

Complaints and Disorders

The Sexual Politics of Sickness

Barbara Ehrenreich
and
Deirdre English

THE FEMINIST PRESS
at The City University of New York
New York

Published in the United States by The Feminist Press at
The City University of New York, 311 East 94 Street, New
York, NY 10128.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Ehrenreich, Barbara.
Complaints and disorders; the sexual politics
of sickness.

1. Woman—Health and hygiene—Sociological aspects.
English, Deirdre, joint author. II. Title. [DNLM: 1.
Gynecology—History. 2. History of medicine, Modern.
3. Obstetrics—History. 4. Women. WP11 E33c 1973]
RG121.E43 362.1'9'81 73-18356
ISBN 0-912670-20-7

First edition.

07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15

Printed in the United States on acid-free paper by McNaughton & Gunn, Inc.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people helped us with this pamphlet. Ros Baxandall, Betts Collett, Linda Friedman, Linda Gordon, Jenny Knauss, Susanne Paul, Steve Rose, Steve Talbot, and Shirley Whitney commented on our early drafts. Many other people contributed ideas and criticisms along the way. Rachel Fruchter and Susan Reverby, in particular, spent hours with us discussing some of the ideas presented here. In addition, Rachel contributed the interpretations of women and TB included in this pamphlet.

We thank the members of The Feminist Press for their patience and support, and Donna Obojski of the library at the College of Old Westbury for her enthusiastic help.

Finally we want to acknowledge the immense contribution of John Ehrenreich in discussing ideas, digging out obscure statistics, encouraging us, and doing more than his share of watching the kids.

The main sources of our pictures were The Bettman Archive in New York City, the picture collection of the New York Public Library, and *American Labor: A Pictorial History,* by M. B. Schnapper (Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C. 1972).

Gynecological Exam

INTRODUCTION

A Perspective on the Social Role of Medicine

The medical system is strategic for women's liberation. It is the guardian of reproductive technology—birth control, abortion, and the means for safe childbirth. It holds the promise of freedom from hundreds of unspoken fears and complaints that have handicapped women throughout history. When we demand control over our own bodies, we are making that demand above all to the medical system. It is the keeper of the keys.

But the medical system is also strategic to women's oppression. Medical science has been one of the most powerful sources of sexist ideology in our culture. Justifications for sexual discrimination—in education, in jobs, in public life—must ultimately rest on the one thing that differentiates women from men: their bodies. Theories of male superiority ultimately rest on biology.

Medicine stands between biology and social policy, between the "mysterious" world of the laboratory and everyday life. It makes public interpretations of biological theory; it dispenses the medical fruits of scientific advances. Biology discovers hormones; doctors make public judgements on whether "hormonal imbalances" make women unfit for public office. More generally, biology traces the origins of disease; doctors pass judgement on who is sick and who is well.

Medicine's prime contribution to sexist ideology has been to describe women as sick, and as potentially sickening to men.

Of course, medicine did not invent sexism. The view that

women are "sick," or defective versions of men, is as old as Eden. In the traditions of Western thought, man represents wholeness, strength, and health. Woman is a "misbegotten male," weak and incomplete. Since Hippocrates bewailed women's "perpetual infirmities," medicine has only echoed the prevailing male sentiment: it has treated pregnancy and menopause as diseases, menstruation as a chronic disorder, childbirth as a surgical event. At the same time, woman's "weakness" has never barred her from heavy labor; her "instability" has never disqualified her from total responsibility for childraising.

In the psychology of sexism, contempt is always mixed with *fear*. If woman is sick, there is always the danger that she will infect men. Menstrual and postpartum taboos, which serve to protect males from female "impurity," are almost universal in human cultures and, not surprisingly, are strictest in the most patriarchal societies. Historically, medicine ratified the dangers of women by describing women as the source of venereal disease. Today, we are more likely to be viewed as mental health hazards—emasculating men and destructively dominating children.

Medicine inherited from religion its role as a guardian of sexist ideology. Early Christian writings are filled with denunciations of women as men's spiritual inferiors, their contagious sexuality capable of dragging men down into the mire of passion. "Every woman ought to be filled with shame

Early Christian Preacher

at the thought that she is a woman," wrote Clement of Alexandria (c.150-215). And St. John Chrysostom (c.347-407)—an early church father who once pushed a woman off a cliff to demonstrate his immunity to temptation—said, "Among all the savage beasts none is found so harmful as woman." In medieval Europe, it was the Church that regulated women's reproductivity, legislating on abortion and contraception, proscribing the use of herbs to ease the pain of labor. It banned women from the sacraments during menstruation and the weeks following delivery. It controlled the licensing of midwives and, in some cases, that of physicians generally.

American Protestantism also resisted the legalization of contraception and abortion and even the use of anesthesia in labor. But generally it took a more benign and paternalistic view of women. It granted them spirituality though only at the price of their sexuality. It granted them "equality" if they stayed within their "God-appointed sphere" of domestic life. And Protestantism, unlike Catholicism, was willing to join forces with science in discovering and upholding the "natural order" of things. Nineteenth-century religious leaders happily supplemented religious justifications of sexism with newly developed bio-medical ones. Gradually woman's supposed physical infirmities won out over her moral defects as the rationale for male supremacy. The secularization of male domination has advanced rapidly in just the last few decades: contraception is legal *when dispensed by doctors*. Abortion is no longer a moral outrage but a matter "between a woman *and her doctor*."

Thus it is no accident that the women's liberation movement today puts so much emphasis on health and "body" issues. Women are dependent on the medical system for the most basic control over their own reproductivity. At the same time, women's encounters with the medical system bring them face to face with sexism in its most unmistakably crude and insulting forms.

Our motivation to write this pamphlet comes out of our own experiences as women, as health care consumers, and as activists in the women's health movement. In writing this, we have tried to see beyond our own experiences (and anger)

and to understand medical sexism as a *social force* helping to shape the options and social roles of all women.

Our approach is largely historical. In the first sections of this pamphlet we attempt to describe medicine's contribution to sexist ideology and sexual oppression in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (approximately 1865 to 1920 though a few of the important medical books were written earlier). We chose to begin with this period because it witnessed a pronounced shift from a religious to a bio-medical rationale for sexism, as well as the formation of the medical profession as we know it—a male elite with a legal monopoly over medical practice. We feel that this period provides a perspective essential for understanding our relation to the modern medical system. In the last two sections we attempt to apply that perspective to our present situation and the issues that concern us today.

We want to make it clear that we have not tried to write a definitive social history of women and medicine in America, nor have we tried to make an objective evaluation of women's health or the quality of their medical treatment, past or present. Our interest is primarily in medical *ideas* about women, particularly the ideas and themes that struck a chord with *us* and seemed to explain our own condition. We trust that you will take what we have done not as a final statement but as an invitation to go much further.

In this pamphlet our focus is on women and their relation to medical practice and medical beliefs. But the context goes beyond medicine itself and embraces all oppressed groups. In the historical period we have studied, science in general was invoked to justify the social inequities imposed by race and class as well as by sex. Industrial technology—plus the labor of millions of working people—was creating the wealth of the business elite that still rules America. If technology could make some men rich and powerful, surely *science* could justify their power. Racism, like sexism, seemed to shift from the realm of prejudice into the light of "objective" science. Blacks and European immigrants were described as congenitally inferior to white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, having smaller brains, larger muscles, and a host of "inherited" social traits. Race and class oppression, like sexual oppression, were not undemocratic; they were only "natural."



1891 scientific illustration of ethnic differences

During this transitional period morality was still mixed with science in the ideology of domination. Scientists believed that moral traits—like the supposed shiftlessness of blacks or disorderliness of Irish immigrants—were inheritable. Public health officials spoke of "God's sanitary laws," and doctors saw themselves as the moral, as well as physical, guardians of women. Today the transition is almost complete: science needs no assistance from the pulpit. When it passes judgement on the IQ of blacks, or on the prenatally determined psychological differences between the sexes, it is only being "objective." The fading of the last vestiges of religious moralism from scientific ideology has made it all the more mystifying, all the more effective as a potential tool for domination. We hope that the story presented here will contribute to people's confidence and ability to see through the "rational," "scientific" disguises of power.

The Bettmann Archive

Female Garbage-Picker and Well-to-do Passerby, about 1875

WOMEN AND MEDICINE IN THE LATE NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURIES

The Historical Setting

Women are not a "class"; they are not uniformly oppressed; they do not all experience sexism in the same ways. In the period between 1865 and 1920, class differences among American women were particularly sharp: the lifestyle, manners, and expectations of upper-class women had little in common with those of working-class women. This was a period of rapid industrialization, urbanization, and class polarization, affecting all Americans. In the cities—and here we are concerned only with the urban world, where medical trends were set—two classes, essentially new to American society, were coming to dominate the scene: an upper middle class whose wealth was based on business and industry and an industrial working class whose labor provided that wealth.*

The social roles of women in these two classes were almost diametrically opposed. For the affluent women, society prescribed lives of leisured indolence; for the working-class women, back-breaking toil. No *single* ideology of sexism could embrace both realities or justify both social roles. Hence, bio-medical thought had to provide two distinct views of women: one appropriate to the upper middle class (and

* It is important not to project current conceptions of class onto the classes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The urban working class of the time bore no relation to today's Archie Bunker image of the working class (which is inaccurate today anyway). Mostly European immigrants, they were extremely poor, even by the standards of the day. They occupied somewhat the same social status as poor urban blacks do today.

the middle class that aspired to an upper-middle-class lifestyle), and one appropriate to poor and working-class women.

It was as if there were two different human species of females. Affluent women were seen as inherently sick, too weak and delicate for anything but the mildest pastimes, while working-class women were believed to be inherently healthy and robust. The reality was very different. Working-class women, who put in long hours of work and received inadequate rest and nutrition, suffered far more than wealthy women from contagious diseases and complications of childbirth.

But doctors reversed the causality and found the soft, "civilized" life of the upper classes more health-threatening and medically interesting than hard work and privation. Dr. Lucien Warner, a popular medical authority,* wrote in 1874, "It is not then hard work and privation which make the women of our country invalids, but circumstances and habits

* We have chosen to quote only those doctors who seemed to us to be representative, based on our reading of popular gynecology books in the collection of the New York Academy of Medicine.

intimately connected with the so-called blessings of wealth and refinement." In an article on the servant shortage, a contemporary journalist in *The Nation* (1912) wrote:

> It might be a very good thing for a woman's health to sweep her room, and make her bed, and dust her parlor, and get her dinner; but the attenuation of her physical energies has been carried so far by civilization that it will take a generation or two of golfing, boating and bathing to give her sex back the strength of old days, when the domestic virtues went hand in hand with the domestic labors.

Someone had to be well enough to do the work, though, and working-class women, Dr. Warner noted with relief, were *not* invalids: "The African negress, who toils beside her husband in the fields of the south, and Bridget, who washes, and scrubs and toils in our homes at the north, enjoy for the most part good health, with comparative immunity from uterine disease."

But if "Bridget" and "Beulah" were not too sick to do the housework and the factory work, they *were* unhealthy—at least to the upper-class observers who described immigrants and blacks as congenitally dirty and possibly contagious. The



working-class woman might not faint, or get "uterine disease," but she undoubtedly harbored germs of typhoid, cholera, or venereal disease. Furthermore, as a breeder, she was seen as a public health threat, undermining the American "race" with her "inferior" offspring.

Beneath all this ran two ancient strands of sexist ideology: contempt for women as weak and defective, and fear of women as dangerous and polluting. Here we see the two separated, and applied to wealthy and poor females respectively. Upper- and upper-middle-class women were "sick"; working-class women were "sickening." In the sections that follow we deal first with the upper-middle-class or "sick" women, their relation to the medical system and the ideology applied to them, and then we go on to the bio-medical views of the working class, and working-class women in particular.

THE "SICK" WOMEN OF THE UPPER CLASSES

The affluent woman normally spent a hushed and peaceful life indoors, sewing, sketching and reading romances, planning menus and supervising servants and children. Her clothes, a sort of portable prison of tight corsets and long skirts, prevented activity any more vigorous than a Sunday stroll. Society agreed that she was frail and sickly. Her delicate nervous system had to be shielded as carefully as her body, for the slightest shock could send her reeling off to bed. Elizabeth Barrett Browning, for example, although she was an extraordinarily productive woman, spent six years in bed following her brother's death in a sailboat accident.

But not even the most sheltered woman lived in a vacuum. Just outside the suffocating world of the parlor and the

boudoir lay a world of industrial horror. This was the period of America's industrial revolution, a revolution based on the ruthless exploitation of working people. Women, and children as young as six, worked fourteen-hour days in factories and sweatshops for sub-subsistence wages. Labor struggles were violent bordering, at times, on civil wars. For businessmen, too, survival was a bitter struggle: you squeezed what you could out of the workers, screwed the competition, and the devil take the hindmost. Fortunes were made and destroyed overnight, and with them rode the fates of thousands of smaller businessmen.

The genteel lady of leisure was not just an anomaly in an otherwise dog-eat-dog world. She was as much a product of that world as her husband or his employees. It was the wealth extracted in that harsh outside world that enabled a man to afford a totally leisured wife. She was the social ornament that proved a man's success: her idleness, her delicacy, her childlike ignorance of "reality" gave a man the "class" that money alone could not provide. And it was the very harshness of the outside world that led men to see the home as a refuge—"a sacred place, a vestal temple," a "tent pitch'd in a world not right," presided over by a gentle, ethereal wife. Among the affluent classes, the worlds of men and women drifted further and further apart, with divergent standards of decorum, of health, of morality itself.

There were exceptional women in the upper classes—women who rebelled against the life of enforced leisure, the

limitations on meaningful work—and it is these exceptional women who usually are remembered in history books. Many became women's rights activists or social reformers. A brave few struggled to make their way in the professions. And toward the end of the nineteenth century a growing number were demanding, and getting, college educations. But the majority of upper- and upper-middle-class women had little chance to make independent lives for themselves; they were financially at the mercy of husbands or fathers. They had to accept their roles—outwardly at least—and remain dutifully housebound, white-gloved and ornamental. Of course, only a small minority of urban women could afford a life of total leisure, but a great many more women in the middle class aspired to it and did their best to live like "ladies."

The Cult of Female Invalidism

The boredom and confinement of affluent women fostered a morbid cult of hypochondria—"female invalidism"—that began in the mid-nineteenth century and did not completely fade until the late 1910s. Sickness pervaded upper- and upper-middle-class female culture. Health spas and female

LADIES OF FASHION AND THEIR DOCTORS

(SCENE: The Waiting-Room of a Fashionable Physician.)

FAIR PATIENT (*just ushered in*).—"What—*you* here, Lizzie? Why, ain't you *well?*"
SECOND DITTO.—"Perfectly, tnanks! But what's the matter with *you*, dear?"
FIRST DITTO.—"Oh, nothing whatever! I'm as right as possible, dearest . . .!"

specialists sprang up everywhere and became part of the regular circuit of fashionable women. And in the 1850s a steady stream of popular home readers by doctors appeared, all on the subject of female health. Literature aimed at female readers lingered on the romantic pathos of illness and death; popular women's magazines featured such stories as "The Grave of My Friend" and "Song of Dying." Paleness and lassitude (along with filmy white gowns) came into vogue. It was acceptable, even fashionable, to retire to bed with "sick headaches," "nerves," and a host of other mysterious ailments.

In response, feminist writers and female doctors expressed their dismay at the chronic invalidism of affluent women. Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, an outstanding woman doctor of the late nineteenth century, wrote in 1895:

> . . . it is considered natural and almost laudable to break down under all conceivable varieties of strain—a winter dissipation, a houseful of servants, a quarrel with a female friend, not to speak of more legitimate reasons. . . . Women who expect to go to bed every menstrual period expect to collapse if by chance they find themselves on their feet for a few hours during such a crisis. Constantly considering their nerves, urged to consider them by well-intentioned but short-sighted advisors, they pretty soon become nothing but a bundle of nerves.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman, the feminist writer and economist, concluded bitterly that American men "have bred a race of women weak enough to be handed about like invalids; or mentally weak enough to pretend they are—and to like it."

It is impossible to tell, in retrospect, how sick upper-middle-class women really were. Life expectancies for women were slightly higher than for men though the difference was nowhere near as great as it is today.

It is true, however, that women—*all* women—faced certain risks that men did not share, or share to the same degree. First were the risks associated with childbearing, which were all the greater in an age of primitive obstetrical technique when little was known about the importance of prenatal nutrition. In 1915 (the first year for which national figures are available) 61 women died for every 10,000 live babies born, compared to 2 per 10,000 today, and the maternal mortality rates were doubtless higher in the nineteenth century. Without adequate, and usually without any, means of contraception, a married woman could expect to face the risk of childbirth repeatedly through her fertile years. After each childbirth a woman might suffer any number of gynecological complications, such as a prolapsed (slipped) uterus or irreparable pelvic tear, which would stay with her for the rest of her life.

Another special risk to women came with tuberculosis, the "white plague." In the mid-nineteenth century, TB raged at epidemic proportions, and it continued to be a major threat until well into the twentieth century. Everyone was affected, but women, especially young women, were particularly vulnerable, often dying at rates twice as high as those of men of their age group. For every hundred women aged twenty in 1865, more than five would be dead from TB by the age of

thirty, and more than eight would be dead by the age of fifty. (It is now believed that hormonal changes associated with puberty and childbearing accounted for the greater vulnerability of young women to TB.)

The dangers of childbearing, and of TB, must have shadowed women's lives in a way we no longer know. But these dangers cannot explain the cultural phenomenon of "female invalidism" which, unlike TB and maternal mortality, was confined to women of a particular social class. The most important legitimization of this fashion came not from the actual dangers faced by women but from the medical profession.

The medical view of women's health not only acknowledged the specific risks associated with reproductivity, it went much further: it identified *all* female functions as *inherently* sick. Puberty was seen as a "crisis," throwing the entire female organism into turmoil. Menstruation—or the lack of it—was regarded as pathological throughout a woman's life. Dr. W.C. Taylor, in his book *A Physician's Counsels to Woman in Health and Disease* (1871), gave a warning typical of those found in popular health books of the time:

We cannot too emphatically urge the importance of regarding these monthly returns as periods of ill health, as days when the ordinary occupations are to be suspended or modified. . . . Long walks, dancing, shopping, riding and parties should be avoided at this time of month invariably and under all circumstances. . . . Another reason why every woman should look upon herself as an invalid once a month, is that the monthly flow aggravates any existing affection of the womb and readily rekindles the expiring flames of disease.

Similarly, a pregnant woman was "indisposed," and doctors campaigned against the practice of midwifery on the grounds that pregnancy was a disease and demanded the care of a doctor. Menopause was the final, incurable ill, the "death of the woman in the woman."

Women's greater susceptibility to TB was seen as proof of the inherent defectiveness of female physiology. Dr. Azell Ames wrote in 1875: "It being beyond doubt that consumption . . . is itself produced by the failure of the [menstrual] function in the forming girls . . . one has been the parent of the other with interchangeable priority." Actually, as we know today, it is true that consumption may *result* in suspension of the menses. But at that time consumption was blamed on woman's nature and on her reproductive system. When men were consumptive, doctors sought some environmental factor, such as over-exposure, to explain the disease. But in popular imagery, consumption was always effeminate: novels of the time usually featured as male consumptives only such "effete" types as poets, artists, and other men "incompetent" for serious masculine pursuits.

The association of TB with innate feminine weakness was strengthened by the fact that TB is accompanied by an erratic emotional pattern in which a person may behave sometimes frenetically, sometimes morbidly. The behavior characteristic for the disease fit expectations about woman's personality, and the look of the disease suited—and perhaps helped to create—the prevailing standards of female beauty. The female consumptive did not lose her feminine identity, she embodied it: the bright eyes, translucent skin, and red lips were only an extreme of traditional female beauty. A romantic myth rose up around the figure of the female consumptive and was reflected in portraiture and literature: for example, in the sweet and tragic character of Beth, in

Little Women. Not only were women seen as sickly—sickness was seen as feminine.

The doctors' view of women as innately sick did not, of course, *make* them sick, or delicate, or idle. But it did provide a powerful rationale against allowing women to act in any other way. Medical arguments were used to explain why women should be barred from medical school (they would faint in anatomy lectures), from higher education altogether, and from voting. For example, a Massachusetts legislator proclaimed:

> Grant suffrage to women, and you will have to build insane asylums in every county, and establish a divorce court in every town. Women are too nervous and hysterical to enter into politics.

Medical arguments seemed to take the malice out of sexual oppression: when you prevented a woman from doing

anything active or interesting, you were only doing this for her own good.

The Doctors' Stake in Women's Illness

The myth of female frailty, and the very real cult of female hypochondria that seemed to support the myth, played directly to the financial interests of the medical profession. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the "regular" AMA doctors (members of the American Medical Association—the intellectual ancestors of today's doctors) still had no legal monopoly over medical practice and no legal control over the number of people who called themselves "doctors." Competition from lay healers of both sexes, and from what the AMA saw as an excess of formally trained male physicians, had the doctors running scared. A good part of the competition was female: women lay healers and midwives dominated the urban ghettos and the countryside in many areas; suffragists were beating on the doors of the medical schools.

For the doctors, the myth of female frailty thus served two purposes. It helped them to disqualify women as healers, and, of course, it made women highly qualified as patients.*

* See *Witches, Midwives and Nurses* by Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English. Glass Mountain Pamphlets, no. 1 (Old Westbury, N.Y.: The Feminist Press, 1973).

Competition between doctors led them to run ads like this one (from 1878) in the newspapers.

In 1900 there were 173 doctors (engaged in primary patient care) per 100,000 population, compared to 50 per 100,000 today. So, it was in the interests of doctors to cultivate the illnesses of their patients with frequent home visits and drawn-out "treatments." A few dozen well-heeled lady customers were all that a doctor needed for a successful urban practice. Women—at least, women whose husbands could pay the bills—became a natural "client caste" to the developing medical profession.

In many ways, the upper-middle-class woman was the ideal patient: her illnesses—and her husband's bank account—seemed almost inexhaustible. Furthermore, she was usually submissive and obedient to the "doctor's orders." The famous Philadelphia doctor S. Weir Mitchell expressed his profession's deep appreciation of the female invalid in 1888:

> With all her weakness, her unstable emotionality, her tendency to morally warp when long nervously ill, she is then far easier to deal with, far more amenable to reason, far more sure to be comfortable as a patient, than the man who is relatively in a like position. The reasons for this are too obvious to delay me here, and physicians accustomed to deal with both sexes as sick people will be apt to justify my position.

Playing Doctor

In Mitchell's mind women were not only easier to relate to, but sickness was the very key to femininity: "The man who does not know sick women does not know women."

Some women were quick to place at least some of the blame for female invalidism on the doctors' interests. Dr. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, an American woman doctor, argued that the extent of female invalidism was much exaggerated by male doctors and that women's natural functions were not really all that debilitating. In the working classes, she observed, work went on during menstruation "without intermission, and, as a rule, without ill effects." (Of course, working-class women could not have afforded the costly medical attention required for female invalidism.) Mary Livermore, a women's suffrage worker, spoke against "the monstrous assumption that woman is a natural invalid," and denounced "the unclean army of 'gynecologists' who seem desirous to convince women that they possess but one set of organs—and that these are always diseased." And Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi put the matter most forcefully when she wrote in 1895, "I think, finally, it is in the increased attention paid to women, and especially in their new function as lucrative patients, scarcely imagined a hundred years ago, that we find explanation for much of the ill-health among women, freshly discovered today. . . ."

The "Scientific" Explanation of Female Frailty

As a businessman, the doctor had a direct interest in a social role for women that encouraged them to be sick; as a doctor, he had an obligation to find the causes of female complaints. The result was that, as a "scientist," he ended up proposing medical theories that were actually justifications of women's social role.

This was easy enough to do at the time: no one had a very clear idea of human physiology. American medical education, even at the best schools, put few constraints on the doctors' imaginations, offering only a scant introduction to what was known of physiology and anatomy and no training in rigorous scientific method. So doctors had considerable intellectual license to devise whatever theories seemed socially appropriate.

Generally, they traced female disorders either to women's inherent "defectiveness" or to any sort of activity beyond the mildest "feminine" pursuits—especially sexual, athletic, and mental activity. Thus promiscuity, dancing in hot rooms, and subjection to an overly romantic husband were given as the origins of illness, along with too much reading, too much seriousness or ambition, and worrying.

The underlying medical theory of women's weakness rested on what doctors considered the most basic physiological law: "conservation of energy." According to the first postulate of this theory, each human body contained a set quantity of energy that was directed variously from one organ or function to another. This meant that you could develop one organ or ability only at the expense of others, drawing energy away from the parts not being developed. In particular, the sexual organs competed with the other organs for the body's fixed supply of vital energy. The second postulate of this theory—that reproductivity was central to a woman's biological life—made this competition highly unequal, with the reproductive organs in almost total command of the whole woman.

The implications of the "conservation of energy" theory for male and female roles are important. Let's consider them.

Curiously, from a scientific perspective, *men* didn't jeopardize their reproductivity by engaging in intellectual pursuits. On the contrary, since the mission of upper- and upper-middle-class men was to be doers, not breeders, they had to be careful not to let sex drain energy away from their "higher functions." Doctors warned men not to "spend their seed" (i.e., the essence of their energy) recklessly, but to conserve themselves for the "civilizing endeavors" they were embarked upon. College youths were jealously segregated from women—except on rare sexual sprees in town—and virginity was often prized in men as well as women. Debilitated sperm would result from too much "indulgence," and this in turn could produce "runts," feeble infants, and girls.

On the other hand, because reproduction was woman's grand purpose in life, doctors agreed that women ought to concentrate their physical energy internally, toward the womb. All other activity should be slowed down or stopped

A Visit to the Invalid

during the peak periods of sexual energy use. At the onset of menstruation, women were told to take a great deal of bed rest in order to help focus their strength on regulating their periods—though this might take years. The more time a pregnant woman spent lying down quietly, the better. At menopause, women were often put to bed again.

Doctors and educators were quick to draw the obvious conclusion that, for women, higher education could be physically dangerous. Too much development of the brain, they counseled, would atrophy the uterus. Reproductive development was totally antagonistic to mental development. In a work entitled *Concerning the Physiological and Intellectual Weakness of Women*, the German scientist P. Moebius wrote:

> If we wish woman to fulfill the task of motherhood fully she cannot possess a masculine brain. If the feminine abilities were developed to the same degree as those of the male, her material organs would suffer and we should have before us a repulsive and useless hybrid.

In the United States this thesis was set forth most cogently by Dr. Edward Clarke of Harvard College. He warned, in his influential book *Sex in Education* (1873), that higher

education was *already* destroying the reproductive abilities of American women.

Even if a woman should choose to devote herself to intellectual or other "unwomanly" pursuits, she could hardly hope to escape the domination of her uterus and ovaries. In *The Diseases of Women* (1849), Dr. F. Hollick wrote: "The Uterus, it must be remembered, is the *controlling* organ in the female body, being the most excitable of all, and so intimately connected, by the ramifications of its numerous nerves, with every other part." To other medical theorists, it was the ovaries that occupied center stage. This passage, written in 1870 by Dr. W. W. Bliss, is, if somewhat overwrought, nonetheless typical:

> Accepting, then these views of the gigantic power and influence of the ovaries over the whole animal economy of woman,—that they are the most powerful agents in all the commotions of her system; that on them rest her intellectual standing in society, her physical perfection, and all that lends beauty to those fine and delicate contours which are constant objects of admiration, all that is great, noble and beautiful, all that is voluptuous, tender, and endearing; that her fidelity, her devotedness, her perpetual vigilance, forecast, and all those qualities of mind and disposition which inspire respect and love and fit her as the safest counsellor and friend of man, spring from the ovaries,—*what must be their influence and power over the great vocation of woman and the august purposes of her existence when these organs have become compromised through disease!* Can the record of woman's mission on earth be otherwise than filled with tales of sorrow, sufferings, and manifold infirmities, all through the influence of these important organs?

This was not mere textbook rhetoric. In their actual medical practices, doctors found uterine and ovarian "disorders" behind almost every female complaint, from headaches to sore throats and indigestion. Curvature of the spine, bad posture, or pains anywhere in the lower half of the body could be the result of "displacement" of the womb, and one doctor ingeniously explained how constipation results from the pressure of the uterus on the rectum. Dr. M.E. Dirix wrote in 1869:

> Thus, women are treated for diseases of the stomach, liver, kidneys, heart, lungs, etc.; yet, in most instances, these diseases will be found, on due investigation, to be, in reality, no diseases at all, but merely

the sympathetic reactions or the symptoms of one disease, namely, a disease of the womb.

The Psychology of the Ovary

If the uterus and ovaries could dominate woman's entire body, it was only a short step to the ovarian take-over of woman's entire personality. The basic idea, in the nineteenth century, was that female psychology functioned merely as an extension of female reproductivity, and that woman's nature was determined solely by her reproductive functions. The typical medical view was that "The ovaries . . . give to woman all her characteristics of body and mind. . . ." And Dr. Bliss remarked, somewhat spitefully, "The influence of the ovaries over the mind is displayed in woman's artfulness and dissimulation." According to this "psychology of the ovary," all woman's "natural" characteristics were directed from the ovaries, and any abnormalities—from irritability to insanity—could be attributed to some ovarian disease. As one doctor wrote, "All the various and manifold derangements of the reproductive system, peculiar to females, add to the causes of insanity." Conversely, actual physical reproductive problems and diseases, including cancer, could be traced to bad habits and attitudes.

Masturbation was seen as a particularly vicious character defect that led to physical damage, and although this was believed to be true for both men and women, doctors seemed more alarmed by female masturbation. They warned that "The Vice" could lead to menstrual dysfunction, uterine disease, and lesions on the genitals. Masturbation was one form of "hypersexuality," which was said to lead to consumption; in turn, consumption might result in hypersexuality. The association between "hypersexuality" and TB was easily "demonstrated" by pointing to the high rates of TB among prostitutes. All this fueled the notion that "sexual disorders" led to disease, and conversely, that disease lay behind women's sexual desires.

The medical model of female nature, embodied in the "psychology of the ovary," drew a rigid distinction between reproductivity and sexuality. Women were urged by the health books and the doctors to indulge in deep preoccupation with themselves as "The Sex"; they were to devote themselves to developing their reproductive powers,

their maternal instincts, their "femininity." Yet they were told that they had no "natural" sexual feelings whatsoever. They were believed to be completely governed by their ovaries and uteruses, but to be repelled by the sex act itself. In fact, sexual feelings were seen as unwomanly, pathological, and possibly detrimental to the supreme function of reproduction. (Men, on the other hand, *were* believed to have sexual feelings, and many doctors went so far as to condone prostitution on the grounds that the lust of upper-middle-class males should have some outlet other than their delicate wives.)

The doctors themselves never seemed entirely convinced of this view of female nature. While they denied the existence of female sexuality as vigorously as any other men of their times, they were always on the lookout for it. Medically, this vigilance was justified by the idea that female sexuality could only be pathological. So it was only natural for some doctors to test for it by stroking the breasts or the clitoris. But under the stern disapproval, there always lurked the age-old fear of and fascination with woman's "insatiable lust" that, once awakened, might be totally uncontrollable. In 1853, when he was only twenty-five years old, the British physician Robert Brudenell Carter wrote (in a work entitled *On the Pathology and Treatment of Hysteria*):

> . . . no one who has realized the amount of moral evil wrought in girls . . . whose prurient desires have been increased by Indian hemp and partially gratified by medical manipulations, can deny that

remedy is worse than disease. I have . . . seen young unmarried women, of the middle class of society, reduced by the constant use of the speculum to the mental and moral condition of prostitutes; seeking to give themselves the same indulgence by the practice of solitary vice; and asking every medical practitioner . . . to institute an examination of the sexual organs.

(Did Dr. Carter's patients actually smoke "Indian hemp" or beg for internal examinations? Unfortunately, we have no other authority on the subject than Dr. Carter himself.)

Medical Treatments

Uninformed by anything that we would recognize today as a scientific description of the way human bodies work, the actual practice of medicine at the turn of the century was largely a matter of guesswork, consisting mainly of ancient remedies and occasional daring experiments. Not until 1912, according to one medical estimate, did the average patient, seeking help from the average American doctor, have more than a fifty-fifty chance of benefiting from the encounter. In fact, the average patient ran a significant risk of actually getting worse as a result: bleeding, violent purges, heavy doses of mercury-based drugs, and even opium were standard therapeutic approaches throughout the nineteenth century, for male as well as female patients. Even well into the twentieth century, there was little that we would recognize as modern medical technology. Surgery was still a highly risky enterprise; there were no antibiotics or other "wonder drugs"; and little was understood, medically, of the

Nurse.—Well, Mrs. Fogy, the Doctor's Iperac points you splendidly. He will soon give you the Calomel and Jalap, next the Castor Oil, then an injection, and after that we will apply the blisters and the leeches, and if necessary shave your head. You will be well in three or four weeks,—a little agitated, perhaps, but that's nothing. The Doctor don't charge you more than $40 or $50.

relationship between nutrition and health or of the role of hormones in regulating physiological processes.

Every patient suffered from this kind of hit-or-miss treatment, but some of the treatments applied to women now seem particularly useless and bizarre. For example, a doctor confronted with what he believed was an inflammation of the reproductive organs might try to "draw away" the inflammation by creating what he thought were counter-irritations—blisters or sores on the groin or the thighs. The common medical practice of bleeding by means of leeches also took on some very peculiar forms in the hands of gynecologists. Dr. F. Hollick, speaking of methods of curing amenorrhea (chronic lack of menstrual periods), commented: "Some authors speak very highly of the good effects of leeches, applied to the external lips [of the genitals], a few days before the period is expected." Leeches on the breasts might prove effective too, he observed, because of the deep sympathy between the sexual organs. In some cases leeches were even applied to the cervix despite the danger of their occasional loss in the uterus. (So far as we know, no doctor ever considered perpetrating similar medical insults to the male organs.)

Such methods could be dismissed as well intentioned, if somewhat prurient, experimentation in an age of deep medical ignorance. But there were other "treatments" that were far more sinister—those aimed at altering female *behavior*. The least physically destructive of these was based, simply, on isolation and uninterrupted rest. This was used to treat a host of problems diagnosed as "nervous disorders."

Passivity was the main prescription, along with warm baths, cool baths, abstinence from animal foods and spices, and indulgence in milk and puddings, cereals, and "mild sub-acid fruits." Women were to have a nurse—not a relative—to care for them, to receive no visitors, and as Dr. Dirix wrote, "all sources of mental excitement should be perseveringly guarded against." Charlotte Perkins Gilman was prescribed this type of treatment by Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, who advised her to put away all her pens and books. Gilman later described the experience in the story "The Yellow Wallpaper," in which the heroine, a would-be writer, is ordered by her physician-husband to "rest":

So I take phosphates or phosphites—whichever it is, and tonics and journeys, and air, and exercise, and am absolutely forbidden to "work" until I am well again.

Personally, I disagree with their ideas.

Personally, I believe that congenial work, with excitement and change, would do me good.

But what is one to do?

I did write for a while—in spite of them; but it *does* exhaust me a good deal—having to be so sly about it, . . . or else meet with heavy opposition.

Slowly Gilman's heroine begins to lose her grip ("It is getting to be a great effort for me to think straight. Just this nervous weakness, I suppose.") and finally she frees herself from her prison—into madness, crawling in endless circles about her room, muttering about the wallpaper.

But it was the field of gynecological surgery that provided the most brutally direct medical treatments of female "personality disorders." And the surgical approach to female psychological problems had what was considered a solid theoretical basis in the theory of the "psychology of the ovary." After all, if a woman's entire personality was dominated by her reproductive organs, then gynecological surgery was the most logical approach to any female psychological problem. Beginning in the late 1860s, doctors began to act on this principle.

At least one of their treatments probably *was* effective: surgical removal of the clitoris as a cure for sexual arousal. A medical book of this period stated: "Unnatural growth of the clitoris . . . is likely to lead to immorality as well as to serious disease . . . amputation may be necessary." Although many doctors frowned on the practice of removing the clitoris, they tended to agree that this might be necessary in cases of "nymphomania." (The last clitorectomy we know of in the United States was performed twenty-five years ago on a child of five, as a cure for masturbation.)

More widely practiced was the surgical removal of the ovaries—ovariotomy, or "female castration." Thousands of these operations were performed from 1860 to 1890. In his article "The Spermatic Economy," Ben Barker-Benfield describes the invention of the "normal ovariotomy," or removal of ovaries for non-ovarian conditions—in 1872 by Dr. Robert Battey of Rome, Georgia.

An early nineteenth century ovariotomy

Among the indications were a troublesomeness, eating like a ploughman, masturbation, attempted suicide, erotic tendencies, persecution mania, simple "cussedness," and dysmenorrhea. 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.

Patients were often brought in by their husbands, who complained of their unruly behavior. When returned to their husbands, "castrated," they were "tractible, orderly, industrious and cleanly," according to Dr. Battey. (Today ovariotomy, accompanying a hysterectomy, for example, is not known to have these effects on the personality. One can only wonder what, if any, personality changes Dr. Battey's patients really went through.) Whatever the effects, some doctors claimed to have removed from fifteen hundred to two thousand ovaries; in Barker-Benfield's words, they "handed them around at medical society meetings on plates like trophies."

We could go on cataloging the ludicrous theories, the lurid cures, but the point should be clear: late nineteenth-century



medical treatment of women made very little sense as *medicine*, but it was undoubtedly effective at keeping certain women—those who could afford to be patients—in their place. As we have seen, surgery was often performed with the explicit goal of "taming" a high-strung woman, and whether or not the surgery itself was effective, the very threat of surgery was probably enough to bring many women into line. Prescribed bed rest was obviously little more than a kind of benign imprisonment—and the prescriptions prohibiting intellectual activity speak for themselves!

But these are just the extreme "cures." The great majority of upper-middle-class women were never subjected to gynecological surgery or long-term bed rest, yet they too were victims of the prevailing assumptions about women's "weakness" and the necessity of frequent medical attention. The more the doctors "treated," the more they lured women



SORE NIPPLES.—Dr A. C. CASTLE, 297 Broadway, says he has known Sherman's Papillary Oil cure the worst cases in a short time, where every thing else failed.

The Hon. B B. Beardsley's lady suffered for six weeks with sore nipples; her physician tried every thing his skill could devise; she thought she should lose them when a friend recommended Sherman's Papillary Oil; she tried it and was immediately relieved, and perfectly cured in five days. This invaluable article is for sale at 106 Nassau street, 643 Broadway, New York, and at 139 Fulton street Brooklyn, n18

Advertisement for a Patent Medicine

into seeing themselves as sick. The entire mystique of female sickness—the house calls, the tonics and medicines, the health spas—served, above all, to keep a great many women busy at the task of doing nothing. Even among middle-class women who could not afford constant medical attention and who did not have the leisure for full-time invalidism, the myth of female frailty took its toll, with cheap (and often dangerous) patent medicines taking the place of high-priced professional "cures."

One very important effect of all this was a great increase in the upper-middle-class woman's dependence on men. To be sure, the leisured lady of the "better" classes was already financially dependent on her husband. But the cult of invalidism made her seem dependent for her very physical survival on both her doctor and her husband. She might be tired of being a kept woman, she might yearn for a life of meaning and activity, but if she was convinced that she was seriously sick or in danger of becoming so, would she dare to break away? How could she even survive on her own, without the expensive medical care paid for by her husband? Ultimately, she might even become convinced that her restlessness was itself "sick"—just further proof of her need for a confined, inactive life. And if she did overcome the paralyzing assumption of women's innate sickness and begin to act in unconventional ways, a doctor could always be found to prescribe a return to what was considered normal.



A SOCIETY DISEASE.

DR. SCHMERZ.—Nervous prostration. You need rest.
MRS. AIKEN.—Why, I do nothing but rest!
DR. SCHMERZ.—Well, try some light employment. Watch other people work.

In fact, the medical attention directed at these women amounted to what may have been a very effective surveillance system. Doctors were in a position to detect the first signs of rebelliousness, and to interpret them as symptoms of a "disease" which had to be "cured."

Subverting the Sick Role

It would be a mistake to assume that women were merely the passive victims of a medical reign of terror. In some ways, they were able to turn the sick role to their own advantage, especially as a form of birth control. For the "well-bred" woman to whom sex really *was* repugnant, and yet a "duty," or for any woman who wanted to avoid pregnancy, "feeling sick" was a way out—and there were few others. Contraceptive methods were virtually unavailable; abortion was risky and illegal. It would never have entered a respectable doctor's head to advise a lady on contraception (if he *had* any advice to offer, which is unlikely). Or to offer to perform an abortion (at least according to AMA propaganda). In fact, doctors devoted considerable energy to "proving" that contraception and abortion were inherently unhealthy, and capable of causing such diseases as cancer.

(This was before the pill!) But a doctor *could* help a woman by supporting her claims to be too sick for sex: he could recommend abstinence. So who knows how many of this period's drooping consumptives and listless invalids were actually well women, feigning illness to escape intercourse and pregnancy?

If some women resorted to sickness as a means of birth—and sex—control, others undoubtedly used it to gain attention and a limited measure of power within their families. Today, everybody is familar with the (sexist) myth of the mother-in-law whose symptoms conveniently strike during family crises. In the nineteenth century, women developed, in epidemic numbers, an entire syndrome which even doctors sometimes interpreted as a power grab rather than a genuine illness. The new disease was hysteria, which in many ways epitomized the cult of female invalidism. It

affected upper- and upper-middle-class women almost exclusively; it had no discernible organic basis; and it was totally resistant to medical treatment. For those reasons alone, it is worth considering in some detail.

A contemporary doctor described the hysterical fit this way:

> The patient . . . loses the ordinary expression of countenance, which is replaced by a vacant stare; becomes agitated; falls if before standing; throws her limbs about convulsively; twists the body into all kinds of violent contortions; beats her chest; sometimes tears her hair; and attempts to bite herself and others; and, though a delicate woman, evinces a muscular strength which often requires four or five persons to restrain her effectually.

Hysteria appeared, not only as fits and fainting, but in every other form: hysterical loss of voice, loss of appetite, hysterical coughing or sneezing, and, of course, hysterical screaming, laughing, and crying. The disease spread wildly, yet almost exclusively in a select clientele of urban middle- and upper-middle-class white women between the ages of fifteen and forty-five.

Doctors became obsessed with this "most confusing, mysterious and rebellious of diseases." In some ways, it was the ideal disease for the doctors: it was never fatal, and it required an almost endless amount of medical attention. But it was not an ideal disease from the point of view of the husband and family of the afflicted woman. Gentle invalidism had been one thing; violent fits were quite another. So hysteria put the doctors on the spot. It was essential to their professional self-esteem either to find an organic basis for the disease, and cure it, or to expose it as a clever charade.

There was plenty of evidence for the latter point of view. With mounting suspicion, the medical literature began to observe that hysterics never had fits when alone, and only when there was something soft to fall on. One doctor accused them of pinning their hair in such a way that it would fall luxuriantly when they fainted. The hysterical "type" began to be characterized as a "petty tyrant" with a "taste for power" over her husband, servants, and children, and, if possible, her doctor.

In historian Carroll Smith-Rosenberg's interpretation, the

The Bettmann Archive

doctor's accusations had some truth to them: the hysterical fit, for many women, must have been the only acceptable outburst—of rage, of despair, or simply of *energy*—possible. But as a form of revolt it was very limited. No matter how many women might adopt it, it remained completely individualized: hysterics don't unite and fight. As a power play, throwing a fit might give a brief psychological advantage over a husband or a doctor, but ultimately it played into the hands of the doctors by confirming their notion of women as irrational, unpredictable, and diseased.

On the whole, however, doctors did continue to insist that hysteria was a real disease—a disease of the uterus, in fact. (Hysteria comes from the Greek word for uterus.) They remained unshaken in their conviction that their own house calls and high physician's fees were absolutely necessary; yet at the same time, in their treatment and in their writing, doctors assumed an increasingly angry and threatening attitude. One doctor wrote, "It will sometimes be advisable to speak in a decided tone, in the presence of the patient, of the necessity of shaving the head, or of giving her a cold shower bath, should she not be soon relieved." He then gave



a "scientific" rationalization for this treatment by saying, "The sedative influence of fear may allay, as I have known it to do, the excitement of the nervous centers. . . ."

Carroll Smith-Rosenberg writes that doctors recommended suffocating hysterical women until their fits stopped, beating them across the face and body with wet towels, and embarrassing them in front of family and friends. She quotes Dr. F.C. Skey: "Ridicule to a woman of sensitive mind, is a powerful weapon . . . but there is not an emotion equal to fear and the threat of personal chastisement . . . . They will listen to the voice of authority." The more women became hysterical, the more doctors became punitive toward the disease; and at the same time, they began to see the disease everywhere themselves until they were diagnosing every independent act by a woman, especially a women's rights action, as "hysterical."

With hysteria, the cult of female invalidism was carried to its logical conclusion. Society had assigned affluent women to a life of confinement and inactivity, and medicine had justified this assignment by describing women as innately sick. In the epidemic of hysteria, women were both accepting their inherent "sickness" *and* finding a way to rebel against

an intolerable social role. Sickness, having become a way of life, became a way of rebellion, and medical treatment, which had always had strong overtones of coercion, revealed itself as frankly and brutally repressive.

But hysteria is more than a bizarre twist of medical history. The nineteenth-century epidemic of hysteria had lasting significance because it ushered in a totally new "scientific" approach to the medical management of women.

While the conflict between women and their doctors in America was escalating on the issue of hysteria, Sigmund Freud, in Vienna, was beginning to work on a treatment that would remove the disease altogether from the arena of gynecology. In one stroke, he solved the problem of hysteria and marked out a new medical specialty. "Psychoanalysis," as Carroll Smith-Rosenberg has said, "is the child of the hysterical woman." Freud's cure was based on changing the rules of the game: in the first place, by eliminating the issue of whether or not the woman was faking. Psychoanalysis, as Thomas Szasz has pointed out, insists that "malingering *is* an illness—in fact, an illness 'more serious' than hysteria." Secondly, Freud established that hysteria was a mental disorder. He banished the traumatic "cures" and legitimized a doctor-patient relationship based solely on talking. His therapy urged the patient to confess her resentments and rebelliousness, and then at last to accept her role as a woman.

Under Freud's influence, the scalpel for the dissection of female nature eventually passed from the gynecologist to the psychiatrist. In some ways, psychoanalysis represented a

A PAINTING WOMAN IN THE CROWD.—FROM A SKETCH BY T. DART WALKER.

The Bettmann Archive

The psychiatrist enters the scene.

sharp break with the past and a genuine advance for women: it was not physically injurious, and it did permit women to have sexual feelings (although only vaginal sensations were believed to be normal for adult women; clitoral sensation was "immature" and "masculine"). But in important ways, the Freudian theory of female nature was in direct continuity with the gynecological view which it replaced. It held that the female personality was inherently defective, this time due to the absence of a penis, rather than to the presence of the domineering uterus. Women were still "sick," and their sickness was still totally predestined by their anatomy.

THE "SICKENING" WOMEN OF THE WORKING CLASS

While doctors were manufacturing ills for affluent women, living conditions in the growing urban slums were making life actually hazardous for poor women. Tenements, which sometimes provided a single privy for dozens of families, were fertile breeding places for typhoid, yellow fever, TB, cholera, and diphtheria. Women who worked outside their homes often put in ten or more hours a day in crowded, poorly ventilated factories or sweat shops, with the constant danger of fatal or disfiguring industrial accidents.