy, had to live their participation in the individualism of the free market solely through their fathers and husbands. The grand theories of political scientists and economists from Thomas Hobbes to Milton Friedmann, who discussed rational economic man as the liberated individual with no ties to anyone but himself, left women subsumed under the category of household unit.

Footnotes

1) Emile Durkheim may have been nearly alone, except for few reactionary thinkers like Louis de Bonald,
in lamenting the loss of the guilds. Durkheim, like Auguste Comte had been before him, was less enthusiastic about individualism than many of his contemporaries, and Durkheim was concerned about what was holding society together. He wished for intermediate forms of social organization such as guilds as a buffer between individual and state.

2) "Sociologists should be reminded of this point by the economic theory of public goods. One may only imagine that ever-increasing numbers of interaction partners leave less time to the individual for others. In the economists' language, the marginal utility of every individual social contract decreases. This means that individuals -with their own interest- become more important to themselves. The impact of others on individuals' social identity is decreasing. This is a numerical way of explaining the growing impact of individualism and individual interests with respect to collective interests, an analysis in the spirit of Simmel's (1890) and Blau's (1977) structural sociology....Simmel described how individual identity -and, I may add, the particularity of individual interests -is developed by belonging to different and cross-cutting social circles. Individuals' participation in many of those circles guarantees that there can be no interest identity between any social circle and its individuals. The conflict of collective and individual interests is inevitable." Karl Hondrich, "Micropathology and Macronormality" in The Micro-Macro Link, by Jeffrey Alexander, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1987
Chapter Seven: The Secular Inquisition of Biological Determinism

There has been an international effort across several centuries fought to systematically de-individualize women in every sense of individuality. Male ideologues of the new social order fought to ensure women's economic dependence on men, to destroy and discredit women's independent sources of knowledge and moral criticism, to prevent women from developing professional skills, to keep easy access to women's sexuality for men, and to see women as a means to another person's, whether man or fetus's, utility and well-being. In the Middle Ages the Roman Catholic Church carried out the Inquisition which was responsible for the deaths of millions of women while the new educational elite used Greek physiological theory to explain why women were inferior to men. In the modern era the powers of religious institutions declined to be replaced by science and medicine as the new white garbed priesthood. In the past scientists had fought against traditional authority, now scientists and doctors became the traditional moral authority by successfully limiting entrance into their professions and thus elevating their prestige for all matters. Whereas priests had expounded from the pulpit on women's subordination being created by the Original Sin, Social-Darwinists, doctors and psychologists taught from behind their lecterns that women's minds were captive to their reproductive tracts. I call this the Secular Inquisition, an international and coordinated search-and-destroy effort to destroy the authenticity of women's own reports of their experiences, to label women as pathologically sick, and to label any women who did not behave properly, as deviant.

The Secular Inquisition of Biological Determinism has its roots in the distant past yet was most manifested in the period of the Victorian Era through to the 1960s. In the French Enlightenment philosophers like Jean-Jacques Rousseau argued that women should confine themselves to motherhood, yet what I call the Secular Inquisition started when women's economic independence declined in the 19th century simultaneously as the male secular institutions of science, medicine, and law rose in prestige and social control to become pro-active social forces, imposing their own moral vision upon women. As the
institution of medicine, like the Roman Catholic Church before it, was homosocial, staffed only by men who treated women as objects and subject matter to be controlled, its version of morality was warped and misogynistic.

The utility and security of traditional household productive roles declined in the 19th century, creating a dependence for subsistence of all people on the public sphere of wage earning in industrial capitalism. Where once women's work had been essential for survival, the work done within the family unit and household became greatly insufficient for one's economic independence. Women then had to work outside the home, or failing to take in boarders or the neighbour's washing, had to strike up a sexual relationship of dependence with some man who was employed. However, as individualism and equality arose for men through the 19th century, men sought to retain for themselves the new wealth of the Industrial Revolution and the new skills of science and technology. With women's traditional role of producer of the means of subsistence within the home no longer tenable, men debated 'the Woman Question' to decide for women their proper place in the new modern age. Though Enlightenment philosophers had sought to make motherhood women's sole vocation in the late 18th century, it was in the early to mid-19th century that men began using science and specifically medicine, to argue for women's confinement to the home. When as before in Greek, Roman, and Medieval times, women's key role in economic production kept any misogynist philosophy from becoming too restrictive in practice on a personal level, as women became confined to a sole reproductive role, women became much more vulnerable to the growing sexist pseudo-scientific ideology labeling women as sexless creatures of sex whose sole destiny was to propagate the human race.

Starting in the mid 19th century, in the western industrialized countries, men both bourgeois and proletarian, gradually drove women out of the workforce. Men successfully excluded women from the growing professions and unionized industrialized jobs, and often placed additional limits on the paid labour participation of married women. Most disturbing of all, men placed emotional barriers around women, successfully dominating the production of legitimate knowledge about what was proper 'womanhood,' a sort of psychological rape, and blocking women's opportunities for self-realization.
Women were prevented from following their own inclinations or developing their unique talents. For example, a middle-class young woman would be expected to have several "accomplishments" such as piano or sewing, but never to be taken seriously for any skill. Lower class women never entirely left the workforce, but their working conditions and job security were poor, and they were held in much contempt by the general population. A man who had a working wife was seen as a failure, and a working mother was seen as a bad mother. Working women of the lower class were also seen as racially different than the general population, more hardy, coarse and animal-like, fit for male sexual assault, unlike the refined and delicate middle-class women who needed male protection. This left women the roles of being a stay-at-home mother, a hysteric, an invalid, a domestic servant, a nonunionized factory worker, a cleaning lady, and of course, a prostitute. By driving the majority of women out of the paid labour force, men as a group successfully expropriated women's unpaid labour and could delegate all economically unproductive but necessary work to them. Men would write or research, women would type out the manuscript, men would work, and women would feed them and care for their children. Women lost recognition of their desires for sexual satisfaction in the Victorian Age at the same time men would ensure that women's economic dependence would facilitate their own.

Industrialization raised life expectancies for both men and women, and eventually both lowered infant mortality rates and created incentives for family planning as children switched from being another set of hands around the home to work to being another useless mouth to feed. The greatest horrors of working and living conditions of the mid 19th gradually faded and there was a general increase in the standard of living until the Great Depression. Literacy rates rose, and jobs eventually required knowledge or training rather than brute physical labour though working-class men continued to claim that most (industrial) jobs had to be closed to women because men alone possessed the necessary physical strength. Likewise, middle-class men felt that women lacked the necessary mental faculties for professions like politics, law, and medicine, and should play their debt to the whole society by raising children. This notion that women had an obligation to devote their lives to child-rearing, seems to be uncannily analogous to how ancient Christian theologians argued that women had to save themselves through child-
bearing. Family size steadily dwindled, yet women were told to dedicate their whole lives to their husband's children. There came to be only one proper role for women, that of the dedicated mother, and the definition of that role was to be solely decided by men. Women's initiation into proper motherhood would be controlled by men, women's tasks would be assigned by men, and women's sexuality would be controlled by men. Men's individualism would rest upon women's housework raising children and upon men's control over women's sexuality, allowing men to more or less freely express their sexual desires and to invest in their own careers and leisure.

The Secular Inquisition was a case of massive Biological Determinism spilling out of science and social science, and in particular medicine and psychology, to rob women of their recognition as normal human beings. Women were told to be mothers, and were unable to escape from their sexual identity as women. Women's lives were seen and made to revolve around their sexuality, that is their attractiveness and usefulness to men as women. A woman's mind, her thoughts, her aspirations, her morality, were all seen to be created solely by her sexuality and her acceptance of her proper place. Women were told to bind themselves with bras and corsets, to have their bodies injured with rib-removal, liposuction, and silicone implants, to diet until they fainted from malnutrition, to sacrifice their careers for their children and husbands, to have vaginal orgasms instead of clitoral ones, and to be attractive and deferential to men but to blame themselves if they got raped or beaten. Most deviance by women from the proper roles created for them by men would get them stigmatized as being labeled a single-mother, a slut, frigid, or as mentally ill. Women would be drugged, shocked, or have their brains cut into by white-robed male professionals trying to exorcise any demon of uniqueness within a woman that prevented her from being generic.

Men appropriated for themselves the legitimate sources of knowledge. Women's sexuality was fascinating for men who sought to come up with theories to explain women's subordination in society as necessary and to improve men's benefits from the control of women. As we have discussed in an earlier chapter, anatomists of the late Middle Ages either denied that women "contributed to the form of children," (that is gave children half of their DNA) or believed it and sought to prevent the knowledge
from reaching women. [O'Faolain, 1973] In the 19th century, however, this misogyny reached new heights as male physicians and Social-Darwinists denied women the status of being human. Social Darwinists took and twisted Charles Darwin's basic concepts of evolution and applied them to human society to come to the conclusion that those people with superior economic power, the white males, were obviously those who were the most evolved. Herbert Spencer, as well as Beecher and Sumner, were social commentators who believed that women were less evolved than men. Spencer and the Social Darwinists believed that this evolutionary superiority should be instituted by law and women should be prevented from being applying for jobs in business and government. [Ollenburger, p.5, 1992] Women were classified as the vessels in which mankind reproduced itself but were denied all recognition of independent identity by many of the prestigious minds of the late Victorian Era. For example, one of the founders of obstetrics in the 1880s, Dr. DeLee said that he "often wondered whether Nature did not deliberately intend women to be used up in the process of reproduction, in a manner analogous to that of the salmon that dies after spawning." [Hubbard, p. 150, 1989]

This belief that men alone constituted the essential component of the human species was quite prevalent in the late 19th century from the influence of Social-Darwinism. All progress was attributed to men, mankind was seen to have made its progress from the innovations of male hunters in the prehistoric past, and women were seen as less evolved and lacking the vital human element of innovation. [Ehrenreich,p.107,1978] This was also quite common in sociological theory at the time as well, and it would remain to the American sociologist Lester Ward to stand this sexist theory on its head by pointing out that with most other animals, such as spiders, apes, bees, and ants, it was the female that was the species and that males only were necessary for reproduction. [Gilman, (1898) 1966] But people like Lester Ward and the humanist Charlotte Gilman were a decided minority as the self-proclaimed scientists who supported the ruling establishment used Social Darwinism to fight to entrench the interests of white men in American and European society. Darwin's theory of Evolution was used by conservatives all over the world to justify the status quo. The rich used evolutionary theory to explain that they were rich because they were more highly evolved, and white male ideologues speculated that women and Negroes were less
Psychology was built upon the subordination of women. Le Bon, the founder of social psychology in the 19th century, called women "the most inferior form of human evolution-closer to children... than to an adult civilized man." [Freedman, p. 17, 1986] Sigmund Freud, that famous Austrian psychologist and founder of the Psycho-Analytic Theory of moral development, stated that women were biologically destined to be inferior to men. Freud bluntly declared that all women had unconscious penis envy, that it was men and not women who were responsible for civilization, and that because women had not had Oedipal Complexes to overcome, their diminutive Electra Complexes were inadequate creations of morality. [Donovan, p. 95 1990] Freud also helped invent the absurd myth of the vaginal orgasm, and insisted that a properly adjusted woman would transfer her sexual feelings away from her clitoris. Even modern psychologists discussing the foundation of morality, like Lawrence Kohlberg, (1976) thought that women had inferior morality because they were less prone to insisting on violent retribution to enforce universal laws but were more likely to negotiate. [Hagedorn, p. 70, 1990]

The application of science with its emphasis on the rational and detached researcher experimenting wisely on the irrational human subject for its own good, has led to substantial mistreatment of people, especially women:

Western scientific medicine is said to be objective and value-free and doctors are seen as medical scientists who are objective about their patients in much the same way as any other scientists are about their subject matter. Medical science progresses via the scientific method (the experiment), resulting in the acquisition of certain, objective and unchallengeable facts and an autonomous and value-free body of knowledge. However, there are problems with this view of science, which sociologists have challenged in general and specifically with respect to medicine. Sociologists argue that all scientific activity is inevitably influenced by the society in which it is carried out and that the scientist plays a major role in explaining and ultimately justifying various aspects of the way in which a society is organized. Furthermore, feminists regard medical knowledge as part of the means by which gender divisions in society are maintained. Medicine not only reflects discriminatory views of women but serves to reproduce these views by actively stereotyping and controlling women who deviate from them. The way in which women were seen as weak and in need of constant rest by the medical profession in the nineteenth century, thus justifying, for instance, their exclusion from higher education is one example. [Abbott, p. 96, 1990]

Feminists have seen other problems in modern medicine. Physicians came to dominate the process of
childbirth and to manage labour paternalistically as if they were producing a product out of the raw material of women. Women have also borne the brunt of psychiatric management of their personal lives, with women who complained of depression from caring endlessly for husband and children to be treated with psychoactive drugs and tranquilizers. [Abbott, p.96] Likewise, women have had serious trouble with the physician's control of abortion and contraception, which caused delays in abortions and disasters such as the Dalkon Shield I.U.D.

Part of the dangers of the rising economic power of science as a profession was that the new male scientists considered that the ends always justified the means. The scientists who violated moral decency were often financially rewarded. This ties in with women's subjection by science, as male doctors considered the female body, as more research material than human:

"One of the most outrageous cases of experimentation is found in the practice of J. Marion Sims, originator of gynecology and early president of the American Medical Association. One of his early claims to fame was the discovery of ways to suture tears that occurred between the vagina and bladder and the vagina and anus. He developed these techniques by purchasing black female slaves, whom he kept in hospital quarters that he built in his own yard. (Axelson 1985) Because he saw black slaves as enduring, passive, and helpless, he performed countless experimental operations on them without anesthesia. The pain he inflicted on them had to create unimaginable agony, yet this seemed not to faze him in his obsessive search for techniques to build his own career... Sims, like other medical men of his day, believed that women's psychology stemmed from their sex organs, and he was anxious to perform clitoridectomies and oophrectomies (removal of the clitoris and ovaries.) His drastic use of the knife seemed intended not for the betterment of women, but for the enhancement of his own career, because an aspiring specialist, then as now, made his name through the invention and publication of new techniques. Indeed, as one historian has noted, the operating rooms where female surgery was performed in the nineteenth century were essentially 'an arena for an exchange between men'..." [Andersen, 1988, p.210]

Women, members of minority racial groups in industrialized countries, citizens of Third World countries, and other disadvantaged people have too often ended up as research material for white male middle-class scientists, or as guinea pigs and naive consumers for their multinational corporations. Such examples include the Meme breast implant, the Dalkon Shield I.U.D., and Nestle's marketing of infant formula in Africa.

The development of science was not value-free at all, rather one of its main projects was to
control women, to explain their inferiority, and to prevent them from rising up in status. Women were identified with nature, and nature was meant to be ripped apart, to have her secrets raped from her, and to be controlled. Science, and in particular medicine, fought to keep women from becoming self-responsible subjects for themselves because these male institutions perceived a threat to their cosy wealth and prestige if women (and blacks) got in. [Ehrenreich, 1978] Not ignoring the real benefits of science which are many, science and medicine has traditionally only seen women as subject matter for experimentation, and seen women only by their role as mothers:

One example of the class-specificity of biologically determinist arguments is provided by the kind of statements made during the later nineteenth century concerning the constraints imposed by women's biology. Many medical treatises at this time opposed education for women on the grounds that women were naturally physically weaker, as a result of the demands made on their reproductive systems; stimulating the brain through education could only result in energy being drawn away from the reproductive system, resulting in further weakening and enfeeblement. A particular target for such attacks were those women who were seeking entry into higher education, including the medical profession itself. [Birke, 1986, p. 26]

Also, the rise of Darwinism and the acceptance of Evolutionism, was often used as a rationale for denigrating women in the late nineteenth century. Biologists, physicians, and anatomists argued that men were more highly evolved and had biological superiority over women. [Simmel, p. 30, 1984] Also, Social-Darwinists often used scientific gibberish to justify the oppression of black people and Asians, saying that their brains were less developed than white people. [Andersen, 1988, p.70]

The high-point of women's dehumanization was created by the gynecology and psychiatric professions, which were both founded to deal with the problem of women's deviance from their assigned social roles. The operation hysterectomy was invented and named for treating hysteria in female patients. Women's biology was seen by the male practitioners as pathologically sick. Doctors in the late 19th and early 20th century saw menstruation as a debilitating illness for both the mind and body. Doctors recommended rest and abstention from work and reading during menstruation, and some doctors argued that menstruation should be sufficient grounds to prevent women from entering the highly-skilled professions as they would be mentally unstable in those times. [Ehrenreich, p. 101] Most doctors throughout the Secular Inquisition believed that women's whole identities were not just affected but were
determined by either their ovaries or their uteruses. In 1870 Dr. W. Bliss stated that all of a woman's qualities of mind and disposition sprang from her ovaries, and in 1883 Dr. G Austin stated that the ovaries gave women all her characteristics of mind and body. [Ehrenreich, p. 108, 1978] In the 1870s and 1880s, doctors explained women's higher incidence of diseases such as tuberculosis, indigestion, kidney failure, on their wombs. [Ehrenreich, p. 110] The uterus and brain were seen to compete for a woman's energy, and most Victorian Age doctors said that they feared women reading because it would cause them sterility, while other doctors were more open with their motivation, and stated they feared the entrance of women into medical schools. In retrospect it is difficult to judge all doctors (and others) as being guilty of biological determinism because not all of them left damning evidence behind in medical journals and diaries, but this Biological Determinism was prevalent of both psychology and medicine until women started to recreate for themselves a secure economic foundation in the late twentieth century.

The scalpel was the Secular Inquisition's ultimate answer to deviance in women when women wanted to be human instead of to act out the narrow role prescribed for them. Brain surgery of leucotomies and lobotomies became frequent in the mid-twentieth century while gynecological surgery removing the ovaries or clitoris became common starting about the 1860s as soon as antiseptics and anesthetics were invented to prevent the patients from dying. As soon as it was possible to remove a woman's ovaries, men saw it as a necessity in treating women. To twist an old proverb, "Where there is a way there is a will." Removing a woman's ovaries was seen as the ultimate cure-all for any undesirable behavior. According to historian G. Barker-Benfield:

"Among the indications were troublesomeness, eating like a ploughman, masturbation, attempted suicide, erotic tendencies, persecution mania, simple "cussedness," and dysmenorrhea (painful menstruation.) Most apparent in the enormous variety of symptoms doctors took to indicate castration was a strong current of sexual appetitiveness on the part of women." [Ehrenreich, p.111]

It was desirable for men to have a strong sex drive and to ensure that women would obey them in their will, but because men felt uncomfortable about women's natural human sexuality, women would have to have either their ovaries or clitoris removed. These doctors who performed these operations were not necessarily evil, but because women had no place in the male society, men tended to see any problems
they had as a medical problem. During the Secular Inquisition the Biological Determinism of the times resulted in motherhood and invalidism (1) being the two main social roles for women. If a woman was not a good mother and only a mother, that is sexless, cheerful, and obedient, she would be seen as needing medical treatment to make 'a proper adjustment.'

Biological Determinism within the medical profession did not die off with Social Darwinism at the start of the twentieth century, rather it has lingered on until recent times. Doctors considered pregnancy an illness which required mental and emotional rest, and would need a doctor to cure it through drugs and a scalpel at its termination. All pregnant women were seen as neurotic and to be at the mercy of their hormones. Gynecologists eagerly accepted a responsibility for the mental health of their patients. In 1962 Drs. Sturgis and Menzer-Benaron wrote that improper gynecological health was the cause of sexual unhappiness, broken homes, illegitimacy, sterility, sexual deviancy, and juvenile delinquency. [ Ehrenreich, p.252 ] In 1967 an article in the journal Obstetrics and Gynecology urged gynecologists and obstetricians to link pelvic problems to emotional stress and to take management of the total patient to ensure a proper outcome.

The Secular Inquisition was science's attempt to deal with the problems that women faced from not having independence. It is essential to note that technical and medical solutions were proposed for social problems. Well-meaning men hoped to use their scientific expertise to help individual women cope with and accept their problems of the lack of individualism, which prevented women as a whole from attaining the very autonomy and self-worth they needed. The problems that women complained about were usually seen as having pathological origins located within the woman's body, the woman then would be treated, and the doctors would assume it to be a cure. Housewives complaining of depression or lassitude was one of the most common occurrences. Victorian Age doctors prescribed total intellectual rest, while modern doctors prescribed brain surgery. Psychiatrists Sargant and Slater (1972) stated that it was often preferable to treat the housewife who experienced the symptom even if her problem was found to be caused by the abuse that she received from her husband:
"A depressed woman, for instance, may owe her illness to a psychopathic husband who cannot change and who will not accept treatment... [women] patients of this type are often helped by anti-depressant drugs. But in the occasional case where they do not work, we have seen patients enabled by a leucotomy to return to the difficult environment and cope with it." [Hanmer, p.118, 1987]

Here we can clearly see the problem: Men are individuals, and it is wrong and difficult to change their behavior, and so if women experience difficulty, than it is women's minds and women's behavior that should be changed. This paradigm has been used throughout history. Adultery and illegitimacy would be usually blamed on the woman, and women would be told that they would have to be careful to avoid rape, wife-beating, or sexual assault. Men were assumed to be individuals who could do what they wanted.

Men fought to keep science from making a positive contribution to women's lives where it really mattered, contraception. According to some sources like Elizabeth Gould Davis, the Vatican condemned abortion as a sin only after the discovery of anesthetics, because that would allow women to shirk their duty to give birth in pain. In 1873 the Comstock laws were passed in America to prohibit the mailing of birth control and the publish of knowledge to women about their fertility. [McElroy, p. 199, 1982] Birth control in Canada was banned outright in 1892. [Wilson, p. 20, 1991] In Britain, Canada, and the United States, women birth-control activists like Margaret Sanger were arrested and harassed for teaching women about their menstrual cycles. There was a tremendous fear about giving contraception to women because of the perceived subsequent lost of male control. Men thought that if women had freedom from fear, they would become promiscuous, demand the same sexual satisfaction that men had, and would not have to only have sex within marriage due to the economic burden of caring for a child. [Homans, p. 66, 1985] If men fought to prevent women from having freedom from fear of having an unwanted child or a dangerous pregnancy, it is difficult to see how women could have experienced true self-realization during this period that contraception was legally unobtainable. Women would have to suppress their human desires for happiness in order to survive in the man-made role of proper womanhood. The same people who kept contraception illegal and unobtainable for women did little to help unwed mothers struggle with grinding poverty and social stigmatization.
During the Secular Inquisition men debated on how to use science to solve the 'woman problem.' Turning housework into a little science for women was proposed, that home economics would teach women how to be good homemakers. Men found more reasons to argue for the importance of constant child-caring, that children needed an attentive mother in order to develop properly. Bad mothers were seen as a threat to the proper established order of society. Mothers were not supposed to work and were not supposed to let the child out of their sight, and at the same time women had to be careful not to stunt the masculinity of their boy children by being overprotective. Life Magazine in 1956 blamed working women for alcoholism in adult men and homosexuality in little boys. | Margolis, p. 222, 1984 | Also in the 1950s, the anti-feminist pro-Freudian psychologist Marynia Farnham made a career for herself by urging women to stick to motherhood as their sole profession, and said that women's sense of morality was not up to the challenges of the workforce and women should avoid objective concepts and work. | Margolis, p. 246 |

The isolation of child-rearing and women's lack of direct involvement with the economic means of production was a historically unique and temporary development. The homosociality of science has also now started to fade. Science remains influenced by its patriarchal and sexist past, but women now have a voice within science, and through their developing economic independence, are less vulnerable to science's coercive powers. Women are no longer under such coercive power from their husbands. Today, if a man who has cheated on his wife, suggests that his wife have brain surgery to stop being so depressed, the woman would probably tell him to go to hell. Women now have much more bargaining power within marriage, their recognized (paid) work gives them a greater sense of self-worth and an increased number of social contacts, and their work is often in the professions, giving them a voice in the institutions of social control. Things are not perfect today, women remain about twice as likely to be prescribed drugs for mental problems than men are, | Williams, p.463, 1987 | and at least half of the hysterectomies performed each year in North America are thought to be unnecessary. | Sue Fisher, 1986 | However, today the feminist movement has succeeded in showing people that greater independence and individualism for women is the cure for women's emotional problems and concerns. | Ollenger, 1992 |
problems are seen today to be socially constructed from inequality instead from a biological pathology. The feminist movement has highlighted the coercion that women feel in their everyday lives from men, and have fought to remove systemic sexual discrimination within institutions caused by regulations that do not take into account women's accounts of their own experiences of inequality. It is to the feminist movement that we now turn.

Notes

1) Invalidism was a career for middle-class women in the late nineteenth century. Some women adopted this voluntarily. Women invalids got continual bed rest and lots of sympathy. Other women were depressed and tired with incredible fatigue because of their confinement to the domestic sphere without sufficient adult and human stimulation. Charlotte Gilman wrote The Yellow Wallpaper to describe how her well-meaning husband and egotistical doctor almost drove her mad by their treatment of continual baby-sitting without intellectual activity as treatment for her post-partum depression.
Chapter Eight: Democracy and Autonomy

Democracy is one of the necessary attributes of a society built upon achievement rather than ascription. Without democracy, the political power of any state is a tyranny, and there are few restraints to prevent elites from solidifying their power and wealth at the expense of all others. However, democracy is not a sufficient condition in order to guarantee individualism or egalitarianism. In the modern industrial capitalist countries of the West, democracy ensures political debate, a circulation of elites, and perhaps most important, a liberal framework of political rights. Democracy in the most narrow sense of half of a population bothering to vote every four years is completely insufficient to safeguard individual rights, rather the institutions that support democracy are crucial to give the rights and freedoms people need in their lives every day. The process of maintaining democracy through adhering to a constitution and participating in political groups is more important than the mere act of voting.

The voters of a democracy have control over their society in a way that completely transforms the relationship of the individual versus the collective from traditional society such as theocracies, dictatorships, monarchies, and fiefdoms. The individual emerges as not only ultimately responsible for their own fate, but also for the fate of the whole nation. Voters are asked to make decisions regarding the proper relationships of people and policies institutions they have never encountered themselves. In a traditional society it is the people's duty to modify themselves to tradition and to obey authority. In the democracy it is the voter's obligation to educate themselves and become authority. The voters in a democratic state only rarely take part in the executive administration of government, yet govern themselves. The voters are asked to make judgements regarding the whole nation, the allocation of resources, and their civil liberties. The elected representatives, though they can act with considerable discretion within their elected terms, are responsible to their peers who elected them. It is crucial to note that democracy dissolves sources of traditional authority. The voter cannot refuse responsibility for the fate of their country. People in a democracy often get the government that they deserve, for example if the people place a low premium on honesty, or are gullible to exhortations of nationalism, extreme partisanship, ideology, militarism, they will generally get a government that reflects their own values. The
election campaigns often pander to both the lowest common values and to lofty abstract ideals, and voters have to exercise self discipline. Voters have an obligation to participate. Unlike in a traditional society, in a democracy voters has only themselves to blame for the evolution of government and the society. If they disapprove of government policy, they are obliged to do something about it. Voters can run for office, vote, serve as volunteers in campaigns, and give donations to candidates and lobby groups. The democratic system can only survive as long as its citizens do more than just vote once in a while.

The growth of the franchise in a democratic state proportionately erodes traditional authority. The people who cannot vote remain essentially legal minors who have to obey tradition and acknowledge the authority of those above them. In regards to the experience of women, women remained fully ensconced under male authority within the family until they gained an independent voice and power at the ballot box. In Canada in 1867, the franchise was denied to Indians, madmen, prisoners, children, and women, all groups which remained under the direct control of the white men who did gain the vote. The act of getting the vote in the twentieth century for women (and other groups) in most western countries did not suddenly liberate women, but keeping the vote out of their hands was a sufficient means of ensuring their oppression. People who do not have the vote do not have responsibility for making decisions for themselves and for their own country, and do not have the opportunity to elect officials to secure their rights, but rather find themselves bearing responsibilities to obey traditional authority for the perceived public good. For example in Canada and other western countries, the burden of maintaining public morality was kept solely on women's shoulders until they gained the vote, women were "the gatekeepers of morality." Women remained under the control of religion and of their fathers and husbands until they gained the vote. Men used religious arguments to block women's suffrage in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. Men used passages in the Bible to say that women should not speak in public, teach men, or gainsay men in public. When women did gain the vote, they broke the powers that religion and traditional authority had over them. Women with the vote were no longer obliged to obey the Bible, a book which they could not control its contents, but were obliged to help make up the rules for the administration of the whole country. Women, and other groups such as Blacks, were no longer obliged to
act subserviently as tradition dictated but became free to fight against traditions. As the lower classes, Blacks, and then women, gained the vote, their political power emerged as new sources of authority, diminishing the relative power of other sources, such as the voting power of the upper class, the power of traditional religion and local customs. (1) If a person cannot be trusted to mark a ballot, then they certainly cannot be trusted to make important decisions regarding themselves or other people. Giving the vote to people helps them develop themselves, to take responsibility, to vote intelligently, and gives them increased respect from other people. Male politicians may not have been eager to implement a feminist agenda, but they had to listen seriously to women voters as they would to men.

Democracy has been implemented in different ways in varying degrees. In the United States, many positions including dog-catcher, sheriff, and district attorney are elected. In Germany and other social democratic countries, workers of unions can elect representatives to their company's board of directors, an act which stresses democracy's materialist concerns. Canada has a more authoritative tradition, and with our parliamentary system, we approach more of a model of elected dictatorship, almost reminiscent of some ancient Greek city states. In addition, Canadian leaders in the failed Charlottetown Accord of 1992 proposed to strengthen the power of native chiefs who need not be elected, in aboriginal self-government. Western Europe and North America have strong democratic traditions yet ultimately democracy remains nonparticipatory, which renders an organization of government which can easily do without elections or civil rights in emergencies. The state remains ultimately responsible to the people, but is not continuously responsible. During both World Wars, political rights and freedoms were severely curtailed and young men were drafted to fight and die. Likewise in 1970 in Canada Pierre Trudeau invoked the War Measures Act to deal with a terrorist kidnapping. These circumstances would seem to suggest some wildly differing interpretations, that democracy can be taken away and put back in place easily because it poses no threat to the established powers of the capitalist class or the political bureaucracy, or alternately that our democratic traditions are strong enough to overcome any obstacle.

In regards to exploring the separate developments of individualism in western society for men and women, we can speak of individualism as in facilitating democracy. Democracy does not make people...
feel unique, autonomous, and empowered, but democracy does intensify the very individualism that gave it birth. A democratic government reflect the uniqueness of all its citizens and evenly protect civil liberties so that all citizens have equal economic and political (but not financial) rights. Today the constitution of our elected states safeguards individual rights and liberties, but those safeguards would not necessarily disappear if the time interval between elections increased from what has been traditional. Hypothetically speaking we can suggest that a nonelected government can create civil liberties and encourage individualism, and that an elected government can equally take such liberties away. However, today the elected democratic state is generally essential for maintaining the present and agreed upon mix and composition of liberties equally for all groups, such as protecting minorities from discrimination. Our democracy safeguards civil rights and ensures that the present level of individualism is shared equally, yet it would be a folly to speak of democracy as having created individualism. Indeed, if individualism had not emerged from other causes at the end of feudalism, it is doubtful if democracy would have been achieved, or even able to be implemented.

Democracy has been invented in many different ways. We cannot speak of the development of a single great democratic tradition. The Ancient Grecian model of participatory democracy of town meetings of the land-owning men died, and a great gulf separated the Greeks from modern times. Parliamentary democracy emerged in Iceland and England separately as a way of bringing together nobles to forge a consensus and to prevent civil war by allowing all regions to have a say in policy. The English model of parliament shall bear the brunt of our scrutiny for the interest of this chapter as its history is well known and it will not be necessary to make references for all points.

The Normans conquered England in 1066 and set up a feudal system unique in all Europe. On the continent, a vassal owed loyalty directly to his lord, and not to the lord or king to which the vassal's lord had sworn or otherwise owed, allegiance. This meant that in continental Europe a knight could not be prosecuted for treason for rebelling against a king if they had merely obeyed their own lord in his rebellion. In England, the opposite system was created. Each knight in England owed direct and primary allegiance to the king, regardless of the actions of the nobles of intervening ranks to whom the knight also
owed additional allegiance. [Painter, p.115] This meant that the king of England was king equally to all of his subjects, and was not merely just the strongest of the nobles or a nobleman with a fancy title. The king of England might be weak or ineffectual, depending on the person, but he was always everybody's king. Geography also contributed to the unique development of English feudalism. The English were generally secure from invasion and there was less fighting between nobles over land, both factors contributed to the peasant not needing their lords for protection as much as vassals did on the continent. [Macfarlane, 1978] In summary, in England the knights and barons had stronger links to the king and weaker links to their own little power bases. The farmers in England did not take on all the distinctly feudal characteristics of peasants in continental and especially Eastern Europe. [Macfarlane, p.28 & 143] By the fourteenth century the class of yeomans had quickly emerged in England. Yeomans were free and independent small farmers one class below knights, with few feudal privileges or obligations save owing allegiance to the king. These yeoman gradually evolved into an important non-noble land-owning middle class which was to dominate the House of Commons, government bureaucracy, and business. [Adams, p.350, 1913]

The Magna Carta of 1215 signed by the despotic King John set the stage for further development of democratic rights, but not necessarily democracy, in England. The Magna Carta specified the rights of all free men to be free from such things as being arrested without charge, or from arbitrary taxation. The Magna Carta would both have been less important and less likely to occur in continental European kingdoms at the time, with the probable exception of Scandinavia. In England the class of free men grew the quickest. The rights of the Magna Carta were initially only meant for the nobility, but then were extended to the growing yeoman class, and then eventually to the whole population as feudalism faded. King Henry the Eighth in the sixteenth century encouraged parliament in become an independent institution separate from direct royal control. King Charles the First, the second of the Stuart kings, tried to turn the clock back but lost the English Civil War of 1641-1649. Parliament consolidated its power with the Glorious Revolution of 1689, which ended the monarchy's executive powers but not its prestige in English politics. The King of England remained influential, with the right to appoint citizens to the
nobility. The king's nobles could sit in the House of Lords, the upper house of parliament. The House of Lords, in which each member was an aristocrat, remained quite powerful until 1911, after which it was no longer able to be independent of the House of Commons or block legislation from the lower house.

The English Parliament ended the executive and legislative powers of the monarchy, (patronage remained under royal control) but its purpose was never to create political equality or to strengthen the rights of the individual versus society. For example, divorce in England was available only by an act of Parliament, and thus was generally reserved only for the nobility and those men with parliamentary connections. 

Parliament remained dominated by aristocrats and large landowners until the 20th century. Seats in the House of Commons were sometimes essentially bought and sold as only a small minority of the citizens could vote. To be a voter, a person had to be an individual, to both be male and to own property. The Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867 reduced the property qualifications significantly but did not abolish them. It was not until the late 19th century that universal suffrage for men was created in most western countries. Universal suffrage for women had to wait until feudalism was completely abolished, until the property qualifications had been eliminated, and until women gained control of property within marriage. Canada, the U.K., and the United States implemented female suffrage at the end of World War I. Quebec women gained the provincial vote in 1940. France and Japan had to wait until being occupied by American troops in 1944 and 1945 before the women gained political equality.

Individualism necessarily precedes democracy and suffrage. Crucially, individuals need to be self-responsible and autonomous before they can have the right to vote. This judgement needs some explanation. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were right, (3) ideas do not have independent existences, and today's ideas of free trade, equality, and universal suffrage would not have been tenable as solutions back in the Middle Ages. 

Individuals can only be free to vote after they have become free individuals. To turn cause and effect backwards, would suggest that Abraham Lincoln would have given American blacks the vote first before freeing them from slavery. Likewise in South Africa today, the Apartheid of the Group Areas Act and the Mixed Marriages Act had to be abolished
before blacks could be given the vote. People have to be free in their daily interactions and relations with other people before universal suffrage becomes tenable. In Canada and Britain, universal suffrage for both men and women, was not preceded by particular feelings of denial and revolutionary class consciousness for those excluded from suffrage. [Cleverdon, p. 7, 1974] After nearly all groups gained the right to vote, they were quickly co-opted into the traditional establishment. A worker's revolution failed to occur with mass suffrage, and the first wave of feminism is generally thought to have come to an end when women won the right to vote and failed to alter the balance of political power. (4)

In a feudal society, people have an interdependent nonautonomous existence. They are not interdependent only in the Durkheimian sense of organic solidarity, but they live with little separation between themselves. In Durkheim's organic solidarity, the economy as a whole is greatly interdependent, depending on hundreds of professions and international trade. In the feudal world, the local economy was independent and there was only a little trade, but the manner of daily living was not autonomous. In today's industrial wage economy, a person's wages and savings gives them autonomy from their neighbours because that money belongs to them alone and they can spend it on whatever they choose and move wherever they wish. Democracy would have impossible in the Middle Ages. Nobles were obligated by law to give land tenure to their peasants. Likewise, a baron's castle or a knight's manor was not a dwelling separate from the rest of the community. The local people expected to crowd into the castle during an invasion. A nobleman's home was full of people, and privacy was impossible. Servants slept on the floor of the rooms of their masters. Servants, men at arms, prostitutes, travelers, bards, and livestock all slept in the main hall. There were few hallways to separate rooms from each other, and there was little lighting and no central heating, and people generally stayed crowded together. Giving an equal democratic vote to all the inhabitants of a castle, let alone a barony, would have been impossible even if a baron had been infected with twentieth century idealism and zeal. As long as people are living in your home and castle and did not have homes of their own, giving them the vote (to control your property) would have been unthinkable. In essence, the castles, the barons, and the peasants were all public property. Both barons and servants would have to acquire private space and separate property before
democracy would have been feasible. Likewise, the arbitrary brutality of the barons to the peasants would also have to end. The people who participate as voters in a democracy have to have relatively equal amounts of personal autonomy over their homes and bodies to secure a commitment to the social order. It was no coincidence that democracy developed strongest in Britain and places like Geneva, which lost the feudal qualities of land ownership the earliest. The unequal economic and living relations of feudal life had to end before democracy would give a result that would not be chaos.

The very processes which caused the transition from ascriptive feudalism to competitive capitalism ensured that women did not gain the vote until long after democracy matured. The change from the peasant society to modern individualism was caused, in part, by the creation of private ownership of land. [Macfarlane, 1978] In a peasant economy, individuals do not own land, rather the land or the right to farm land in the village, belongs to the whole peasant family. Likewise, in a peasant village there is usually considerable common land for both growing crops and pasturing animals. The economic change which ended feudalism was the private ownership of land, as land would then belong exclusively to a single individual, and not to a noble or peasant family. The new private land then could be bought and sold merely as a commodity. England was one of the first countries in medieval Europe to develop primogeniture. [Macfarlane, 1978] Primogeniture the practice of the eldest son (or the daughter if there are no sons) to exclusively inherit the parent's land. Later, fathers could will their land to which of their sons they pleased. It is essential to note the development of private property with the rise of democracy and the expansion of the voting franchise.

As long as private property did not exist, the only form of democracy that could hypothetically exist was participatory democracy, which was too difficult in the conditions of the Middle Ages to be considered. Representative democracy needed private property and individual autonomy to develop. However, this meant that as long as women did not own property, and that serfs lived on the land holding of feudal lords, most of the population could not be given voting rights. Suffrage was reserved exclusively for those who had private property to control. There was considerable sexism against women participating in government at the time democracy started in Europe from diffuse sources such as the Bible, Greek
philosophy, and both Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment philosophy, but the main obstacle which prevented women from gaining the vote in the fledgling democracies, is that they had no independent control of property. A voter had to meet property qualifications in order to get the vote. To prevent property from being counted twice, only the man in a marriage was recognized as the owner of all property that both partners had brought into the marriage. Women had certain legal rights over their dowries, but this seems to have disappeared in most European countries shortly after democracy started and expanded. [O'Faolain, 1974] In fact, couverture (male supremacy within marriage) in England started before universal suffrage was extended to men of all classes.

Democracy could have developed along a different path than it did. It is possible that women could have been included from the start, after all women had administered property in the Middle Ages. A communal system of democracy could have happened, but aside from peasant communes formed spontaneously in the Slavic countries of Serbia and Russia there was no will nor means for such a system. Democracy itself faced serious opposition from the aristocracy and nearly died several times. As the different classes worked out political compromises in the French Revolutions and in the development of the English Parliament, women were excluded. Men had been always recognized as the heads of households, and the 19th century liberal framework was built on the assumption that all male household heads should be equal. Each household in the 19th century had both production for exchange, primarily under the control of the man, and production for use, that is women's new "domestic sphere." For a household to survive, it needed both kinds of work, (especially child raising) and as such, only the household was a complete and autonomous unit. Men were equal because they equally dominated women and women were all equal because they had to obey their husbands. Men competed as equals, and women became, as victims from both sex-blind economics and sexist misogyny, their level playing field. For most of the 19th century, a male voter had to considerable property qualifications. Many men did fight to exclude women from politics as the feminist movement gradually arose, but for the most part, the male dominance of politics was gained with little protest and was formed primarily from economic considerations. However, when a few women did protest, such as Abigail Adams who asked her husband
and future president John Adams to give equal rights to women in the American Revolution, and Mary Wollstonecraft who asked the French education minister Talleyrand in the French Revolution to give women an equal opportunity for education, they were patronizingly rebuffed.

The rise of women's suffrage deserves special attention. In the United Kingdom and Canada in the 19th century, married women were under the complete control of their husbands due to the couverture of common law. A husband had complete control over his wife's property and body. In this context, giving women a right to vote would have been only an abstract solution to a significant tangible injustice. In 1840, a man won a case in a British court, defending his right to imprison his wife in his house to prevent her from living with her mother. The judge wrote in his verdict that the husband had a right to prevent his wife from seeing people he did not know or of whom he disapproved:

"...he has a right to restrain her from the power to frequent such amusements, unprotected by his presence and without his permission ...She has not the right to bring his honor or her own into possible or even imagined jeopardy."[O'Faolain, p.318, 1974]

It is interesting to note that a wife had not the right to risk her husband's honor by making new friends. A woman's honor depended on her chastity, and a man's honor depended on his wife or daughter's chastity. At this period of time, there were few occupations available for respectable middle-class women, and because married women did not own property, a man had to control his wife to prevent her from spending his money without permission. Without a husband being autonomous from his wife, the husband had to deny the wife significant rights to safeguard himself. In 1852, a new judicial precedent was set in Britain. The judge ruled that a wife could not be forced to cohabit and could legally run away. [O'Faolain, p. 319]

Any runaway wife would risk violent reprisals or starvation, and if she stayed within the husband's home, the husband had a right to her body, but gradually the law began to recognize increasing gradations of autonomy between all people and within marriage.

In 1857 in Britain the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 transferred divorce from parliament to the courts. [O'Faolain, p.328, 1974] making it more affordable and within reach of the upper middle class who had now become an essential part of the political establishment. The Matrimonial Act also had
the effect of ending adultery as a criminal act against the community, an action which I would use to mark the passage of family law from the societal focus of ancient civilizations, to the modern liberal individualistic framework. It is crucial to note how both men and women lacked autonomy. Sexual morality was seen as a public matter until the mid twentieth century. In Canada, legislation banning the sale, distribution, and advertisement of contraceptives became illegal as an Offence Against Morality. (5)

Similar laws had been enacted in Great Britain in 1889 and in United States in 1873. I Gee, (in Hagedorn) p.211, 1990 | It is intriguing to note that the arguments at the time against birth control in this period that women did not have the vote centered on that men feared that women would become promiscuous and cheat on their husbands. [Homans, 1985, p.66 ] The period was not one of unmitigated progress towards individualism. Rather, it seems possible that much of the developments that in retrospect seem as victories for modern individualism were actually built upon an effort to strengthen the collective obligations of the individual to society, or were at least disguised that way.

In the 1880s the Married Women's Property Acts gave women in Britain and Canada the right to own and control their property independently of their husbands. At the time, the rationale for these laws seemed to have two concerns. A middle-class woman needed to protect her father's inheritance from an irresponsible husband. Intriguingly, this legislation did not protect women's earnings within marriage, only their inheritances. At this time, respectable women did not work for wages, and there were few opportunities for a woman to earn a significant amount of money. It would have been difficult to justify the bills as a way for women to earn money and to spend it on their own pleasure, rather it was justified through women's role in looking after their father's legacy.

Women won the vote in Canada through an interesting process which owed as much to collective rights as to individual rights. As early as 1885, then Prime-Minister John A. MacDonald had been ready to introduce legislation to allow women to vote, but the lack of demand for such a bill from members of his own party led to those clauses being omitted from the final versions of voting reform bills. [Cleverdon, p.108, 1974] Middle class women organized Literary Clubs to lobby for suffrage. Women in Canada and the United States argued that giving the vote to women was necessary to make them better mothers for
their children and to keep North America civilized and British against the cultural ravages of the new immigrants. [Kealey, p.13, 1979] Finally, the Liberal Borden granted women the vote as an expedient method to gather support for its policy of conscription. Women were seen as supporting conscription stronger than men did, and that government belatedly seized upon suffrage for women as a goal. However, significant social changes happened in that time, that made women's suffrage much more practical. Women were increasing their entrance into high school and university, and the industrialization that occurred during World War I intensified the size of the wage economy. Women entered the paid workforce in greater numbers. The work of Canadian women had entered the public sphere for the first time in World War One and had been seen as vital for the war effort and worthy of reward. [Cleverdon, p. 8] After World War I, women in North America and Europe became liberated in their daily lives, more free to dress how they wished, to smoke, and to go out without an escort.

The Women's Suffrage movement and the Temperance Movement were linked together. This is an interesting combination, because the Temperance movement stressed that an individual owed an obligation to the community not to drink to safeguard public morality, while the Suffrage Movement would seem to advocate individual rights to give women new rights to end their traditional subordination. Prohibition was aimed against men, and women played the strongest role within that campaign. Drinking spirits was reserved for men at this time, and women only began to drink liquor during the era of Prohibition when it became glamorous to do so. Women reformers in the Temperance Movement then advocated that they had a right to change the social behavior of men, and they also fought for the right to vote to elevate the responsibilities of motherhood and to change the laws passed in the past by an all male electorate. Prohibition and women's suffrage became enacted at the same time in North America, following World War One.

It is noteworthy that women voters did not change voting patterns appreciably. Conventional wisdom of feminist theory has it that first wave feminism exhausted itself in the struggle for the vote to explain the lack of new reforms in politics in Britain, Canada, and the U.S. after women won the vote. It seems likely that many women voters were less radical than the leaders of the suffrage movement.
Where does this leave us in regard to the relationship between democracy and individual autonomy? First, that the causal relationship is that individual autonomy precedes democracy. Women had to be aware of themselves as individuals with different interests and opinions than their fathers, brothers, and husbands, in order to want the vote. However, women never voted as a block and have never voted only as women. Women may vote differently than their male family members, but neither do they form strong ties of solidarity with other female voters. Women remain free of any biological essentialism or of a collective conscience and remain individuals. Second, the stability of democracy depends on the education and literacy of the public. Countries that have a higher rate of illiteracy have the greater risk of coup, vote buying and rigging, and general electoral distortion. With such hindsight, a public school system mandatory for all children and the opening up of universities for women, both of which were accomplished in the 19th century, were necessary prerequisites for universal suffrage. Thirdly, people need personal autonomy before they can enter the democratic political process. People need rights to their bodies, personal space, property, and to be responsible for themselves without guardians. Self-responsibility has to precede responsibility in the public sphere. Fourthly, democracy did affect people's individualism in that democracy is the best mechanism to safeguard those rights once they are created and to give them to all members of the population. Winning the right to vote regardless of sex or property qualifications opened up the avenue for social reforms and new social programs in later decades. Without women having the right to vote, constitutional equality banning discrimination would have been difficult to achieve. Having the franchise, is society's recognition on a person as a mature person, self-responsible and able to take upon responsibility in the public sphere for the greater good of society.

Individual women will not necessarily make decisions different than individual men. As Mary Wollstonecraft argued, intellect is not sexed. As we have seen from the actions of women heads of state like Golda Meir, Indira Gandhi, and Margaret Thatcher, can be just as blood thirsty, and authoritarian autocrats as men. As women enter politics, the military, the courts, they have to conform to
past rules, customs, and laws made by men, and if anything, may have to be more competitive and aggressive to succeed. This entrance of women into male dominated institutions is a success of liberalism which may have long term radical ramifications that extend beyond equality within the present system to transform society by diminishing gender stereotypes. (7) Political and business institutions may lose their hyper masculinization and take upon more human characteristics. As women gained representation in the upper echelons of power, men will have to redefine their own roles as men no longer assume a monopoly on positions of prestige and importance. Masculinity will no longer be synonymous with success. The 'Old Boys' networks within institutions will become eroded. Men's behavior may change as the homosociality of institutions ends, for the men in power will no longer interact with only men as their peers and women as mothers, sex objects and dependents. The transformation of behavior within institutions and intermediate organizations caused by women's rise in status, may have much greater effect than merely giving women a greater share of the decision making process in an abstract way. Women will no longer have to have their needs met, their money received, their political rights protected, solely through men. Issues such as abortion rights will no longer be decided only by men.

Durkheim, Tocqueville, and Kornhauser believed that democracy can only be built upon an infrastructure of intermediate organizations. [ Sartori, p.119, 1968 ] The individual must never be juxtaposed naked and alone against an all powerful state. The underlying structure connecting the two poles, individual and state, must at first be built out of autonomous, that is separate, building blocks. Democratic government is formed less out of an abstract contract between all individuals than as an evolution of smaller social structures such as the family, guilds, professional associations, literary and political clubs, military units, churches, and political parties. The democratic state now serves to protect the rights of the individual, but the democratic state in turn depends on the voluntary and regular participation of the individual in other groups. Hence, the individualism of a person's daily life, their free and unfettered voluntary participation in the public sphere remains crucial to any understanding of the more abstract qualities of individualism, as well as for the maintenance of basic civil liberties.
Footnotes

1) The political power of the economic elite remained but the upper class would have to use its economic power to win influence through the votes of members of the other classes.

2) Some countries such as Franco's Spain and Gorbachev's U.S.S.R. moved towards democracy peacefully from dictatorship. In other instances, democratic governments proved quick to take away civil rights in war time. Several pacifists were executed in Canada for treason during World War One for opposing the war.

3) Personally, I choose a more liberal interpretation of Marx's work, and I note how he stressed that ideas were tied to the material foundations of life and production, and not blindly determined, and could develop an autonomous existence and even influence the material foundation.

4) Women have failed to vote as a solid block and thus women have never formed a consensus between themselves about their political interests as women independent of men. In regards to ending class barriers for suffrage, it would take decades before social-democratic governments were elected in Britain and Canada. Though Ramsay MacDonald won election twice in the 1920s, the Labour Party would have to wait for Clement Attlee in 1945 before implementing its own agenda and reforms. In Canada, Tommy Douglas was elected premier of Saskatchewan in 1944. Considering the late date of his election, and that Saskatchewan was one of Canada's least industrialized provinces, that gives little evidence for the formation of a revolutionary class consciousness for the industrial workers in Canada at the time they won the vote in the 19th century.

5) It is intriguing to note that the arguments at the time against birth control in this period that women did not have the vote centered on that men feared that women would become promiscuous and cheat on their husbands. [Homans, 1985, p.66] Women did not gain the legalization of birth control right after they gained the vote, but at least women and men then had equal responsibility for public morality. That helped women get their rights for birth control in the 1960s in Canada and the U.S.

6) However, there are whole traditions of thought, from Enlightenment philosophy, to radical and cultural feminism which argues the opposite, that women are innately different mentally than men. However, there does not seem to be enough evidence for biological essentialism, which if expanded, could be too easily expanded to both sexism and racism. Carol Gilligan may be right that women in general may have different moral processes than men which should be given equal weight, but such differences are most likely the product of different life experiences, such as childhood socialization, careers, and child bearing, rather than the inevitable product of having two X chromosomes.

7) However, it is too soon to tell to what extent that gender inequality could reduce overall coercion, violence, sexual assault, homophobia, and business aggression. Understandably, there is a lack of evidence to predict what will happen in the future.
Chapter Nine: Feminism and The Decline of the Patriarchal Family

The mid-19th century found women legally dead and without any recognition of self-determination, autonomy, and rights within marriage. Though many working-class women were in the paid workforce working at lower wages than men earned, the only accepted role for middle-class women and a growing proportion of women of all classes in general, was to be a wife and mother. Girls were raised to be demure, to guard their virginity, to wait passively for their prince to come along and sweep them off their feet, and then change their name and exchange their obedience to their parents for obedience to their husband. Women were to bear their husband's children and then devote the rest of their time to care for them. A woman could hope that their husband would be a 'good provider' who was not too abusive, drunk or violent, but if the marriage failed or her husband beat her she usually had no recourse to divorce; in Britain (1) and Canada divorce was granted only as an Act of Parliament. As the writer Charlotte Gilman pointed out at the end of the 19th century, women were kept physically stunted and encumbered, and mentally impoverished. Women were denied the use of their minds, and the whole human race suffered from women's enforced dependency on men, which kept women and men in rigidly separate roles and prevented them from having much in common. This dependency kept middle-class women in a parasitical relationship with their husbands at the same time it was a prison which could drive women mad. [Gilman, (1898) 1966]

In the industrialized democratic countries of western Europe and North America, men achieved the last elements of the expanding concepts of freedom and individuality. Universal male suffrage was implemented at the end of the 19th century, industrialization gave men the opportunity to specialize their occupations, laissez-faire capitalism gave them the responsibility and opportunity to take care of themselves in the growing market, there was in general a lack of censorship and a relative freedom of thought and conscience, and men and women could chose from an expanding array of consumer goods. However, the market and industrialization had led to individuality for men and not for women:
"The modern world broke radically with this traditional practice in daring to propose that individual merit and individual choice should govern men's membership in communities. By the time such individualism had become a viable or even expedient basis for men's participation in society, the market had begun to erode the material foundations of traditional communities, although without immediately releasing women from their constraints. Modern bourgeois states and markets retained severe restrictions on women's mobility and independence, notably by denying married women the right to hold property and frequently even to control their own wages. Even protective labor legislation, which sought to shield women from the most demanding jobs and the longest hours, can, from one perspective, be viewed as limiting women's access to economic independence and as enforcing their dependence on men. Individualism for women lagged far behind individualism for men, as individualism for the dispossessed of all races lagged far behind that for the propertied. ...Women did indeed remain subject to involuntary community membership long after men had, in principle if not always in fact, become entitled to self-determination. When women trespassed or were thrown upon the market, the consequences of the ideology of separate spheres followed them in the form of licensed violence against their persons, lower wages, and exclusion from opportunity. [Fox, p. 43]

It is critical to note that until the success of the Women's Movement in the early twentieth century, women were not persons. Women were mothers, to be kept sheltered in the home, away from the corrupting influences of politics, away from the sterilizing effects of higher education, and away from the defeminization and dangers of the workplace. In Canada, women were only recognized as persons by the federal government in 1929 after five women appealed a Supreme Court of Canada ruling to the Judicial Committee of the United Kingdom. [Baker, 1990, p.217] Women achieved their due recognition through political organization and lobbying which finally forced their governments to grant them legal and theoretical equality with men. This was achieved in different times in different places, and even today, women are often hampered by a lack of freedom of choice and action that would seem ludicrous if applied to men. (2)

The American Woman's Movement issued a Declaration of Sentiments at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. The Declaration of Sentiments was based on liberal Enlightenment theory of natural rights for all individuals and it worded the Declaration of Independence as if women mattered:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. [Donovan. 1990, p.6]"
Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who wrote the declaration, argued that men built the institutions and laws of society to service themselves on the exploitation of women, to reduce women to nameless shadows whose only goal is to raise the children of men and propagate the next generation:

"He has compelled her to submit to laws in the formation of which she has no voice... He has made her, if married, in the eyes of the law, civilly dead. He has taken from her all right to property, even to the wages she earns... In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming to all intents and purposes her master -the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement... He closes against her all the avenues of wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine or law, she is not known. He had denied her the facilities of for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her... He has created a false public sentiment by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society are not only tolerated, but deemed of little account to man. He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and to her God. He has endeavored in every way that he could to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life. [Friedan, 1963, p. 84]

Elizabeth Stanton, though happily married, emphasized repeatedly in her career as a suffragist that the traditional institution of marriage robbed women of their identity and hindered their opportunity for self-realization:

"The contract of marriage is by no means equal... In entering this compact, the man gives up nothing that he before possessed, he is a man still; while the legal existence of the woman is suspended during marriage, and hence forth, she is known but in and through the husband. She is nameless, purseless, childless -though a woman, an heiress, and a mother. [Eisenstein, p. 157]

Feminists fought a long battle for the recognition of women as individuals who have a right to their own name, their own careers, and a right to their own bodies, which includes the right to refuse to have sex with their husbands, (3) the right to divorce, and the right to safe forms of birth control and abortion. Gradually feminists in the 19th century won freedom to enter university and own property. After World War One women achieved the right to vote in both Canada and the United States. However, it was not until the mid-1960s that feminists were able to end all formal discrimination against women, which allows society today to seem as if women have all the same freedoms that men do, and the same opportunities for freedom of choice and self-realization.

"From the late 1800s to well into the twentieth century, women gradually gained more
political and legal rights, but only after many years of speeches, protests, and legal battles. In Britain, the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 was seen as a milestone for women's rights. Similar laws were introduced into the Canadian provinces within the next few years. From 1910 to 1923, provincial legislation allowed mothers to gain legal custody of their children both during marriage and after divorce. In 1918, women gained the right to vote in federal elections, but could not vote in Quebec provincial elections until as late as 1940. These legal changes were precipitated by the participation of women in the labour force, by ideologies of equality emanating from other political movements, and by the determined efforts of the women's rights movement. [Baker, 1990, p.334]

Restrictions on divorce in Canada were loosened in 1968 and 1985, the dissemination and distribution of birth control became legal in 1968. Limited legal access to therapeutic abortions became available for women in 1968, the access to abortion not becoming widely available until after the Canadian Supreme Court struck down federal (and not municipal hospital board) restrictions on abortion in January 1988.

The progress for women's rights has not been linear and free of backlash. For example, during World War II, women entered the paid labour force in unprecedented numbers in both industrial and service sector jobs, to feed their families and to enjoy economic independence and self-reliance. But then in the 1950s the ideology of motherhood and the happy housewife reemerged, and women's role was seen to be only wives and helpmeets to their husbands:

"Incentives such as free government nurseries and income tax concessions were provided to attract married women into the labour force. ...When the war ended, the incentives were withdrawn in an attempt to move married women back into the home. Married women were forced out of government jobs through regulations and legislation. Single women were strongly encouraged to return to their former 'female' jobs. [Hamilton, p.58, 1986]

However, as the economy continued to grow, more employment opportunities for female oriented jobs became available in the service sector, and more women entered part-time and full-time work in what has been called 'the pink collar ghetto.' It is vital to note even after the rise of second wave feminism in the 1960s when women are legally free to enter the workplace, and discriminatory hiring practices are not legal, considerable gender segregation still exists in both the paid work force and in domestic work. Working women shoulder a double burden of paid and unpaid work, and women are still more likely to be found in lower paying jobs than men, [Gunderson, 1990] though this disparity appears to be easing gradually.
The equalization of the relationship between the husband and the wife in marriage is central to the achievement of freedom and individuality in most women's lives. As long as women get battered, raped, threatened, forced to work longer hours than men do by being responsible for domestic housework, [Hamilton, p.149] women will not enjoy the same freedom from violence and the same opportunities for self-realization that men do:

"Full individualism for women has increasingly been understood to include equality both within marriage and in the workplace. Initially, the freeing of women from the crippling aspects of marriage only entailed the removal of legal disabilities. But almost from the start, the promotion of women's equality in the workplace and such attendant arenas as educational institutions was taken to necessitate affirmative action. Removing barriers was not enough; the redistribution of scarce resources had to be promoted. Increasingly, the improvement of women's position within marriage is taken to require positive intervention. [Fox, p.66]"

As long as women are the ones expected to drop out of the labour force to care for children, and as long as women earn less than men, women will remain at an unnecessarily high risk of wife-battering, spousal rape, and poverty. [Lewis, p. 1, 1988] with the poverty rate for single-mothers being particularly high. [Ross, 1990]

Despite the real victories of the woman's movement to gain legal equality with men and to highlight women's oppression, even today many women do not have the same opportunities that men do from the double-work day, the threat of rape, on the job sexual harassment, and the gender-segregation of work yielding low wages for women. Women may now have legal equality with men, and use the powers of the state to guard their liberty and freedom, but women often do not have the same opportunities for self-realization that men take for granted.
Footnotes

1) In Britain women only gained the right to divorce their husbands on the same ground as the husbands could divorce them in 1928. [Abbott, 1990, p. 77]

2) For example, February 1992 was notable for two landmark cases: In Ireland, a pregnant fourteen year old rape victim was denied the right to leave the country by the courts until such a time had passed that she had given birth. This was appealed to the Irish Supreme Court, and she won her appeal on February 26, 1991. On February 27, 1992, a change in French law made it possible for French women to work at night, ending a law prohibiting them from doing so passed in 1892. It is hard to see such restrictions applying to men without the situation being called an occupation or oppression.

3) Spousal rape cases are rarely tried in court but when they are brought to court they have a higher chance of conviction than other forms of rape. Spousal rape first became a crime in about 1980 in both California and Canada, see Diana Russell's Rape in Marriage, 1982.
Chapter Ten: The Housewife and Self-Realization

To be accurate, housewives across America did not all rebel consciously against the ideology of motherhood being women's sole calling that was imposed on them. Rather, married women (1) re-entered the workforce in greater numbers because of a variety of factors such as inflation and unemployment cutting their husband's income, rising expectations of material wealth, to pursue a calling in a profession such as medicine or business, to support themselves after divorce or otherwise single-motherhood, to get more respect within the marriage from their husband to have real bargaining power, or just to pay the bills. This trend has continued so that in 1987 (2) only in 12 percent of Canadian couples did the wife had not worked since marriage, [Baker, p. 70, 1990] Most women today in western industrialized countries expect to work outside the home after marriage. As greater numbers of women increased their involvement in the paid labour force, it was observed by sociological researchers that married women who did work reported a greater sense of self-worth, independence, freedom, control over their fate, and meaning in their lives:

Women's access to any wage does mean some increase in power. As two incomes become more and more necessary, women's paid jobs must also be taken into account. Moreover, women with paid work seem to be healthier and happier than other women. Eicher (1988; 214) concludes that 'all indications are that in terms of mental health, self-esteem, and marital happiness wives with paying jobs fare better than housewives.' [Baker, p. 75, 1990]

To be sure, because women are often segregated into lower paying, nonunionized, 'pink collar ghetto' jobs in the workplace, [Baker, p. 74] women are more likely to have uninteresting jobs with lower material rewards than men, but nevertheless, paid employment in itself for married women is a necessary condition for their self-realization, independence, and for equality within marriage with their husbands.

Women writers Charlotte Gilman Women and Economics (1898) and Betty Friedan The Feminine Mystique(1963) were both crucial in their times for high-lighting the positive advantages for both the individual woman and society at large for women and men to be equal in the paid labour force.
Gilman emphasized that the world had become over-sexed, with the workplace overly masculinized with only male values, and women's lives in the home over-feminized as they concentrated all their identity and efforts on childrearing, beauty, and their sexuality. Gilman foresaw a massive positive social change with women's entry into the paid workforce. Men and women would have more in common and more likely to be friends with each other, as men did not have to fear women latching like parasites onto them, could meet each day at work, could discuss more things they had in common than children, earned each other's respect, and could have a relationship together that was not merely sexual. If women and men were equal partners in the workplace, this could change how work was done, and de-emphasize the overly masculine, competitive, ruthless character of work, and end the violent sexual euphemisms in business such as 'screwing your opponents.' With the separation of gender specific spheres of work ended, the two dichotomous value systems, which depended on each other for support and definition, [Fox, 1991, p. 57] the male being competitive and autonomous, the female being nurturing and caring, would merge into one. The result would be a humanization and de-sexualization of modern life to the benefit of all. [Gilman, (1898), 1966] Betty Friedan in The Feminine Mystique focused more on the benefits to individual women and housewives, that paid work would end the cycle of ceaseless boring work that they did in their prison-like home, and give them intellectual and social stimulation, and a sense of independence and self-reliance. Critically, both Gilman and Friedan noted that society's deprivation of paid and meaningful work for the housewife contributed to her experiencing depression and confusion, and increased the chance of her being diagnosed as having a mental disorder. (3)

Conventional individualism may be problematic for women within the traditional marriage. The concepts of marriage in western society have often included the merging of identity, as typefied by the woman changing her name to that of her husband, and an acknowledged loss of control by the woman over her body by giving permanent sexual consent. Traditionally, the man gained a guarantee of sexual access to the woman, and the woman nearly always changed her life plans to accommodate the man's career. This systemic sexism built within conventional forms of marriage prevents women's individualism from necessarily arising from living in a liberal democratic industrialized consumer society:
Like racism, sexism testified to and guarded against a particular group's access to full participation in individualism. But the condition of women within households, notwithstanding rhetorically strong analogies, had not been identical to that of slaves. For if more women than we like to think had suffered various forms of domestic violence and sexual abuse, more women than we like to admit had accepted their position within marriage as their natural condition. Marriage did subject women, including their property and their wages, to the authority of a man, upon whom they depended for support. Marriage did expose women to private forms of abuse against which they had little or no recourse. But, in many instances, marriage also offered women protection against the uncertainties of single life -offered them economic support and a social and personal identity that enhanced their self-respect. The residual corporatism of marriage excluded women from individualism, but at least for a time it also offered them important benefits in return. For many women, in short, marriage constituted a viable career, a more promising source of security than anything the individualism of the public sphere could offer. [ Fox, 1991, p.63 ]

Therefore, not only it is quite possible to have women denied individualism in a free society, it is quite probable, providing the institution of marriage which regulates and maintains traditional narrow gender roles for women is not reformed.

Betty Friedan wrote extensively in The Feminine Mystique how the limited role for the housewife denied her full humanity and identity:

"We have made woman a sex creature," said a psychiatrist at the Margaret Sanger marriage counseling clinic. "She has no identity except as a wife and mother. She does not know who she is herself. She waits all day for her husband to come home at night to make her feel alive. [ Friedan, p. 29, 1963 ]

Educated middle-class housewives were suffering from the "problem with no name," as they found themselves without much purpose, and succumbed easily to depression and anxiety. The repetitive, isolated, and interminable nature of housework prevents it from being what Marxists would call praxis, or free creative engagement in the world in which the best qualities of the individual emerge. Housework, to the contrary, though it does offer some control over the timing of tasks, is usually undervalued and restricts personal growth and freedom. The results from housework are usually intangible, the house is always slowly getting dirty, and a meal, once made and served, becomes more garbage to be disposed of.

Traditionally until the 1960s, sociologists such as Talcott Parsons, [ Abbott, p. 74, 1990 ] and Freudian psychiatrists were quite convinced that the women's place was in the home and should not even 'try to compete (why not cooperate?) with men in the public sphere. As the neo-Freudians Marynia
Farnham and the sociologist Ferdinand Lundberg were quoted in the *Modern Woman: The Lost Sex* (1947):

"It is not in the capacity of the female organism to attain feelings of well-being by the route of male achievement... It was the error of the feminists that they attempted to put women on the essentially male road of exploit, off the female road of nurture..."

Friedan, 1963, p. 120

Guidance counselors, teachers, legislators, and business executives from the nineteenth century to past the middle of the twentieth century were all generally unanimous that women and men were different, and that women's lives should revolve around their sex and genitals, that is women would only have a sexual identity rather than be normal individuals. Betty Friedan quotes an educational study from the journal *The American College*:

"The identity issue for the boy is primarily an occupational-vocational question, while self-definition for the girl depends more directly on marriage. A number of differences follow from this distinction. The girl's identity centers more exclusively on her sex-role - whose wife will I be, what kind of a family will we have, while the boy's self-definition forms about two nuclei; he will be a husband and father (his sex-role identity) but he will also and centrally be a worker... The boy can begin to think and plan for this aspect of identity early... The sexual identity, so critical for feminine development, permits no such conscious or orderly effort. It is a mysterious and romantic issue, freighted with fiction, mystique, illusion. [Friedan, p. 164, 1963]

As we can see from this excerpt, the career specialization of the boy coupled with the girl's self-identity through her sexuality, leads the boy to ask 'what will I be?' while the girl asks 'whose shall I be?' As long as women are brainwashed or otherwise coerced into only being housewives, they will not have self-reliance, independence, and an identity separate from that of their marriage. It does not matter how many freedoms society offers, the freedom of privacy, equality, to be left alone, free speech, and the freedom to chose consumer goods, as long as marriage remained untransformed the attainment of individualism and self-identity by women remained difficult and tenuous.

The modern conceptualization of the individual, male or female, has progressed in the twentieth century, notably under the influence of the psychologist Abraham Maslow, to include the necessary conditions of self-realization, the expression of creativity, intellect, and the need to be esteemed and capable of controlling one's fate in a manner of meaningful independence. [Maslow, p.27-35, 1970]
After a person is free from violence and has their physiological needs of food and shelter met, the person usually seeks comfort and a sense of place and belonging in their relationships with other people. Then, the final step the person seeks self-expression, esteem, and to discover and be all that they can be:

"Even if all these needs are satisfied, we may still often (if not always) expect that a new discontent and restlessness will soon develop, unless the individual is doing what he is fitted for. A musician must make music, an artist must paint, a poet must write, if he is to be ultimately happy. What a man can be, he must be. This need we may call self-actualization." [Maslow, p. 33, 1970]

But because western women have traditionally been forced to see their responsibilities to their family as their main if not only calling, then the endless housework, coupled by the deskilled work in the labour force that they may end up doing because they did not foresee to train for a career or because of job segregation, usually prevents them from being all they can be to the same extent their husbands or ex-husbands can. (4)

Betty Friedan emphasizes the point that individuality is not something that is granted people by economic and legal factors, such as laissez-faire capitalism and the constitution, but that individuality is achieved through the person's own active struggle for self-definition, provided they are not crushed and overwhelmed by legalized oppression:

American housewives have not had their brains shot away, nor are they schizophrenic in the clinical sense. But if this new thinking is right, and the fundamental human drive is not the urge for pleasure or the satisfaction of biological needs, but the need to grow and to realize one's full potential, their comfortable, empty, purposeless days are indeed cause for a nameless terror. In the name of femininity, they have evaded the choices that would have given them a personal purpose, a sense of their own being. For, as the existentialists say, the values of human life never come about automatically. "The human being can lose his own being by his own choices, as a tree or stone cannot." [Friedan, p. 314, 1963]

Ensconced numbly in the home, a woman loses all individuality if she passively accepts her fate and identifies herself as only her husband's wife and her children's mother. Individuality is something that needs to be constantly maintained. This praxis involves an individual making a positive and tangible difference to the sphere of production as well as the family, and transforming and evolving that individual for the better through their relationship to the world around them. And as Georg Simmel stated
"Individuality in being and action generally increases to the degree that the social circle encompassing the individual expands." [Simmel, 1971, p.252] Praxis and individualism requires active involvement in the world without letting one's horizon's constrict.

Betty Friedan fully embraces Maslow's psychological theory that the human being intrinsically yearns to develop its full potential, and to improve and to develop its own distinct qualities. This and similar theories that emerged after World War II and later in the 1960s modified the notion of the individual to be more than just a recognized separate person by law, but as a consciously blossoming unique person, who after being free from constraint then consciously strives for self-development and to fulfill more abstract and artistic goals than just survival and duty:

"In a sense, this evolving hierarchy of needs moves further and further away from the physiological level which depends on the material environment, and tends toward a level relatively independent of the environment, more and more self-determined. But a man can be fixated on a lower need level; higher needs can be confused or channeled into the old avenues and may never emerge. The progress leading finally to the highest human level is easily blocked -blocked by deprivation of a lower need, as the need for food or sex, blocked also by the channeling all existence into these lower needs and refusing to recognize that higher needs exist. In our culture, the development of women has been blocked at the physiological level with, in many cases, no need recognized higher than the need for love or sexual satisfaction. Even the need for self-respect, for self-esteem and for the esteem of others -"the desire for strength, for achievement, for adequacy, for mastery and competence, for confidence in the face of the world and for independence and freedom" - is not clearly recognized for women. ...If a woman's needs for identity, for self-esteem, for achievement, and finally for expression of her unique human individuality are not recognized by herself or others in our culture, she is forced to seek identity and self-esteem in the only channels open to her: the pursuit of sexual fulfillment, motherhood, and the possession of material things. And, chained to these pursuits, she is stunted at a lower level of living, blocked from the realization of her higher human needs. [Friedan, p. 316]

Motherhood in itself, though it may be a large part of self-fulfillment for many individual women, is not a sufficient condition for individuality. In fact as Georg Simmel mentioned, because motherhood is something that is generic and happens to most women, strictly speaking we cannot speak of motherhood in itself as being a factor in individualization. Though birth certainly may be a major experience in a woman's life, it does not make her unique, and it certainly makes her less autonomous. [Fox, 1991, p.61-66] Confining women to the home, and making them focus all their human energies into what is a sexual role of being a lover and mother, stunts women's growth as human beings. As Charlotte Gilman
pointed out in *Women and Economics* (1898), the individual members of the human race had unrealized potential in becoming more human as they rejected narrowly rigid and dichotomous sexually defined gender roles.

Footnotes

1) Lower class married women, and often unmarried women, had been always in the workforce. Also, official statistics regarding women's participation in the labour force are distorted because until recently the wives of farmers were not counted as active members of the labour force. Also, another traditional source of income for women because they faced such discrimination in the labour market was to take in boarders, and as women have re-entered the labour force, the boarding-houses have declined in number.

2) It may seem confusing to some readers to skip from the turn of the century industrial revolution to the late post-industrial economy, but in terms of labour force participation and the ideology of motherhood imposed on them, women in the 1950s resembled women of the late Victorian Age in the limits to their opportunities. In the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, labour force participation rates for women in all industrialized countries rose continuously. Today, most women do not expect not to work after marriage, and so plan and make allowances for a career, and so are much more prepared than women of the previous generation who often entered the labour force unexpectedly after many years of marriage, without job experience and significantly marketable skills.

3) For another reference to the inverse correlation between women's participation in the paid work-force and mental illness, see Jessie Bernard's article "His Marriage and Hers." Or read Charlotte Gilman's story "The Yellow Wallpaper" of her own experiences as her family doctor tried to prevent her from reading and encouraged her to devote her whole life solely to care for her child.

4) "The combination of higher male wages, female segregation, and traditional attitudes toward men's labour force work means that men's jobs in the market take precedence over those of women. When families have to decide who will leave the market in order to care for children or elderly relatives, to handle emergencies, or to do the regular domestic work, they usually choose to forgo the earnings of the person with the lowest wage and least interesting work." [Baker, p.75, 1990]
Chapter Eleven: Concluding Comments

Women have had to struggle against men to achieve recognition as both persons and individuals. However, women's individualism must not end with mere equality with men as men. That is, it is completely insufficient for individual women to achieve access to the public sphere and skilled paid labour by being granted status as 'honorary men' and being rewarded only by men and men's values on how they conform to the behavior of men, a goal unattainable by women as a whole:

"To claim women's humanity only insofar as women can show themselves to be like (as good as) men is to challenge men's definition of women but not their definition of humanity... because man has been identical with humanity in male-dominated society, and female-identified activity has been devalued and marginalized, the overall direction of political struggle must be primarily to feminize the world and man and the concept of humanity. This is to provide concrete content for values and goals, such as 'non-alienated man,' which have remained abstractions in male-dominated radical politics. It is also to bring together the psychological and the social, the individual and the collective, the personal and the political, in a far more effective and sustained way than male radicals have been able to do." [Miles, 1982, p.218]

Real equality between men and women needs recognition of difference, not of supposed sociobiological differences between men and women, but the recognition that institutions in our society have been overmasculinized and overabstracted, and that women continue to face a double burden of paid and unpaid work, are still primarily responsible for childraising, and are uniquely vulnerable to sexual assault and rape. Men must change their own behavior somewhat, for example in ridding themselves of sexual stereotypes and in taking an equal share of the work of childraising, it is insufficient to demand that only women change their behavior. It would be impossible for women to attain true individualism if the method was for them to deny their womanhood, and to try to act as masculine, aggressive, and boorish, as men, and to be judged by men by male standards. Women ultimately have to judge themselves rather than continuing to live their lives around men which would deny them their identity.

The sociologist Edwin Schur (1984) who helped found Labeling Theory argued that women continue to have their gender being more important in their daily lives than men do:

Stigma can accrue to what a person is as well as to what she does. Schur argued that femaleness is socially a master status, and a stigmatized one at that. Master status means that 'women are perceived and reacted to at least initially, and often primarily, in terms
of their femaleness. Only secondarily, if at all, do their other identities and qualities determine responses to them. In responding to a female on the basis of her master status, others tend to selectively perceive and depict that person in terms of stereotypes about that type of person. Contradictions to the stereotype go unnoticed or are defined as exceptions. Moreover, since behavior is interpreted by other on the basis of gender-based stereotypes, the same behavior by a man and a woman may be labeled very differently, being stigmatized for one but not the other. In particular, Schur argued that gender norm deviance, and even female victimization by males, are likely to be labeled by authorities as mental illness for men. Because women are responded to on the basis of their membership in a devalued category, they are objectified. Schur claimed that they are not seen as unique individuals but rather as part of the category women. Objectification allows others to treat the stigmatized individuals in exploitative and degrading ways. In response, women often feel like they are being treated like a thing rather than a person. [Chafetz, 1988, p.111]

Women are more self-reflective than men because women are less powerful. In unequal relationships, the dominated groups need to define themselves in relation to the dominant partner. [Rhode, 1990, p.93]

Women's individuality cannot be divorced from their status vis-a-vis men. Women have had to organize themselves against men for recognition as human beings and for the freedoms and opportunities for the development of their self-development.

Ultimately it is the Marxist concept of praxis which emerges to replace stigmatization, alienation and coercion as women achieve individualism. Praxis is the measurement of individualism. Praxis is the free, creative, and voluntary engagement of a person in the world which then maintains and transforms both the person and the world for the better. True individualism brings empowerment and praxis for the individual. Praxis comes from the word 'practice'. It is only when the practice of our mundane everyday life is free, meaningful and productive that we truly have achieve the full benefits of individualism. Hence we see the unification of materialist and idealist elements: a legal recognition of autonomy and equality as well as protection against discrimination is a necessary but insufficient condition, but the process of women's liberation did not stop with legal equality (as obtained after World War One) but is an effort to transform everyday life for women and men for the better. Consciousness does not exist before being, for a person to be an individual they have to be an individual in practice and praxis. Consciousness of one's individuality is essential, but must be matched by corresponding engagement in the world. As long as women are restricted to the roles they can take part in, either in the home or the labour force, though individual women may feel distinguished or fulfilled, women as a whole have not achieved their full
potential. Individualism for women remains tenuous and often fleeting. Legal recognition as equal individuals by the state is insufficient, a transformation of women's everyday life to a state of praxis is the final criteria for complete individualism.

The liberal paradigm for social change, as well as for the law, is unable to grant women full individuality. Women have used the liberal concept of equal rights for all people to successfully lobby the state to grant them legal equality with men. In doing so, women have won the right to vote, own property, enter university, to work without being handicapped by discriminatory and sexist regulations, and to enter politics. However, there are serious limits to how far this approach can aid the Woman's Movement. The state must not remain as the sole safeguard of women's rights, as women's guardian against patriarchy, because the state in itself is patriarchal. Women cannot count on the state to continue to strive for their individualism, because at present the state is part of the problem. The legal bulwark and component of women's individualism, the fact that it is necessary for the state to delineate women's rights, maintains women in a paternalistic relationship. The patriarchal family has declined the western nations, and as of today, the absolute power of the father over their (female) offspring and wife is generally found only in small pockets of ethnic and immigrant families. The state protects women from being dominated by men within the family, by giving them the right to divorce, the right to work, the right to use birth control, and the right to call the police to arrest their husbands or fathers for violent actions. However, this has been a shift from private patriarchy to public patriarchy:

As capitalism has developed further, there has been a shift from private patriarchy within the family to public patriarchy centered in industry and government. (Brown, 1981). Although individual men may still hold power in families where they are present, the patriarchal state ensures that all women are subject to a patriarchal order. Thus, in contemporary society, social welfare systems, education, family courts, and reproductive policies are all controlled by men, even though their primary effect is upon women and children. [Andersen, 1988, p.152]

The issue of abortion makes this very clear. If a woman is considering not carrying a child to term, she may talk to her local religious leader, who is a man, talk to her impregnator, who is a man, talk with her doctor, who is usually a man, then her social worker perhaps, and if the male legislators in Parliament and the male justices on the Supreme Court manage to concur that under these circumstances she is allowed to
have an abortion, she may then go ahead. In fact, though it is nice that the male legislators of western industrialized countries have legislated women's equality with men and legislated women's access to some birth control measures (and not to others), this obscures the vital fact that it remains men who have control, who believe it is their right, to decide on the choices women may make. The fact that male politicians give women rights still implies that male politicians have the right to take the same rights away. Individualism for women is not something that women can have the state give to them like a father to a daughter, rather individualism is something that has to be consciously and actively maintained. It remains fully possible for a person to lose their identity and still have all the legal rights that would allow a person to be an individual. The fact that the law allows women to be individuals does not mean that the law makes sure all women are able to overcome the structural behaviors that men have placed in their way, to be self-realized individuals to their full potential.

Ultimately, individualism may have to be reconsidered. For the 19th and most of the 20th centuries, men found it relatively easy to get a feeling of individual identity and autonomy, for they had sexual rights over their wives within marriage and with the professions essentially closed to women and racial minorities, white men reserved for themselves the best jobs. If women were treated as generic, as a category of 'Other,' that they could be used without being respected as fully human, the autonomous identities of men became more apparent in contrast. The introduction of equality for all makes traditional individualism no longer tenable. High unemployment for men reduces their economic security as women's entrance into the professions gives men increased competition to get ahead. The unemployed lack control over their fates that the employed take for granted, and unemployment encourages passivity and dependency. [Lane, p.73, 1981] Chronic unemployment threatens to create a multi-tiered society within even highly industrialized nations. Equality becomes problematic. Political and moral equality become difficult to sustain when there is no equality in the labour market. All employed people are relatively equal perhaps, but we cannot say that the chronically unemployed have the same opportunities and positive freedoms, as well as self-worth and dignity, as those who are able to find meaningful or steady work. The unemployed experience feelings of helplessness, a condition not congruous with individualism. [Lane.
In contemporary society in the industrialized western nations we have a ruling ideology of anarchic individualism, the social obligations to other people, outside of refraining from criminal acts, no longer exist. The rewards for investing in the group or in a marriage decline, while the rewards for self-investment rise, creating a vicious cycle as the family and marriage become insecure and individuals are becoming truly alone even within their relationships with other people. Certain groups in our society, such as certain ethnic minorities and religious groups such as the Amish, Mennonites, Latter-Day-Saints, retain the use of mutual obligation for the basis of their daily life. Life in these subcultures may be seen as lacking some of the elements of individualism of our broader society, but the human relationships are much more stable and secure.

Atomic individualism can either exist in the form of one group (white men) being equal and autonomous by standing on the backs of the other members who are not free and autonomous in their relationships with the ruling caste, or in the form of every group having such atomic individualism, in which case informal social bonds are diminished. If social bonds, such as investment in the extended family, are no longer obligatory, the individual can no longer depend on their security as well. Several different options are possible if atomic individualism creates too much isolation, alienation, and anomie between people. A collectively oriented society can exist in a number of ways: 1) A totalitarian method in which all people are equally enslaved to a central authority, be it a communist or theological leader. 2) A communal society in which decisions are made by the group. The group would have freedom of determination but individuals would be identified primarily by their bonds to each other before their commitments to themselves. 3) A society in which all members have definite and relatively binding obligations to each other as individuals. Such a society would be interlocking, that people would have to obey each other in different ways, with no one being able to control any other person in all ways or able to escape obligations to other people. A person opting out of their obligations would automatically lose all benefits, though there would be a way to appeal unrealistic orders. Instead of people merely having rights for their own autonomy, they would have rights within their social relationships with other people. This
latter option would seem to be impractical for a large scale. Ultimately, every constitution or plan of
society seeks to find a solution based on different divisions between collective and individual rights, and
like points on the perimeter of a curve, there might be many equally efficient or equally livable
alternatives or solutions.

The increase of individualism in modern society has put a greater responsibility on the state.
People look to the government for security in their normal relationships. A person no longer expects
marriage or the family to give them economic security, but will depend instead on the state to make sure
child support is paid, and when necessary to protect them from their family members. However, the state
is ultimately also a potential threat to individuals' rights and freedoms, and the powers of the state, though
formidable, are difficult to be used by the individual when they most need help. The state may outlaw
rape, discrimination, and murder, and declare a war on poverty, but unless a person can make a case to
stand up in court, the state will not intervene on their behalf. The state is in principle, more reactive than
proactive. Real benefits for women will rise when women do not have to worry about walking down a dark
street, or having to make the decision to press charges against abusive partners. Legal equality on paper is
not always liberating if it fails to take into account very real social inequality. Ultimately, women have to
feel free as human beings in the practice of their daily lives. A woman will need to feel that she is being
evaluated in a job solely on the basis on her qualifications and not by her looks, and to have her moral
authority and autonomy unchallenged by the fact she is a woman. A woman will have to be able to go
through a day without being constantly made aware that she a female or without men retaining the notion
that they are objective individuals and women are 'Other.'
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Individualism, political and social philosophy that places high value on the freedom of the individual and generally stresses the self-directed, self-contained, and comparatively unrestrained individual or ego. The French political commentator Alexis de Tocqueville, who coined the word, described it in terms of a kind of moderate selfishness, disposing human beings to be concerned only with their own small circle of family and friends.

As a philosophy, individualism involves a value system, a theory of human nature, a general attitude or temper, and belief in certain political, economic, social, and religious arrangements. The value system may be described in terms of three propositions: all values are man-centered—that is, they are experienced (but not necessarily created) by human beings; the individual is an end in himself and is of supreme value, society being only a means to individual ends; and all individuals are in some sense morally equal, this equality being best expressed by the proposition that no one should ever be treated solely as a means to the well-being of another person.

The individualistic theory of human nature holds that the interests of the normal adult are best served by allowing him maximum freedom and responsibility for choosing his objectives and the means for obtaining them, and acting accordingly. This belief follows from the conviction that each person is the best judge of his own interests and, granted, educational opportunities, can discover how to advance them. It is also based upon the assumption that the act of making these choices contributes to the development of the individual and to the welfare of society—the latter because individualism is thought to provide the most effective incentive to productive endeavour. Society, from this point of view, is seen as only a collection of individuals, each of which is a self-contained and ideally almost self-sufficient entity.

As a general attitude, then, individualism embraces a high valuation on self-reliance, on privacy, and on respect for other individuals. Negatively, it embodies opposition to authority and to all manner of controls over the individual, especially when they are exercised by the state. It also anticipates and values "progress" and, as a means to this end, subscribes to the right of the individual to be different from, to compete with, and to get ahead of (or fall behind) others.

The institutional embodiment of individualism follows from these principles. Only the most extreme individualists believe in anarchy, but all believe that government should keep its interference with human lives at a minimum and that it should confine itself largely to maintaining law and order, preventing individuals from interfering with others, and enforcing agreements (contracts) voluntarily arrived at. The states tends to be viewed as a necessary evil and the slogan "The government that governs least governs best" is applauded.

Individualism also implies a property system according to which each person (or family) enjoys the maximum of opportunity to acquire property and to manage and dispose of it as he sees fit. Freedom of association extends to the right to join (or to refuse to join) any organization.

Although instances of individualism have occurred thought history in many cultures and times, full-fledged individualism, as it is usually conceived to be, seems to have emerged first in England, especially after the publication of the ideas of Adam Smith.
and Jeremy Bentham and their followers in economic and political theory. Smith's doctrine of laissez-faire, based upon a profound belief in the natural harmony of individual wills and Bentham's utilitarianism, with the basic rule of "each to count for one and none for more than one," set the stage for these developments. On the economic side, Smith's "obvious and simple system of natural liberty" pictured exchange of goods and services in free and competitive markets as the ideal system of cooperation for mutual advantage. Such an organization should maximize efficiency as well as freedom, secure for each participant the largest yield from his resources to be had without injury to others, and achieve a just distribution, meaning a sharing of the social product in proportion to individual contributions.

Although economic individualism and political individualism in the form of democracy advanced together for a while, eventually they proved incompatible as newly enfranchised voters increasingly came to demand, in the course of the 19th century, governmental intervention in the economic process. In point of fact, the reasons for the growing demand for intervention were inherent in the attempt to adhere rigorously to an economic theory based almost solely on individualistic assumptions. In economics as in all other phases of life these assumptions are inadequate. Man is a social animal. His nature, his wants, and his capacities are to a great extent the product of society and its institutions. His most effective behavior is often through groups and organizations, running the gamut from the family through all manner of voluntary social and economically motivated associations to the state and international organizations. These units in varying ways interfere with the individualistic ideals of perfectly free association and of atomistic competition. Problems of monopoly and of technology, seasonal and cyclical unemployment, frequently associated in the public mind with individualistic economic theory, caused widespread dissatisfaction.

The prestige of individualistic ideas declined during the latter part of the 19th century and the first part of the 20th with the rise of large-scale social organization. One consequence of this was the emergence of theories calling for the organization of society on principles diametrically opposed to those of individualism (see collectivism). In liberal democracies, however, the notion of the importance of the individual has survived, providing a check on the tendency toward depersonalizing that, some say, is a consequence of collectivist trends. [Encyclopedia Britannica Micropedia Volume 5, 1976]